
Subject: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [Deej \[5\]](#) on Mon, 04 Feb 2008 08:01:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Opened up the mudroom door to go take out the trash and.....

File Attachments

1) [enough already.JPG](#), downloaded 345 times



Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [Deej \[5\]](#) on Mon, 04 Feb 2008 08:31:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

the horses have shelter and can plow through it when they leave the shelter. the hounds are indoors with us. We have two other doors we can access that have covered porches over them and we can get outside that way. We've had over 18" of snow in the last 24 hours.....and no.....this is not normal. Not at all....but it was normal for this area until around 1990. Another thing that used to be normal around here is the spring flooding of the Animas River valley across the road from us where there is now a golf course, a bunch of upper 6 figure homes and a shopping center being built.

<http://www.daltonranch.com/>

It will be interesting to see if there is anything left of this come May.

"Kim" <hiddensounds@hotmail.com> wrote in message news:47a6cd69\$1@linux...

>
>
> Holy guacamole! Is that normal for this time of year?!?
>
> You got supplies? How are all your animals doing in all that?
>
> Sheez... that's scary. I hope it clears up soon.
>
> Remind me not to ask about those tweeters for another week. ;o(Seems you
> have far bigger fish to fry...
>
> Cheers,
> Kim.
>
> "Deej" <noway@jose.net> wrote:
>> Opened up the mudroom door to go take out the trash and.....
>>
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [Kim](#) on Mon, 04 Feb 2008 09:31:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Holy guacamole! Is that normal for this time of year?!?

You got supplies? How are all your animals doing in all that?

Sheez... that's scary. I hope it clears up soon.

Remind me not to ask about those tweeters for another week. ;o(Seems you have far bigger fish to fry...

Cheers,
Kim.

"Deej" <noway@jose.net> wrote:

>Opened up the mudroom door to go take out the trash and.....

>
>
>

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [Kim](#) on Mon, 04 Feb 2008 10:03:35 GMT

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

"Deej" <noway@jose.net> wrote:

><http://www.daltonranch.com/>

>
>It will be interesting to see if there is anything left of this come May.

That much melted snow has to go somewhere...

Sounds like you're not at the bottom of the hill. Lucky.

Cheers,
Kim.

>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

>"Kim" <hiddensounds@hotmail.com> wrote in message news:47a6cd69\$1@linux...

>>
>>
>> Holy guacamole! Is that normal for this time of year?!?
>>

>> You got supplies? How are all your animals doing in all that?
>>
>> Sheez... that's scary. I hope it clears up soon.
>>
>> Remind me not to ask about those tweeters for another week. ;o(Seems
you
>> have far bigger fish to fry...
>>
>> Cheers,
>> Kim.
>>
>> "Deej" <noway@jose.net> wrote:
>>> Opened up the mudroom door to go take out the trash and.....
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [Don Nafe](#) on Mon, 04 Feb 2008 12:41:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Welcome to Global Warming Deej...toasty?

hehehe

"Deej" <noway@jose.net> wrote in message news:47a6c9df@linux...
> Opened up the mudroom door to go take out the trash and.....
>
>

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [Aaron Allen](#) on Mon, 04 Feb 2008 14:22:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

That's just awful man. I'll think about you as I'm riding my motorcycle to
work today. We've had a freak blast of 'global warming' thrust upon us
yesterday and today. You and Amy about ready to load of the animals and hang
at my pad?

AA

"Deej" <noway@jose.net> wrote in message news:47a6c9df@linux...
> Opened up the mudroom door to go take out the trash and.....
>
>

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Mon, 04 Feb 2008 17:20:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hey Don, it's true that one of the expected byproducts of global warming is increased extreme weather events, including winter weather events. But it's not possible to pin a particular event on global warming until you review all the data, much later, to account for other variables/cycles.

Hey Deej, that's an impressive pile of snow! I haven't seen anything like that since the big storm of 03 (I think it was) when I was snowed OUT of my house in Conifer for a week. I was something like 8 feet of snow. When they finally plowed a one lane channel through the snow past the end of the driveway, we went back up to see if the place survived. We had to borrow snow shoes to get over the snow and then dig down to get to the front door.

That storm was the only one where I had to shovel snow off of the roof. I was very surprised the roof and deck didn't collapse under all that weight.

Stay safe and warm, bro!

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKruz.com

Don Nafe wrote:
> Welcome to Global Warming Deej...toasty?
>
> hehehe
>
>
> "Deej" <noway@jose.net> wrote in message news:47a6c9df@linux...
>> Opened up the mudroom door to go take out the trash and.....
>>
>>
>

>

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [LaMontt](#) on Mon, 04 Feb 2008 18:43:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

DJ, Where is this?

"Deej" <noway@jose.net> wrote:

>Opened up the mudroom door to go take out the trash and.....

>

>

>

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [Deej \[5\]](#) on Mon, 04 Feb 2008 19:00:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote in message news:47a74ed7\$1@linux...

>

> DJ, Where is this?

>

In front of our door!!!!

;o)

(Durango, Colorado, USA.)

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 02:20:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

But temperature changes cause weather changes, and the greater the temperature change, the more extreme the weather. A small change at a global level can cause big changes at the regional level (e.g. introduce warmer winds into a cold climate and you'll get snow, sleet, etc).

At the same time, weather comes in cycles, so to measure increases and decreases in weather patterns you have to go back many decades, or even centuries.

DT

On 2/4/08 7:56 PM, in article 47a7c26a\$1@linux, "Neil" <OIOIU@OI.com> wrote:

>
> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>
>> Hey Don, it's true that one of the expected byproducts of global warming
>
>> is increased extreme weather events, including winter weather events.
>
> This is like saying that one of the byproducts of global
> stupidity is that people will get more intelligent.
>
> Let's see, what else can we blame on opposite-cause events like
> this? If you gain weight, then you'll get skinny? If you become
> rich, it means you can't afford a place to live? If you go
> crazy, then it means you're sane? Nope, none of those make
> sense. Hmmmm.... doesn't seem to work with ANYTHING else except
> global warming, where a cold, cold winter can be blamed on too
> much heat.
>
> Neil

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [audioguy_editout_](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 02:42:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

OK, you win.... ;-)

David.

Deej wrote:

> Opened up the mudroom door to go take out the trash and.....
>
>
>

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [Neil](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 02:56:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>
>Hey Don, it's true that one of the expected byproducts of global warming

>is increased extreme weather events, including winter weather events.

This is like saying that one of the byproducts of global stupidity is that people will get more intelligent.

Let's see, what else can we blame on opposite-cause events like this? If you gain weight, then you'll get skinny? If you become rich, it means you can't afford a place to live? If you go crazy, then it means you're sane? Nope, none of those make sense. Hmmm.... doesn't seem to work with ANYTHING else except global warming, where a cold, cold winter can be blamed on too much heat.

Neil

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [chuck duffy](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 03:36:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Neil" <OIOIU@OI.com> wrote:

"This is like saying that one of the byproducts of global stupidity is that people will get more intelligent."

That is exactly what is happening. Rampant global stupidity makes true intelligence stand out.

Chuck

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [Kim](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 04:25:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Neil" <OIOIU@OI.com> wrote:

>This is like saying that one of the byproducts of global
>stupidity is that people will get more intelligent.

Hehe, I see your point. I mean I'm sure everybody sees it, but...

(1) Weather has always been a bit like that. I mean generally the equator is warm and the poles are cold, but we all know that things like tornadoes, storms, rain, temperature etc, don't follow this simple rule. Otherwise we'd have one global weather prediction and you'd just add 2 degrees because you're closer to the equator than GMT (T for temp ;o)

(2) Scientists predicted this well over two decades ago, and have become more confident of it each year. Meanwhile the planet has heated each year,

and extreme weather events have increased. This is commonly accepted as explaining your wacked storms and tornadoes of the last decade. Indeed you break the tornado record almost every year now, and the planet breaks the temp record.

You examples aren't as rock solid as they appear in any case:

>If you gain weight, then you'll get skinny?

Well one might have thought that eating couldn't make you skinny, but the more celery you eat...

>If you become rich, it means you can't afford a place to live?

Well if you get rich emitting greenhouse gasses can you buy a new planet?
;o)

>If you go crazy, then it means you're sane?

Ask Galileo. He was mad. The dude claimed the earth was round, and that the moon surface wasn't flat but had mountains. He then invented and built this thing called a telescope so people could look through it at the moon. People thought he had won until all the top scientists discussed it and explained that "No, the surface of the moon is totally flat, but it's covered in a TRANSPARENT MATERIAL which can't be seen by the telescope". Thank goodness for that.

Now that doesn't refute your points very solidly, but all rules have limits.

I trust the people who are acclaimed as experts, and put there hand up saying "This is what will happen" which was then followed by that thing actually happening. Generally speaking when somebody claims to be an expert and I can't fault their claims I trust them.

I'd be interested as to whether anybody else on the planet, who doesn't support global warming, correctly predicted the increase in extreme weather events with some alternate reason. I'm sure they have concocted some explanation by now, now that they see it, but when I'm deciding who to take my horse betting advice from, I trust the guy who predicted 9 of the last ten races before, not the guy who has a good excuse after the event...

....nor, indeed, the guy who posts on a NG saying "I know nothing about horses, but that blokes horse tipping method doesn't make sense to me!". ;o)

Cheers,
Kim.

Subject: How I spent my day part 1

Posted by [Deej \[5\]](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 05:31:21 GMT

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

"Deej" <noway@jose.net> wrote in message news:47a6c9df@linux...

> Opened up the mudroom door to go take out the trash and.....

>

>

>

File Attachments

1) [snowblower.JPG](#), downloaded 337 times



Subject: Part 2
Posted by [Deej \[5\]](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 05:31:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Deej" <noway@jose.net> wrote in message news:47a6c9df@linux...
> Opened up the mudroom door to go take out the trash and.....
>
>
>

File Attachments

1) [winnebago.JPG](#), downloaded 326 times



Subject: part 3
Posted by [Deej \[5\]](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 05:32:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Deej" <noway@jose.net> wrote in message news:47a6c9df@linux...
> Opened up the mudroom door to go take out the trash and.....
>
>
>

File Attachments

1) [snowblower.JPG](#), downloaded 333 times



Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 05:33:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Neil wrote:

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

>> Hey Don, it's true that one of the expected byproducts of global warming

>

>> is increased extreme weather events, including winter weather events.

>

> This is like saying that one of the byproducts of global

> stupidity is that people will get more intelligent.

We can only hope! :^)

An increase in extreme weather events is predicted by climate scientists as a consequence of the current climate change event.

It may seem counter-intuitive until you really think about it.

Warmer ocean water, more evaporation, more energy in weather systems to carry the moisture farther, this can bring more snow over the mountains.

(And again, any single weather event can't be linked to the current climate change by itself. But over time we can measure patterns.)

Another recent study shows the possibility for earlier rain and earlier snow pack melting leading to quicker snow pack degradation. So even though individual weather systems may dump a lot of moisture (hang in there, Dee!), it may not stay around as long or melt as slowly. Which means we may be facing possible water shortages in some areas.

<http://climate.weather.com/articles/watertrends020108.html>

"They found that up to 60 percent of changes in river flow, temperature and snow pack between 1950 and 1999 can be attributed to human activities, such as driving, that release emissions including carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases into the atmosphere."

> Let's see, what else can we blame on opposite-cause events like
> this?

Don't be confused by the term "global warming." It doesn't mean equal heat everywhere on the globe, weather doesn't work like that.

That's one reason to use the "climate change" label instead. It's more accurate and less confusing to people. Another is that as the surface warms (on average), the mesosphere cools. Both from the same mechanism, the additional heat absorption and re-radiation from additional greenhouse gases.

It's interesting to read about this stuff.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Earth%27s_atmosphere

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Global_warming

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Greenhouse_effect

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Atmospheric_chemistry

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Meteorology>

Cheers,

-Jamie

www.JamieKruz.com

> Neil

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this

Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 06:02:13 GMT

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

Neil wrote:

> I'd love to stick around & read more of your one-trick-pony-
> turn-every-single-fucking-thread-on-this-board-into-a-global -
> warming-rant...

Heh. It was hardly a rant, Neil. You should see it when I really cut lose. ;^)

I didn't bring up climate change in this thread. I just responded to it, like you.

> ...but right now I've got to go buy some carbon credits.

If you think that's best.

Cheers,

-Jamie

www.JamieKruz.com

> Neil

>

>

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

>> Neil wrote:

>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>> Hey Don, it's true that one of the expected byproducts of global warming
>>>> is increased extreme weather events, including winter weather events.
>
>>> This is like saying that one of the byproducts of global
>>> stupidity is that people will get more intelligent.
>> We can only hope! :^)
>>
>> An increase in extreme weather events is predicted by climate scientists
>
>> as a consequence of the current climate change event.
>>
>> It may seem counter-intuitive until you really think about it.
>>
>> Warmer ocean water, more evaporation, more energy in weather systems to
>
>> carry the moisture farther, this can bring more snow over the mountains.
>>
>> (And again, any single weather event can't be linked to the current
>> climate change by itself. But over time we can measure patterns.)
>>
>> Another recent study shows the possibility for earlier rain and earlier
>
>> snow pack melting leading to quicker snow pack degradation. So even
>> though individual weather systems may dump a lot of moisture (hang in
>> there, Deeji!), it may not stay around as long or melt as slowly. Which
>> means we may be facing possible water shortages in some areas.
>>
>> <http://climate.weather.com/articles/watertrends020108.html>
>>
>> "They found that up to 60 percent of changes in river flow, temperature
>
>> and snow pack between 1950 and 1999 can be attributed to human
>> activities, such as driving, that release emissions including carbon
>> dioxide and other greenhouse gases into the atmosphere."
>>
>>
>>> Let's see, what else can we blame on opposite-cause events like
>>> this?
>> Don't be confused by the term "global warming." It doesn't mean equal
>> heat everywhere on the globe, weather doesn't work like that.
>>
>> That's one reason to use the "climate change" label instead. It's more
>> accurate and less confusing to people. Another is that as the surface
>> warms (on average), the mesosphere cools. Both from the same mechanism,
>
>> the additional heat absorption and re-radiation from additional
>> greenhouse gases.

>>
>> It's interesting to read about this stuff.
>>
>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Earth%27s_atmosphere
>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Global_warming
>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Greenhouse_effect
>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Atmospheric_chemistry
>> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Meteorology>
>>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> www.JamieKruz.com
>>
>>
>>
>>> Neil
>

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [Tony Benson](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 06:02:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

So you're saying we're all pretty much f*cked then, huh Jamie. We really are our own worst enemies. The problem now is we can't do much to stop it. Short of deciding, as a species, to go back to living "pre-industrialization" life styles. Wanna place any bets on that happening? ;>)

Seriously, I don't know if I believe everything the doomsayers are preaching. I also don't think we're doing the world any good though by the amount of carbon we pump into the air. Hopefully, we still have enough time to figure out a clean way to produce the energy we need to maintain our current and growing rate of consumption. I just don't see us all getting around on horses, plowing our fields with oxen, and reading by candlelight anytime soon.

