

Friday 18 September 2009 | [Blog Feed](#) | [All feeds](#)

Advertisement



Making fast, faster.
First and only wireless 4G network from a national carrier.



3G/4G Card

Get it now →



[Website of the Telegraph Media Group with breaking news, sport, business, latest UK and world news. Content from the Daily Telegraph and Sunday Telegraph newspapers and video from Telegraph TV.](#)

Enhanced by Google



- [Home](#)
- [News](#)
- [Sport](#)
- [Finance](#)
- [Lifestyle](#)
- [Comment](#)
- [Travel](#)
- [Culture](#)
- [Technology](#)
- [Fashion](#)

- [Jobs](#)
- [Dating](#)
- [Games](#)
- [Offers](#)

- [UK](#)
- [World](#)
- [UK Politics](#)
- [Celebrities](#)
- [Obituaries](#)
- [Weird](#)
- [Earth](#)
- [Science](#)
- [Health News](#)
- [Education](#)
- [Topics](#)
- [News Blogs](#)
- [News Video](#)

[Blogs Home](#) » [News](#) » [James Delingpole](#)

[James Delingpole](#)

James Delingpole is a writer, journalist and broadcaster who is right about everything. He is the author of numerous fantastically entertaining

books including *Welcome To Obamaland: I've Seen Your Future And It Doesn't Work, How To Be Right*, and the Coward series of WWII adventure novels. His website is www.jamesdelingpole.com



'Dark Energy' reminds us: consensus has no place in real science

By [James Delingpole](#) Last updated: August 18th, 2009

[38 Comments](#)

So [Dark Energy might not exist after all](#)? Good. I'm delighted to hear it. Not that I have anything personal against this mysterious substance which until very recently scientists

believed made up three quarters of the universe. (In fact if it does exist, I want some in a jar in my office. It sounds pretty cool).

No, the reason I'm pleased is because it shows the healthy, normal process of science in action.

Dark Energy was invented by cosmologists "to fit Albert Einstein's General Theory of Relativity into reality after modern space telescopes discovered that the Universe was not behaving as it should."

"According to Einstein's work, the speed at which the Universe is expanding following the Big Bang should be slower than it actually is and this unexplained anomaly threatened to turn the whole theory upside down. In order to reconcile this problem the concept of dark energy was invented".

"But now Blake Temple and Joel Smoller, mathematicians at the University of California and the University of Michigan, believe they have come up with a whole new set of calculations that allow for all the sums to add up without the need for this controversial substance."

"The research could change the way astronomers view the composition of our Universe."

Or then again, it might not. Let's just be grateful, shall we, that Temple and Smoller have been free to publish their research, without being vilified by the rest of the scientific community, risking their funding being withdrawn and being described as "dark matter deniers."

As Aussie geology professor Ian Plimer points out in his excellent *Heaven And Earth - global warming: the missing science*, the row over whether Anthropogenic Global Warming does or doesn't exist has led to a widespread public misconception about the process of science. It is not a static belief system but an ongoing learning process.

"Science is married to evidence derived from observation, measurement and experiment. Evidence is fraught with healthy uncertainties and scientists argue about the methods, accuracy and repeatability and veracity of data collection. If the data can be validated, then this body of new evidence awaits explanation. The explanation is called a scientific theory. This scientific theory must be abandoned or modified if the evidence is not repeatable or if the evidence is not coherent with previously validated evidence. With new evidence theories are abandoned or refined. A scientific hypothesis tests a concept by the collection and analysis of evidence. Hypotheses are invalidated by just one item of contrary evidence, no matter how much confirming evidence is present. Science progresses by abandoning theories and

hypotheses and creating new explanations for validated evidence.”

In short, science is not, never has been and never should or can be about “consensus”. There is no consensus on dark matter. Anyone who claims that there is one on climate change or Anthropogenic Global Warming is living on another planet.

