

# THE DEATH OF REALTY (2012 edition)

## by Lawrence Dawson

### The Nobel Prize in Chemistry 1995

The **Nobel Prize** in Chemistry 1995 was awarded jointly to Paul J. Crutzen, Mario J. Molina and F. Sherwood **Rowland** "for their work in atmospheric chemistry, ...

### FORWARD TO 2012 EDITION

When this book was first issued in the last decade of the last century it was considered by some to be a political polemic; as a tool to further favored political causes. If this were true, why reissue the book in 2012 when those causes are now stone cold? It is being reissued precisely because the political issues covered in the book are "stone cold." Now, the larger purpose of the *Death of Reality* might be considered objectively. This book was never about politics. It was about the way that the infusion of our culture by the social-linguistic philosophy of Ludwig Wittgenstein had allowed a political movement to reinvent reality. In the mid '90's, political passions were too close to the issues chosen to exemplify the corruption and the book had to oppose a counter-tide of political prejudices. Since most of those issues have cooled in 2012, that tide of political prejudice has receded allowing a more reasoned examination of the issues.

The issue is even more critical in our day, because the practice of Wittgensteinianism threatens to undermine science itself. Our culture does not recognize that fact. In 1995, F.S. Rowland shared the Nobel Prize in Chemistry for a mathematical hypothesis which alleged that chlorine oxides such as those contained in the refrigerant freon threatened atmospheric ozone. Environmentalists at the time were seeking the banning of freon and were using Rowland's hypothesis towards that end. However, by objective scientific standards, Rowland's hypothesis had been disproved through experimentation. Nonetheless, Rowland received the Nobel because none of the contradictory experiments could or would be reported in the scientific press. It could only be reported in "alternative" scientific journals unrecognized by academic science. Any opposition to Rowland's hypothesis, even from science itself, was seen as "anti-environmentalist." That may no longer be true as environmentalists have gone on to a new "issue du jour" in man-made global warming.

In retrospect, we can now reexamine the Rowland fiasco, outside the pressure of political passions, and see what threat it might place upon the factual practice of science. It shows a willingness to impose artificial socially-constructed reality in place of the scientific method. It is an application of Wittgenstein's thesis that we cannot know objective reality as all our concepts of reality are socially generated. Wittgenstein simply cannot coexist with objective science.

That *The Death of Reality* is actually a critique of Wittgenstein's social linguistics and not a political polemic was acknowledged in the pages of the British journal *Philosophy Now*, in 2003. The thesis of the book was attacked by Professor Anthony Flew who was a graduate student under one of Wittgenstein's disciples, Gilbert Ryle, and who had been "privileged to have studied *The Blue Book* and *The Brown Book* in typescript before the publication of [Wittgenstein's] *Philosophical Investigations*." \* Flew is one of the last living academics with a direct connection to Wittgenstein himself. His defense of Wittgenstein's

commitment to objective reality falls well short of the mark. If anything, his article shows the confusion which Wittgensteinian thought can impose upon an otherwise fine mind.

• "The Death of Reality by Lawrence Dawson; Anthony Flew scorns Lawrence Dawson's attack on Wittgenstein"; Philosophy Now, Issue 39, December 2002/January 2003

EXCERPT FROM CHAPTER 1 OF "The Death of Reality"

## **Suppressing Science by Social Unreality: the Case of Ozone**

That there is a Politics of Unreality abroad in the land is easy enough to prove. It is apparent, for example, in the environmental movement. Draconian regulations ultimately banning the use of freon in refrigeration have been forged at a huge social cost, especially to the poor. It is alleged that escaping freon from refrigeration units is destroying a stratospheric ozone layer. It is said that this ozone layer protects us from high frequency ultraviolet radiation from the sun, and that if it is lost we will be subjected to massive increases in skin cancer and other radiologically-induced disorders. This is presented as a "collective threat," and it is claimed that the "selfish wills" of individuals to keep their personal comfort must be surrendered to the "good of the whole." This socialist idea is ALWAYS present in environmentalist claims, specifically that individual freedom of action must surrender to the "good of the whole."