Maybe the Mayans's were right? Four years and counting is it? :>o

Tony

On 2/4/08 11:33 PM, in article 47a7f891@linux, "Jamie K"
<Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

> Neil wrote:
>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>> Hey Don, it's true that one of the expected byproducts of global warming
>>

>>> is increased extreme weather events, including winter weather events.
>>
>> This is like saying that one of the byproducts of global
>> stupidity is that people will get more intelligent.
>
> We can only hope! :^)
>
> An increase in extreme weather events is predicted by climate scientists
> as a consequence of the current climate change event.
>
> It may seem counter-intuitive until you really think about it.
>
> Warmer ocean water, more evaporation, more energy in weather systems to
> carry the moisture farther, this can bring more snow over the mountains.
>
> (And again, any single weather event can't be linked to the current
> climate change by itself. But over time we can measure patterns.)
>
> Another recent study shows the possibility for earlier rain and earlier
> snow pack melting leading to quicker snow pack degradation. So even
> though individual weather systems may dump a lot of moisture (hang in
> there, Dee!), it may not stay around as long or melt as slowly. Which
> means we may be facing possible water shortages in some areas.
>
> <http://climate.weather.com/articles/watertrends020108.html>
>
> "They found that up to 60 percent of changes in river flow, temperature
> and snow pack between 1950 and 1999 can be attributed to human
> activities, such as driving, that release emissions including carbon
> dioxide and other greenhouse gases into the atmosphere."
>
>
>> Let's see, what else can we blame on opposite-cause events like
>> this?
>
> Don't be confused by the term "global warming." It doesn't mean equal
> heat everywhere on the globe, weather doesn't work like that.
>
> That's one reason to use the "climate change" label instead. It's more
> accurate and less confusing to people. Another is that as the surface
> warms (on average), the mesosphere cools. Both from the same mechanism,
> the additional heat absorption and re-radiation from additional
> greenhouse gases.
>
> It's interesting to read about this stuff.
>
> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Earth%27s_atmosphere
> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Global_warming

> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Greenhouse_effect
> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Atmospheric_chemistry
> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Meteorology>
>
> Cheers,
> -Jamie
> www.JamieKruz.com
>
>
>
>> Neil

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 06:35:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Tony Benson wrote:

> So you're saying we're all pretty much f*cked then, huh Jamie.

Me? No, I'm not saying that.

We would have been better off not dragging our feet for so long, but there's still time to make a difference, and people ARE acting on what we know.

> We really are
> our own worst enemies. The problem now is we can't do much to stop it.

It's important to realize that's not true.

Doing nothing would be a very risky choice.

Some warming has happened, some will still happen no matter what we do because of how long greenhouse gases already added will stay in the atmosphere.

But a significant amount of warming can still be prevented. There's a lot we can do, some of which we are already doing.

> Short
> of deciding, as a species, to go back to living "pre-industrialization" life
> styles. Wanna place any bets on that happening? ;>)

I haven't seen that idea proposed in any serious mitigation plan. :^)

> Seriously, I don't know if I believe everything the doomsayers are
> preaching.

Nor I. There are always exaggerations. But if you avoid some of the more hyperbolic special interest groups and stick closely to the science, the more likely range of possible outcomes is worth paying attention to and working to mitigate.

> I also don't think we're doing the world any good though by the
> amount of carbon we pump into the air.

It might be good for some places where a warmer climate is at least a superficial improvement, but bad overall for the possible shock of rapid ecosystem change, threats to coastlines and hard to predict outcomes like the possible melting of permafrost (which would release methane, another greenhouse gas), changing of ocean currents and other rolls of the dice.

> Hopefully, we still have enough time
> to figure out a clean way to produce the energy we need to maintain our
> current and growing rate of consumption. I just don't see us all getting
> around on horses, plowing our fields with oxen, and reading by candlelight
> anytime soon.

I don't know that horses are all that great of a solution, although I like horses. :^)

But we have a lot of options. There are a lot of efficiency improvements we can make in building design, city planning and manufacturing; logistical improvements to transportation; more efficient uses of fossil fuels; increased use of renewable energy; and faster adoption of more efficient technologies.

Here are a few different perspectives:

<http://carbonsequestration.us/Papers-presentations/htm/Pacala-Socolow-ScienceMag-Aug2004.pdf>

<http://www.ases.org/climatechange/>

<http://www.westernresourceadvocates.org/energy/clenergy.php>

<http://www.ipcc.ch/>

I highly recommend this issue of Scientific American:

<http://www.sciam.com/sciammag/?contents=2006-09>

Especially this article:

<http://www.sciam.com/article.cfm?id=a-plan-to-keep-carbon-in>

Worth a trip to the library.

> Maybe the Mayans's were right? Four years and counting is it? :>o

What did the Mayan's say?

Cheers,

-Jamie

www.JamieKruz.com

> Tony

>

>

> On 2/4/08 11:33 PM, in article 47a7f891@linux, "Jamie K"

> <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>

>> Neil wrote:

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

>>>> Hey Don, it's true that one of the expected byproducts of global warming
>>>> is increased extreme weather events, including winter weather events.

>>> This is like saying that one of the byproducts of global
>>> stupidity is that people will get more intelligent.

>> We can only hope! :^)

>>

>> An increase in extreme weather events is predicted by climate scientists
>> as a consequence of the current climate change event.

>>

>> It may seem counter-intuitive until you really think about it.

>>

>> Warmer ocean water, more evaporation, more energy in weather systems to
>> carry the moisture farther, this can bring more snow over the mountains.

>>

>> (And again, any single weather event can't be linked to the current
>> climate change by itself. But over time we can measure patterns.)

>>

>> Another recent study shows the possibility for earlier rain and earlier
>> snow pack melting leading to quicker snow pack degradation. So even
>> though individual weather systems may dump a lot of moisture (hang in
>> there, Deeji!), it may not stay around as long or melt as slowly. Which
>> means we may be facing possible water shortages in some areas.

>>

>> <http://climate.weather.com/articles/watertrends020108.html>

>>

>> "They found that up to 60 percent of changes in river flow, temperature

>> and snow pack between 1950 and 1999 can be attributed to human
>> activities, such as driving, that release emissions including carbon
>> dioxide and other greenhouse gases into the atmosphere."
>>
>>
>>> Let's see, what else can we blame on opposite-cause events like
>>> this?
>> Don't be confused by the term "global warming." It doesn't mean equal
>> heat everywhere on the globe, weather doesn't work like that.
>>
>> That's one reason to use the "climate change" label instead. It's more
>> accurate and less confusing to people. Another is that as the surface
>> warms (on average), the mesosphere cools. Both from the same mechanism,
>> the additional heat absorption and re-radiation from additional
>> greenhouse gases.
>>
>> It's interesting to read about this stuff.
>>
>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Earth%27s_atmosphere
>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Global_warming
>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Greenhouse_effect
>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Atmospheric_chemistry
>> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Meteorology>
>>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> www.JamieKruz.com
>>
>>
>>
>>> Neil
>

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 06:46:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Neil wrote:
> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>> Neil wrote:
>>> I'd love to stick around & read more of your one-trick-pony-
>>> turn-every-single-fucking-thread-on-this-board-into-a-global -
>>> warming-rant...
>> Heh. It was hardly a rant, Neil. You should see it when I really cut
>> lose. ;^)
>
> I have, trust me.

>
>>> ...but right now I've got to go buy some carbon credits.
>> If you think that's best.
>
> Oh, I'm sure it'll fix everything.

It's more likely to take more than one approach. There's no single magic bullet.

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKruz.com

> Neil

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [Neil](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 06:59:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'd love to stick around & read more of your one-trick-pony-turn-every-single-fucking-thread-on-this-board-into-a-global-warming-rant...

...but right now I've got to go buy some carbon credits.

Neil

Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>Neil wrote:

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

>>> Hey Don, it's true that one of the expected byproducts of global warming

>>

>>> is increased extreme weather events, including winter weather events.

>>

>> This is like saying that one of the byproducts of global
>> stupidity is that people will get more intelligent.

>

>We can only hope! :^)

>

>An increase in extreme weather events is predicted by climate scientists

>as a consequence of the current climate change event.

>

>It may seem counter-intuitive until you really think about it.

>
>Warmer ocean water, more evaporation, more energy in weather systems to

>carry the moisture farther, this can bring more snow over the mountains.
>
>(And again, any single weather event can't be linked to the current
>climate change by itself. But over time we can measure patterns.)
>
>Another recent study shows the possibility for earlier rain and earlier

>snow pack melting leading to quicker snow pack degradation. So even
>though individual weather systems may dump a lot of moisture (hang in
>there, Dee!), it may not stay around as long or melt as slowly. Which
>means we may be facing possible water shortages in some areas.
>
> <http://climate.weather.com/articles/watertrends020108.html>
>
>"They found that up to 60 percent of changes in river flow, temperature

>and snow pack between 1950 and 1999 can be attributed to human
>activities, such as driving, that release emissions including carbon
>dioxide and other greenhouse gases into the atmosphere."
>
>
>> Let's see, what else can we blame on opposite-cause events like
>> this?
>
>Don't be confused by the term "global warming." It doesn't mean equal
>heat everywhere on the globe, weather doesn't work like that.
>
>That's one reason to use the "climate change" label instead. It's more
>accurate and less confusing to people. Another is that as the surface
>warms (on average), the mesosphere cools. Both from the same mechanism,

>the additional heat absorption and re-radiation from additional
>greenhouse gases.
>
>It's interesting to read about this stuff.
>
>http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Earth%27s_atmosphere
>http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Global_warming
>http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Greenhouse_effect
>http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Atmospheric_chemistry
><http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Meteorology>
>
>Cheers,
> -Jamie
> www.JamieKrutz.com

>
>
>
>> Neil

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [Neil](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 07:24:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>Neil wrote:

>> I'd love to stick around & read more of your one-trick-pony-
>> turn-every-single-fucking-thread-on-this-board-into-a-global -
>> warming-rant...

>

>Heh. It was hardly a rant, Neil. You should see it when I really cut
>lose. ;^)

I have, trust me.

>> ...but right now I've got to go buy some carbon credits.

>

>If you think that's best.

Oh, I'm sure it'll fix everything.

Neil

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [Erling](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 09:29:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

There's always new ways for someone to get more \$ out of problems in
the world, so I'm sure this also will fix everything for some few
ones;-)

Erling

On 5 Feb 2008 17:24:36 +1000, "Neil" <OIUOI@OI.com> wrote:

>>> ...but right now I've got to go buy some carbon credits.

>>

>>If you think that's best.

>

>Oh, I'm sure it'll fix everything.

>
>Neil

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [rick](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 10:00:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

you're probably just being punished for something you did as a child.
(for men that means up into our 60's)

On Mon, 4 Feb 2008 01:01:53 -0700, "Deej" <noway@jose.net> wrote:

>Opened up the mudroom door to go take out the trash and.....
>

Subject: Re: How I spent my day part 1
Posted by [rick](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 10:02:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ya gonna paint those gutters in the spring?

On Mon, 4 Feb 2008 22:31:21 -0700, "Deej" <noway@jose.net> wrote:

>

Subject: Re: Part 2
Posted by [rick](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 10:04:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

hoffa's final resting place???

On Mon, 4 Feb 2008 22:31:45 -0700, "Deej" <noway@jose.net> wrote:

>

Subject: Re: part 3
Posted by [rick](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 10:05:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

reruns already???

On Mon, 4 Feb 2008 22:32:08 -0700, "Deej" <noway@jose.net> wrote:

>

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [Don Nafe](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 12:22:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:47a7f891@linux...

> <http://climate.weather.com/articles/watertrends020108.html>

>

> "They found that up to 60 percent of changes in river flow, temperature
> and snow pack between 1950 and 1999 can be attributed to human activities,
> such as driving, that release emissions including carbon dioxide and other
> greenhouse gases into the atmosphere."

>

>

> Cheers,

> -Jamie

> www.JamieKrutz.com

>

>

Bullshit...sorry got to call you on this one

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [Don Nafe](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 12:40:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote in message news:47a85854@linux...

>

> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:47a7f891@linux...

>

>> <http://climate.weather.com/articles/watertrends020108.html>

>>

>> "They found that up to 60 percent of changes in river flow, temperature
>> and snow pack between 1950 and 1999 can be attributed to human
>> activities, such as driving, that release emissions including carbon
>> dioxide and other greenhouse gases into the atmosphere."

>>

>>

>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> www.JamieKruz.com
>>
>>
>
> Bullshit...sorry got to call you on this one

Try this on for size...open letter to the Bali Conference...check the link to the list of signatories at the bottom of the article

<http://www.nationalpost.com/news/story.html?id=164002>

I can only say that when the world's two top scientists (Hawkins and Dyson) disagree on this topic you can be damn sure the science of "Climate Change" is far from decided

nuff said...crawling back under my rock

Subject: Re: Part 2
Posted by [Don Nafe](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 12:44:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

No fair...a snowblower AND a snow plow!

And I thought you were a real man DeeJ

Hire a twelve year old...have some fun watching him suffer while you're warm inside

hehehe

"Deej" <noway@jose.net> wrote in message news:47a7f848@linux...
>
> "Deej" <noway@jose.net> wrote in message news:47a6c9df@linux...
>> Opened up the mudroom door to go take out the trash and.....
>>
>>
>>
>
>
>

Subject: Re: How I spent my day part 1
Posted by [Don Nafe](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 12:49:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"rick" <parnell68@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:51dgq3h1cmoq7o0ftve5h7q2i08aldhpbk@4ax.com...
> ya gonna paint those gutters in the spring?
>
> On Mon, 4 Feb 2008 22:31:21 -0700, "Deej" <noway@jose.net> wrote:
>
>>

do people still do that?

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [Don Nafe](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 12:55:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"erlilo" <erling.lovik@lyse.net> wrote in message
news:5lagq3l1ms0s7p7j5v3r9erjimpakm3au64@4ax.com...
> There's allways new ways for someone to get more \$ out of problems in
> the world, so I'm sure this also will fix everything for some few
> ones;-)
>
> Erling
>

With the amount of money it would cost Canada to adhere to Kyoto for one
year we could provide all of Africa with clean safe drinking water for 30
years.

Interview with Tom Harris Director NRSP

<http://www.nrsp.com/>

Subject: Re: How I spent my day part 1
Posted by [rick](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 14:31:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

thunderstorms today and snow storm here tonight.

On 6 Feb 2008 01:32:33 +1000, "Neil" <OIOIU@OI.com> wrote:

>
>I think DeeJ sent his storm system down the Rockies to me...
>over the weekend it had gotten warmer - shirtsleeve weather,
>really - but yesterday the temp dropped precipitously and this
>morning it's even a little colder and now the sky around the
>mountains is REALLY dark & threatening. Overnight lows are
>going to be in the mid-20's, and the weather-guessers are
>predicting either showers or showers mixed with snow (depending
>on the forecaster).

>
>Back to you, Jamie...

>
>Neil

>
>
>"Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote:

>>
>>"rick" <parnell68@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>>news:51dgq3h1cmoq7o0ftve5h7q2i08aldhpbk@4ax.com...
>>> ya gonna paint those gutters in the spring?

>>>
>>> On Mon, 4 Feb 2008 22:31:21 -0700, "Deej" <noway@jose.net> wrote:

>>>
>>>>

>>
>>do people still do that?

>>
>>
>>

Subject: Re: part 3
Posted by [rick](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 14:32:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

does that include photo journalism?

On 6 Feb 2008 01:22:22 +1000, "Neil" <OIOI@OI.com> wrote:

>
>Well, there IS a writers' strike still going on, you know.

>
>:D

>
>
>rick <parnell68@hotmail.com> wrote:
>>reruns already???

>>

>>
>>
>>On Mon, 4 Feb 2008 22:32:08 -0700, "Deej" <noway@jose.net> wrote:
>>
>>>
>>

Subject: Re: part 3
Posted by [Neil](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 15:22:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well, there IS a writers' strike still going on, you know.

:D

rick <parnell68@hotmail.com> wrote:
>reruns already???
>
>
>
>On Mon, 4 Feb 2008 22:32:08 -0700, "Deej" <noway@jose.net> wrote:
>
>>
>

Subject: Re: How I spent my day part 1
Posted by [Neil](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 15:32:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I think Deej sent his storm system down the Rockies to me... over the weekend it had gotten warmer - shirtsleeve weather, really - but yesterday the temp dropped precipitously and this morning it's even a little colder and now the sky around the mountains is REALLY dark & threatening. Overnight lows are going to be in the mid-20's, and the weather-guessers are predicting either showers or showers mixed with snow (depending on the forecaster).

Back to you, Jamie...