Tags: [climate change](#), [dark matter](#)

  Text size  [Share this article](#)  [Print this article](#)
 [Mail this article](#)      Recent Posts

- [Clarkson, the Baronet's granddaughter and a pile of poo](#)
September 18th, 2009 11:40
[55 Comments](#)
- [The lesson of Arnhem and Afghanistan: heroism is no substitute for strategy](#)
September 17th, 2009 12:48
[22 Comments](#)
- [Do the Conservatives think we're all paedophiles too?](#)
September 16th, 2009 13:28
[79 Comments](#)
- [Barack Obama: ACORN's Manchurian Candidate?](#)
September 16th, 2009 10:17
[41 Comments](#)

- [On Plimer, climate change and the ineffable barkingness of George Moonbat](#)
September 15th, 2009 18:40
[21 Comments](#)

COMMENTS

- “In short, science is not, never has been and never should or can be about “consensus”. There is no consensus on dark matter.”

Sort of. There is consensus that Newton was right, to a suitable definition of “right”. Similarly, Einstein was right. Of course, there is plenty of room for investigating in the edges as weird unexplained results turn up. Google “MOND” to see what I mean about “overturning” Newton.

“risking their funding being withdrawn and being described as “dark matter deniers.””

Indeed. The huge quantities of money and political capital injected into climatology are, of course, corrupting. Just as we corrupt third-world countries when we carpet bomb them with aid. How could it be otherwise?

The trouble is that people are unable to see the difference between Science and Scientists. Science is pure, but

Scientists are corruptible. Chuck in a few Creationists to stir up trouble and you've a toxic mix of politics and religion. Ghastly.



kaytie on Aug 18th, 2009 at 2:06 pm

[Report comment](#)

- All very sensible, James. As far as I can tell, from reading widely, scientists have always had two opinions about matters scientific : the public orthodox, upon which their careers depend : and the private, which must be kept concealed, or at least unpublished and unattributed.

And, while we're about it, why not a public declaration that 'the scientific method' is no more than a practical specialised way of studying the world. It is not, and never has been, the indispensable key to all knowledge.



Jamie MacNab on Aug 18th, 2009 at 2:10 pm

[Report comment](#)

- ““the scientific method' is no more than a practical specialised way of studying the world.”

Talk about understatement! As practical methods go, it's

been more than astonishingly successful.



kaytie on Aug 18th, 2009 at 2:18 pm

[Report comment](#)

- I am just now working on Heaven and Earth by Mr. Plimer, having just finished Unstoppable Global Warming Every 1,500 Years by S. Fred Singer and Dennis Avery (recommended by Bry whats-his-face). In the first place, I am convinced that geologic records as well as written history should definitely trump computer models and “consensus.” Secondly, reading those two books alone (along with a glance at their references) destroys the fiction of consensus. And, as Plimer points out, there was “consensus” in the time of Galileo, but Galileo was still the one who was right. Which brings me to my personal viewpoint. The Crowd is almost NEVER right! I was convinced of this by Charles Mackay in his excellent 19th documentary Extraordinary Popular Delusions and the Madness of Crowds.”



Bu on U on Aug 18th, 2009 at 2:27 pm

[Report comment](#)

- A point well made Mr Delingpole.

What I have noticed on the blogs about the new c words Climate Change, nee Global Warming, is how people keep referring to saving the planet, the world, the ecosystem etc.

One of the things which runs through the old religions is this idea of saving and being saved. The jews saved from the Egyptians, Jesus dying to save the world. As the religions matured especially christianity there became a need to “prove” the existence of god, miracles and signs.

The consensus for sure existed in the religions provided you were on the right side.

The new religion is agw belief, they have all the right credentials of a religion, save the planet (I suppose that means also the people on it). Looking for signs, meltwater, thinning ice polar bears, global warming rising sea levels and many more.

Finally calling all those who do not belief Deniers.

Anyone who has a limited understanding of science at the hypothesis stage knows that consensus is meaningless.

Looks like your boy lost against Mr Monbiot?



coldplay on Aug 18th, 2009 at 2:29 pm

[Report comment](#)

- Oh, has the Plimer-Monbiot grudge match taken place? Where can I find an unbiased account of it?



Hamish McGlobbie on Aug 18th, 2009 at 2:42 pm

[Report comment](#)

- Yes, Kaytie, science has been so astonishingly successful that its fruits have poisoned almost the entire planet.

Perhaps it has occurred to you that there might just be something fundamentally wrong with the way we do science (and therefore tchnology).



Jamie MacNab on Aug 18th, 2009 at 2:53 pm

[Report comment](#)

- @Hamish McGlobbie. Don't you worry my Scottish chum. The debate is going ahead. I think. November 12. Provisionally. But the Moonbat has been playing head games, laying on all sorts of conditions and preparing lots of get-out excuses, so I'm not yet holding my breath.



