
Subject: Re: I hate winter...

Posted by [chuck duffy](#) on Wed, 30 Jan 2008 02:34:45 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

So does this evidence mean that

Chuck

Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>rick wrote:

>> this is a mac vs pc thing in disguise isn't it? ;o) thank god for

>> global dimming...

>

>Heh. Mac vs. PC is more benign.

>

>Here's a paper on the relationship between global dimming and greenhouse

>warming: <http://www.iac.ethz.ch/people/wild/2006GL028031.pdf>

>

> From the summary:

>"In the present study we investigated the role of solar dimming and

>brightening in the context of recent global warming. Our analysis showed

>that the decadal changes of land mean surface temperature as well as

>TMAX, TMIN, and DTR are in line with the proposed transition in surface

>solar radiation from dimming to brightening during the 1980s and with

>the increasing greenhouse effect. This suggests that solar dimming,

>possibly favoured by increasing air pollution, was effective in masking

>greenhouse warming up to the 1980s, but not thereafter, when the dimming

>disappeared and atmospheres started to clear up.

>

>The temperature response since the mid-1980s may therefore be a more

>genuine reflection of the greenhouse effect than during the decades

>before, which were subject to solar dimming. Unlike to the decades prior

>to the 1980s, the recent rapid temperature rise therefore no longer

>underrates the response of the climate system to greenhouse forcing and

>reflects the full magnitude of the greenhouse effect."

>

>More discussion here:

> <http://www.realclimate.org/index.php/archives/2007/11/global-dimming-and-global-warming/>

>

>Cheers,

> -Jamie

> www.JamieKrutz.com

>

>
>
>> On Tue, 29 Jan 2008 10:51:55 -0700, Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com>
>> wrote:
>>
>>> James McCloskey wrote:
>>>> Yep, those scientist don't know what they are talking about,
>>> If you're looking for the opinion of scientists, here's a start:
>>>
>>> From the American Physical Society
>>> http://www.aps.org/policy/statements/07_1.cfm
>>> "Emissions of greenhouse gases from human activities are changing the

>>> atmosphere in ways that affect the Earth's climate. Greenhouse gases

>>> include carbon dioxide as well as methane, nitrous oxide and other
>>> gases. They are emitted from fossil fuel combustion and a range of
>>> industrial and agricultural processes.
>>>
>>> The evidence is incontrovertible: Global warming is occurring. If no

>>> physical and ecological systems, social systems, security and human
>>> health are likely to occur. We must reduce emissions of greenhouse gases

>>> beginning now."
>>>
>>>
>>> From the National Academy of Sciences
>>> <http://nationalacademies.org/onpi/06072005.pdf>
>>> "Climate change is real:
>>> There will always be uncertainty in understanding a system as complex
as

>>> significant global warming is occurring¹. The evidence comes from direct

>>> measurements of rising surface air temperatures and subsurface ocean

>>> temperatures and from phenomena such as increases in average global sea

>>> levels, retreating glaciers, and changes to many physical and biological

>>> systems. It is likely that most of the warming in recent decades can
be
>>> attributed to human activities (IPCC 2001)². This warming has already

>>> led to changes in the Earth's climate.

>>>

>>> The existence of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere is vital to life on

>>> centigrade degrees lower than they are today. But human activities are

>>> well above pre-industrial levels. Carbon dioxide levels have increased

>>> levels that can be reliably measured (i.e. in the last 420,000 years).

>>> Increasing greenhouse gases are causing

>>> centigrade degrees over the twentieth century. The Intergovernmental

>>> Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) projected that the average global surface

>>> temperatures will continue to increase to between 1.4 centigrade degrees

>>> and 5.8 centigrade degrees above 1990 levels, by 2100."