Neil

"Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote:

>
>"rick" <parnell68@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>news:51dgq3h1cmoq7o0ftve5h7q2i08aldhpbk@4ax.com...
>> ya gonna paint those gutters in the spring?
>>
>> On Mon, 4 Feb 2008 22:31:21 -0700, "Deej" <noway@jose.net> wrote:
>>
>>>
>
>do people still do that?
>
>
>

Subject: Re: Part 2
Posted by [Neil](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 15:41:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Do kids still do that kind of stuff? Shovel snow & mow lawns for pocket money? I used to do that when i was a kid, but I don't know if many kids these days have the physical fortitude to accomplish that, considering all they do is sit around playing video games? lol

As a kid in Massachusetts, I used to look forward to every snowstorm, because it always meant two things: 1.) great sledding at the hill not far from my house; 2.) Pocket money from shoveling driveways! :D

Neil

"Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote:
>No fair...a snowblower AND a snow plow!
>
>And I thought you were a real man Deej
>
>Hire a twelve year old...have some fun watching him suffer while you're warm
>inside
>
>hehehe
>
>
>"Deej" <noway@jose.net> wrote in message news:47a7f848@linux...
>>
>> "Deej" <noway@jose.net> wrote in message news:47a6c9df@linux...
>>> Opened up the mudroom door to go take out the trash and.....

>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: Part 2

Posted by [Don Nafe](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 16:02:00 GMT

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

I have two kids...actually adults now who for the last five years have done our driveway in the winter and cut our lawn when we went camping form a month...now I have my 12 year old son do it...for a reasonable rate

"Neil" <IIOU@OUI.com> wrote in message news:47a875a4\$1@linux...

>

> Do kids still do that kind of stuff? Shovel snow & mow lawns
> for pocket money? I used to do that when i was a kid, but I
> don't know if many kids these days have the physical fortitude
> to accomplish that, considering all they do is sit around
> playing video games? lol

>

> As a kid in Massachusetts, I used to look forward to every
> snowstorm, because it always meant two things: 1.) great
> sledding at the hill not far from my house; 2.) Pocket
> money from shoveling driveways! :D

>

> Neil

>

> "Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote:

>>No fair...a snowblower AND a snow plow!

>>

>>And I thought you were a real man Deej

>>

>>Hire a twelve year old...have some fun watching him suffer while you're

> warm

>>inside

>>

>>hehehe

>>

>>

>>"Deej" <noway@jose.net> wrote in message news:47a7f848@linux...

>>>

>>> "Deej" <noway@jose.net> wrote in message news:47a6c9df@linux...
>>>> Opened up the mudroom door to go take out the trash and.....
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: How I spent my day part 1
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 18:15:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Last week we got some "thunder snow" - an unusual snowstorm that began with lightning.

Last night we got about four inches of snow. By the end of the week it will be in the 50s in the Denver area.

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKruz.com

rick wrote:

> thunderstorms today and snow storm here tonight.

>

>

> On 6 Feb 2008 01:32:33 +1000, "Neil" <OIOIU@OI.com> wrote:

>

>> I think Deej sent his storm system down the Rockies to me...
>> over the weekend it had gotten warmer - shirtsleeve weather,
>> really - but yesterday the temp dropped precipitously and this
>> morning it's even a little colder and now the sky around the
>> mountains is REALLY dark & threatening. Overnight lows are
>> going to be in the mid-20's, and the weather-guessers are
>> predicting either showers or showers mixed with snow (depending
>> on the forecaster).

>>

>> Back to you, Jamie...

>>

>> Neil

>>

>>

>> "Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote:
>>> "rick" <parnell68@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>>> news:51dgq3h1cmoq7o0ftve5h7q2i08aldhpbk@4ax.com...
>>>> ya gonna paint those gutters in the spring?
>>>>
>>>> On Mon, 4 Feb 2008 22:31:21 -0700, "Deej" <noway@jose.net> wrote:
>>>>
>>> do people still do that?
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>

Subject: Re: How I spent my day part 1
Posted by [John \[1\]](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 18:30:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It's 78 degrees here in Charleston, SC today Suckas !!!

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 18:37:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Don Nafe wrote:
> "Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote in message news:47a85854@linux...
>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:47a7f891@linux...
>>> <http://climate.weather.com/articles/watertrends020108.html>
>>>>
>>>> "They found that up to 60 percent of changes in river flow, temperature
>>>> and snow pack between 1950 and 1999 can be attributed to human
>>>> activities, such as driving, that release emissions including carbon
>>>> dioxide and other greenhouse gases into the atmosphere."
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> Cheers,
>>>> -Jamie
>>>> www.JamieKruz.com
>>>>
>>>>
>> Bullshit...sorry got to call you on this one

Why? Automatic gainsaying of every study you see that doesn't feed your confirmation biases is not convincing. You'll have to give reasons, for this one and all the rest.

> Try this on for size...open letter to the Bali Conference...check the link
> to the list of signatories at the bottom of the article
>
> <http://www.nationalpost.com/news/story.html?id=164002>

Great! I'll pick it apart over in General to spare Neil any cognitive dissonance. :^)

> I can only say that when the world's two top scientists (Hawkins and Dyson)
> disagree on this topic you can be damn sure the science of "Climate Change"
> is far from decided

Waiting around until all scientists agree means never doing anything.

The threshold is not, "does everyone agree 100%," but "on what most of the evidence shows, what is the risk posed by doing nothing?"

We know this:

-We only get one shot at this. One window of opportunity.

-The risks of inaction are significant even at the lower range of projections.

-Compelling evidence shows that humans are contributing to the current climate change event, which on the plus side means we have the possibility to control our contribution.

-The more we wait, the harder it will be to mitigate.

Given all that, it makes sense to act to mitigate our greenhouse gas contributions sooner rather than later. It's the prudent course.

We can keep arguing about the specifics in the mean time. We will never get 100% of the scientists, let alone the politicians and special interest groups, to agree until after the fact. When the world can look back and say, boy we did the (check one) ___right ___wrong thing. At which point our great grandkids will (check one) ___thank us ___hate us.

> nuff said...crawling back under my rock

Probably a pretty efficient living arrangement with all that thermal mass, if it's insulated. ;^)

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKrutz.com

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 19:00:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Don Nafe wrote:

> "erlilo" <erling.lovik@lyse.net> wrote in message
> news:5lagq3l1ms0s7p7j5v3r9erjimpakm3au64@4ax.com...
>> There's allways new ways for someone to get more \$ out of problems in
>> the world, so I'm sure this also will fix everything for some few
>> ones;-)
>>
>> Erling
>>
>
>
>
> With the amount of money it would cost Canada to adhere to Kyoto for one
> year we could provide all of Africa with clean safe drinking water for 30
> years.

Or you could go to the moon. Or buy every puppy a Popsicle.

All are false choices. The question is "what should Canada do about greenhouse gas emissions?"

If Canada also wants to consider water in Africa, going to the moon or the puppy thing, those are separate issues.

Except possibly water in Africa, since climate change may cause drought in certain areas. So maybe by addressing greenhouse gas emissions, Canada can both mitigate greenhouse gas emissions and possibly help Africa fend off future water problems.

But listen, here's the bottom line: Whether you agree with the solutions Canada signed up for with Kyoto or not, the evidence for human contribution to the current climate change event is compelling enough to merit our attention. So if you have other ideas for mitigation, jump into that conversation.

Kyoto ends in 1012. The next solutions agreement is being negotiated now. And this time it is likely to include the USA, China and India.

So this next agreement will have a larger impact than Kyoto (and it

needs to).

> Interview with Tom Harris Director NRSP

>

> <http://www.nrsp.com/>

I didn't see an interview there, but I read some of their pages.

I agree with some of their stated objectives and disagree with others. The good side of that is we have some common ground on some of the generalities.

However, they are not the objective source they pretend to be. It looks like they are pretty heavily involved in the denial industry from a fossil fuels special interest perspective.

For your consideration.

http://www.sourcewatch.org/index.php?title=Natural_Resources_Stewardship_Project

"The NRSP has been exposed recently as being controlled by energy industry lobbyists."

"The NRSP maintains it has no direct connection with the Calgary-based group of climate change skeptics the "Friends of Science" [5] (FoS), even though the FoS's most outspoken member, Tim Ball, is now the Chairman of the NRSP. With the exact same purpose and goals, and most of the same scientific allies and members as the Friends of Science, the NRSP is viewed by many as a reincarnation of the FoS, after the FoS was "outed" by The Globe and Mail newspaper in August 2006 as being partly funded by the oil and gas industry. [6]."

There's a lot more. Just so you know where your champions are coming from, and what they are most likely to be championing.

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKruz.com

Subject: Re: How I spent my day part 1
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 19:17:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

LOL You're kidding, right?

Climate change does not alter the fact that the earth has weather.

Who do you think is making that claim? That would be a false claim. Who are you listening to for your scientific input? Where do you get this stuff?

Given the fact that the earth has weather systems, one possible outcome from adding more energy to the system is it can cause weather to be more erratic and extreme.

And, again, no specific weather event can be tied to the current climate change event. But over time we can look for patterns.

Is that clearer?

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Weather>

"The weather is the set of all extant phenomena in a given atmosphere at a given time. It also includes interactions with the hydrosphere. The term usually refers to the activity of these phenomena over short periods (hours or days), as opposed to the term climate, which refers to the average atmospheric conditions over longer periods of time."

Cheers,

-Jamie

www.JamieKrutz.com

Neil wrote:

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

>> Last week we got some "thunder snow" - an unusual snowstorm that began
>> with lightning.

>>

>> Last night we got about four inches of snow. By the end of the week it
>> will be in the 50s in the Denver area.

>

> Gee, that sounds suspiciously like something we used to
> call "weather".

>

> You know, before we called it "global warming".

>

> Neil

Subject: Re: How I spent my day part 1

Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 19:52:11 GMT

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

Neil wrote:

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

>> LOL You're kidding, right?

>

> Of course not - I'm actually just trying to put things in
> perspective... it's winter, meaning: sometimes it snows in
> some areas - sometimes it snows a lot. What I find amazing is
> that if it snows only a little, you're gonna say it's due to
> global warming... if it snows a lot - global warming.

That's not at all what I said. Maybe it's what you expected me to say?

What I said in my last post to you was:

"And, again, no specific weather event can be tied to the current climate change event. But over time we can look for patterns."

Which is the opposite of what you think I said. Weird.

Before that I wrote:

"An increase in extreme weather events is predicted by climate scientists as a consequence of the current climate change event.

It may seem counter-intuitive until you really think about it.

Warmer ocean water, more evaporation, more energy in weather systems to carry the moisture farther, this can bring more snow over the mountains.

(And again, any single weather event can't be linked to the current climate change by itself. But over time we can measure patterns.)"

Read that last paragraph again.

> Do I think that, knowing that emissions of various types affect
> the atmosphere in a negative way, we should ignore it & not try
> to do something about it? No.

Agreed.

> But I also don't think we should
> slaughter every cow in India just because their aggregate
> greenhouse gas output in the form of methane surpasses that
> of the five or six largest cities on the planet combined;

I haven't heard anyone suggest slaughtering every cow in India. Who is proposing that one?

Also what is the source for your methane statistic?

- > and
- > when you tend to blame everything on global warming, from the
- > fact that it's snowing in Durango, to the problem someone's
- > having with their PC overheating when they try to run five EDS
- > cards in it, you've kinda gone way past the "cry wolf" zone in
- > terms of credibility.

Right. Except you're wrong. Maybe you're not reading what I wrote because I haven't been saying that.

Maybe you're thinking of someone else. I believe it was Don N. who implied that DJ's snow was a result of GW, but he was being completely facetious.

So no, I didn't blame the snow in Durango on global warming. Nor the thunder snow here. We won't know that about any specific event until we can look back and see what the pattern is, and take into account other cycles and patterns like (for North America) El Nino, La Nina, etc.

However, it is true that an increase in extreme weather events is one possible consequence of the current climate change event. It's just that we can't look at a specific weather event and say, yeah, that one is from climate change.

What we can do is keep track of the data and look for longer term trends.

And finally, I'm pretty sure that running 5 EDS cards in one computer is THE major contributor to the current climate change event. FOR GOD'S SAKE, NEIL, UNPLUG THAT PARIS BOX!!!

LOL! ;^)

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKruz.com

> Neil
>

Subject: Re: How I spent my day part 1

Posted by [Neil](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 20:03:05 GMT

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

Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>
>Last week we got some "thunder snow" - an unusual snowstorm that began
>with lightning.
>
>Last night we got about four inches of snow. By the end of the week it
>will be in the 50s in the Denver area.

Gee, that sounds suspiciously like something we used to call "weather".

You know, before we called it "global warming".

Neil

Subject: Re: How I spent my day part 1

Posted by [Deej \[5\]](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 20:06:36 GMT

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

Let's just all get together and have a big pie fight and then everything's gonna be OK for a while.

;o)

"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:47a8c1bd\$1@linux...

> Neil wrote:

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

>>> LOL You're kidding, right?

>>

>> Of course not - I'm actually just trying to put things in
>> perspective... it's winter, meaning: sometimes it snows in
>> some areas - sometimes it snows a lot. What I find amazing is
>> that if it snows only a little, you're gonna say it's due to
>> global warming... if it snows a lot - global warming.

>

> That's not at all what I said. Maybe it's what you expected me to say?

>

> What I said in my last post to you was:

>

> "And, again, no specific weather event can be tied to the current climate
> change event. But over time we can look for patterns."

>

> Which is the opposite of what you think I said. Weird.

>

> Before that I wrote:
>
> "An increase in extreme weather events is predicted by climate scientists
> as a consequence of the current climate change event.
>
> It may seem counter-intuitive until you really think about it.
>
> Warmer ocean water, more evaporation, more energy in weather systems to
> carry the moisture farther, this can bring more snow over the mountains.
>
> (And again, any single weather event can't be linked to the current
> climate change by itself. But over time we can measure patterns.)"
>
>
> Read that last paragraph again.
>
>
>> Do I think that, knowing that emissions of various types affect
>> the atmosphere in a negative way, we should ignore it & not try
>> to do something about it? No.
>
> Agreed.
>
>
>> But I also don't think we should
>> slaughter every cow in India just because their aggregate
>> greenhouse gas output in the form of methane surpasses that
>> of the five or six largest cities on the planet combined;
>
> I haven't heard anyone suggest slaughtering every cow in India. Who is
> proposing that one?
>
> Also what is the source for your methane statistic?
>
>
>> and
>> when you tend to blame everything on global warming, from the
>> fact that it's snowing in Durango, to the problem someone's
>> having with their PC overheating when they try to run five EDS
>> cards in it, you've kinda gone way past the "cry wolf" zone in
>> terms of credibility.
>
> Right. Except you're wrong. Maybe you're not reading what I wrote because
> I haven't been saying that.
>
> Maybe you're thinking of someone else. I believe it was Don N. who implied
> that DJ's snow was a result of GW, but he was being completely facetious.
>

> So no, I didn't blame the snow in Durango on global warming. Nor the
> thunder snow here. We won't know that about any specific event until we
> can look back and see what the pattern is, and take into account other
> cycles and patterns like (for North America) El Nino, La Nina, etc.
>
> However, it is true that an increase in extreme weather events is one
> possible consequence of the current climate change event. It's just that
> we can't look at a specific weather event and say, yeah, that one is from
> climate change.
>
> What we can do is keep track of the data and look for longer term trends.
>
> And finally, I'm pretty sure that running 5 EDS cards in one computer is
> THE major contributor to the current climate change event. FOR GOD'S SAKE,
> NEIL, UNPLUG THAT PARIS BOX!!!
>
> LOL! ;^)
>
> Cheers,
> -Jamie
> www.JamieKruz.com
>
>
>
>> Neil
>>

Subject: Re: How I spent my day part 1
Posted by [Deej \[5\]](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 20:07:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"rick" <parnell68@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:51dgq3h1cmoq7o0ftve5h7q2i08aldhpbk@4ax.com...
> ya gonna paint those gutters in the spring?
>

Right after I hang them up again. I doubt I'm gonna have any gutters left if
this keeps up.

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [Don Nafe](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 20:07:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Your sources are wrong...they have openly discussed their funding and made
available to the media the sources and amounts contributed to their

organization and in fact there is very little oil funding - they've answered the hard questions (in the media) regarding their funding and apparent affiliations to my satisfaction and truly appear to be on the up and up

That being said I find it funny you mention denial...seems that they have invited and have a standing offer for an open debate on the facts asurrounding Global Warming and to date not one IPCC, or Global Warming advocate has been willing to discuss this topic in a public forum...wonder why that is.

