



Written by [James Murphy](#) on October 24, 2023

Scientists Refute Paper Calling for Censorship in Climate Science

Two scientists from the University of Algarve in Portugal have produced a document that brings into question several assumptions in the “greenhouse gas hypothesis,” which is integral to the climate cult’s claim that mankind’s emissions of greenhouse gasses from our use of fossil fuels is leading to out-of-control global warming.

In their scientific [editorial comment](#) titled “On Earth System Dynamics’ ‘Greenhouse Effect’ Editorial,” chemist and mathematician Igor Khmelinskii and chemical thermodynamicist Leslie V. Woodcock cite several reasons why, in their opinion, the entire theory that carbon dioxide is leading to out-of-control global warming lacks foundation and that any effect that the gas might have on the planet is negligible at best.



Jian Fan/iStock/Getty Images Plus

Khmelinskii and Woodcock set out to refute an editorial [article](#) in the climate journal *Earth Systems Dynamics*, which insists that any theory that posits global warming might be caused by anything other than greenhouse gasses should be summarily dismissed and not be allowed to enter the peer-review process.

Khmelinskii and Woodcock’s refutation of that article begins with its title: “Editorial: Global warming is due to an enhanced greenhouse effect, and anthropogenic heat emissions currently play a negligible role at the global scale.”

“The headline title ... makes two scientifically incorrect assertions: (i) that the greenhouse-gas hypothesis, i.e., cause of global warming by ~1K in 1950-2020, is an established scientific truth, and (ii) that heat emissions from global fuel combustion are, by comparison, negligible,” Khmelinskii and Woodcock write. “Both statements are inconsistent with, and illustrate editorial ignorance of, the laws of classical thermodynamics, of the limitations of the Earth’s global energy budget multivariate computer models, and of the known absorption and emission spectroscopy of carbon dioxide (CO₂).”

“[Khmelinskii and Woodcock] are saying that the idea that CO₂ is driving present warming has not been established and confirmed through experimentation, as is the standard practice following the scientific method,” Dr. H. Sterling Burnett, the Director of the Heartland Institute’s Arthur B. Robinson Center on Climate and Environmental Policy, told *The New American*. “In short, it is not a fact. It was instead, ‘established’ through consensus, which isn’t scientific, it’s proof by voting or proclamation.”

Or, as Khmelinskii and Woodcock put it, “Scientific knowledge cannot be established by consensus politics. We question the wisdom of a policy of rejecting articles that may disparage the greenhouse-gas



hypothesis.”

The climate cult would have the scientists of the world ignore the scientific method and instead use consensus as a means for determining truth. Such a method of determining truth would have robbed us of some significant scientific discoveries through the years.

“By this criterion of science by consensus, [the] 1543-AD publication of Nicholas Copernicus’s research article, that disputed the prevailing consensus of the Ptolemaic hypothesis of a static Earth system, would have been rejected by Copernicus Publications,” Khmelinskii and Woodcock pointed out.

Khmelinskii and Woodcock cite some clear problems with the theory that CO₂ is largely responsible for the Earth’s alleged warming.

“In fact, the absorption of IR radiation by the mole fraction [of CO₂] in air (= 0.0004) is completely negligible compared to conduction and convection from surfaces within the greenhouse irradiated by sunlight, and also compared to water mole fraction [H₂O], 20 times,” the article states. “Hence the term ‘greenhouse effect’ is not relevant for the theory of global warming from 1950-2023. Therefore, the editorial headline, ‘Global warming is due to an enhanced greenhouse effect’ [1] is deceptive.”

The second part of the headline in *Earth Systems Dynamics*, in Khmelinskii and Woodcock’s estimation, is also wrong.

“The second headline statement ‘anthropogenic heat emissions currently play a negligible role at the global scale’ can also be dismissed as untrue simply by applying the first law of thermodynamics to the total enthalpy output,” the authors state.

Khmelinskii and Woodcock argue that it’s impossible for carbon dioxide to create the amount of warming that the IPCC and the climate cult ascribe to the undervalued and demonized gas. According to the authors, since CO₂ can only absorb a fraction of all radiation in the IR bands it affects, at most it could be responsible for just a 0.015°C surface temperature change — not the 1.5°C that the climate cult blames on it.

“This effect would not even be measurable,” the scientists declare.

But the supposed scientific journal *Earth System Dynamics* would, apparently, prefer that anything that disputes the global warming/climate change “consensus” not be challenged with facts and research that run counter to that consensus. Such a stance is the furthest thing from science — it’s political and it’s wrong.



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



[Subscribe](#)

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.