
Subject: Re: I just this liberal would get a clue.....
Posted by [Deej \[5\]](#) on Fri, 01 Feb 2008 18:40:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hehehe!!!.....Jamie, I figured you'd have something to say about this.

;o)

"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:47a27501@linux...

>

> It would be nice if he would get a clue, very true.

>

> Or at least some compelling evidence. The few alternate theories he cites
> have been aired, discussed, and long been discarded by most experts in the
> field. Why? Because the evidence does not support them. Those ideas have
> already been "battled" and found inadequate, and he has nothing new.

>

> So he's left with a persecution complex, a victim mentality. And
> apparently, a book deal.

>

> Put-on or not, the victim branding is working for him. This is shrewd
> because there's a great market for people who want to be told what they
> want to hear. This beats bothering with ALL THAT PESKY EVIDENCE. Who has
> time to understand atmospheric chemistry, after all? Cherrypick a few
> indignant sounding bits here and there, attack peer review, attack
> experts, ignore most of the research, and that's good enough to sell the
> lie.

>

> Anyway, there's been substantial commercial backing for obfuscation of
> climate science. So he'll probably do pretty well in the denial industry.

>

> I don't see any scientific qualifications listed, so he may not have any.
> This could be a detriment if he were trying to write for scientific
> journals. But there are no such qualifications needed to write a denial
> book other than the ability to write hyperbole and half truths. Which,
> judging by that link, he does very well.

>

> Just once it would be nice to see a political writer (left, right or
> sideways) who has a clue about science. But no, he's misusing the issue to
> make political points and create scapegoats, much like he's accusing
> others of doing. There's a word for that.

>

> BTW, not so long ago anthropogenic climate change proponents were the
> contrarians. They were the outcasts, or the visionaries, depending on who
> you asked. But as more and more evidence piled up, theirs became the
> consensus. That's how science works. It's about the data.

>

> But that's not how politics works, obviously. Personally, I think we ought

>>>>> 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/](http://www.realclimate.org/index.php/archives/2007/11/global-dimming-and-global-warming/)
>>>>>
>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>> www.JamieKruz.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

>>>>>> including

>>>>>> rise

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

>>>>>> increased

>>>>>> >previous

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

>>>>>> years).

>>>>>> Increasing greenhouse gases are causing

>>>>>> 0.6

>>>>>> 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

>>>>>> natural
>>>>>> 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

>>>>>> additional

>>>>>> range
>>>>>> 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

>>>>>> are
>>>>>> 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

>>>>>> arising

>>>>>> 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.JamieKrutz.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

>>>>>>> defined
>>>> by

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

>>>>>>> DVD
>>>>>>> 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

>>>>>>>> (<http://ocean.mit.edu/~cwunsch/papersonline/channel4response>)"

>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>> www.JamieKrutz.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.
>>