> Don Nafe wrote:

>> "erlilo" <erling.lovik@lyse.net> wrote in message

>> news:5lagq3l1ms0s7p7j5v3r9erjmpakm3au64@4ax.com...

>>> There's allways new ways for someone to get more \$ out of problems in

>>> the world, so I'm sure this also will fix everything for some few

>>> ones;-)

>>>

>>> Erling

>>>

>>

>>

>>

>> With the amount of money it would cost Canada to adhere to Kyoto for one

>> year we could provide all of Africa with clean safe drinking water for 30

>> years.

>

> Or you could go to the moon. Or buy every puppy a Popsicle.

>

> All are false choices. The question is "what should Canada do about

> greenhouse gas emissions?"

>

> If Canada also wants to consider water in Africa, going to the moon or the

> puppy thing, those are separate issues.

>

> Except possibly water in Africa, since climate change may cause drought in

> certain areas. So maybe by addressing greenhouse gas emissions, Canada can

> both mitigate greenhouse gas emissions and possibly help Africa fend off

> future water problems.

>

> But listen, here's the bottom line: Whether you agree with the solutions

> Canada signed up for with Kyoto or not, the evidence for human

> contribution to the current climate change event is compelling enough to

> merit our attention. So if you have other ideas for mitigation, jump into

> that conversation.
>
> Kyoto ends in 1012. The next solutions agreement is being negotiated now.
> And this time it is likely to include the USA, China and India.
>
> So this next agreement will have a larger impact than Kyoto (and it needs
> to).
>
>
>> Interview with Tom Harris Director NRSP
>>
>> <http://www.nrsp.com/>
>
> I didn't see an interview there, but I read some of their pages.
>
> I agree with some of their stated objectives and disagree with others. The
> good side of that is we have some common ground on some of the
> generalities.
>
> However, they are not the objective source they pretend to be. It looks
> like they are pretty heavily involved in the denial industry from a fossil
> fuels special interest perspective.
>
> For your consideration.
>
> http://www.sourcewatch.org/index.php?title=Natural_Resources_Stewardship_Project
>
> "The NRSP has been exposed recently as being controlled by energy industry
> lobbyists."
>
> "The NRSP maintains it has no direct connection with the Calgary-based
> group of climate change skeptics the "Friends of Science" [5] (FoS), even
> though the FoS's most outspoken member, Tim Ball, is now the Chairman of
> the NRSP. With the exact same purpose and goals, and most of the same
> scientific allies and members as the Friends of Science, the NRSP is
> viewed by many as a reincarnation of the FoS, after the FoS was "outed" by
> The Globe and Mail newspaper in August 2006 as being partly funded by the
> oil and gas industry. [6]."
>
> There's a lot more. Just so you know where your champions are coming from,
> and what they are most likely to be championing.
>
> Cheers,
> -Jamie
> www.JamieKrutz.com

Subject: Re: How I spent my day part 1
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 20:19:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Mmmmm, PIE!!!

I'm so there.

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKruz.com

Deej wrote:

> Let's just all get together and have a big pie fight and then everything's
> gonna be OK for a while.
> ;o)
>
>
> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:47a8c1bd\$1 @linux...
>> Neil wrote:
>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>> LOL You're kidding, right?
>>> Of course not - I'm actually just trying to put things in
>>> perspective... it's winter, meaning: sometimes it snows in
>>> some areas - sometimes it snows a lot. What I find amazing is
>>> that if it snows only a little, you're gonna say it's due to
>>> global warming... if it snows a lot - global warming.
>> That's not at all what I said. Maybe it's what you expected me to say?
>>
>> What I said in my last post to you was:
>>
>> "And, again, no specific weather event can be tied to the current climate
>> change event. But over time we can look for patterns."
>>
>> Which is the opposite of what you think I said. Weird.
>>
>> Before that I wrote:
>>
>> "An increase in extreme weather events is predicted by climate scientists
>> as a consequence of the current climate change event.
>>
>> It may seem counter-intuitive until you really think about it.
>>
>> Warmer ocean water, more evaporation, more energy in weather systems to
>> carry the moisture farther, this can bring more snow over the mountains.
>>
>> (And again, any single weather event can't be linked to the current

>> climate change by itself. But over time we can measure patterns.)"
>>
>>
>> Read that last paragraph again.
>>
>>
>>> Do I think that, knowing that emissions of various types affect
>>> the atmosphere in a negative way, we should ignore it & not try
>>> to do something about it? No.
>> Agreed.
>>
>>
>>> But I also don't think we should
>>> slaughter every cow in India just because their aggregate
>>> greenhouse gas output in the form of methane surpasses that
>>> of the five or six largest cities on the planet combined;
>> I haven't heard anyone suggest slaughtering every cow in India. Who is
>> proposing that one?
>>
>> Also what is the source for your methane statistic?
>>
>>
>>> and
>>> when you tend to blame everything on global warming, from the
>>> fact that it's snowing in Durango, to the problem someone's
>>> having with their PC overheating when they try to run five EDS
>>> cards in it, you've kinda gone way past the "cry wolf" zone in
>>> terms of credibility.
>> Right. Except you're wrong. Maybe you're not reading what I wrote because
>> I haven't been saying that.
>>
>> Maybe you're thinking of someone else. I believe it was Don N. who implied
>> that DJ's snow was a result of GW, but he was being completely facetious.
>>
>> So no, I didn't blame the snow in Durango on global warming. Nor the
>> thunder snow here. We won't know that about any specific event until we
>> can look back and see what the pattern is, and take into account other
>> cycles and patterns like (for North America) El Nino, La Nina, etc.
>>
>> However, it is true that an increase in extreme weather events is one
>> possible consequence of the current climate change event. It's just that
>> we can't look at a specific weather event and say, yeah, that one is from
>> climate change.
>>
>> What we can do is keep track of the data and look for longer term trends.
>>
>> And finally, I'm pretty sure that running 5 EDS cards in one computer is
>> THE major contributor to the current climate change event. FOR GOD'S SAKE,

>> NEIL, UNPLUG THAT PARIS BOX!!!

>>

>> LOL! ;^)

>>

>> Cheers,

>> -Jamie

>> www.JamieKruz.com

>>

>>

>>

>>> Neil

>>>

>

>

Subject: Re: How I spent my day part 1

Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 20:21:18 GMT

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

Neil wrote:

> "Deej" <noway@jose.net> wrote:

>> Let's just all get together and have a big pie fight and then everything's

>

>> gonna be OK for a while.

>> ;o)

>

> No, because a good pie fight necessitates the use of aerosol-

> based propellants for the requisite whipped toppings for said

> pies... said propellants being a major contributor to

> the destruction of the ozone layer, hence accelerating global

> warming.

Luckily we've already mitigated that one with a successful international effort. No more chlorofluorocarbons in propellents!

Pie on!

Cheers,

-Jamie

www.JamieKruz.com

> Neil

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 20:30:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Don Nafe wrote:

> Your sources are wrong...they have openly discussed their funding and made
> available to the media the sources and amounts contributed to their
> organization and in fact there is very little oil funding -

Very little oil funding? IOW, they do accept oil funding.

Just something to keep in mind especially if you are going to charge others with bias based on money, which was one of your claims (and mine, too). It's always interesting to know where a source's bread is buttered.

Accepting money from a biased source doesn't automatically make their arguments wrong, but it does shed light on their perspective and may explain if they choose to ignore some of the evidence in favor of a sponsor.

> they've
> answered the hard questions (in the media) regarding their funding and
> apparent affiliations to my satisfaction and truly appear to be on the up
> and up

Links please.

> That being said I find it funny you mention denial...seems that they have
> invited and have a standing offer for an open debate on the facts
> asurrounding Global Warming and to date not one IPCC, or Global Warming
> advocate has been willing to discuss this topic in a public forum...wonder
> why that is.

I mentioned denial because they are heavily denying existing evidence with vague general statements on their web site. Similar statements to those used by the denial industry in the USA.

I don't know anything about their debate challenge (links please) but the issue is discussed widely worldwide. Although it's really moved on to the solutions discussion at this point. Maybe they aren't being taken seriously internationally. I'll be happy to discuss their perspective, though.

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKrutz.com

>
>> Don Nafe wrote:
>>> "erlilo" <erling.lovik@lyse.net> wrote in message
>>> news:5lagq3l1ms0s7p7j5v3r9erjmpakm3au64@4ax.com...
>>>> There's allways new ways for someone to get more \$ out of problems in
>>>> the world, so I'm sure this also will fix everything for some few
>>>> ones;-)
>>>>
>>>> Erling
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> With the amount of money it would cost Canada to adhere to Kyoto for one
>>> year we could provide all of Africa with clean safe drinking water for 30
>>> years.
>> Or you could go to the moon. Or buy every puppy a Popsicle.
>>
>> All are false choices. The question is "what should Canada do about
>> greenhouse gas emissions?"
>>
>> If Canada also wants to consider water in Africa, going to the moon or the
>> puppy thing, those are separate issues.
>>
>> Except possibly water in Africa, since climate change may cause drought in
>> certain areas. So maybe by addressing greenhouse gas emissions, Canada can
>> both mitigate greenhouse gas emissions and possibly help Africa fend off
>> future water problems.
>>
>> But listen, here's the bottom line: Whether you agree with the solutions
>> Canada signed up for with Kyoto or not, the evidence for human
>> contribution to the current climate change event is compelling enough to
>> merit our attention. So if you have other ideas for mitigation, jump into
>> that conversation.
>>
>> Kyoto ends in 1012. The next solutions agreement is being negotiated now.
>> And this time it is likely to include the USA, China and India.
>>
>> So this next agreement will have a larger impact than Kyoto (and it needs
>> to).
>>
>>
>>> Interview with Tom Harris Director NRSP
>>>
>>> <http://www.nrsp.com/>
>> I didn't see an interview there, but I read some of their pages.
>>
>> I agree with some of their stated objectives and disagree with others. The

>> good side of that is we have some common ground on some of the
>> generalities.
>>
>> However, they are not the objective source they pretend to be. It looks
>> like they are pretty heavily involved in the denial industry from a fossil
>> fuels special interest perspective.
>>
>> For your consideration.
>>
>> http://www.sourcewatch.org/index.php?title=Natural_Resources_ _Stewardship_Project
>>
>> "The NRSP has been exposed recently as being controlled by energy industry
>> lobbyists."
>>
>> "The NRSP maintains it has no direct connection with the Calgary-based
>> group of climate change skeptics the "Friends of Science" [5] (FoS), even
>> though the FoS's most outspoken member, Tim Ball, is now the Chairman of
>> the NRSP. With the exact same purpose and goals, and most of the same
>> scientific allies and members as the Friends of Science, the NRSP is
>> viewed by many as a reincarnation of the FoS, after the FoS was "outed" by
>> The Globe and Mail newspaper in August 2006 as being partly funded by the
>> oil and gas industry. [6]."
>>
>> There's a lot more. Just so you know where your champions are coming from,
>> and what they are most likely to be championing.
>>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> www.JamieKruz.com
>
>

Subject: Re: How I spent my day part 1
Posted by [Don Nafe](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 20:41:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Neil" <OIUOI@OIU.com> wrote in message news:47a8c729\$1@linux...
>
> "Deej" <noway@jose.net> wrote:
>>Let's just all get together and have a big pie fight and then everything's
>
>>gonna be OK for a while.
>>;o)
>
> No, because a good pie fight necessitates the use of aerosol-
> based propellants for the requisite whipped toppings for said
> pies... said propellants being a major contributor to

> the destruction of the ozone layer, hence accelerating global
> warming.
>
> Neil

those are CFCs Neil...have nothing to do with greenhouse gasses so whip cream away

hehe

And yes I was being a smart ass with my DeeJ's weather is a result of global warming comment.

Speaking of weather...China's having the coldest winter in a hundred years...think it might be a sign of global cooling....wait didn't we deal with that in the 70's...or was it the 80's...doesn't matter because it was a natural phenomenon called weather cycles...somewhat like this one we're in...but just to be sure let's pump billions of dollars into useless CO2 reductions just in case.

The research is far from over Jamie and the more that comes in the more the evidence points to causes far more significant than man's contribution to the atmosphere's CO2 levels. If you check I believe we have as humans increased the CO2 levels by 3% which is approximately 0.0003% of the total make up of the earth's atmosphere yet changes in the sun's activity have a significant effect on the level of water vapour in the atmosphere which as we all know is the real engine in temperature change on the planet

And on a slightly different note but on (off) topic check the latest news on NASA's weather reporting stations records on temperature...seems they made a mistake in their calculations...on the high side...oops made a mistake sorry to scare you guys.

Subject: Re: How I spent my day part 1
Posted by [Neil](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 20:47:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>
>LOL You're kidding, right?

Of course not - I'm actually just trying to put things in perspective... it's winter, meaning: sometimes it snows in some areas - sometimes it snows a lot. What I find amazing is that if it snows only a little, you're gonna say it's due to global warming... if it snows a lot - global warming.

Do I think that, knowing that emissions of various types affect the atmosphere in a negative way, we should ignore it & not try to do something about it? No. But I also don't think we should slaughter every cow in India just because their aggregate greenhouse gas output in the form of methane surpasses that of the five or six largest cities on the planet combined; and when you tend to blame everything on global warming, from the fact that it's snowing in Durango, to the problem someone's having with their PC overheating when they try to run five EDS cards in it, you've kinda gone way past the "cry wolf" zone in terms of credibility.

Neil

Subject: Re: How I spent my day part 1
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 21:09:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Don Nafe wrote:

> "Neil" <OIUOI@OIU.com> wrote in message news:47a8c729\$1@linux...
>> "Deej" <noway@jose.net> wrote:
>>> Let's just all get together and have a big pie fight and then everything's
>>> gonna be OK for a while.
>>> ;o)
>> No, because a good pie fight necessitates the use of aerosol-
>> based propellants for the requisite whipped toppings for said
>> pies... said propellants being a major contributor to
>> the destruction of the ozone layer, hence accelerating global
>> warming.
>>
>> Neil
>
> those are CFCs Neil...have nothing to do with greenhouse gasses so whip
> cream away
>
> hehe
>
> And yes I was being a smart ass with my Deej's weather is a result of global
> warming comment.
>
> Speaking of weather...China's having the coldest winter in a hundred
> years...think it might be a sign of global cooling....wait didn't we deal
> with that in the 70's...or was it the 80's...doesn't matter because it was a
> natural phenomenon called weather cycles...somewhat like this one we're
> in...but just to be sure let's pump billions of dollars into useless CO2
> reductions just in case.

You're just baiting now, Don. :^)

Misinterpreting the science, and begging the question.

Google global cooling and see if you can't knock down that straw man yourself. Then read up on weather cycles and get back to me with specifics. And remember that climate change doesn't magically keep weather from happening.

Meanwhile, the world moves on with solutions. Even Canada (except maybe for your "hardly any oil money" guys ;^).

> The research is far from over Jamie and the more that comes in the more the
> evidence points to causes far more significant than man's contribution to
> the atmosphere's CO2 levels.

Of course research is ongoing, Don. And it will be for a long while yet. There's always more to learn. But we already know quite a lot after decades of research.

So far, the research is showing that human contributions are a significant factor in the current climate change event.

None of the scientists are so ignorant that they don't take other climate drivers into account. Except maybe your guys who perhaps ONLY take other climate drivers into account. :^)

If you check I believe we have as humans
> increased the CO2 levels by 3% which is approximately 0.0003% of the total
> make up of the earth's atmosphere yet changes in the sun's activity have a
> significant effect on the level of water vapour in the atmosphere which as we
> all know is the real engine in temperature change on the planet

Thanks for bringing up the tiny number scare. It's specious.

We are releasing a significant amount of greenhouse gases that were previously sequestered underground. By adding them to the tiny fraction of the atmosphere composed of greenhouse gases already in circulation, we're affecting the ability of the atmosphere to retain infrared heat (that's what the greenhouse gases do). With a long lifetime in the atmosphere, the gases stay around and we keep adding to them. And so we are able to have an effect on the average global temperature over time.