The ozone scare is especially poignant because, as we shall see, it clearly illustrates that appreciation of scientifically determined objective reality can be replaced by what might be termed "politically generated formula thought."

The belief that stratospheric ozone is threatened by organic chlorine compounds (CFCs), such as freon, has been accepted as "truth" by both the media and the politicians. Further, it is alleged that unless something is done about human destruction of the ozone layer a new plague will strike the earth. On November 4 of 1991, Newsweek told its readers, "In April the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency announced...more cases of UV-induced cancer— an extra 12 million cancer cases among Americans over the next 50 years." In February of that same year, USA Today told the nation that a report from the United Nations Environment Program predicted serious health effects from ozone depletion. The newspaper approvingly quoted a Greenpeace spokeswoman as saying that "Ozone depletion is now so serious...that it now amounts to a threat to the future of all life on earth."

What are the scientific facts supporting these dire predictions? We find out there are no "facts" as such. We find that the very idea of ozone depletion was politically generated, that the alleged "cause" of this depletion has been changed to fit political needs of the moment, and that scientists have had research projects shutdown to prevent their results from contradicting the belief in "ozone depletion." In short, "atmospheric ozone depletion" was a politically-generated formula not a factual discovery.

The nature and history of the "ozone scare" has been outlined by Dr. Edward Krug in his newsletter Environment Betrayed. Krug is probably the nation's premier environmental scientist currently debunking green pseudoscience. In that capacity, he has appeared on the op-ed pages of the Wall Street Journal and on the CBS television program 60 Minutes. He has identified the origins of the "ozone scare," and it wasn't some relatively obscure scientist making a lonely discovery.

The "ozone scare" began as a tactic invented by the environmentalist movement to stop production of the supersonic transport plane (SST) being contemplated in the early '70's.

The SST was made the alleged "threat" to the stratospheric ozone layer. First, it was said that water vapor in the plane's contrail would decompose to hydroxyl and deplete the ozone layer. When this didn't create the desired public reaction, a second SST "threat" to the ozone layer was invented. Water was simply too "natural" to make a good heavy in this eco-fiction. Krug states, "The preconceived conclusion that SSTs are 'bad' was retained and the SST water vapor bogey man was replaced. The excuse this time— oxides of nitrogen emitted by high flying SSTs will erode the ozone shield (Johnston, 1971)." <sup>1</sup> Ultimately, the nitrogen oxide "ozone threat" succeeded in stopping production of the SST.

The greatly beloved American heretic Ralph Waldo Emerson once said that foolish consistency was the hobgoblin of little minds. The eco-movement would never be accused of being "little minded" by Emerson's standards. It might even be said that they have managed to take "big mindedness" to new heights of absurdity. They couldn't let the eco-fictions they had made of hydroxyls and nitrogen oxides die a decent death and slip ever so quietly into public forgetfulness. They actually resurrected the culprits as "eco-heroes." Green VP Al Gore's book, *Earth in the Balance*, now called those nasty hydroxyls "natural detergents" which cleansed the atmosphere. In 1984, with the newest CFC "bogey" targeted on the ozone-depletion radar screen, *Nature* magazine characterized those once-killer oxides of nitrogen as "defenders" of the ozone shield from the new CFC nasties.

The greens weren't going to lose a bop, neat and keen racket such as "ozone depletion" simply because they had knocked a multibillion dollar aircraft out of the sky. In the 1984 *Nature* article, the US Academy of Science was cited to prove that increases in oxides of nitrogen gases in the atmosphere protected ozone from the CFCs. "[Fortunately] atmospheric concentrations of...N<sub>2</sub>O have been observed to be increasing. Continuation of these trends would delay the time when the dramatic effect of CFCs would occur." The article said that unless the oxides of nitrogen gases would increase faster than the chlorine from the CFCs, ozone depletion would increase dramatically. The same oxides of nitrogen which in 1971 were said to be "threatening ozone" in SST exhaust were now described as "defending" that same ozone against the new enemy CFCs.<sup>2</sup>