>>>

>>>

>>> From the American Geophysical Union

>>> http://www.agu.org/sci_soc/policy/positions/climate_change2008.shtml

>>> "Human Impacts on Climate:

>>> The Earth's climate is now clearly out of balance and is warming. Many

>>> atmosphere, land and ocean, the extent of sea ice and mountain glaciers,

>>> the sea level, the distribution of precipitation, and the length of

>>> and are best explained by the increased atmospheric abundances of

>>> greenhouse gases and aerosols generated by human activity during the

>>> 20th century. Global average surface temperatures increased on average

>>> previous twelve years were warmer than any others since 1850. The

>>> observed rapid retreat of Arctic sea ice is expected to continue and

>>> lead to the disappearance of summertime ice within this century.
>>> Evidence from most oceans and all continents except Antarctica shows

>>> warming attributable to human activities. Recent changes in many
>>> physical and biological systems are linked with this regional climate

>>> change. A sustained research effort, involving many AGU members and
>>> summarized in the 2007 assessments of the Intergovernmental Panel on

>>> Climate Change, continues to improve our scientific understanding of
the
>>> climate.
>>>
>>> During recent millennia of relatively stable climate, civilization
>>> became established and populations have grown rapidly. In the next 50

>>> of climate variability experienced during the past thousand years and

>>> poses global problems in planning for and adapting to it. Warming

>>> disruptive, reducing global agricultural productivity, causing

>>> much of the Greenland ice sheet with ensuing rise in sea level of

>>> annual emissions of CO2 must be reduced by more than 50 percent within

>>> this century. With such projections, there are many sources of
>>> scientific uncertainty, but none are known that could make the impact
of
>>> climate change inconsequential. Given the uncertainty in climate
>>> projections, there can be surprises that may cause more dramatic
>>> disruptions than anticipated from the most probable model projections.
>>>
>>> With climate change, as with ozone depletion, the human footprint on

>>> Earth is apparent. The cause of disruptive climate change, unlike ozone

>>> depletion, is tied to energy use and runs through modern society.
>>> Solutions will necessarily involve all aspects of society. Mitigation

>>> strategies and adaptation responses will call for collaborations across

>>> science, technology, industry, and government. Members of the AGU, as

>>> part of the scientific community, collectively have special
>>> responsibilities: to pursue research needed to understand it; to educate

>>> the public on the causes, risks, and hazards; and to communicate clearly

>>> and objectively with those who can implement policies to shape future

>>> climate."
>>>
>>>
>>> From The Geological Society of America
>>> <http://www.geosociety.org/positions/position10.htm>
>>> "The Geological Society of America (GSA) supports the scientific

>>> due in part to human activities; and the probable consequences of the

>>> climate changes will be significant and blind to geopolitical
>>> boundaries. Furthermore, the potential implications of global climate

>>> change and the time scale over which such changes will likely occur
>>> require active, effective, long-term planning. GSA also supports
>>> statements on the global climate change issue made by the joint national

>>> academies of science (June 2005), American Geophysical Union (December,
>>> 2003), and American Chemical Society (2004). GSA strongly encourages

>>> that the following efforts be undertaken internationally: (1) adequately

>>> research climate change at all time scales, (2) develop thoughtful,
>>> science-based policy appropriate for the multifaceted issues of global

>>> climate change, (3) organize global planning to recognize, prepare for,

>>> and adapt to the causes and consequences of global climate change, and

>>> (4) organize and develop comprehensive, long-term strategies for
>>> sustainable energy, particularly focused on minimizing impacts on global

>>> climate."
>>>
>>>
>>> From the American Meteorological Society
>>> <http://www.ametsoc.org/POLICY/2007climatechange.html>
>>> "Why is climate changing?
>>> Climate has changed throughout geological history, for many natural

>>> have increasingly affected local, regional, and global climate by
>>> altering the flows of radiative energy and water through the Earth
>>> system (resulting in changes in temperature, winds, rainfall, etc.),

>>> which comprises the atmosphere, land surface, vegetation, ocean, land
>>> ice, and sea ice. Indeed, strong observational evidence and results from
>>> modeling studies indicate that, at least over the last 50 years, human
>>> activities are a major contributor to climate change.
>>>
>>> Direct human impact is through changes in the concentration of certain

>>> trace gases such as carbon dioxide, chlorofluorocarbons, methane,
>>> nitrous oxide, ozone, and water vapor, known collectively as greenhouse

>>> gases. Enhanced greenhouse gases have little effect on the incoming
>>> energy of the sun, but they act as a blanket to reduce the outgoing
>>> infrared radiation emitted by Earth and its atmosphere; the surface and

>>> atmosphere therefore warm so as to increase the outgoing energy until

>>> the outgoing and incoming flows of energy are equal. Carbon dioxide
>>> accounts for about half of the human-induced greenhouse gas contribution

