

---

Subject: Re: I just this liberal would get a clue.....

Posted by [excelav](#) on Sat, 02 Feb 2008 04:31:16 GMT

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

---

There are plenty of scientist that say that man is not the reason for global warming. I'm all for polluting the earth less, what I'm not for is global offset taxes based on a lie. Since you bring the word ignorance in to this, I'll say get educated on the trilateral commission.

Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>James McCloskey wrote:

>> Al Gore also got a book deal and a movie deal, so it's about money, fame and

>> power. He is still trying to be a player on the world's stage.

>

>Is that praise or criticism? He's obviously more successful than we are.

>

>But whatever, he's just one guy. As much as some folks want to make the

>issue all about one guy, it's not. It's about atmospheric chemistry.

>

>Our various opinions of Al or Alexander or anyone else make not one whit

>of difference to the atmosphere, which will continue to do what it does

>as trace gas ratios change. Which is to say the trophosphere will get

>warmer and the mesosphere cooler. And the mechanism of how that can

>affect conditions on the ground over time is generally well understood.

>

>

>> There are just as many scientist that say man made global warming is bullshit.

>> Has there been global warming, yes, the earth does that. Has man been

a

>> significant contributor, no!

>

>I'm certainly convinced by your use of the exclamation point. ;^)

>

>Your assertion fails to trump all the evidence to the contrary that

>you're ignoring.

>

>Your incorrect 50/50 scientist count makes it look like you're just

>repeating the false claims of the denial industry.

>

>

>> The US spends more than 2 billion dollars a year on climate research.

The

>> scientist that are benefitting from the government honey want even more money

>> for their programs, it's about money!  
>  
>If that were true why aren't you attacking ALL scientific research. It's  
  
>obviously a total boondoggle with no benefit for mankind. Scientists are  
  
>just in it for the money!  
>  
>Also, musicians. Did you know that some rock stars have made MILLIONS!  
>Some of them even MORE than scientists. They must also be terrible  
>people with diabolical motives. And baseball players, some of them make  
  
>a LOT MORE than scientists. Horrible, evil people they must be.  
>  
>If scientists, rock stars and baseball players were ethical, they would  
  
>WORK FOR FREE!!!! Until they do, we simply can't trust them.  
>  
>Heh.  
>  
>So anyway, I'm sensing a pattern here. Attack the messenger. Al Gore is  
  
>bad, so let's ignore what the evidence suggests may be happening in the  
  
>atmosphere. Climate Scientists are bad, so let's ignore what the  
>evidence suggests may be happening in the atmosphere.  
>  
>I'm probably bad, too. So let's ignore what the evidence suggests may be  
  
>happening in the atmosphere. There, I just saved you some typing. ;^)  
>  
>That's just a form of false rhetorical inoculation. If you can't prevail  
  
>on the merits, find a way to discredit the source. The PR flacks behind  
  
>the denial industry know this tactic well. What they want is for  
>everyone to ignore what the evidence suggests is happening in the  
>atmosphere.  
>  
>Because if we continue to pay attention to what the evidence suggests  
>may be happening in the atmosphere, it may be bad for fossil fuel  
>business in the short term. Which not incidentally may also be bad for  
>some politicians who depend on that industry for support.  
>  
>  
>> They can't prove it. They don't want  
>> their programs cut, so they are trying to scare us.  
>

>If Paul Revere knocked on your door, I guess you'd punch him in the nose.  
>  
>If there were no evidence, then yes, it'd be a mere fear campaign. But  
>there is compelling evidence so at this point the prudent thing is to  
>consider the evidence and act on it.  
>  
>  
>> All the sea life won't  
>> be dead in 50 years, it's a lie!  
>  
>That looks like a straw man. What climate scientist has made that claim?  
>  
>  
>> It is also about the trilateralist wanting  
>> to shift the wealth out of the US to other countries, and rule the world  
>> economically.  
>  
>Clearly your beef is with your trilateralists, then. Whoever and  
>whatever they may be.  
>  
>But if you take out your frustration on mere scientists then you're  
>wasting your time, and their time, and getting in the way of actual  
>research. There are some very hard working, intelligent, caring and  
>helpful climate scientists doing their best to help us understand how  
>the atmosphere works. What's your beef with that?  
>  
>It would be a weird paranoid fantasy to pretend climate scientists are a  
  
