The MOTIVES for failing to examine the old theory of radiative forcing outweigh any rational reasons. Since I'm not a member of the Climatology Club, though, and have nothing to fear, let me explain my own reason for rejecting this postulate.

The 19th century saw the first clear articulation of radiative forcing theory.

The radiation of the sun in which the planet is incessantly plunged, penetrates the air, the earth, and the waters; its elements are divided, change direction in every way, and, penetrating the mass of the globe, would raise its temperature more and more, if the heat acquired were not exactly balanced by that which escapes in rays from all points of the surface and expands through the sky. -- Joseph Fourier (1768-1830)

The direct corollary here is that less outgoing radiation would keep driving the temperature up. That's the essence of the theory. Indeed, Fourier regarded a glass enclosure as a real-life forcing model. Since glass is shortwave-transparent and infrared-opaque, he concluded that a garden greenhouse lets in visible light but prevents the "dark rays" of infrared from escaping. Thus, he believed, the sun-induced heat inside a glass box was unable to escape, an imbalance which forced the temperature to rise. Not so, it turns out, but Fourier's theory persisted even after this practical example was shown to be wrong.

The idea of trapping light was intriguing, however, and Gustav Kirchhoff (1824-1887) conceived a solution: A hole in a cave. A beam of light could enter this hole but the walls inside would absorb any reflections and prevent the light from escaping. Thus, by confining incoming radiation, the thermal energy which light confers could be shown to its maximum advantage. Kirchhoff's scheme was superior to selectively transmitting glass because a cave absorbs and traps ***all*** wavelengths of light, thus creating a ***complete*** radiative imbalance. At least theoretically.

Well, so what was found by cavity experiments? That a perfectly absorptive ("black") body rises to a temperature a bit higher than an actual black body that's free to radiate to its surroundings. A theoretical blackbody thereby defines the upper limit of temperature vs radiant absorption.

Try to grasp the implication, then. A blackbody cavity mimics the radiative restriction that 'greenhouse gases' are said to induce. Indeed, virtually none of the thermal radiation generated inside this cavity is allowed to escape. It "re-circulates" instead, and is sampled through a tiny hole. Does this confinement lead to a runaway greenhouse effect, though? No, it only sets an upper temperature limit — the SAME limit that's applied to the earth ***in the first place***, for its estimated temperature is based on a blackbody equation!

Now, it is very likely that applying a cavity-based formula to the temperature of a rotating half-lit sphere is inherently mistaken. But if not, then 279 Kelvin constitutes the upper limit for the earth because such an estimate ***assumes*** a body that is perfectly absorptive, meaning that it can't possibly absorb ***more*** light than the light it's exposed to. Doing everything a "greenhouse effect" is alleged to do, continuously re-radiating infrared energy inside itself, a light-trapping blackbody demonstrates that radiative forcing is a fiction. For its temperature hits a ceiling not much higher than what you see in real life. Yet greenhouse theory claims that radiative restriction generates temperatures HIGHER THAN a blackbody's. And considerably higher at that. Such a claim overtly contradicts experimental evidence, then. It doesn't have an empirical leg to stand on.

First seized upon as the answer and later dismissed, a glass enclosure proved that infrared opacity had nothing to do with generating extra heat inside. Then came the radiatively restricted blackbody, which nailed the forcing concept shut. Yet against all evidence climatologists still push the radiative forcing theory. WHY?

Alan Siddons