James Delingpole on Aug 18th, 2009 at 3:10 pm

[Report comment](#)

- Jamie,

Would you prefer a world without science or religion, both have poisoned the planet.



geoffthereff on Aug 18th, 2009 at 3:43 pm

[Report comment](#)

- It is clear that “scientists” have taken a well deserved beating over the grant/political driven hoax of manmade global warming.

Just looking at the real geologic record of the planet it is obvious to any reasonable observer that the concept of human civilization surviving another 5,000 years is unlikely regardless of how clever we become. In fact, when the vast majority of the people of the industrialized world would be clueless as to how to kill and prepare a chicken, the more clever we become the less able we are.



Cherokee Kid on Aug 18th, 2009 at 3:50 pm

[Report comment](#)

- “Perhaps it has occurred to you that there might just be something fundamentally wrong with the way we do science.”

Err, no. The “way we do science” is like the “way we do maths”. If you don’t like the truth so discovered, then I suggest you opt out of the modern world. Begin by turning off your computer. Bye!



kaytie on Aug 18th, 2009 at 4:00 pm

[Report comment](#)

- Geoffthereff,
People have also “poisoned the planet”. Would you like a world without people? Come to think of it, *you* have probably also poisoned the planet ...



hapax on Aug 18th, 2009 at 4:04 pm

[Report comment](#)

- Kaytie, there is a fundamental difference between mathematics and science. In mathematics a statement can be proven true using some fundamental methods like

direct proof, proof by induction or proof by contradiction. In science a theorem can only be demonstrated to be false. Until the theorem is proven wrong on the basis of evidence, it is the working hypothesis and the search continues for anomalies.

That is the problem with global warming theory and the intersection of public policy.



tad on Aug 18th, 2009 at 4:24 pm

[Report comment](#)

- Kaytee, I am not saying that science does not discover truths. But partial truths can be dangerous, particularly if some of those parts contain fallacies.

As you reflect on the growth of human knowledge, from the earliest times, do you really imagine that our descendants will still be doing the same kind of science as us - in, say, ten-thousand years time? It seems to me that entirely new and better methods and explanations will be on offer then. Perhaps we will be implementing science in far less destructive ways.



Jamie MacNab on Aug 18th, 2009 at 4:47 pm

[Report comment](#)

- You're mostly right, except for your primary point. Consensus does have a place in Science, and the majority of scientists in the majority of sciences do it fine. We have an idea, prove it to work in every situation we try, work on the assumption that it's true, prove it wrong, reform our understanding, prove it to work in every situation we try, work on the assumption that it's true, etc etc. It's a constant cycle of proving thing definitely wrong, but never proving anything definitely right.

Consensus though, isn't actually "science", science isn't anything (the application of common sense to measurable values), consensus is an attribute of the current system of peer review which will hopefully be heavily reformed in the next century. For one thing, areas like computing are increasingly taking up non-peer review, where ideological assumptions (not present in physics, hence the need for change) are challenged in the forming on conclusion.

This also needs to be adopted in psychology and social sciences where at this time assumptions about leftism being correct (common in sociology) greatly affect conclusions to research, and the conservatives lack of scientific understanding often leaves them in very unnecessary leftist positions.

For example, the incorrect relationships that go unchallenged about ADHD despite there being a far lower percentage of individuals with actual psychological condition than those being diagnosed because of a statistical relationship and the typically liberal assumption that this makes them “mentally challenged” when it’s just a personality trait. The same can be said about the research related to families and children that made big news earlier in the year, where despite the very non-partisan research, the conclusions were all leftist assumptions about the “need” for woman to put there work first, so the government had to get involved. The conservatives should have applied rationality to a proper conclusion that expressed the need for social and family responsibility, but they take the assumption that “science” is correct.

This comes again from the fact that “science” isn’t anything, and people have again failed to get over the raising of science to the state of idol, and comprehended it enough to separate fact and conclusion. This of course isn’t helped by the appearance of popular scientists who make us all look arrogant. I know why Richard Dawkins is heavy handed in his so-called logic and about his hardships in confronting irrationality as an evolutionary biologist and as a public figure for it, but he does nothing for human-kind when he separates scientists into an “Us

and Them”.