What's going on here? How can the same chemical compound be said to "threaten" the ozone layer when the environmentalists wanted to ban the SST and then "protect" that same ozone layer when the environmentalists wanted to ban freon? The answer, as Krug so well points out, is that the "ozone depletion scare" has little to do with science and everything to do with the politics of fear. The ozone scare with its images of people's skin being fried in UVB light and becoming leprous with cancer worked so well with the SST that the environmentalists— who make careers out of "protecting" us from dreaded monsters lurking in the unknown— simply could not give it up. They invented a politically self-serving thought formula that goes something like this: An incredibly thin and vulnerable ozone layer in the stratosphere is all that stands between us and dreaded radiation which threatens to turn the earth into burnt toast ('Ozone depletion is now so serious ...that it now amounts to a threat to the future of all life on earth' Greenpeace, 1991). This vulnerable membrane about which you know nothing is about to be destroyed by (fill in the blank with a human activity you want suppressed and which can plausibly be demonized as ozone threatening)." In short, the alleged "threat to the ozone layer" was not discovered by objective research, it was invented and imposed by political forces seeking to profit by fear-mongering the idea. How else can you explain that the alleged "threat" to the ozone layer changed with such political expediency. The idea is a political unreality substituting for known scientific facts.

We are not exaggerating when we call CFC ozone depletion a scam and a racket. Krug has documented that the popular belief in CFC ozone depletion is a myth which has succeeded only by suppressing scientific information. Those of us who are about to lose our freon-based refrigerators and air conditioners should, at least, be informed about the

most significant of these suppressed facts. No less an authority than the head of the French equivalent of the EPA, Haroun Tazieff, tried to tell us about it in 1991. Tazieff said, "The Rowland and Molina theory [of ozone depletion due to CFCs] is unscientific because it is based upon a model of chemical reaction sequence without having proved the existence of the intermediary products; these reactions, which no one has ever reproduced in the laboratory, have never been observed anywhere." (italics ours) Did you get that? The way that CFCs are supposed to destroy the ozone has never been observed anywhere and indeed cannot even be reproduced in the laboratory. Freon is being banned at an estimated cost of well over a trillion dollars based upon a paper "theory" of a chemical reaction between ozone and freon which has never been observed and which environmentalists have been unable to produce in the laboratory. How much more politically unreal can you get?

The paper theory was first put forward by F. Sherwood Rowland in an article in Science magazine. Dr. Arthur Robinson, himself an organic chemist currently conducting environmental research with the private Oregon Institute of Science and Medicine, explained how the Rowland thesis may have short circuited normal scientific controls. In a private conversation, Dr. Robinson said that Rowland's original article established what scientists term a "hypothesis." This consisted of equations for a speculative complex chain of chemical reactions which were, in Robinson's opinion, most probably mathematically sound. That is, the Rowland equations were consistent with known energy transfers and requirements associated with chemical reactions.

Dr. Robinson cautions, however, that there are many hypothetical chemical reactions which are coherent with the mathematical laws of thermodynamics but which are reactions which don't actually occur. The fact that Rowland could provide mathematical feasibility for his reactions did not prove that they actually happened.

The problem, according to Robinson, was that a hypothesis was elevated to the status of a "fact" without going through the rigors of scientific testing. A chemical hypothesis is a speculation founded upon mathematical feasibility and guided by what Dr. Robinson called the "intuition" of a well-trained expert in the subject. It must be submitted to experimental validation before it is accepted. Rowland's hypothesis was elevated to "fact status" without experimental testing, most likely, in Robinson's opinion, by the lay press which saw the hypothesis' advantage to environmentalism.

In science, an "hypothesis" is defined as a factual proposition presented such that it can be disproved. Nothing reaches the level of hypothesis unless it proposes a method by which it can be disproved. Because Science Magazine published Rowland's hypothesis without testing proves that a portion of established science had already deserted the scientific method in favor of a social consensus reality.