>>> to warming since the late 1800s, with increases in the other greenhouse

>>> gases accounting for the rest; changes in solar output may have provided

>>> an augmentation to warming in the first half of the 20th century.
>>>
>>> Carbon dioxide concentration is rising mostly as a result of fossil-fuel

>>> burning and partly from clearing of vegetation; about 50% of the
>>> enhanced emissions remain in the atmosphere, while the rest of the Earth

>>> system continues to absorb the remaining 50%. In the last 50 years
>>> atmospheric CO₂ concentration has been increasing at a rate much faster

>>> than any rates observed in the geological record of the past several

>>> thousand years. Global annual-mean surface temperatures are rising at

a

>>> rapid rate to values higher than at any time in the last 400 (and
>>> probably in the last 1000) years. Once introduced in the atmosphere,

>>> carbon dioxide remains for at least a few hundred years and implies a

>>> lengthy guarantee of sustained future warming. Further, increases in

>>> greenhouse gases are nearly certain to produce continued increases in

>>> temperature. Such changes in temperature lead to changes in clouds,
>>> pressure, winds, and rainfall in a complex sequence of further effects."
>>>
>>>
>>> Al Gore does,
>>>> after all he invented the internet.
>>> Here's what snopes has to say about that:
>>>
>>> <http://www.snopes.com/quotes/internet.asp>
>>> "Despite the derisive references that continue even today, Al Gore did

>>> not claim he "invented" the Internet, nor did he say anything that could

>>> reasonably be interpreted that way. The "Al Gore said he 'invented' the

>>> Internet" put-downs were misleading, out-of-context distortions of
>>> something he said during an interview with Wolf Blitzer on CNN's "Late

>>> Edition" program on 9 March 1999."
>>>
>>>
>>> Besides, Al Gore is not the point, he's just one guy. Love him or hate

>>> him, the climate will do what it does with or without him. It's best
to
>>> look to the actual science.
>>>
>>>
>>> Nothing like trying to shift the wealth
>>>> of the world and making money doing it by selling global offsets and
taxing
>>>> the shit out of stupid people with a lie!
>>> That the climate is currently changing is not a lie, it's a measurable

>>> phenomenon we are currently experiencing on our planet.
>>>
>>> A lot of evidence points to human contributions to the current climate

>>> change event. So again, this is not a lie.
>>>
>>> Your problem is with politics and economics, not with science. Blaming
>>> the science does not help your cause. You have political and economic
>>> objections to some of the proposed solutions, so by all means take them
>>> on. If you don't like using a market mechanism to regulate carbon
>>> emissions, which is just one idea that's been proposed, there are other
>>> options on the table.
>>>
>>> Do your best to move the solutions conversation in a direction you're
>>> more comfortable with. But simple blanket denial of actual evidence and
>>> peer reviewed science won't get you there.
>>>
>>>
>>>> The Bush's, the Clinton's, and
>>>> the Gore's are all Trilateralists, they have done a fine job of lowering
>>>> the standard of living here in the USA! Long live the CFR, the world
banks
>>>> and man made Global warming.
>>> You can believe what you like about all that, except that there is
>>> actual evidence supporting human contributions to the current climate
>>> change event. Again, ignoring evidence won't get you very far.
>>>
>>>
>>>> By the way, if you buy the man made global warming lie, I got some swamp
>>>> land I'd like to sell you!
>>> You're being sold swamp land already, possibly by the fossil fuels
>>> industry, and by people who want to maintain power and income.
>>>
>>> <http://www.cbc.ca/fifth/denialmachine/index.html>
>>> "The Denial Machine investigates the roots of the campaign to negate
the
>>> science and the threat of global warming. It tracks the activities of
a
>>> group of scientists, some of whom previously consulted for Big Tobacco,
>>> and who are now receiving donations from major coal and oil companies."
>>>
>>> <http://www.exxonsecrets.org/>
>>> "The database compiles Exxon Foundation and corporate funding to a
>>> series of institutions who have worked to undermine solutions to global

>>> warming and climate change. It details the working relationships of
>>> individuals associated with these organizations and their global warming

>>> quotes and deeds."