And, not I'm, ranting, apologies. Needless to say, yes, the debate is never over, should always continue, science is not about fact, it's about proving everything wrong. Also, even if global warming is right, in what way is socialism the answer? Why do we turn to socialism for everything nowadays? If the people want global warming change, they'll show it in purchasing power, and companies will be forced to be more environmentally friendly, and then you'll have far less people doubting it, because doubt comes from government intervention, when people don't teach each other socially but through state force.



James on Aug 18th, 2009 at 4:59 pm

[Report comment](#)

- Thomas Kuhn has shown how a consensus arises in scientific disciplines and this he called a paradigm. He goes on to show how when aspects of the paradigm are found wanting a revolutionary period arises with some defending the existing paradigm and others challenging it. If the challengers win (because their initially tentative theoretical ideas prove to be richer in explaining currently known phenomena and in offering new tests of theory) a new paradigm emerges.

Science is not a process that progresses in solely logical steps. The sociology and psychology of its practitioners need to be understood too.



Pragmatist on Aug 18th, 2009 at 5:27 pm

[Report comment](#)

- “do you really imagine that our descendants will still be doing the same kind of science as us - in, say, ten-thousand years time?”

Yes, I do. The scientific method isn't affected discoveries.

“It seems to me that entirely new and better methods and explanations will be on offer then.”

I'm getting the feeling that you're confusing “science” with scientific discoveries or technologies. Science is the method of making discoveries. It's been around for hundreds of years. If an endeavour doesn't have the essential characteristics of the method (e.g. repeatability, predictability) then it isn't science. That's why religion and philosophy are not branches of science.



kaytie on Aug 18th, 2009 at 5:27 pm

[Report comment](#)

- @James. Point taken - I agree things are more subtle than stated in my blog. (Aren't they always). But I think we can all agree with my fundamental point: the "Consensus" on "global warming" is no such thing - and the very idea that there is one is dangerous to the causes of empiricism, knowledge and rational debate.



James Delingpole on Aug 18th, 2009 at 5:29 pm

[Report comment](#)

- James-
I follow your arguments with interest and will discuss other salient points later.
I take issue with commercial driven resolution to common issues. People will in the current moral climate look after themselves before considering other aspects. Thus the majority will take the cheapest and easiest not the most moral option. Good governance includes encouraging good behaviour.
Without doubt the making of it more financially viable to "live in sin" has reduced marriage and family life, with all the evils that attend.
RSVP



unsuprised on Aug 18th, 2009 at 5:31 pm

[Report comment](#)

- @James Delingpole: Oh yeah, I never actually got around to making that point. While consensus is important, there isn't one on global warming (right or wrong) and I take offense to the intentional, obvious and widespread silencing of dissenting voices, it's not the way democracy or science should be handled.

I'm still undecided (though I support obviously the need to not have the government/EU/UN intervene), but I will always have a tendency to support the dissent for as long as it is silenced in the name of the arguments being "over". It's never over.

@unsuprised: Perhaps, but I can't bring myself to wield the moral authority to support your comments. I support the Enoch Powell style of dissent, where one cannot address things purely in personal terms when it comes to discussing the will of the nation. It is totalitarianism for a Government to intentionally change or form social opinion; while good governance sets an example, intervention reduces freedom of choice. If the general population wants to destroy the world, I have to trust that it is their right to choose. Of course, I will influence them

socially, I support all pressure groups that have attempted to change public opinion (woman's rights) but not ones that have sought to force through public opinion via government (modern "racial" movements/affirmative action).

Also, as a conservative I believe in social responsibility, and history shows me that it has become lessened by government intervention. In reality, with the state not there to back them up, and with the issue of climate change forced upon them by science, and not state, people are far more likely to take the "moral option". You only have to look at the huge industry of (meaningless) carbon credits as pushed by Al Gore, and the comments of fair trade consumers (who say, "it's for a good cause") to know that you are wrong, and liberty breeds the kind of socially responsible nationalism that could actually bring about real change to real issues that people care about.



James on Aug 18th, 2009 at 5:47 pm

[Report comment](#)

- Speaking of Dark Energy, Mr. Delingpole, I hear you're going into the belly of the beast and appearing on "Any Questions" on Friday! The very best of luck in that nest of leftie viper. Give 'em what for!



