

To my own eyes there does appear to be some similarity



Afterword for concerned environmental experts

There are two concerns which may usefully be unpicked here.

Firstly, the preceding chapter may appear to be suggesting that mercury pollution is a good thing or at least not causing any harm in terms of reduced IQ. In reality, if mercury pollution is acting as an antiinnatia factor, then it would be doing so in a much cruder way (being a simple element) than the complex of antiinnatia genes specially selected for advantageousness. It would be expected to be causing advantageous innatons to be suppressed. These are likely to include innate senses of beauty, common-sense, wisdom, relationship skills, parenting skills, judgement of how best to practically manage the tackling of problems lacking neat logical “IQ-type” solutions, and so on. It can hardly be claimed that our current times are notable for the greatest-ever wisdom, artistic excellence, civil harmony, or family harmony. On the contrary, divorce has greatly increased along with the increasing IQ and with public notices telling people how they should behave when they should already know how to. People born at the height of the Lynn-Flynn effect could be analogised as like computers with the fastest processors but lacking (“innate”) hardware graphics acceleration or multimedia hardware extensions – excellent for abstract processing but not better for most real-world practical use. I strongly suspect that the steep decline in intellectual standards has been caused by the same atmospheric mercury.

Secondly, environmental experts might be concerned that if official experts in medicine are shown to be charlatans, that might seem to support those who claim that the official expertise about climate change (global warming) is also charlatanic. I do not think that inference should be made. Social conditions in different fields can be very different. I am not sure whether climate students get trained at “Climate Schools” funded by a climate industry, let alone one as corrupted as the illness industry (Götzsche, 2013). They probably don’t apply for “Climate School” in the first place on a motivation of getting into a prestigious highly-paid profession. Their courses may not involve so much mindless parrot-memorising. On becoming professionals they may not become subject to a reign of terror equivalent of threatened de-licencing by the kangaroo court of a “General Climate Council”. And not least, the established huge corporate interests (aviation industry, motor industry, oil industry, travel industry) may be mostly minded to oppose the global warming theory rather than support it.

In any case, there are important other reasons for not so sloppily wasting the planet's irreplaceable capital of fossil fuels created over millions of years.

Particularly questionable in this connection is the notion that the exposure of some emails revealed proof of a "ClimateGate" conspiracy of climate scientists to deceive the public. This notion appears to have been thoroughly debunked by bloggers such this one linked here:

Comment 22 at <http://www.skepticalscience.com/Mikes-Nature-trick-hide-the-decline.htm>

"scaddenp at 11:12 AM on 27 October, 2013

Ironbark, if your impression of climategate emails is based on solely on emails as reported by the misinformation crew, then you are missing some interesting information – like how the misinformation/ disinformation sites manipulate you. You might want to check out about..." [see internet for continuation]

If that rubbish is the best(worst) the "ClimateGate" allegations can find in thousands of emails going back a decade, that looks to me like evidence that there hasn't been any deception rather than that there has.

Nevertheless, a fact of some climate "skeptics" being wrong would still not prove that the climatologists were competent themselves. And maybe those experts are all corrupted by a powerful lobby of some "climate change industry" promoting profitable carbon storage and a gravy-train of further research into an allegedly serious problem that possibly doesn't really exist anyway.

But I am no expert on the subject and am not intending to pretend to be one here by siding with one or other side. You would be better advised to get your information from those who at least claim to be. I recommend checking out the various viewpoints for yourself, not least via the internet. Also many informative charts may be found at www.climate4you.com. They may or may not be a load of rubbish.

There's no substitute for carefully studying the science. Watching propaganda films is an especially bad way of trying to inform yourself. Your time would be better spent looking at some charts, blogs, and books, *about the science*. (Though some science films are very good.)

~