> And on a slightly different note but on (off) topic check the latest news on
> NASA's weather reporting stations records on temperature...seems they made a

> mistake in their calculations...on the high side...oops made a mistake sorry
> to scare you guys.

Link? That sounds like old news, long since corrected. Get with the times, Don. Are we going to hear every denial rationalization now, one after the other? I've probably heard them all by now. I should number them.

At some point you're going to realize that your real complaint is with some of the proposed solutions, rather than with the essential facts of the problem. Denying the problem is just an ineffective way of trying to head off solutions that may not be politically attractive to you. It's a losing strategy on multiple levels. For one thing it removes you from the solutions debate where you could have an effect on the solutions chosen.

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKruz.com

Subject: Re: How I spent my day part 1
Posted by [Nei](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 21:29:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Deej" <noway@jose.net> wrote:
>Let's just all get together and have a big pie fight and then everything's

>gonna be OK for a while.
>;o)

No, because a good pie fight necessitates the use of aerosol-based propellants for the requisite whipped toppings for said pies... said propellants being a major contributor to the destruction of the ozone layer, hence accelerating global warming.

Neil

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [Don Nafe](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 22:07:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:47a8cad0@linux...
> Don Nafe wrote:
>> Your sources are wrong...they have openly discussed their funding and
>> made available to the media the sources and amounts contributed to their
>> organization and in fact there is very little oil funding -

- >
- > Very little oil funding? IOW, they do accept oil funding.
- >
- > Just something to keep in mind especially if you are going to charge
- > others with bias based on money, which was one of your claims (and mine,
- > too). It's always interesting to know where a source's bread is buttered.
- >
- > Accepting money from a biased source doesn't automatically make their
- > arguments wrong, but it does shed light on their perspective and may
- > explain if they choose to ignore some of the evidence in favor of a
- > sponsor.

Actually they were initially funded by the University of Alberta and much their funding came from the oil industry so they were indirectly funded by the oil industry

- >
- >
- >> they've answered the hard questions (in the media) regarding their
- >> funding and apparent affiliations to my satisfaction and truly appear to
- >> be on the up and up
- >
- > Links please.

<http://www.nrsp.com/news.html> - sorry, don't remember which interview but it's there...late summer early fall 07 I believe (either with Lowell Green or CBC or both)

- >
- >
- >> That being said I find it funny you mention denial...seems that they have
- >> invited and have a standing offer for an open debate on the facts
- >> asurrounding Global Warming and to date not one IPCC, or Global Warming
- >> advocate has been willing to discuss this topic in a public
- >> forum...wonder why that is.
- >
- > I mentioned denial because they are heavily denying existing evidence with
- > vague general statements on their web site. Similar statements to those
- > used by the denial industry in the USA.

Same URL - many of their articles and interviews get very specific

- >
- > I don't know anything about their debate challenge (links please) but the
- > issue is discussed widely worldwide. Although it's really moved on to the
- > solutions discussion at this point. Maybe they aren't being taken
- > seriously internationally. I'll be happy to discuss their perspective,
- > though.
- >
- > Cheers,

> -Jamie
> www.JamieKrutz.com

same URL - will take you to the article or interview (December 23rd I believe)

And lastly comparing the unsafe drinking water in a continent to buying a puppy a popsicle is a sad and disturbing commentary on the enviro-movement....in fact they have been accused of using Kyoto etc as a means of keeping the underdeveloped countries underdeveloped. Trust me...follow the money, I think you'll be surprised.

>
>>
>>> Don Nafe wrote:
>>>> "erlilo" <erling.lovik@lyse.net> wrote in message
>>>> news:5lagq3l1ms0s7p7j5v3r9erjmpakm3au64@4ax.com...
>>>>> There's allways new ways for someone to get more \$ out of problems in
>>>>> the world, so I'm sure this also will fix everything for some few
>>>>> ones;-)
>>>>>
>>>>> Erling
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> With the amount of money it would cost Canada to adhere to Kyoto for
>>>>> one year we could provide all of Africa with clean safe drinking water
>>>>> for 30 years.
>>> Or you could go to the moon. Or buy every puppy a Popsicle.
>>>
>>> All are false choices. The question is "what should Canada do about
>>> greenhouse gas emissions?"
>>>
>>> If Canada also wants to consider water in Africa, going to the moon or
>>> the puppy thing, those are separate issues.
>>>
>>> Except possibly water in Africa, since climate change may cause drought
>>> in certain areas. So maybe by addressing greenhouse gas emissions,
>>> Canada can both mitigate greenhouse gas emissions and possibly help
>>> Africa fend off future water problems.
>>>
>>> But listen, here's the bottom line: Whether you agree with the solutions
>>> Canada signed up for with Kyoto or not, the evidence for human
>>> contribution to the current climate change event is compelling enough to
>>> merit our attention. So if you have other ideas for mitigation, jump

>>> into that conversation.
>>>
>>> Kyoto ends in 1012. The next solutions agreement is being negotiated
>>> now. And this time it is likely to include the USA, China and India.
>>>
>>> So this next agreement will have a larger impact than Kyoto (and it
>>> needs to).
>>>
>>>
>>>> Interview with Tom Harris Director NRSP
>>>>
>>>> <http://www.nrsp.com/>
>>> I didn't see an interview there, but I read some of their pages.
>>>
>>> I agree with some of their stated objectives and disagree with others.
>>> The good side of that is we have some common ground on some of the
>>> generalities.
>>>
>>> However, they are not the objective source they pretend to be. It looks
>>> like they are pretty heavily involved in the denial industry from a
>>> fossil fuels special interest perspective.
>>>
>>> For your consideration.
>>>
>>> http://www.sourcewatch.org/index.php?title=Natural_Resources_Stewardship_Project
>>>
>>> "The NRSP has been exposed recently as being controlled by energy
>>> industry lobbyists."
>>>
>>> "The NRSP maintains it has no direct connection with the Calgary-based
>>> group of climate change skeptics the "Friends of Science" [5] (FoS),
>>> even though the FoS's most outspoken member, Tim Ball, is now the
>>> Chairman of the NRSP. With the exact same purpose and goals, and most of
>>> the same scientific allies and members as the Friends of Science, the
>>> NRSP is viewed by many as a reincarnation of the FoS, after the FoS was
>>> "outed" by The Globe and Mail newspaper in August 2006 as being partly
>>> funded by the oil and gas industry. [6]."
>>>
>>> There's a lot more. Just so you know where your champions are coming
>>> from, and what they are most likely to be championing.
>>>
>>> Cheers,
>>> -Jamie
>>> www.JamieKruz.com
>>

Subject: Re: How I spent my day part 1

Posted by [Don Nafe](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 22:19:26 GMT

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

"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:47a8d3cf@linux...

> Don Nafe wrote:

>> "Neil" <OIUOI@OIU.com> wrote in message news:47a8c729\$1@linux...

>>> "Deej" <noway@jose.net> wrote:

>>>> Let's just all get together and have a big pie fight and then

>>>> everything's

>>>> gonna be OK for a while.

>>>> ;o)

>>> No, because a good pie fight necessitates the use of aerosol-

>>> based propellants for the requisite whipped toppings for said

>>> pies... said propellants being a major contributor to

>>> the destruction of the ozone layer, hence accelerating global

>>> warming.

>>>

>>> Neil

>>

>> those are CFCs Neil...have nothing to do with greenhouse gasses so whip

>> cream away

>>

>> hehe

>>

>> And yes I was being a smart ass with my Deej's weather is a result of

>> global warming comment.

>>

>> Speaking of weather...China's having the coldest winter in a hundred

>> years...think it might be a sign of global cooling....wait didn't we deal

>> with that in the 70's...or was it the 80's...doesn't matter because it

>> was a natural phenomenon called weather cycles...somewhat like this one

>> we're in...but just to be sure let's pump billions of dollars into

>> useless CO2 reductions just in case.

>

> You're just baiting now, Don. :^)

yes...my apologies, couldn't resist

> Misinterpreting the science, and begging the question.

>

> Google global cooling and see if you can't knock down that straw man

> yourself. Then read up on weather cycles and get back to me with

> specifics. And remember that climate change doesn't magically keep weather

> from happening.

>

> Meanwhile, the world moves on with solutions. Even Canada (except maybe

> for your "hardly any oil money" guys ;^).

talk about baiting (hehehehe)

actually Canada proposed a 20% decrease in emissions and that still didn't satisfy the enviro-movement

>> The research is far from over Jamie and the more that comes in the more
>> the evidence points to causes far more significant than man's
>> contribution to the atmosphere's CO2 levels.

>

> Of course research is ongoing, Don. And it will be for a long while yet.
> There's always more to learn. But we already know quite a lot after
> decades of research.

I've heard that 90+ % of the research on climate change has taken place since 1997

> So far, the research is showing that human contributions are a significant
> factor in the current climate change event.

>

> None of the scientists are so ignorant that they don't take other climate
> drivers into account. Except maybe your guys who perhaps ONLY take other
> climate drivers into account. :^)

>

>

> If you check I believe we have as humans
>> increased the CO2 levels by 3% which is approximately 0.0003% of the
>> total make up of the earth's atmosphere yet changes in the sun's activity
>> have a significant effect on the level of water vapour in the atmosphere
>> which as we all know is the real engine in temperature change on the
>> planet

>

> Thanks for bringing up the tiny number scare. It's specious.

>

> We are releasing a significant amount of greenhouse gases that were
> previously sequestered underground. By adding them to the tiny fraction of
> the atmosphere composed of greenhouse gases already in circulation, we're
> affecting the ability of the atmosphere to retain infrared heat (that's
> what the greenhouse gases do). With a long lifetime in the atmosphere, the
> gases stay around and we keep adding to them. And so we are able to have
> an effect on the average global temperature over time.

>

>
>> And on a slightly different note but on (off) topic check the latest news
>> on NASA's weather reporting stations records on temperature...seems they
>> made a mistake in their calculations...on the high side...oops made a
>> mistake sorry to scare you guys.
>
> Link? That sounds like old news, long since corrected. Get with the times,
> Don. Are we going to hear every denial rationalization now, one after the
> other? I've probably heard them all by now. I should number them.

<http://www.nrsp.com/news.html> interview with Tom Harris (late January I believe)

>
> At some point you're going to realize that your real complaint is with
> some of the proposed solutions, rather than with the essential facts of
> the problem. Denying the problem is just an ineffective way of trying to
> head off solutions that may not be politically attractive to you. It's a
> losing strategy on multiple levels. For one thing it removes you from the
> solutions debate where you could have an effect on the solutions chosen.

Wrong, it opens up debate which this subject has been sorely lacking in since the IPCC report was issued.

and I will stop here. You're entitled to one rebuttal to my last posts then we must move this to the General forum or wait at least six months before bringing it up again

:-)

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

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 22:33:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Don Nafe wrote:
> Actually they were initially funded by the University of Alberta and much

> their funding came from the oil industry so they were indirectly funded by
> the oil industry
> <http://www.nrsp.com/news.html> - sorry, don't remember which interview but
> it's there...late summer early fall 07 I believe (either with Lowell Green
> or CBC or both)
>>
> Same URL - many of their articles and interviews get very specific
>
> same URL - will take you to the article or interview (December 23rd I
> believe)

So your only support for the validity of this group is the web site from the same group? That's not enough.

Looking over their news page it appears to be a long list of cherry picked examples, scapegoating and hyperbole while ignoring most of the evidence.

You should widen your horizons.

> And lastly comparing the unsafe drinking water in a continent to buying a
> puppy a popsicle is a sad and disturbing commentary on the
> enviro-movement....

What? No it's not. That's just my weird sense of humor.

Just trying to point out to you that you set up a false choice there, and it almost doesn't matter what the second choice is, your false choice is merely a rhetorical diversion.

Now you're being further diverted by the puppies. What did the puppies ever do to you!!!??? ;^)

> in fact they have been accused of using Kyoto etc as a
> means of keeping the underdeveloped countries underdeveloped.

Yeah, that was in that ridiculously slanted "Swindle" video. Totally specious. If you buy that, you'll buy anything.

> Trust
> me...follow the money, I think you'll be surprised.

If you truly want to follow the money Don, you can't ignore the fossil fuel lobby's interest in this issue. Because that's where, by far, the most money is. Including some with your NRSP guys.

As with most issues there are a few scammers on all sides, some at the fringes, and some front and center. I denounce them all, how about that! It's looking like your guys are probably in that group, too.

But what matters is the scientific evidence. Most of which you appear to be simply ignoring, apparently because a denier web site says "trust us."

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKrutz.com

Subject: Re: How I spent my day part 1
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 22:50:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

> You're just baiting now, Don. :^)
Don Nafe wrote:
> yes...my apologies, couldn't resist

But dang, then I'll answer you and then Neil will get all bent out of shape about it. See how you are! :^)

>> Misinterpreting the science, and begging the question.
>>
>> Google global cooling and see if you can't knock down that straw man
>> yourself. Then read up on weather cycles and get back to me with
>> specifics. And remember that climate change doesn't magically keep weather
>> from happening.
>>
>> Meanwhile, the world moves on with solutions. Even Canada (except maybe
>> for your "hardly any oil money" guys ;^).
>
> talk about baiting (hehehehe)
>
> actually Canada proposed a 20% decrease in emissions and that still didn't
> satisfy the enviro-movement

I imagine not.

I'll make a prediction: no matter what we do someone won't be satisfied.

But that's not a good reason for inaction.

>>> The research is far from over Jamie and the more that comes in the more

>>> the evidence points to causes far more significant than man's
>>> contribution to the atmosphere's CO2 levels.
>> Of course research is ongoing, Don. And it will be for a long while yet.
>> There's always more to learn. But we already know quite a lot after
>> decades of research.
>
>
> I've heard that 90+ % of the research on climate change has taken place
> since 1997

You've heard a lot of things. :^)

How about a link to something other than your denial site...

>> Link? That sounds like old news, long since corrected. Get with the times,
>> Don. Are we going to hear every denial rationalization now, one after the
>> other? I've probably heard them all by now. I should number them.
>
> <http://www.nrsp.com/news.html> interview with Tom Harris (late January I
> believe)

OH, OK, back to your denial site. Give me a specific link so I don't
have to listen to ALL of January's propaganda. ;^)

But it's probably a rehash, this one went around last summer and was
debunked then.

>> At some point you're going to realize that your real complaint is with
>> some of the proposed solutions, rather than with the essential facts of
>> the problem. Denying the problem is just an ineffective way of trying to
>> head off solutions that may not be politically attractive to you. It's a
>> losing strategy on multiple levels. For one thing it removes you from the
>> solutions debate where you could have an effect on the solutions chosen.
>
> Wrong, it opens up debate which this subject has been sorely lacking in
> since the IPCC report was issued.

Where have you been? This conversation has been going on scientifically
since at least the 1970s.

The IPCC has put out periodic reports since 1990.

<http://www.ipcc.ch/ipccreports/assessments-reports.htm>

You can't come late to the party and pretend it just started. :^)

Now I understand your confusion...

> and I will stop here. You're entitled to one rebuttal to my last posts then
> we must move this to the General forum or wait at least six months before
> bringing it up again

No need, you've already taken enough rope to hang yourself my friend. ;^)

I'll put that other thing up on General when I get around to it...

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKrutz.com

> :-)
>
>
>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>
>

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [Don Nafe](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 23:18:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jamie within the various articles are links to several studies, reports and research papers, within the interviews are comments made with backing evidence

To date I have read every link you have posted and even quoted your sources. So far you have done nothing but insist my sources are shills for big oil and refuse to even read a single article a listen to an interview. that simple fact speaks volumes about you and the enviro-movement.