Wargs on Aug 18th, 2009 at 6:00 pm

[Report comment](#)

- James Delingpole,

I'm not a physicist, but didn't the variable speed of light theory (i.e., light was faster soon after the Big Bang) obviate the need for Dark Energy?

And Pragmatist has cited Thomas Kuhn about scientific consensus and paradigms. But I think your points about there not being the consensus on global warming is a good one and more generally about consensus doesn't mean anything if it can be demonstrated to be wrong. There are always problems of egos getting in the way in science, and that is in the short term important but in the long term not very important. I think ego can explain what is going on with global warming and them importance/implications of climate change.



tad on Aug 18th, 2009 at 6:00 pm

[Report comment](#)

- James- it is off topic- I look forward to a discussion when opportunity offers.

JD's main thrust is justified- the terminology, science, and evidence in regard to mans impact on the planet are being slighted and distorted to political and financial ends.

The result will be a backlash and total repudiation of the declared (beneficial)as oposed to real aims. However science and scientists will recover (they have from previous notorious events). It will be a sad day when an FRS is treated with the same level of belief in integrity as a politician.

Basic science says that if it looks like a duck, sounds like a duck and walks like a duck- for the moment, until someone proves different we will hypothosise it is indeed a duck. CC or GW looks like BS, sounds like BS and.....



unsuprised on Aug 18th, 2009 at 6:32 pm

[Report comment](#)

- “consensus has no place in real science”

Absolutely right, unfortunately when there are massive political and commercial vested interests, that staement goes right out of the window.

Laydeeeeeez an' Gennnnermennn, I give yewww,

Manmade Global Warming as prime example wher the “consensus” is now effectively a religion where to disbelieve is to be seen as an heretic, an outcast to be ridiculed at best and totally destroyed at worst.

The new religion is condemning the third world to a “low carbon” hell to make first world smug “liberals” and mentalenvironists feel good and bolster their bloated egos to the proles.

The “consensus” on AGW is anything but, but the conspiracy of silence and collusion by the media and other “vested interests” is the most disconceting. Meanwhile AL BORE gets fabulously wealthy on the backs of all of those “feel good but do bugger all” Carbon Credits.

As for “Dark Energy” the darkest energy is that being expended by Comrade McBrown and his coterie of 6th form Marxists turning the once-UK into the worlds largest offshore CCTV infested, Id-slave-carded, databased, Open Prison.



jerzed on Aug 18th, 2009 at 6:40 pm

[Report comment](#)

- *”Anyone who claims that there is one on climate change*

or Anthropogenic Global Warming is living on another planet.”

Or has a political or financial stake in making the rest of the population believe in the nonsense.

The financial stake: How much has Al Gore made on it? How much more does he stand to make on it? What will be the profit for Goldman Sachs, who owns part of the carbon-offset exchange being created? Who else profits from the future carbon-offset system?

The political stake: Cap and trade in the U.S. will further impoverish the poor, and wipe out many small business and much of the middle class. The main proponent of the bill, Nancy Pelosi admits it will have no actual effort on global warming, but is only to “set a good example.” No one puts such an onerous burden on consumers and business, a burden that will wipe out many, when it does nothing towards the supposed goal – stop global warming, unless the real goals are something else.

As I said above, someone profits from the resultant carbon offsets system, In terms of political goals: further impoverishment of the poor and wiping out many small business and much of the middle class creates more poor people who would be assumed to vote Democratic and who will have to look more to government for services.

The bill's proponents may also include the utopians who want to roll back as much industrialization as possible as they think people should live in a pre-Industrial society. (They of course have enough money so they will continue to be able to live well whether business flourishes or not.) The most malignant aspect of the bill is that the public will never realize a massive tax on them has been levied. The bill puts a tax on utilities, who will have to raise their prices, and therefore home electricity costs will be higher and the cost of all goods and services (since in one way or another, they all use electricity) will be higher – and the public will blame the utilities and the producers of goods and services, never realizing that it is a government tax – for no good reason - from a president who promised no tax increases on the poor or middle class.

Unfortunately Michael Jackson died the day after cap and trade passed in the House and all news coverage went to his death. Most of the American public has no idea about the pernicious – no, that's not a strong enough word, this evil bill that is pending in the Senate.

So *"anyone who claims that there is one on climate change or Anthropogenic Global Warming is living on another planet"* may not be a correct statement. They may well live on this planet and have ulterior motive for claiming scientific consensus on climate change and

global warming.

