

of the editors of Progress in Physics).
Papers need not be published in journals
which you prefer. Your journal
preference has no bearing on scientific
arguments and experimental facts.

Stephen J. Crothers
3 March 2015

Reply



Brian Koberlein

3 March 2015 at 11:52 am

One of the most frustrating
aspects of dealing with fringe
science ideas is the constant
bombardment of accusations and
false claims.

How insulting that I referred to
Robitaille as a radiologist given
that's his area of expertise, rather
than addressing him as Herr
Professor and listing his work in
radiology. I suppose it must be
equally insulting to all the Nobel
Laureates and professors of
astronomy, physics, and
astrophysics who support the
standard model that I referred to
them as mere "astronomers" and
"astrophysicists" without listing
their prominent achievements.

How dishonest of me to call
Progress in Physics an alternative
physics journal, when on its very
website it presents itself as an
alternative to the narrow and
biased approach of traditional
research journals.

How dare I make a "patently
false" statement that Robitaille
argues the CMB signal is due to
ocean water. How dare I link to
[this video](#) (at about 24:17) where,
after arguing that ocean water is a
big source of microwaves,

Robitaille states (and I quote) “The Penzias and Wilson signal is very likely to be produced by the Earth.” Perhaps, Mr. Crothers, you would prefer I quote from one of your own published papers, where you state: “Moreover, Robitaille concludes that the CMB is not cosmic, but a signal produced by the oceans of the Earth.”

How dare I actually call people out based upon the ridiculous claims they’ve actually made.

Reply



Stephen J. Crothers

4 March 2015 at 1:56 am

Professor Koberlein,

You have the boot on the wrong foot.

(1) You attempted to imply that Professor Robitaille’s papers have not been ‘peer reviewed’. You said:

“His work hasn’t been published in refereed astrophysics journals”

No, not in astrophysics journals, but in a physics journals, where they have been peer reviewed, in accordance with that journal’s policy, which you failed to mention.

(2) You said,

“He claims that the cosmic microwave background isn’t due to the thermal remnant of the big bang, but rather due to

microwaves reflected off the surface of Earth's oceans.”

I reiterate that this is a patently false claim. I request you once again to produce citations and quotes from Professor Robitaille's papers and videos where it is you claim he asserts that the so-called CMB is due to reflection of microwaves from the oceans.

(3) Although Professor Robitaille is a Professor of Radiology, you failed to mention that he has a joint appointment as Professor in Inorganic Chemistry. You also failed to mention anything about his work in MRI, which is directly relevant to Kirchhoff's Law and Planck's equation. MRI is a thermal process, and it violates the accepted theory of thermal emission. This is an experimental fact. The human head is not at 1K.

(4) You said,

“ We could point out that the CMB has been observed by satellites millions of miles away from Earth, and aimed away from Earth's surface, or that reflected microwaves wouldn't give a blackbody curve due to absorption bands in both water and Earth's atmosphere.”

It is a scientific fact that the so-called monopole signal of the 'CMB' has not been observed by any satellites beyond ~900km of Earth. Professor Robitaille has never claimed that the 'CMB' is actually microwaves reflected from the oceans. Once again, I request you to produce citations and quotes from Professor Robitaille's works upon which you rely for your claim. I hasten to add, Professor Robitaille has never said that reflected microwaves from the oceans reach distances of millions of kilometres from Earth, such as at L2.

You neglected to mention Professor Robitaille's analysis of the properties of water, by which a blackbody spectrum at an apparent temperature of ~3K is emitted by water; here is his paper, so that your readers can study it too and decide for themselves on the balance of evidence:

Robitaille P.-M.

'Water, Hydrogen Bonding, and the Microwave Background', Progress in Physics, Vol.2, April, 2009,
http://www.ptep-online.com/index_files/2009/PP-17-L2.PDF

(5) You said:

"You could point out that his liquid-metal Sun model relies upon thermal blackbodies to be impossible, that his argument in favor of a liquid photosphere is that it looks liquid, and that his main argument against gravity-driven solar fusion is that the model uses mathematics."

You have not mentioned any of Professor Robitaille's arguments for the Sun being condensed matter. I therefore urge you and your readers to study his paper on the Sun. Here it is again:

Robitaille P.-M.

Forty Lines of Evidence for Condensed Matter — The Sun on Trial: Liquid Metallic Hydrogen as a Solar Building Block, Progress in Physics, v.4, pp.90-142, (2013),
http://www.ptep-online.com/index_files/2013/PP-35-16.PDF

Furthermore, Kirchhoff's Law of Thermal Emission is refuted by both experiment and theory. Nobody can build a blackbody cavity, for instance, from silver, because its reflectivity is far too high. Silver cavities do not contain black radiation at thermal equilibrium. At thermal equilibrium,

radiation in arbitrary cavities is not black unless there is a black material present. Also, theoretically, Kirchhoff's Law is proven false, as demonstrated in detail in the paper I previously cited. Here it is again, so that your readers can study it too, and decide for themselves on the balance of evidence:

Robitaille P.-M., Crothers S. J. "The Theory of Heat Radiation" Revisited: A Commentary on the Validity of Kirchhoff's Law of Thermal Emission and Max Planck's Claim of Universality, Progress in Physics, v. 11, p.120-132, (2015),
http://www.ptep-online.com/index_files/2015/PP-41-04.PDF

(7) You said:

"How dare I make a "patently false" statement that Robitaille argues the CMB signal is due to ocean water. How dare I link to this video (at about 24:17) where, after arguing that ocean water is a big source of microwaves, Robitaille states (and I quote) "The Penzias and Wilson signal is very likely to be produced by the Earth." Perhaps, Mr. Crothers, you would prefer I quote from one of your own published papers, where you state: "Moreover, Robitaille concludes that the CMB is not cosmic, but a signal produced by the oceans of the Earth."

Professor Robitaille is correct, and so am I. The source of the so-called CMB is the Earth, specifically its oceans. Neither Professor Robitaille nor I have ever said that microwaves reflected from the Earth or from its oceans are the source of the 'CMB', contrary to your allegations. Yet again, please adduce citations and quotations from the works of Professor Robitaille, and also me if you must, upon which you rely for your allegation of reflection of microwaves

from Earth or its oceans. Your reflected
microwaves is not due to Professor
Robitaille or me, so from where did you
get it?

Stephen J. Crothers

4 March 2015

Your comment is awaiting moderation.

Reply

© 2015 Brian Koberlein

