

ABOUT DISAGREEALISTS

(April 2021)

The paper about [a sense of climatological proportion](#) suggests that human activities have most probably no measurable effect on weather patterns.

Although the author could not be properly called a "*climate change denialist*" ¹ (see endnote), since he believes that there is strictly no reason for the climate not to change continuously, he thinks the term "*denialist*" is rather arrogant and possibly abusive, and he proposes that an epithet such as "*disagreealist*" would be more appropriate, since the word "*denial*" implies the presumed ascendancy without debate of the object of denial.

In line with that statement, he is also:

- i. a denialism disagreealist;
- ii. a supernatural-entity-created-and-rules-the-universe disagreealist;
- iii. a Santa-Claus disagreealist;
- iv. an interstellar-travel disagreealist;
- v. an alien-visitors disagreealist;
- vi. a communism-as-a-model-for-society disagreealist;
- vii. a fascism-as-a-model-for-society disagreealist;
- viii. a so-called-intuition disagreealist;
- ix. an elections-were-rigged-if-I-lose disagreealist;
- x. a dictatorship-of-the-majority-over-the minority disagreealist;
- xi. a dictatorship-of-the-minority-over-the majority disagreealist;
- xii. a democracies-must-be-in-a-constant-state-of revolution disagreealist;
- xiii. an activist-academics-are-immune-from-forfeiting-their-degrees-when-proven-wrong disagreealist;

- xiv. a so-called-common-sense disagreeelist;
- xv. a Qanon disagreeelist;
- xvi. a Y2K disagreeelist;
- xvii. a Bible-tall-tales disagreeelist;
- xviii. a prohibition-of-horse-meat, alcohol, weed, tobacco, prostitution, euthanasia, abortion, religion, etc. disagreeelist;
- xix. an infused-science disagreeelist;
- xx. an I'm-better-than-thou-because-I'm-more skilled-at-taking-other-people's-money disagreeelist;
- xxi. a race-superiority disagreeelist;
- xxii. a cultural-superiority disagreeelist;
- xxiii. a my-country-is-better-than-thine disagreeelist;
- xxiv. a my-language-is-more-perfect-than-thine disagreeelist;
- xxv. a twisting-History-to-fit-nationalistic-propaganda disagreeelist;
- xxvi. a physicians-and-lawyers-deserve-to be rich-at-your-expense-because-you're-so-damn-scared-of-dying-or-going-to-jail disagreeelist;
- xxvii. a Mankind-was-put-on-Earth-to-rule-over-it-and-is-superior-to-all-other-forms-of-life disagreeelist;
- xxviii. a women-must-paint-their-face-and-adorn-themselves-with-rags-and-artifacts disagreeelist;
- xxix. a Mankind-has-a-perfect-right-to-abuse-and-deface-nature disagreeelist;
- xxx. a we're-going-to-colonize-Mars-before-we-populate-Antarctica, Siberia-and-the-Australian, Gobi-and-Sahara-deserts disagreeelist;
- xxxi. and many-other-strange-and absurd-beliefs disagreeelist.

Although the author frequently disagrees with the beliefs of others, he would not have the audacity to deny them the essential right to those beliefs, since he is neither God nor can he, like Adam, boast any Infused Science.

It is the absolute right of the reader to disagree with the author and choose to call him quite arrogantly a denialist, but the characterization a-priori of his persona does not bear on the validity of his reasoning.

Likewise, the reader may call him an idiot if he disapproves of the author's documented reasoning, even when the reader produces no solid argument in support of his, but in so doing he is judging character, not ideas.

The reader may also judge the author's ideas based on the personal appraisal of past credentials, but in so doing he would be judging past ideas, not those being currently argued.

The author invites the reader to fill the attached "[Questionnaire about basic scientific knowledge](#)".

¹ In line with several other dictionaries and encyclopedias, the Oxford Dictionary provides a quite arrogant definition of the word "*denialist*":

a person who does not acknowledge the truth of a concept or proposition that is supported by the majority of scientific or historical evidence; a denier.

"the small minority of very vocal climate change denialists"

and goes on to suggest that disagreeing with the climate change theory is of the same tenor as denying the Holocaust and other historical events.

For one thing, the merits of art and science can hardly be judged in democratic terms, any more than athletic prowess could, and for another there is little commonality between the level of evidence raised about a historical fact and that regarding a scientific theory, since the two concepts are quite dissimilar, the former being based on observation of, and testimony about past events, and the latter on pure intellectual construction of future events.