>vast cabal of evil villains. And I suppose only fossil fuel lobbyists  
>can save us from this scourge, by helping us pollute more and faster! :^)  
>  
>BTW, if you ignore the evidence to date, or just cherrypick, you're  
>working from a position of ignorance which will not help you with your  
>apparent trilateralist issue.  
>  
>Now maybe your trilateralists are a big evil conspiracy worthy of your  
>time, I don't know.  
>  
>But by contrast, scientists are generally people who have a passion for  
  
>knowledge and the motivation to learn and explore. Not evil villains  
>plotting to take away your freedom.  
>  
>  
>> Al Gore is a trilateralist, he wants to make global offsets  
>> a mandatory tax on America. It's another sin tax, how original.  
>  
>Hate Al Gore all you want, if that's what floats your boat.

>  
>There are many approaches to mitigating pollution. Find the ones you can  
>support, oppose the ones you can't.  
>  
>Resorting to denying the evidence is the lazy way out. And it's not  
>going to be an effective strategy unless you expect everyone to quit  
>reading the science. Because those that do read the science are going  
>wonder why you ignore it.  
>  
>  
>> They are  
>> already teaching kids in school that all the weather changes are because  
>> of man made global warming, it's early brain washing. Man made global  
warming  
>> is a theory that can not be proven!  
>  
>Are you kidding? It's a theory that's well supported by current  
>evidence. Take the time to read the actual science.  
>  
>What is your concept of proof? Do you want to see if the worst case  
>happens before you would support doing something prudent to prevent it?  
  
>You just lost my vote for president.  
>  
>We're living in the test tube, so to speak. So it's not like we can just  
  
>run the experiment full tilt and see what happens, without risk.  
>  
>  
>> It's a bout money, power and control.  
>> Man made global warming is a lie that is being pushed by a politician!  
  
>  
>The atmosphere cares nothing about money, power or control.  
>  
>Chemical reactions and associated heating changes will continue with or  
  
>without our knowledge or interest. But it looks like we can change our  
>part of the equation if we DO pay attention.  
>  
>As far as lies being pushed by politicians, that does happen. Exhibit A:  
  
>Senator James Imhoff, Oklahoma, funded in part by the fossil fuels  
>industry and a prime political mouthpiece for climate change denial.  
>That may be an example of "money, power and control" you are actually  
>supporting, despite your criticism of such things. Think about that.  
>

>Cheers,  
> -Jamie  
> www.JamieKruz.com  
>  
>  
>  
>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:  
>>> 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 to face facts as we find them and quit playing political games  
>>> when it comes to the planet. That goes for all parties on all sides in  
>>> all countries.  
>>>  
>>> Cheers,  
>>> -Jamie  
>>> www.JamieKrutz.com  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> Deej wrote:  
>>>> [http://www.spiked-online.com/index.php?site/reviewofbooks\\_printable/4357/](http://www.spiked-online.com/index.php?site/reviewofbooks_printable/4357/)  
>>>>  
>>>> ;o)  
>>>>  
>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:47a0168b@linux...  
>>>>> chuck duffy wrote:  
>>>>>> So does this evidence mean that .....

>>>> ....global dimming and greenhouse gas induced warming are two different  
>>  
>>>> processes that for a time overlapped. Global dimming is not going to  
>>  
>>>> magically save us from the current warming trend. We're on the right  
>> track  
>>>> with worldwide plans to slow our contribution of greenhouse gases ASAP.  
>>>>  
>>>> Cheers,  
>>>> -Jamie  
>>>> www.JamieKruz.com  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>> 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](http://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](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 occurring<sup>1</sup>. 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)<sup>2</sup>. 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

>>>>>>>> carbon dioxide, methane, tropospheric ozone, and nitrous oxide

>> to

>>>>>>>> rise

>>>>>>>> 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

>> 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](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

the  
>>  
>>>>>>> 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

the  
>>  
>>>>>>> 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

the  
>>  
>>>>>>> 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  
>>

net  
>>  
>>>>>>> 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  
>>

>>

>>>>>>> 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."





>>>>> 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](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,

>> 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.p hp](http://www.medialens.org/alerts/07/0313pure_propaganda_the.p hp)  
>>>>>>>>> "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](http://ocean.mit.edu/~cwunsch/papersonline/channel4response))"  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> Cheers,  
>>>>>>>>> -Jamie  
>>>>>>>>> [www.JamieKruz.com](http://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.  
>>>>  
>>

---