Dr. Edward Krug, whose newsletter Environment Betrayed is an attempt to snatch authentic science from this voodoo of environmentalist unreality, has a knack for unraveling the science babble which the Greens use to mystify the common man. He points out that the amount of man-made freon which could possibly be "blamed" for "killing" the ozone is so minuscule in comparison to the volume of the atmosphere that a "super killer" mechanism had to be invented. For every part of chlorine, the alleged "killer," from the CFCs there are 100 billion parts of air and 100,000 parts of ozone. To make the scare work, environmentalists had to make every chlorine atom "kill" 100,000 molecules of ozone. They achieved this sleight-of-hand through Rowland's untested "model" by which every chlorine atom is alleged to combine with ozone, breakdown the ozone molecule, then separate and commence the process all over again.

This is supposed to reoccur 100,000 times until the process is finally exhausted. Thus, one atom of chlorine could "kill" 100,000 molecules of ozone.

There was a slight problem with Rowland's untested hypothesis. When put to tests in labs it was proved to be wrong. The destruction of ozone it postulates could not be produced in the lab, nor had it been observed occurring naturally in the atmosphere. The hypothesis could easily be proved to be true or false by simple test. Reproduce the conditions in which the reaction is said to occur and see if it actually does. Create a stratospheric-like atmosphere with the proper amount of ozone in a sealed container, inject freon at the prescribed rate and photo decompose the freon. When tried, It did not "kill" the ozone.

Why? In answering this question, Krug is much harsher on the Rowland hypothesis than Robinson has been. Krug argues that the hypothesis is not only wrong, but that it is junk chemistry as well. The Rowland theory alleges that the "super-killer" chlorine molecule— what scientists call dimers of chlorine monoxide must break apart at the point it is strongest. As Krug notes, "Of the many ways that this chain of atoms [dimers of chlorine monoxide] could break apart, ozone theorists say that the chain breaks at its strongest links— the chlorine-oxygen bond. They say that the weakest link— the oxygen-oxygen bond— does not break apart! Imagine that!" 3 Dimers occur when two molecules of a compound weakly join together. They become something of a "duplex" molecule and do not form a new compound because they can relatively easily be separated again. They are like magnetized ball bearings joining together. The ozone-depletion theory asserts that when two ball bearings are thus joined, one of the ball bearings will break in half before the two can be forced apart. We are being asked to believe that, if you strike two magnetically connected ball bearings with a hammer, one of the ball bearings will crack before the magnetic attraction breaks.

The scientific method by which any hypothesis must be disprovable was simply abandoned. All authentic tests of the hypothesis had proven negative. Injecting artificial stratospheric atmospheres with freon— or even chlorine monoxide— did not "kill" the ozone. Advocacy experimentation was substituted for hypothesis testing. Advocates of the disproved Rowland model spent time and money to see if they could produce a single anecdotal experiment to substitute for repeatable hypothesis testing. They spent time and money to see if they could force the molecule to break at its strongest bond using high energy. However, the pseudo scientists seeking a consensus for Rowland's now-disproved hypothesis could not even produce direct anecdotal data.

Krug points out, "No one has ever observed the chlorine monoxide dimer breaking at its strongest link and not at its weakest link." Unable to produce the reaction which the paper theory demanded, they did the thing that pseudo science must do in such politically sensitive areas. They went for a substitute, another molecule which they pretended was "like" the molecule in question. Krug continues, "Indeed, the idea that this chain of atoms would break at its strongest link had to be inferred from the behavior of a different chemical molecule—  $\text{ClONO}_2$ . And, of the numerous experiments run on this proxy molecule, only once was it demonstrably seen that this strongest link— the chlorine oxygen (Cl-O) bond— nearly always broke. Problem— This one favorable study cooked the sample with high energy lasers." After great numbers of studies on a "substitute" molecule, the defenders of a discredited theory were only able to get the molecule to break apart at the predicted bond one time, and that with the infusion of massive amounts of energy. They had their needed anecdote.