Re scientific consensus. Man-caused global warming is a theory based on unreliable (and in some cases, proven wrong) historical temperature readings and computer models. The models vary by several hundred percent in their projections. A several hundred percent variation is hardly consensus. Using computer models for projections a hundred years out is insanity when computer models cannot reliably project weather a month out. This is idiocy imposed on us by those with ulterior motives.



msher1 on Aug 18th, 2009 at 7:31 pm

[Report comment](#)

- I've just read this article on MNSBC: NASA sets schedule for handling asteroid threat.(this is the link:<http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/9871982>)
Why don't governments start a huge worldwide project to preserve humankind? This may sound insane for many people but it is more insane to keep on waiting until an asteroid causes our extinction. The worst scenario is a massive asteroid hitting our planet causing enormous tsunamis to wipe out entire cities, dust would block the atmosphere, preventing the earth from getting any sun. Plant life would become extinct, and a nuclear winter

would begin .Maybe a deadly impact is unlikely to happen soon but we cannot put at risk our existence in the hope that a megadisaster will never happen. This is no joke. We have to build underground cities (nuclear powered - artificial light to keep plants growing to provide food and oxygen, etc.). A HUMAN PRESERVATION PROJECT must be initiated.



jesusbeteta on Aug 18th, 2009 at 8:15 pm

[Report comment](#)

- Well, well! This is precisely the argument that I've been boring/infuriating/disappointing (even! Can you believe it?) for I don't know how long.

Trying to stifle dissent is heresiatic persecution ; pure and simple.

But there, as many have pointed out before, this ... this ... whatever the hell it's called this week, IS a new religion, isn't it?

As Chesterton said : ” When men cease to believe in God, they do not believe in nothing, they believe in anything.”

What a brilliantly concise depiction of these latterday

Flagellants, who go about in designer sackcloth and perfumed ashes, weeping and gnashing their teeth ; tearing their hair and ripping their rabbit!

These same fanatics who, given their way, would scourge us all with whips and scorpions for our depraved and profligate lifestyle.

For are we not the seed of the Whore of Babylon, when any fule can see that we're doomed to roast. If not in this world, then certainly in the next.

Hell is being nagged at by autolatrous, pompous, faux-virtuous votaries of The Church of ... of ... hell, what's it called now?

Hmm .. metaphorically, that's exactly what they do, isn't it?

” I'm right, and you're wrong!” ain't science.



Ariel on Aug 18th, 2009 at 8:17 pm

[Report comment](#)

- Oops!

Just pretend that this ‘ Hmm .. metaphorically, that's

exactly what they do, isn't it? comes after 'If not in this world, then certainly in the next.'

Sorry about that.

It's this global warming ; plays hell with your fingers!



Ariel on Aug 18th, 2009 at 8:22 pm

[Report comment](#)

- At that sort of level Science becomes an act of faith, you cannot prove or disprove the existence of dark matter we don't have the instruments and never will have. Its like the existence of god really.



swatantra on Aug 18th, 2009 at 8:44 pm

[Report comment](#)

- @Wargs. I can't pretend that I'm not totally bricking it. But at least the audience at the Museum of Army Flying in Middle Wallop ought to be marginally more sympathetic than the card-carrying libtards who gave me such a walloping one infamous year at Hay on Wye. (And I adore Hay on Wye, that's the sadness)



James Delingpole on Aug 18th, 2009 at 9:01 pm

[Report comment](#)

- ” A HUMAN PRESERVATION PROJECT must be initiated.”

Why?



Cherokee Kid on Aug 18th, 2009 at 10:19 pm

[Report comment](#)

- If Temple and Smoller are correct, it means that WE are at the center of the universe!



Caroline the Cat on Aug 18th, 2009 at 11:27 pm

[Report comment](#)

- Well James. a more or less full-house of agreeable comments.

As someone earlier so succinctly put it, we must wait for the ‘6th Form Marxists’ to get out of bed and onto their employers computers, before you experience any dissent. Strangely, the AGW zealots are an eclectic crowd. Mostly they can be identified as lefties, but circling round them

like a pack of wolves, are the Al Gores and his swindlers on Wall St.

If it was not so serious, it would be hilarious. Here we have a pseudo-religious belief, largely promulgated by socialists, being high-jacked by cynical capitalists, who have discovered how to make a quick fortune out of the gullible, liberal lambs.