I'm done

"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:47a8e781\$1@linux...
> Don Nafe wrote:
>> Actually they were initially funded by the University of Alberta and much
>> their funding came from the oil industry so they were indirectly funded
>> by the oil industry

>> <http://www.nrsp.com/news.html> - sorry, don't remember which interview but
>> it's there...late summer early fall 07 I believe (either with Lowell
>> Green or CBC or both)
>>>
> > Same URL - many of their articles and interviews get very specific
>>
>> same URL - will take you to the article or interview (December 23rd I
>> believe)
>
> So your only support for the validity of this group is the web site from
> the same group? That's not enough.
>
> Looking over their news page it appears to be a long list of cherry picked
> examples, scapegoating and hyperbole while ignoring most of the evidence.
>
> You should widen your horizons.
>
>
>> And lastly comparing the unsafe drinking water in a continent to buying a
>> puppy a popsicle is a sad and disturbing commentary on the
>> enviro-movement....
>
> What? No it's not. That's just my weird sense of humor.
>
> Just trying to point out to you that you set up a false choice there, and
> it almost doesn't matter what the second choice is, your false choice is
> merely a rhetorical diversion.
>
> Now you're being further diverted by the puppies. What did the puppies
> ever do to you!!!??? ;^)
>
>
>> in fact they have been accused of using Kyoto etc as a means of keeping
>> the underdeveloped countries underdeveloped.
>
> Yeah, that was in that ridiculously slanted "Swindle" video. Totally
> specious. If you buy that, you'll buy anything.
>
>
>> Trust me...follow the money, I think you'll be surprised.
>
> If you truly want to follow the money Don, you can't ignore the fossil
> fuel lobby's interest in this issue. Because that's where, by far, the
> most money is. Including some with your NRSP guys.
>
> As with most issues there are a few scammers on all sides, some at the
> fringes, and some front and center. I denounce them all, how about that!
> It's looking like your guys are probably in that group, too.

>
> But what matters is the scientific evidence. Most of which you appear to
> be simply ignoring, apparently because a denier web site says "trust us."
>
> Cheers,
> -Jamie
> www.JamieKrutz.com

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Tue, 05 Feb 2008 23:55:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Don Nafe wrote:

> Jamie within the various articles are links to several studies, reports and
> research papers, within the interviews are comments made with backing
> evidence
>
> To date I have read every link you have posted and even quoted your sources.

Lessee, how so? You said one report on water effects was BS but you didn't ever say why you came to that conclusion. You said another group was wrong about your denier web site's bias but the only evidence you presented was from that very denial web site. Hard to be convinced by that.

> So far you have done nothing but insist my sources are shills for big oil
> and refuse to even read a single article a listen to an interview. that
> simple fact speaks volumes about you and the enviro-movement.

Did I miss something? That's not true on several levels.

You might have noticed that I looked at your sources. For what turned out to be your denial site, I read the overview and a couple of other pages, and commented on them.

As mentioned, I looked into the background of your denial site which turned out to have real connections to the fossil fuels industry. Your ironclad logic is that they say they're OK, and anyway they don't take much oil money any more. What a relief.

I asked for a specific link for the interview you wanted me to listen to from your denial site (is that too much to ask?). Still waiting on that. I'm not planning to listen to all the interviews from January just to guess which one you meant, sorry, Don.

And I'm halfway through evaluating the other thing, the letter to the UN, which I'll post in general when I'm done. But I do have a few other

tasks to do today, ya know.

And since when did I become a spokesman for the "enviro-movement"? I'm just a guy who pays attention to the science behind the issue. I know it's geeky but I'm into climate science.

I happen to think it's ridiculous when people don't pay attention to the science, no matter what agenda they are pushing.

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKrutz.com

> I'm done
>
> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:47a8e781\$1@linux...
>> Don Nafe wrote:
>>> Actually they were initially funded by the University of Alberta and much
>>> their funding came from the oil industry so they were indirectly funded
>>> by the oil industry
>>> <http://www.nrsp.com/news.html> - sorry, don't remember which interview but
>>> it's there...late summer early fall 07 I believe (either with Lowell
>>> Green or CBC or both)
>> > Same URL - many of their articles and interviews get very specific
>>> same URL - will take you to the article or interview (December 23rd I
>>> believe)
>> So your only support for the validity of this group is the web site from
>> the same group? That's not enough.
>>
>> Looking over their news page it appears to be a long list of cherry picked
>> examples, scapegoating and hyperbole while ignoring most of the evidence.
>>
>> You should widen your horizons.
>>
>>
>>> And lastly comparing the unsafe drinking water in a continent to buying a
>>> puppy a popsicle is a sad and disturbing commentary on the
>>> enviro-movement...
>> What? No it's not. That's just my weird sense of humor.
>>
>> Just trying to point out to you that you set up a false choice there, and
>> it almost doesn't matter what the second choice is, your false choice is
>> merely a rhetorical diversion.
>>
>> Now you're being further diverted by the puppies. What did the puppies
>> ever do to you!!!???? ;^)
>>

>>
>>> in fact they have been accused of using Kyoto etc as a means of keeping
>>> the underdeveloped countries underdeveloped.
>> Yeah, that was in that ridiculously slanted "Swindle" video. Totally
>> specious. If you buy that, you'll buy anything.
>>
>>
>>> Trust me...follow the money, I think you'll be surprised.
>> If you truly want to follow the money Don, you can't ignore the fossil
>> fuel lobby's interest in this issue. Because that's where, by far, the
>> most money is. Including some with your NRSP guys.
>>
>> As with most issues there are a few scammers on all sides, some at the
>> fringes, and some front and center. I denounce them all, how about that!
>> It's looking like your guys are probably in that group, too.
>>
>> But what matters is the scientific evidence. Most of which you appear to
>> be simply ignoring, apparently because a denier web site says "trust us."
>>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>
>

Subject: Re: How I spent my day part 1
Posted by [Neil](#) on Wed, 06 Feb 2008 00:36:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>
>> You're just baiting now, Don. :^)
>Don Nafe wrote:
>> yes...my apologies, couldn't resist
>
>But dang, then I'll answer you and then Neil will get all bent out of
>shape about it. See how you are! :^)

Nope, it's too late for me to make a difference... you've managed to hijack the entire board once again, save for two posts... you've won.

Neil

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [Don Nafe](#) on Wed, 06 Feb 2008 01:28:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You looked at my sources...jee thanks...I read yours.

TTYL

"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:47a8fabb\$1@linux...

> Don Nafe wrote:

>> Jamie within the various articles are links to several studies, reports
>> and research papers, within the interviews are comments made with backing
>> evidence

>>

>> To date I have read every link you have posted and even quoted your

>> sources.

>

> Lessee, how so? You said one report on water effects was BS but you didn't
> ever say why you came to that conclusion. You said another group was wrong
> about your denial web site's bias but the only evidence you presented was
> from that very denial web site. Hard to be convinced by that.

>

>

>> So far you have done nothing but insist my sources are shills for big oil
>> and refuse to even read a single article a listen to an interview. that
>> simple fact speaks volumes about you and the enviro-movement.

>

> Did I miss something? That's not true on several levels.

>

> You might have noticed that I looked at your sources. For what turned out
> to be your denial site, I read the overview and a couple of other pages,
> and commented on them.

>

> As mentioned, I looked into the background of your denial site which
> turned out to have real connections to the fossil fuels industry. Your
> ironclad logic is that they say they're OK, and anyway they don't take
> much oil money any more. What a relief.

>

> I asked for a specific link for the interview you wanted me to listen to
> from your denial site (is that too much to ask?). Still waiting on that.
> I'm not planning to listen to all the interviews from January just to
> guess which one you meant, sorry, Don.

>

> And I'm halfway through evaluating the other thing, the letter to the UN,
> which I'll post in general when I'm done. But I do have a few other tasks
> to do today, ya know.

>

> And since when did I become a spokesman for the "enviro-movement"? I'm
> just a guy who pays attention to the science behind the issue. I know it's

> geeky but I'm into climate science.
>
> I happen to think it's ridiculous when people don't pay attention to the
> science, no matter what agenda they are pushing.
>
> Cheers,
> -Jamie
> www.JamieKrutz.com
>
>
>> I'm done
>>
>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
>> news:47a8e781\$1@linux...
>>> Don Nafe wrote:
>>>> Actually they were initially funded by the University of Alberta and
>>>> much their funding came from the oil industry so they were indirectly
>>>> funded by the oil industry
>>>> <http://www.nrsp.com/news.html> - sorry, don't remember which interview
>>>> but it's there...late summer early fall 07 I believe (either with
>>>> Lowell Green or CBC or both)
>>> > Same URL - many of their articles and interviews get very specific
>>>> same URL - will take you to the article or interview (December 23rd I
>>>> believe)
>>> So your only support for the validity of this group is the web site from
>>> the same group? That's not enough.
>>>
>>> Looking over their news page it appears to be a long list of cherry
>>> picked examples, scapegoating and hyperbole while ignoring most of the
>>> evidence.
>>>
>>> You should widen your horizons.
>>>
>>>
>>>> And lastly comparing the unsafe drinking water in a continent to buying
>>>> a puppy a popsicle is a sad and disturbing commentary on the
>>>> enviro-movement...
>>> What? No it's not. That's just my weird sense of humor.
>>>
>>> Just trying to point out to you that you set up a false choice there,
>>> and it almost doesn't matter what the second choice is, your false
>>> choice is merely a rhetorical diversion.
>>>
>>> Now you're being further diverted by the puppies. What did the puppies
>>> ever do to you!!!??? ;^)
>>>
>>>
>>>> in fact they have been accused of using Kyoto etc as a means of keeping

>>>> the underdeveloped countries underdeveloped.
>>> Yeah, that was in that ridiculously slanted "Swindle" video. Totally
>>> specious. If you buy that, you'll buy anything.
>>>
>>>
>>>> Trust me...follow the money, I think you'll be surprised.
>>> If you truly want to follow the money Don, you can't ignore the fossil
>>> fuel lobby's interest in this issue. Because that's where, by far, the
>>> most money is. Including some with your NRSP guys.
>>>
>>> As with most issues there are a few scammers on all sides, some at the
>>> fringes, and some front and center. I denounce them all, how about that!
>>> It's looking like your guys are probably in that group, too.
>>>
>>> But what matters is the scientific evidence. Most of which you appear to
>>> be simply ignoring, apparently because a denier web site says "trust
>>> us."
>>>
>>> Cheers,
>>> -Jamie
>>> www.JamieKruz.com
>>

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Wed, 06 Feb 2008 01:57:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Don Nafe wrote:
> You looked at my sources...jee thanks...I read yours.

But didn't give much back about them. I went to your links and responded.

Now, what is the _actual interview link_ you want me to listen to?

Your other thing is up in General, BTW.

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKruz.com

> TTYL

>

> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:47a8fabb\$1@linux...

>> Don Nafe wrote:

>>> Jamie within the various articles are links to several studies, reports

>>> and research papers, within the interviews are comments made with backing

>>> eviidence
>>>
>>> To date I have read every link you have posted and even quoted your
>>> sources.
>> Lessee, how so? You said one report on water effects was BS but you didn't
>> ever say why you came to that conclusion. You said another group was wrong
>> about your denier web site's bias but the only evidence you presented was
>> from that very denial web site. Hard to be convinced by that.
>>
>>
>>> So far you have done nothing but insist my sources are shills for big oil
>>> and refuse to even read a single article a listen to an interview. that
>>> simple fact speaks volumes about you and the enviro-movement.
>> Did I miss something? That's not true on several levels.
>>
>> You might have noticed that I looked at your sources. For what turned out
>> to be your denial site, I read the overview and a couple of other pages,
>> and commented on them.
>>
>> As mentioned, I looked into the background of your denial site which
>> turned out to have real connections to the fossil fuels industry. Your
>> ironclad logic is that they say they're OK, and anyway they don't take
>> much oil money any more. What a relief.
>>
>> I asked for a specific link for the interview you wanted me to listen to
>> from your denial site (is that too much to ask?). Still waiting on that.
>> I'm not planning to listen to all the interviews from January just to
>> guess which one you meant, sorry, Don.
>>
>> And I'm halfway through evaluating the other thing, the letter to the UN,
>> which I'll post in general when I'm done. But I do have a few other tasks
>> to do today, ya know.
>>
>> And since when did I become a spokesman for the "enviro-movement"? I'm
>> just a guy who pays attention to the science behind the issue. I know it's
>> geeky but I'm into climate science.
>>
>> I happen to think it's ridiculous when people don't pay attention to the
>> science, no matter what agenda they are pushing.
>>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> www.JamieKruz.com
>>
>>
>>> I'm done
>>>
>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message

>>> news:47a8e781\$1@linux...
>>>> Don Nafe wrote:
>>>>> Actually they were initially funded by the University of Alberta and
>>>>> much their funding came from the oil industry so they were indirectly
>>>>> funded by the oil industry
>>>>> <http://www.nrsp.com/news.html> - sorry, don't remember which interview
>>>>> but it's there...late summer early fall 07 I believe (either with
>>>>> Lowell Green or CBC or both)
>>>> > Same URL - many of their articles and interviews get very specific
>>>>> same URL - will take you to the article or interview (December 23rd I
>>>>> believe)
>>>> So your only support for the validity of this group is the web site from
>>>> the same group? That's not enough.
>>>>
>>>> Looking over their news page it appears to be a long list of cherry
>>>> picked examples, scapegoating and hyperbole while ignoring most of the
>>>> evidence.
>>>>
>>>> You should widen your horizons.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> And lastly comparing the unsafe drinking water in a continent to buying
>>>>> a puppy a popsicle is a sad and disturbing commentary on the
>>>>> enviro-movement....
>>>> What? No it's not. That's just my weird sense of humor.
>>>>
>>>> Just trying to point out to you that you set up a false choice there,
>>>> and it almost doesn't matter what the second choice is, your false
>>>> choice is merely a rhetorical diversion.
>>>>
>>>> Now you're being further diverted by the puppies. What did the puppies
>>>> ever do to you!!!??? ;^)
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> in fact they have been accused of using Kyoto etc as a means of keeping
>>>>> the underdeveloped countries underdeveloped.
>>>> Yeah, that was in that ridiculously slanted "Swindle" video. Totally
>>>> specious. If you buy that, you'll buy anything.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> Trust me...follow the money, I think you'll be surprised.
>>>> If you truly want to follow the money Don, you can't ignore the fossil
>>>> fuel lobby's interest in this issue. Because that's where, by far, the
>>>> most money is. Including some with your NRSP guys.
>>>>
>>>> As with most issues there are a few scammers on all sides, some at the
>>>> fringes, and some front and center. I denounce them all, how about that!
>>>> It's looking like your guys are probably in that group, too.

>>>>
>>>> But what matters is the scientific evidence. Most of which you appear to
>>>> be simply ignoring, apparently because a denier web site says "trust
>>>> us."
>>>>
>>>> Cheers,
>>>> -Jamie
>>>> www.JamieKruz.com
>

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [Don Nafe](#) on Wed, 06 Feb 2008 02:49:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Can't just blame just Jamie there Neil...my name's up there too.

Wasn't there a song with the line "I started a joke"

;-)

it's over on the general thread now so ya'll can return to your regularly
sheduled programming...along with the religious discussion

hehehe

"Neil" <OIOUI@OUI.com> wrote in message news:47a91ced\$1@linux...

>

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

>

>

>>Your other thing is up in General, BTW.

>

>

> Not content with hijacking this entire board, Jamie now moves
> over to another one on this server... please, please, nobody
> post any tube gear they're trying to unload on the "for sale"
> section, otherwise he'll take that board over too, with a
> series of 8,700 web links that claim a direct correlation
> between the heat emissions of tube gear in New Zealand
> & increases in the number of icebergs calving off the Ross Ice
> Shelf in Antarctica.

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [Don Nafe](#) on Wed, 06 Feb 2008 02:50:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Neil" <OIOUI@OUI.com> wrote in message news:47a91ced\$1@linux...

>
> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>
>
>>Your other thing is up in General, BTW.
>
>
> Not content with hijacking this entire board, Jamie now moves
> over to another one on this server... please, please, nobody
> post any tube gear they're trying to unload on the "for sale"
> section, otherwise he'll take that board over too, with a
> series of 8,700 web links that claim a direct correlation
> between the heat emissions of tube gear in New Zealand
> & increases in the number of icebergs calving off the Ross Ice
> Shelf in Antarctica.

forgot to mention that was funny

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Wed, 06 Feb 2008 03:10:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Neil, what's up?

Don asked me to look at a letter to the UN, I told him I'd look at it and post a reply in General. Now I have. There's no big conspiracy there.