>>>

>>> Cheers,

>>> -Jamie

>>> www.JamieKruz.com

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>>>>> Rich Lamanna wrote:

>>>>>> Must be global warming. Anyone seen this? If you've got an hour check
>>>>> it

>>>>>> out. It may take a minute or two to load.

>>>>>> Yep, the swindle movie is old news, we even discussed it here.

>>>>>

>>>>>> As I mentioned at the time, it ignores the main body of peer-reviewed

>>>>>> scientific evidence for the sake of sensationalism. It was done that
way

>>>>>> deliberately by the producers, with no attempt at an objective look
at

>>>>>> the actual scientific evidence. Fair and balanced it ain't.

>>>>>

>>>>>> I do like the breathless announcer, fast cuts and dramatic music. It's

>>>>>> always fun to see a one-sided polemic that ironically accuses others
of

>>>>>> being one-sided. I doubt anyone here is gullible enough to take it
as an

>>>>>> objective authority.

>>>>>

>>>>>> But anyway, here's more (follow the links):

>>>>>

>>>>>> From:

>>>>>> <http://climatedenial.org/2007/05/01/why-was-the-great-global-warming-swindle-so-persuasive/>

>>>>>> "The fans of the film would argue that it has been effective because
it

>>>>>> is true. But truth is not, of itself, persuasive. When we receive new

>>>>>> information on a topic we have no idea whether it is true or not. We

>>>>>> base our conclusions on how it was presented to us, whether it concurs

>>>> with what we already know about that topic, how far we trust the person
>>>> telling us, and how well that information fits inside our world view.
We
>>>> then seek to match our initial conclusions against the conclusions
of
>>>> our peers. So, although we think we seek truth, the process by which
we
>>>> reach opinions is equally capable of leading us in the wrong direction.
>>>> It turns out that Swindle was a collection of rather crude distortions

>>>> in an elegant package. We now know that the data was misrepresented,
the
>>>> charts re-arranged, and the interviews edited in ways that were designed
>>>> to mislead."
>>>>
>>>> From: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Great_Global_Warming_Swindle
>>>> "Although the documentary was welcomed by global warming sceptics,
it
>>>> was criticised heavily by many scientific organisations and individual

>>>> scientists (including two of the film's contributors[3][4]). The film's
>>>> critics argued that it had misused data, relied on out-of-date research,
>>>> employed misleading arguments, and misrepresented the position of the

>>>> Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change."
>>>>
>>>> From: <http://www.climateofdenial.net/?q=node/7>

>>>> available for purchase since late July 2007. The front of the

by

>>>> programme giving a factual account of something, using film,

>>>> contains at least five major misrepresentations of the scientific

>>>> presents details of the five misrepresentations."
>>>>
>>>> From http://www.medialens.org/alerts/07/0313pure_propaganda_the.php
>>>> "What we now have is an out-and-out propaganda piece, in which there
is
>>>> not even a gesture toward balance or explanation of why many of the

>>>> extended inferences drawn in the film are not widely accepted by the

>>>> scientific community. There are so many examples, it's hard to know

>>>> where to begin, so I will cite only one: a speaker asserts, as is true,
>>>> that carbon dioxide is only a small fraction of the atmospheric mass.

>>>> The viewer is left to infer that means it couldn't really matter. But

>>>> even a beginning meteorology student could tell you that the relative

>>>> masses of gases are irrelevant to their effects on radiative balance.

A

>>>> director not intending to produce pure propaganda would have tried
to

>>>> papersonline/channel4response)"

>>>>

>>>> Cheers,

>>>> -Jamie

>>>> www.JamieKruz.com

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> Rich Lamanna wrote:

>>>>> Must be global warming. Anyone seen this? If you've got an hour check

>>>> it

>>>>> out. It may take a minute or two to load.

>>>>>

>>>>> <http://en.sevenload.com/videos/ha4PoKY/The-Great-Global-Warming-Swindle>

>>>>>

>>>>> Rich

>>>>>

>>>>> "EK Sound" <ask_me@nospam.net> wrote in message news:479e36ad\$1@linux...

>>>>>> Woke up this morning and the temp with wind chill was -59C >:(

>>>>>>

>>>>>> Why did I move here again???

>>>>>>

>>>>>> David.

>>