Carbon trading, windmills, stealth taxes, moral pomposity, lower middle class self-hating - it's all there to illustrate clearly the ridiculous notion of man-made climate change. But the naked emperor marches on!



proximus sen Tory on Aug 19th, 2009 at 3:49 am

[Report comment](#)

- As a subscriber to the highly specific anthropic principle (courtesy of one Terry Pratchett)I thought I was the center of the Universe. It was all created for my enjoyment. As for physics I am now certain that they are now making it up as they go along after one too many beers at the pub. It would be very improbable that we lie anywhere close to the Universes center.



crownarmourer on Aug 19th, 2009 at 4:41 am

[Report comment](#)

- I agree very much with what the author of the above article is saying. Oh what a surprise scientists might be wrong about their theory of yet another undiscovered and eventually proven to be non-existent particle. Where is the graviton or the magnetic monopole. Also the soon to be undiscovered Higgs Boson. Quantum mechanics enthusiasts don't like to mention the failures of Quantum Mechanics. As an alternative to Quantum Theory there is a new theory that describes and explains the mysteries of physical reality. While not disrespecting the value of Quantum Mechanics as a tool to explain the role of quanta in our universe. This theory states that there is also a classical explanation for the paradoxes such as EPR and the Wave-Particle Duality. The Theory is called the Theory of Super Relativity and is located at: [Super Relativity](#)

This theory is a philosophical attempt to reconnect the physical universe to realism and deterministic concepts. It explains the mysterious.



Mark on Aug 19th, 2009 at 2:37 pm

[Report comment](#)

- Parlez vous Delingpole? If not, then I should say that “bricking it” means “scared”, and a “libtard” is a “liberal

retard” (not one of those things James wears in the gym).



Clothilde Simon on Aug 19th, 2009 at 4:55 pm

[Report comment](#)

- “marginally more sympathetic than the card-carrying libtards who gave me such a walloping one infamous year at Hay on Wye”. James Delingpole.

The audience were indeed stacked against you. Sorry to reheat this evening but at least it gave the listener a rare chance to hear Carry On style smut on Any Questions. Mr Delingpole had mentioned knowing Alain De Botton earlier on and later mentioned a health issue, a ‘bottom problem’. The chair suavely interjected, “Is that an ‘Alain De Bottom’ problem?”

Well, it’s the way Dimbleby tells ‘em.



markramsden on Aug 19th, 2009 at 7:02 pm

[Report comment](#)

- DE was invented to account for the observed(measured) accelerated expansion of space.
Likewise DM was invented to account for the

observed(measured) anomalous high rotation speeds of galactic stars. DM and DE are only obvious inventions, and surly that cannot be considered the last word in science. The problem is, most of the scientific world have started believing in this stuff can only be real. And a lot of them actually make a living out of this stuff and therefore naturally have faith in it. But there are other alternatives like MOND which accounts well with observations. The only trouble with MOND is it is empirical, with no underlying concept behind it. Like wise, Newton's gravitational law can be considered empirical too, because it lacks a physical concept.

Einstein's gravity concept is much superior, but again it cannot explain things like the static Weight problem or Mass and Inertia.

I have a very powerful but simple concept in mind that can explain all the problems mentioned above. It is so simple but not new that many will find hard to believe. The concept is to believe in the existence of an additional ultra large closed spatial dimension. With this, DE and DM are banished forever. MOND itself is now modified and becomes more important. Of course now it all becomes the search for evidence of the extra dimension. At least the formulas I derive are all simple and plain, that is a scientific virtue.

For more check my website:

http://cosmicdarkmatter.com/Newtonian_Dynamics.html



ktperera on Aug 25th, 2009 at 9:23 pm

[Report comment](#)

OUR NEWS BLOGS

- [Celebrities](#)
- [Defence](#)
- [Education](#)
- [Pictures](#)
- [Politics](#)
- [Religion](#)
- [UK](#)
- [World](#)

Advertisement

News Tags

[Abdelbaset Ali al-Megrahi](#) [afghanistan](#) [al-Qaeda](#) [Alistair Darling](#) [Archbishop Vincent Nichols](#) [Barack](#)