Let us review then why your refrigerators and air conditioners are currently at risk. Freon is being banned because a hypothesis was presented by a political advocate which predicted that each atom of chlorine in that freon would "kill" 100,000 molecules of ozone by

a method which has never been observed in nature nor could be produced in the laboratory. It is asserted that we accept the politicized hypothesis as established "truth" because one occasion produced one anecdotal piece of evidence. A substitute molecule could be shown to break apart in the predicted way after being bombarded with massive amounts of energy.

How can this one experiment, obviously "cooked," as Krug calls it, stand in the stead of well established scientific testing principles? Why would the breaking apart of a "proxy" molecule under high energy bombardment be given more "weight" than lab-controlled hypothesis testings which demonstrated that the chemical reactions predicted never occur under experimentally controlled conditions?

Chlorine monoxide simply never acts as the theory's proponents claim, either in the presence or outside the presence of ozone. In a controlled atmosphere normal levels of stratospheric ozone are not reduced to oxygen by minuscule amounts of chlorine monoxide. The advocates of a politicized consensus science know this. It is a reason that the "proxy" experiment replaces factual observation, The proxy experiment is useful because it helps establish an artificial consensus "reality." It is following the rules governing political unreality.

In establishing belief in political, socially constructed unreality, one deals in the plausible, not in facts. One must make an artificial reality seem plausible in the same way that an alibi must be made "plausible" while factual reality is ignored. The "proxy" experiment described above was designed to shore up the "ozone scare" theory's plausibility, not test its factuality. It is crucial to recognize the intentions of the advocates in these matters. The experiment, or at least its significance, is designed to overcome the psychology of disbelief. It is used to address a state of mind, not factual or external conditions.

Here again is the essence of political unreality. One observation of desired consequence is given more credibility than the sum total of all natural observations combined. The will to believe is given more authority than either the objective witness of the senses or the rationality of the mind.

Environmentalists have indicted themselves as deliberate practitioners of unreality by the fact that evidence which strongly and directly contradicts the "ozone depletion theory" has been suppressed. During the scare over SST aircraft "depleting the ozone," the National Cancer Institute actually established monitoring network to see if the allegedly thinning ozone would allow an increase in high-energy ultraviolet (UVB) to hit earth's surface. Even though the environmentalists succeeded in killing the SST program, the UVB monitoring system kept gathering data from 1974 onward. By 1985, when greens began arguing that "ozone-killing" freon was going to fry us all, the UVB monitoring system had collected 11 years of data.

Unfortunately, the monitoring data didn't support the "ozone depletion theory." Not only was there no increase in UVB radiation reaching the surface, but there was an actual decrease during the period the ozone was supposedly "thinning" from CFC contamination. "Ozone depletion theorists," if they were interested in factual reality, should have wanted data on UVB hitting the earth's surface after 1985 since they had just "discovered" the alleged "ozone hole" at the South Pole, supposedly depleted through CFC contamination. Instead, the National Cancer UVB monitoring network was summarily shut down. Its data didn't help the "ozone depletion" unreality and had to be suppressed. When the National Cancer Institute finally published its UVB data in 1988, environmentalists attacked the data, saying UVB rates were "masked" by alleged "air pollution." Unfortunately, many of the sites, including the master site at Muana Loa observatory in Hawaii, were not subjected to

air pollution. 4

Least anyone is trusting enough to believe that the elimination of the UVB monitoring system was not connected to a desire to protect the "ozone depletion theory" from real-world data, consider what happened when a high government scientist suggested reestablishing UVB monitoring at the earth's surface to "test" the depletion theory.

According to the newsletter Inside Energy, Dr. William Happer, the chief scientist at the U.S. Department of Energy, approached the office of Vice President Albert Gore to get aid in restoring the monitoring of UVB radiation. Gore, who is known as an "environmental activist" and author of environmental books, had been warning the nation of the "health dangers" from alleged freon poisonings of the stratospheric ozone layer. Happer, who had apparently taken the Vice President's words seriously, had thought we should resume the UVB radiation monitoring canceled in 1985.

Did the environmental vice president grab Happer's hand and shake it as a "concerned scientist?" Not exactly. The "Green" vice president who had once warned the nation of an imminent danger from a "hole in the ozone" which he inaccurately predicted would open over the U.S. — fired Happer on the spot for making the suggestion.