Also, there's no "hijacking." Look back again, I wasn't the one to bring up climate change in these threads.

Like you, I replied to it. I have an interest in the issue, as apparently you do, too.

You're welcome to join us in general. I don't bite, much, but I can't speak for Don. :^)

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKruz.com

Neil wrote:

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

>

>

>> Your other thing is up in General, BTW.

>

>

> Not content with hijacking this entire board, Jamie now moves
> over to another one on this server... please, please, nobody
> post any tube gear they're trying to unload on the "for sale"
> section, otherwise he'll take that board over too, with a
> series of 8,700 web links that claim a direct correlation
> between the heat emissions of tube gear in New Zealand
> & increases in the number of icebergs calving off the Ross Ice
> Shelf in Antarctica.

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [Neil](#) on Wed, 06 Feb 2008 03:35:25 GMT

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

Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>Your other thing is up in General, BTW.

Not content with hijacking this entire board, Jamie now moves
over to another one on this server... please, please, nobody
post any tube gear they're trying to unload on the "for sale"
section, otherwise he'll take that board over too, with a
series of 8,700 web links that claim a direct correlation
between the heat emissions of tube gear in New Zealand
& increases in the number of icebergs calving off the Ross Ice
Shelf in Antarctica.

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Wed, 06 Feb 2008 04:26:08 GMT

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

Nice rant, Neil. Wow, you're really bothered. Sorry about that, nothing
I've posted has been meant in any kind of mean spirit.

None of my links have been random, but rather pointers to further
reading if anyone wants to check the evidence. But you don't have to
follow them if you're simply not interested.

Again, though, you're welcome to join us on the General board.

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKrutz.com

Neil wrote:

> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>> Neil, what's up?
>
> What's up? Well... "Up" is a Shania Twain album:
> <http://www.amazon.com/Up-Shania-Twain/dp/B00006IX86>
>
> Or a Peter Gabriel album:
> <http://www.amazon.com/Up-Peter-Gabriel/dp/B00006F7S3>
>
> Or, apparently, also a relatively obscure band from the last
> decade:
> <http://www.allmusic.com/cg/amg.dll?p=amg&sql=10:hzfwxqujldhe>
>
> Or the URL for the Union Pacific Railroad:
> <http://www.up.com/>
>
> Or, also the URL (with a different suffix, of course) of the
> university of Portland:
> <http://www.up.edu/>
>
> Or, shorthand slanguage for Michigan's Upper Peninsula (The "U.P." - kinda
> like "The O.C.", i guess.)
> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Upper_Peninsula_of_Michigan
> <http://www.uptravel.com/>
>
>
> There, read all that shit & get back to me with a response,
> willya? I mean, it ALL must be true, because I saw it on the
> internet, right?
>
> (look familiar???)
>
> <SQUAK!!!>
>
> (was that a parrot???)
>
>
>> Also, there's no "hijacking." Look back again, I wasn't the one to bring
>

>> up climate change in these threads.

>

> <rant>

> No, Don brought it up- jokingly... and you opportunistically
> stepped in as you always do & took over the thread to the
> extent where (and yes, sure, people responded) the entire board
> was nothing but a giant global-warming thread. Now I don't care
> if people talk about politics here, or religion, or Deejay's
> dogs, or their health, or their enjoyment of the chronic, or
> goddamn near ANYTHING except when YOU get involved in anything
> relating to an extra drop of rain falling in Sumatra this year,
> because without fail, NONE of those other topics ever takes
> over the whole fucking board, but without fail, you always
> somehow manage to. Those other non-musical topics are
> peripherally interesting and always transient... you get a
> thread going & it never fails to fucking turn into a thread
> buildup akin to something like we've seen here since
> the shitstorm that proceeded our buildup to the invasion of
> Iraq. No shit!

> </rant>

>

> Now, if someone wants to scold me on my rant - game on, let's

> go.

>

> Neil

>

Subject: Re: How I spent my day part 1

Posted by [Kim](#) on Wed, 06 Feb 2008 04:36:10 GMT

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

"Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote:

>...but just to be sure let's pump billions of dollars into useless CO2
>reductions just in case.

As per Chuck's thread, it's important to realise that a massive number of the changes which will reduce climate change are beneficial regardless of climate change.

Things like better house insulation and design, more efficient appliances, solar and wind power etc all have benefits on many levels whether climate change exists or not. Pretty much all of them cost less in the long term. They use less resources in the long term (and whether it's in our lifetimes or not we WILL run out of naturally occurring coal, crude oil etc eventually. In many cases it takes extra effort to begin with, but this effort does return in the long term. It seems odd to be passionately against such things.

Not that you are, but I guess I can't see why everybody can't band together on things when we agree on the direction, even if we have different reasons for wanting to head that way.

Cheers,
Kim.

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [Neil](#) on Wed, 06 Feb 2008 04:56:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>

>Neil, what's up?

What's up? Well... "Up" is a Shania Twain album:

<http://www.amazon.com/Up-Shania-Twain/dp/B00006IX86>

Or a Peter Gabriel album:

<http://www.amazon.com/Up-Peter-Gabriel/dp/B00006F7S3>

Or, apparently, also a relatively obscure band from the last decade:

<http://www.allmusic.com/cg/amg.dll?p=amg&sql=10:hzwfxqujldhe>

Or the URL for the Union Pacific Railroad:

<http://www.up.com/>

Or, also the URL (with a different suffix, of course) of the university of Portland:

<http://www.up.edu/>

Or, shorthand slanguage for Michigan's Upper Peninsula (The "U.P." - kinda like "The O.C.", i guess.)

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Upper_Peninsula_of_Michigan

<http://www.uptravel.com/>

There, read all that shit & get back to me with a response, willya? I mean, it ALL must be true, because I saw it on the internet, right?

(look familiar???)

<SQUAK!!!>

(was that a parrot???)

>Also, there's no "hijacking." Look back again, I wasn't the one to bring

>up climate change in these threads.

<rant>

No, Don brought it up- jokingly... and you opportunistically stepped in as you always do & took over the thread to the extent where (and yes, sure, people responded) the entire board was nothing but a giant global-warming thread. Now I don't care if people talk about politics here, or religion, or Deejay's dogs, or their health, or their enjoyment of the chronic, or goddamn near ANYTHING except when YOU get involved in anything relating to an extra drop of rain falling in Sumatra this year, because without fail, NONE of those other topics ever takes over the whole fucking board, but without fail, you always somehow manage to. Those other non-musical topics are peripherally interesting and always transient... you get a thread going & it never fails to fucking turn into a thread buildup akin to something like we've seen here since the shitstorm that proceeded our buildup to the invasion of Iraq. No shit!

</rant>

Now, if someone wants to scold me on my rant - game on, let's go.

Neil

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this

Posted by [Tony Benson](#) on Wed, 06 Feb 2008 05:19:59 GMT

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

The Mayan calendar stops on December 21st, 2012. They thought this was the date the world would end. It was a tongue-in-check reference, but it is interesting that you pointed out Kyoto expires in 2012. Coincidence? . . . I THINK NOT! ;>)

Seriously, I think it's great that you're "smallerizing" your carbon foot print. It's a good idea for everyone just in terms of pollution, no matter what side of the debate you're on. I have switched over many of our lights bulb to CF's and installed energy efficient windows, but there is much more I could do. My fear is that the average person will do little or nothing simply because it requires too much effort. I think it's true that individuals can be pretty smart when they need to be, but large groups are generally ignorant. As Ronnie James Dio so elegantly put it when singing

with Black Sabbath, "The Mob Rules".

I'll try to have a more positive outlook.

Tony

On 2/5/08 12:35 AM, in article 47a80709@linux, "Jamie K"
<Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

> Tony Benson wrote:

>> So you're saying we're all pretty much f*cked then, huh Jamie.

>

> Me? No, I'm not saying that.

>

> We would have been better off not dragging our feet for so long, but
> there's still time to make a difference, and people ARE acting on what
> we know.

>

>

>> We really are

>> our own worst enemies. The problem now is we can't do much to stop it.

>

> It's important to realize that's not true.

>

> Doing nothing would be a very risky choice.

>

> Some warming has happened, some will still happen no matter what we do
> because of how long greenhouse gases already added will stay in the
> atmosphere.

>

> But a significant amount of warming can still be prevented. There's a
> lot we can do, some of which we are already doing.

>

>

>> Short

>> of deciding, as a species, to go back to living "pre-industrialization" life
>> styles. Wanna place any bets on that happening? ;>)

>

> I haven't seen that idea proposed in any serious mitigation plan. :^)

>

>

>> Seriously, I don't know if I believe everything the doomsayers are
>> preaching.

>

> Nor I. There are always exaggerations. But if you avoid some of the more
> hyperbolic special interest groups and stick closely to the science, the
> more likely range of possible outcomes is worth paying attention to and

> working to mitigate.
>
>
>> I also don't think we're doing the world any good though by the
>> amount of carbon we pump into the air.
>
> It might be good for some places where a warmer climate is at least a
> superficial improvement, but bad overall for the possible shock of rapid
> ecosystem change, threats to coastlines and hard to predict outcomes
> like the possible melting of permafrost (which would release methane,
> another greenhouse gas), changing of ocean currents and other rolls of
> the dice.
>
>
>> Hopefully, we still have enough time
>> to figure out a clean way to produce the energy we need to maintain our
>> current and growing rate of consumption. I just don't see us all getting
>> around on horses, plowing our fields with oxen, and reading by candlelight
>> anytime soon.
>
> I don't know that horses are all that great of a solution, although I
> like horses. :^)
>
> But we have a lot of options. There are a lot of efficiency improvements
> we can make in building design, city planning and manufacturing;
> logistical improvements to transportation; more efficient uses of fossil
> fuels; increased use of renewable energy; and faster adoption of more
> efficient technologies.
>
> Here are a few different perspectives:
> [http://carbonsequestration.us/Papers-presentations/htm/Pacal a-Socolow-ScienceM
> ag-Aug2004.pdf](http://carbonsequestration.us/Papers-presentations/htm/Pacal%20a-Socolow-ScienceMag-Aug-2004.pdf)
>
> <http://www.ases.org/climatechange/>
> <http://www.westernresourceadvocates.org/energy/clenergy.php>
> <http://www.ipcc.ch/>
>
> I highly recommend this issue of Scientific American:
> <http://www.sciam.com/sciammag/?contents=2006-09>
>
> Especially this article:
> <http://www.sciam.com/article.cfm?id=a-plan-to-keep-carbon-in>
>
> Worth a trip to the library.
>
>> Maybe the Mayans's were right? Four years and counting is it? :>o
>
> What did the Mayan's say?

>
> Cheers,
> -Jamie
> www.JamieKruz.com
>
>
>
>> Tony
>>
>>
>> On 2/4/08 11:33 PM, in article 47a7f891@linux, "Jamie K"
>> <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>
>>> Neil wrote:
>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>> Hey Don, it's true that one of the expected byproducts of global warming
>>>>> is increased extreme weather events, including winter weather events.
>>>>> This is like saying that one of the byproducts of global
>>>>> stupidity is that people will get more intelligent.
>>> We can only hope! :^)
>>>
>>> An increase in extreme weather events is predicted by climate scientists
>>> as a consequence of the current climate change event.
>>>
>>> It may seem counter-intuitive until you really think about it.
>>>
>>> Warmer ocean water, more evaporation, more energy in weather systems to
>>> carry the moisture farther, this can bring more snow over the mountains.
>>>
>>> (And again, any single weather event can't be linked to the current
>>> climate change by itself. But over time we can measure patterns.)
>>>
>>> Another recent study shows the possibility for earlier rain and earlier
>>> snow pack melting leading to quicker snow pack degradation. So even
>>> though individual weather systems may dump a lot of moisture (hang in
>>> there, Dee!), it may not stay around as long or melt as slowly. Which
>>> means we may be facing possible water shortages in some areas.
>>>
>>> <http://climate.weather.com/articles/watertrends020108.html>
>>>
>>> "They found that up to 60 percent of changes in river flow, temperature
>>> and snow pack between 1950 and 1999 can be attributed to human
>>> activities, such as driving, that release emissions including carbon
>>> dioxide and other greenhouse gases into the atmosphere."
>>>
>>>
>>>> Let's see, what else can we blame on opposite-cause events like
>>>> this?

>>> Don't be confused by the term "global warming." It doesn't mean equal
>>> heat everywhere on the globe, weather doesn't work like that.
>>>
>>> That's one reason to use the "climate change" label instead. It's more
>>> accurate and less confusing to people. Another is that as the surface
>>> warms (on average), the mesosphere cools. Both from the same mechanism,
>>> the additional heat absorption and re-radiation from additional
>>> greenhouse gases.
>>>
>>> It's interesting to read about this stuff.
>>>
>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Earth%27s_atmosphere
>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Global_warming
>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Greenhouse_effect
>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Atmospheric_chemistry
>>> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Meteorology>
>>>
>>> Cheers,
>>> -Jamie
>>> www.JamieKruz.com
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>> Neil
>>

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [Aaron Allen](#) on Wed, 06 Feb 2008 06:12:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Tony Benson" <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote in message
news:C3CE9F9F.16188%tony@standinghampton.com...
As Ronnie James Dio so elegantly put it when singing
> with Black Sabbath, "The Mob Rules".

dang, and I thought it was "evil", "woman" and "lookout" all these years.

Subject: Re: part 3
Posted by [Aaron Allen](#) on Wed, 06 Feb 2008 06:23:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Unless you can guarantee I'll get out of work, you just keep that weather
there with you :)

Seriously though, it's gotten rather nasty, windy and cold here in Tulsa

now. Yuk.
Still no snow so far though.

AA

"Deej" <noway@jose.net> wrote in message news:47a80a7d@linux...
>
> "Deej" <noway@jose.net> wrote in message news:47a6c9df@linux...
>> Opened up the mudroom door to go take out the trash and.....
>>
>>
>>
>
>
>

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Wed, 06 Feb 2008 07:36:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Tony Benson wrote:

> The Mayan calendar stops on December 21st, 2012. They thought this was the
> date the world would end. It was a tongue-in-check reference, but it is
> interesting that you pointed out Kyoto expires in 2012. Coincidence? . . . I
> THINK NOT! ;>)

Heh. I'll have to look into that, maybe they were on to something. :^)

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKruz.com

> Seriously, I think it's great that you're "smallerizing" your carbon foot
> print. It's a good idea for everyone just in terms of pollution, no matter
> what side of the debate you're on. I have switched over many of our lights
> bulb to CF's and installed energy efficient windows, but there is much more
> I could do. My fear is that the average person will do little or nothing
> simply because it requires too much effort. I think it's true that
> individuals can be pretty smart when they need to be, but large groups are
> generally ignorant. As Ronnie James Dio so elegantly put it when singing
> with Black Sabbath, "The Mob Rules".
>
> I'll try to have a more positive outlook.