[Obama](#) [BBC](#) [BBC bias](#) [china](#) [climate change](#) [Conservative Party](#) [Conservatives](#) [David Cameron](#) [david miliband](#) [eu](#) [George Osborne](#) [global warming](#) [gordon brown](#) [Guardian](#) [Hillary Clinton](#) [immigration](#) [India](#) [Iran](#) [Islam](#) [Israel](#) [Jews](#) [labour](#) [Libya](#) [Lockerbie](#) [michael jackson](#) [MPs' expenses](#) [NHS](#) [Norwich North](#) [Obama](#) [Peter Mandelson](#) [Pope Benedict XVI](#) [President Barack Obama](#) [racism](#) [swine flu](#) [Taliban](#) [terrorism](#) [The Guardian](#) [tony blair](#) [Tories](#) [twitter](#)

ON THE NEWS BLOG

- [Democrats are heading for a fall](#)
- [Brussels lobbyists pile into the Irish referendum campaign](#)
- [In rebuking Israel and letting Hamas off the hook, the UN's Goldstone Report is a gift to world terrorism](#)
- [Barack Obama: President Pantywaist restores the satellite states to their former owner](#)
- [Pro-life Catholics have a message for President Barack Obama...](#)

News bloggers

- [Adrian Michaels](#)
- [Alex Singleton](#)
- [Alex Spillius](#)
- [Andrew Gimson](#)
- [Andrew M Brown](#)
- [Ben Leapman](#)
- [Benedict Brogan](#)
- [Henry Samuel](#)
- [India Lenon](#)
- [James Delingpole](#)
- [James Kirkup](#)
- [Janet Daley](#)
- [Jonathan Wynne-Jones](#)
- [Julian Kossoff](#)

- [Bruno Waterfield](#)
- [Bryony Gordon](#)
- [Ceri Radford](#)
- [Christopher Hope](#)
- [Con Coughlin](#)
- [Damian Thompson](#)
- [Damien McElroy](#)
- [Daniel Hannan](#)
- [David Hughes](#)
- [David Lindsay](#)
- [Dean Nelson](#)
- [Ed West](#)
- [Geoffrey Lean](#)
- [George Pitcher](#)
- [Gerald Warner](#)
- [Harry Miller](#)
- [Malcolm Moore](#)
- [Matthew Moore](#)
- [Melissa Whitworth](#)
- [Michael Deacon](#)
- [Nile Gardiner](#)
- [Patrick Hennessy](#)
- [Peter Foster](#)
- [Peter Wedderburn](#)
- [Peter Whittle](#)
- [Philip Johnston](#)
- [Rachel Marsden](#)
- [Richard Preston](#)
- [Richard Spencer](#)
- [Robert Colvile](#)
- [Sarah Marcus](#)
- [Stephanie Gutmann](#)
- [The Cartoon Blog](#)
- [Tim Collard](#)
- [Toby Harnden](#)
- [Will Heaven](#)

Advertisement

Advertisement



Advertisement



[Back to top](#)

Hot topics

- [The State of Europe](#)
- [Football](#)
- [London Fashion Week](#)
- [Frankfurt Motor Show](#)
- [Strictly Come Dancing](#)
- [Shop Awards](#)

- [News](#)
- [UK News](#)
- [World News](#)
- [Obituaries](#)

- [Travel](#)

- [Health](#)
- [Jobs](#)

- [Sport](#)
- [US Open](#)
- [Football](#)
- [Formula 1](#)

- [Culture](#)

- [Motoring](#)
- [Dating](#)

- [Finance](#)
- [Personal Finance](#)
- [Markets](#)
- [Economics](#)

- [Fashion](#)

- [Property](#)
- [Games](#)

- [Comment](#)
- [Letters](#)
- [My Telegraph](#)
- [Blogs](#)

- [Technology](#)

- [Gardening](#)
- [Offers](#)

- [Contact Us](#)
- [Privacy Policy](#)
- [Advertising](#)
- [A to Z](#)

- [Announcements](#)
- [Marketplace](#)

- [Promotions](#)
- [RSS feeds](#)
- [Widgets](#)
- [Mobile](#)
- [Epaper](#)

- [Reader Prints](#)
- [Subscribe](#)
- [Syndication](#)

© Copyright of Telegraph Media Group Limited 2009

[Terms and Conditions](#)

[Today's News](#)

[Archive](#)

[Style Book](#)

[Weather Forecast](#)