The ozone depletion theory and its voodoo chemistry must be accepted on faith and anyone suggesting that the idea be "hypothesis tested" against real-world data was a friend of the damnable skeptics. Obviously, environmentalism is not concerned with an actual threat from ozone depletion. They have not rejoiced at unthreatening surface radiation levels, but have cursed the researchers for contradicting their carefully crafted artificial reality. They have made sure those measurements won't be taken again. The "reality" of ozone thinning is what they say it is, not what it has been found to be. They believe their words create reality and are not committed to an objectively determined truth.

But why? How can the environmental movement so rigorously desert objective science for favored belief? The answer, I'm afraid, is that that environmental movement is emotionally feeding the ideological appetites of its adherents and has little or no commitment to scientific objectivity.

It has perhaps become a cliché to repeat that environmentalism is not conservationism. Environmentalists do not conserve natural resources to human use, they defend nature against human use. It is rooted in a form of prejudice, being for nature and against human activity. The movement began in unreality because the very words "nature" and "humanity" were given an artificial meaning of a very peculiar sort. One has to go back to the ancient pagan world to find an intellectual precedent. A kind of sanctity or sacredness was imposed upon the concept of "nature."

This is not a wild exaggeration. The Colorado Sacred Earth Institute invited the UN regional director for the Environment, Noel Brown, to speak at a 1994 conference. Brown told the audience that the only way to prevent population pressures, pollution and energy consumption from destroying the earth, was to embrace what he called a "new spirituality" which recognized the earth as sacred. The theme was also taken up by Al Gore in his book *Earth in the Balance*. In one place, Gore reinterprets the Biblical story of Cain slaying Abel, asserting that the sin was not the killing of a brother made in the image of God, but the "polluting" of the sacred earth with blood. In 1992, the U.S. Forest Service sponsored a Washington conference called the "Spirituality/Wildland Interface." Workshops included "Symbolism and Spiritual Values in Experiencing Nature," "Sacred Land, Sacred Sex," and "Gaian Buddhism." The "sacred earth" concept has recently been baptized with the name of the ancient earth goddess Gaia. The earth-as-goddess idea has even crept into "science"

with the "Gaia hypothesis" which holds that the earth is a "living organism." This is treated as a "serious scientific theory" in environmental circles.

With the very concepts of the "earth" and "nature" being mystified, human activities which might impact the "earth" and "nature" also take on a novel artificial meaning. In the eyes of environmentalists, human objects and activities don't allegedly threaten scientific facts, they profane the temple. Pollution is not a practical problem, it is a violation of the religious sentiments. Unclean unbelievers have invaded the sanctuary and are trashing the Holy Order.

In carefully looking at environmentalism, one can see the methods and origins of the phenomenon we are calling political unreality. The movement invests the natural order with presumed meanings, overlaying it with a religious sentiment. They have lost the capacity for thought because the world must fit into patterns and categories of their own making.

Reality becomes what they have presumed it to be, not what it is discovered to be. They have overlaid the world with meanings of their own invention and call it "reality."

Reality becomes what we presume it to be, not what it is discovered to be. The "proof" for the presumed "truth" is social opinion, not fact. Consider the fate of two men of "science," one who sought to pursue fact and the other who lent his weight to the "popular" religiously-motivated opinion on ozone. The first was the Dr. William Happer mentioned earlier as the object of a vice-presidential purge because he suggested that the "danger" alleged by the ozone depletion theory actually be tested. The second is Dr. F. Sherwood Rowland, "father" of the currently fashionable theory that ozone is being "killed" by your refrigerator.

As we have noted, Happer was fired by the office of Vice President Albert Gore after the scientist had attempted to get Gore's aid in refunding an ultra violet monitoring program which had been canceled in 1985. On June 17, 1993, an article revealing the Happer firing and its implications appeared in the Wall Street Journal (Bad Climate in Ozone Debate). The revelation was "refuted" by Michael Elroy, Chairman of Harvard's Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences. Prior to his firing, Happer had testified before a congressional committee and revealed the actual data by the 1974-1985 monitoring of UVB radiation hitting the earth. This was considered "treason" by environmental enforcers since the actual data discounted the fashionable ozone depletion theory. In a letter to the Wall Street Journal, Elroy— with the full weight of Harvard "earth science" behind him— discounted the controversy by ridiculing Happer.

According to this spokesman for establishment orthodoxy, Happer was deserving of his treatment because of alleged impure motives in attacking the credibility of revealed ozone "science." To reveal data which could disprove accepted "truth" was considered a treasonable act. To ask for even more such data only emphasized the treason. Thus a scientist asking for data, the very object of the scientific method, was condemned as a heretic in one of the nation's leading forums by someone wrapping himself in the mantle of scientific "authority." Later, we will find out that much political unreality is sustained by "political appointees" to high positions in the sciences and the university, political appointees who confer legitimacy upon favored untruths with their alleged "authority."

Now contrast this treatment of Happer at the hands of "authoritative" science with that given F. Sherwood Rowland. Rowland is the author of the "super-killer" chlorine-atom theory, the dimers of chlorine monoxide which supposedly break apart in a way contrary to the laws of chemistry and have therefore never been observed to do so. As Edward Krug points out, "Rowland's hypothesis predicts neither location, chemistry, nor rate of ozone depletion and Rowland's hypothesized reactions have been observed in neither nature nor laboratory." 5

Rowland was a chemist with the University of California at Irvine in 1973 when he invented the paper theory which was subsequently used to justify the draconian freon ban. His own attitude, as shown on a 1993 Discovery Channel television program, indicated that he, himself, recognized his insupportable voodoo theory as a kind of career coup which would give environmentalists the pseudoscientific rationalization they needed to reignite the ozone-scare scam. He demonstrated that he trivialized the alleged "threat" to the ozone, but was enthusiastic about its impact upon his career. He said that when his wife asked him about his work, he replied, "It is really going very well. But it looks like we may see the end of the world." People who actually believe the world is about to "end" don't glow enthusiastically about the prospect. Someone who sees a bright career prospect in making others believe it might.

Needless to say, Rowland has been paid handsomely for providing a "theory" which can be sold the public as a "plausible" ozone depletion mechanism. Both he and his absurd science have been the recipients of "conferred legitimacy" by politicized "authorities." In August of 1994 it was announced that Rowland would be enshrined in the Smithsonian Science Hall of Fame. In 1995 Rowland was awarded the Nobel Prize in Chemistry.

The Nobel Prize citation says of Rowland that he "contributed to our salvation from a global environmental problem that could have catastrophic consequences." This is the same "environmental problem" which got William Happer fired for trying to measure it. A member of the Academy which gave the award said it went to Rowland to put pressure on a forthcoming international meeting of the "Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer." Significantly, this same member of the Swedish Academy admitted that the award's "prestige" was designed to overcome resistance from authentic science to Rowland's voodoo chemistry. Academy member Henning Rohde said, "The Nobel prize will put a rest to this debate on whether the ozone hole really is a result of CFCs."

You know, gentle reader, of what this "debate" consists. Rowland's "theory" is a failed hypothesis which failed in lab tests because it violates the laws of chemistry. Despite its authentic status as a disproved hypothesis, the Rowland theory was furthered in the pages of Science Magazine because it fit a socialist political agenda in environmentalism. To disguise Rowland's failure to meet scientific testing standards, an alternative one-time, anecdotal experiment was concocted using an "alternative" molecule. To give credibility to the deception, scientific prizes were conferred, scientific prizes which were under the control of socialist political advocates.

It is actually a debate between real science and an artificial science composed of politically imposed unreality. Science lost to Rowland's

unreality by the granting of a prestige award; The Nobel Prize.

Truth will now be determined by a politically-constructed committee which will vote upon which particular "truth" they prefer and confer an alleged honor upon it. As Krug states, politically-appointed scientific "authorities" like the Smithsonian and the Swedish Academy are "now passing off a disproved hypothesis as science fact."