> Tony
>

>
> On 2/5/08 12:35 AM, in article 47a80709@linux, "Jamie K"
> <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>
>> Tony Benson wrote:
>>> So you're saying we're all pretty much f*cked then, huh Jamie.
>> Me? No, I'm not saying that.
>>
>> We would have been better off not dragging our feet for so long, but
>> there's still time to make a difference, and people ARE acting on what
>> we know.
>>
>>
>>> We really are
>>> our own worst enemies. The problem now is we can't do much to stop it.
>> It's important to realize that's not true.
>>
>> Doing nothing would be a very risky choice.
>>
>> Some warming has happened, some will still happen no matter what we do
>> because of how long greenhouse gases already added will stay in the
>> atmosphere.
>>
>> But a significant amount of warming can still be prevented. There's a
>> lot we can do, some of which we are already doing.
>>
>>
>>> Short
>>> of deciding, as a species, to go back to living "pre-industrialization" life
>>> styles. Wanna place any bets on that happening? ;>)
>> I haven't seen that idea proposed in any serious mitigation plan. :^)
>>
>>
>>> Seriously, I don't know if I believe everything the doomsayers are
>>> preaching.
>> Nor I. There are always exaggerations. But if you avoid some of the more
>> hyperbolic special interest groups and stick closely to the science, the
>> more likely range of possible outcomes is worth paying attention to and
>> working to mitigate.
>>
>>
>>> I also don't think we're doing the world any good though by the
>>> amount of carbon we pump into the air.
>> It might be good for some places where a warmer climate is at least a
>> superficial improvement, but bad overall for the possible shock of rapid
>> ecosystem change, threats to coastlines and hard to predict outcomes
>> like the possible melting of permafrost (which would release methane,
>> another greenhouse gas), changing of ocean currents and other rolls of

>> the dice.
>>
>>
>>> Hopefully, we still have enough time
>>> to figure out a clean way to produce the energy we need to maintain our
>>> current and growing rate of consumption. I just don't see us all getting
>>> around on horses, plowing our fields with oxen, and reading by candlelight
>>> anytime soon.
>> I don't know that horses are all that great of a solution, although I
>> like horses. :^)
>>
>> But we have a lot of options. There are a lot of efficiency improvements
>> we can make in building design, city planning and manufacturing;
>> logistical improvements to transportation; more efficient uses of fossil
>> fuels; increased use of renewable energy; and faster adoption of more
>> efficient technologies.
>>
>> Here are a few different perspectives:
>> [http://carbonsequestration.us/Papers-presentations/htm/Pacal a-Socolow-ScienceM
>> ag-Aug2004.pdf](http://carbonsequestration.us/Papers-presentations/htm/Pacal_a-Socolow-ScienceMag-Aug2004.pdf)
>>
>> <http://www.ases.org/climatechange/>
>> <http://www.westernresourceadvocates.org/energy/clenergy.php>
>> <http://www.ipcc.ch/>
>>
>> I highly recommend this issue of Scientific American:
>> <http://www.sciam.com/sciammag/?contents=2006-09>
>>
>> Especially this article:
>> <http://www.sciam.com/article.cfm?id=a-plan-to-keep-carbon-in>
>>
>> Worth a trip to the library.
>>
>>> Maybe the Mayans's were right? Four years and counting is it? :>o
>> What did the Mayan's say?
>>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> www.JamieKruz.com
>>
>>
>>
>>> Tony
>>>
>>>
>>> On 2/4/08 11:33 PM, in article 47a7f891@linux, "Jamie K"
>>> <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>

>>>> Neil wrote:
>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>> Hey Don, it's true that one of the expected byproducts of global warming
>>>>>> is increased extreme weather events, including winter weather events.
>>>>> This is like saying that one of the byproducts of global
>>>>> stupidity is that people will get more intelligent.
>>>> We can only hope! :^)
>>>>
>>>> An increase in extreme weather events is predicted by climate scientists
>>>> as a consequence of the current climate change event.
>>>>
>>>> It may seem counter-intuitive until you really think about it.
>>>>
>>>> Warmer ocean water, more evaporation, more energy in weather systems to
>>>> carry the moisture farther, this can bring more snow over the mountains.
>>>>
>>>> (And again, any single weather event can't be linked to the current
>>>> climate change by itself. But over time we can measure patterns.)
>>>>
>>>> Another recent study shows the possibility for earlier rain and earlier
>>>> snow pack melting leading to quicker snow pack degradation. So even
>>>> though individual weather systems may dump a lot of moisture (hang in
>>>> there, Deeji!), it may not stay around as long or melt as slowly. Which
>>>> means we may be facing possible water shortages in some areas.
>>>>
>>>> <http://climate.weather.com/articles/watertrends020108.html>
>>>>
>>>> "They found that up to 60 percent of changes in river flow, temperature
>>>> and snow pack between 1950 and 1999 can be attributed to human
>>>> activities, such as driving, that release emissions including carbon
>>>> dioxide and other greenhouse gases into the atmosphere."
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> Let's see, what else can we blame on opposite-cause events like
>>>>> this?
>>>> Don't be confused by the term "global warming." It doesn't mean equal
>>>> heat everywhere on the globe, weather doesn't work like that.
>>>>
>>>> That's one reason to use the "climate change" label instead. It's more
>>>> accurate and less confusing to people. Another is that as the surface
>>>> warms (on average), the mesosphere cools. Both from the same mechanism,
>>>> the additional heat absorption and re-radiation from additional
>>>> greenhouse gases.
>>>>
>>>> It's interesting to read about this stuff.
>>>>
>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Earth%27s_atmosphere
>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Global_warming

>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Greenhouse_effect
>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Atmospheric_chemistry
>>>> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Meteorology>
>>>>
>>>> Cheers,
>>>> -Jamie
>>>> www.JamieKruz.com
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> Neil
>

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [Erling](#) on Wed, 06 Feb 2008 07:42:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Robin Gibb should know how far it can go when he started his joke;-)

Erling

On Tue, 5 Feb 2008 21:49:32 -0500, "Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote:

>Can't just blame just Jamie there Neil...my name's up there too.
>
>Wasn't there a song with the line "I started a joke"
>
>;-)
>
>it's over on the general thread now so ya'll can return to your regularly
>sheduled programming...along with the religious discussion
>
>hehehe

Subject: Re: How I spent my day part 1
Posted by [rick](#) on Wed, 06 Feb 2008 09:55:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

maybe just preparing your for your final destination???

;o)

On 6 Feb 2008 04:30:28 +1000, "John" <no@no.com> wrote:

>
>It's 78 degrees here in Charleston, SC today Suckas !!!

Subject: Re: How I spent my day part 1
Posted by [rick](#) on Wed, 06 Feb 2008 09:57:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

where's mr. simplicity when you need him??? just remember that little train...i think i can...ithink i can...i think i can. if yo cat fast you can use the snow banks in lieu of a ladder.

On Tue, 5 Feb 2008 13:07:26 -0700, "Deej" <noway@jose.net> wrote:

>
>"rick" <parnell68@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>news:51dgq3h1cmoq7o0ftve5h7q2i08aldhpbk@4ax.com...
>> ya gonna paint those gutters in the spring?
>>
>
>Right after I hang them up again. I doubt I'm gonna have any gutters left if
>this keeps up.
>
>

Subject: Re: part 3
Posted by [rick](#) on Wed, 06 Feb 2008 09:58:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

i've done this for many over the years...you get the day off.

you're welcome
;o)

On Wed, 6 Feb 2008 00:23:49 -0600, "Aaron Allen"
<know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote:

>Unless you can guarantee I'll get out of work, you just keep that weather
>there with you :)
>
>Seriously though, it's gotten rather nasty, windy and cold here in Tulsa
>now. Yuk.
>Still no snow so far though.
>
>AA

>
>"Deej" <noway@jose.net> wrote in message news:47a80a7d@linux...
>>
>> "Deej" <noway@jose.net> wrote in message news:47a6c9df@linux...
>>> Opened up the mudroom door to go take out the trash and.....
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [Don Nafe](#) on Wed, 06 Feb 2008 12:09:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Intersting note about CF bulbs

No one has actually determined whether there is a real overall savings with these things as they cost more to make, ship, dispose of and buy. And if not used in high traffic areas that need light on for long periods, do not last as long as claimed.I know this last bit as fact as I replaced every light in our house that wasn't on a dimmer and several of these bulbs lasted barely six months...others on the otherhand are on their second year. Good thing they go on sale every once in a while otherwise I'd never use them again.

"Tony Benson" <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote in message news:C3CE9F9F.16188%tony@standinghampton.com...
> The Mayan calendar stops on December 21st, 2012. They thought this was the
> date the world would end. It was a tongue-in-check reference, but it is
> interesting that you pointed out Kyoto expires in 2012. Coincidence? . . .
> I
> THINK NOT! ;>)
>
> Seriously, I think it's great that you're "smallerizing" your carbon foot
> print. It's a good idea for everyone just in terms of pollution, no matter
> what side of the debate you're on. I have switched over many of our lights
> bulb to CF's and installed energy efficient windows, but there is much
> more
> I could do. My fear is that the average person will do little or nothing
> simply because it requires too much effort. I think it's true that
> individuals can be pretty smart when they need to be, but large groups are
> generally ignorant. As Ronnie James Dio so elegantly put it when singing
> with Black Sabbath, "The Mob Rules".
>

> I'll try to have a more positive outlook.
>
> Tony
>
>
> On 2/5/08 12:35 AM, in article 47a80709@linux, "Jamie K"
> <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>
>> Tony Benson wrote:
>>> So you're saying we're all pretty much f*cked then, huh Jamie.
>>
>> Me? No, I'm not saying that.
>>
>> We would have been better off not dragging our feet for so long, but
>> there's still time to make a difference, and people ARE acting on what
>> we know.
>>
>>
>>> We really are
>>> our own worst enemies. The problem now is we can't do much to stop it.
>>
>> It's important to realize that's not true.
>>
>> Doing nothing would be a very risky choice.
>>
>> Some warming has happened, some will still happen no matter what we do
>> because of how long greenhouse gases already added will stay in the
>> atmosphere.
>>
>> But a significant amount of warming can still be prevented. There's a
>> lot we can do, some of which we are already doing.
>>
>>
>>> Short
>>> of deciding, as a species, to go back to living "pre-industrialization"
>>> life
>>> styles. Wanna place any bets on that happening? ;>)
>>
>> I haven't seen that idea proposed in any serious mitigation plan. :^)
>>
>>
>>> Seriously, I don't know if I believe everything the doomsayers are
>>> preaching.
>>
>> Nor I. There are always exaggerations. But if you avoid some of the more
>> hyperbolic special interest groups and stick closely to the science, the
>> more likely range of possible outcomes is worth paying attention to and
>> working to mitigate.

>>
>>
>>> I also don't think we're doing the world any good though by the
>>> amount of carbon we pump into the air.
>>
>> It might be good for some places where a warmer climate is at least a
>> superficial improvement, but bad overall for the possible shock of rapid
>> ecosystem change, threats to coastlines and hard to predict outcomes
>> like the possible melting of permafrost (which would release methane,
>> another greenhouse gas), changing of ocean currents and other rolls of
>> the dice.
>>
>>
>>> Hopefully, we still have enough time
>>> to figure out a clean way to produce the energy we need to maintain our
>>> current and growing rate of consumption. I just don't see us all getting
>>> around on horses, plowing our fields with oxen, and reading by
>>> candlelight
>>> anytime soon.
>>
>> I don't know that horses are all that great of a solution, although I
>> like horses. :^)
>>
>> But we have a lot of options. There are a lot of efficiency improvements
>> we can make in building design, city planning and manufacturing;
>> logistical improvements to transportation; more efficient uses of fossil
>> fuels; increased use of renewable energy; and faster adoption of more
>> efficient technologies.
>>
>> Here are a few different perspectives:
>> [http://carbonsequestration.us/Papers-presentations/htm/Pacal a-Socolow-ScienceM](http://carbonsequestration.us/Papers-presentations/htm/Pacal-a-Socolow-ScienceMag-Aug2004.pdf)
>> [ag-Aug2004.pdf](http://carbonsequestration.us/Papers-presentations/htm/Pacal a-Socolow-ScienceMag-Aug2004.pdf)
>>
>> <http://www.ases.org/climatechange/>
>> <http://www.westernresourceadvocates.org/energy/clenergy.php>
>> <http://www.ipcc.ch/>
>>
>> I highly recommend this issue of Scientific American:
>> <http://www.sciam.com/sciammag/?contents=2006-09>
>>
>> Especially this article:
>> <http://www.sciam.com/article.cfm?id=a-plan-to-keep-carbon-in>
>>
>> Worth a trip to the library.
>>
>>> Maybe the Mayans's were right? Four years and counting is it? :>o
>>
>> What did the Mayan's say?

>>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> www.JamieKruz.com
>>
>>
>>
>>> Tony
>>>
>>>
>>> On 2/4/08 11:33 PM, in article 47a7f891@linux, "Jamie K"
>>> <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>> Neil wrote:
>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>> Hey Don, it's true that one of the expected byproducts of global
>>>>>> warming
>>>>>> is increased extreme weather events, including winter weather events.
>>>>>> This is like saying that one of the byproducts of global
>>>>>> stupidity is that people will get more intelligent.
>>>> We can only hope! :^)
>>>>
>>>> An increase in extreme weather events is predicted by climate
>>>> scientists
>>>> as a consequence of the current climate change event.
>>>>
>>>> It may seem counter-intuitive until you really think about it.
>>>>
>>>> Warmer ocean water, more evaporation, more energy in weather systems to
>>>> carry the moisture farther, this can bring more snow over the
>>>> mountains.
>>>>
>>>> (And again, any single weather event can't be linked to the current
>>>> climate change by itself. But over time we can measure patterns.)
>>>>
>>>> Another recent study shows the possibility for earlier rain and earlier
>>>> snow pack melting leading to quicker snow pack degradation. So even
>>>> though individual weather systems may dump a lot of moisture (hang in
>>>> there, Dee!), it may not stay around as long or melt as slowly. Which
>>>> means we may be facing possible water shortages in some areas.
>>>>
>>>> <http://climate.weather.com/articles/watertrends020108.html>
>>>>
>>>> "They found that up to 60 percent of changes in river flow, temperature
>>>> and snow pack between 1950 and 1999 can be attributed to human
>>>> activities, such as driving, that release emissions including carbon
>>>> dioxide and other greenhouse gases into the atmosphere."
>>>>

>>>>
>>>>> Let's see, what else can we blame on opposite-cause events like
>>>>> this?
>>>> Don't be confused by the term "global warming." It doesn't mean equal
>>>> heat everywhere on the globe, weather doesn't work like that.
>>>>
>>>> That's one reason to use the "climate change" label instead. It's more
>>>> accurate and less confusing to people. Another is that as the surface
>>>> warms (on average), the mesosphere cools. Both from the same mechanism,
>>>> the additional heat absorption and re-radiation from additional
>>>> greenhouse gases.
>>>>
>>>> It's interesting to read about this stuff.
>>>>
>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Earth%27s_atmosphere
>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Global_warming
>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Greenhouse_effect
>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Atmospheric_chemistry
>>>> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Meteorology>
>>>>
>>>> Cheers,
>>>> -Jamie
>>>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> Neil
>>>>
>

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [chuck duffy](#) on Wed, 06 Feb 2008 14:39:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Don,

Here's my experience. The last set I put in the basement lasted five years.
When I bought them 5 years ago they were big money. Probably 10 times the
cost of an incandescent.

When I went to get the replacements a pack of 8 GE CFs was around \$12.00.
I was shocked at how much they have come down in price.

The 60 watt equivalent uses 13 watts.

So anyway... My house has a basement apartment in it, and has a separate electric
meter. We use the basement for our 'playroom'/tv room/office.

Since switching to CF and LCD TV and Computer monitors the basements monthly electric bill comes in around \$15 a month. It used to run in the mid 30's.

Granted this is not that big of a deal money wise, but I'm clearly seeing a directly measurable cut in consumption of over 50%.

Chuck

"Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote:

>Intersting note about CF bulbs

>

>No one has actually determined whether there is a real overall savings with

>these things as they cost more to make, ship, dispose of and buy. And if not

>used in high traffic areas that need light on for long periods, do not last

>as long as claimed.I know this last bit as fact as I replaced every light in

>our house that wasn't on a dimmer and several of these bulbs lasted barely

>six months...others on the otherhand are on their second year. Good thing

>they go on sale every once in a while otherwise I'd never use them again.

>

>

>"Tony Benson" <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote in message

>news:C3CE9F9F.16188%tony@standinghampton.com...

>> The Mayan calendar stops on December 21st, 2012. They thought this was the

>> date the world would end. It was a tongue-in-check reference, but it is

>> interesting that you pointed out Kyoto expires in 2012. Coincidence? .

..

>> I

>> THINK NOT! ;>)

>>

>> Seriously, I think it's great that you're "smallerizing" your carbon foot

>> print. It's a good idea for everyone just in terms of pollution, no matter

>> what side of the debate you're on. I have switched over many of our lights

>> bulb to CF's and installed energy efficient windows, but there is much

>> more

>> I could do. My fear is that the average person will do little or nothing
>> simply because it requires too much effort. I think it's true that
>> individuals can be pretty smart when they need to be, but large groups
are
>> generally ignorant. As Ronnie James Dio so elegantly put it when singing
>> with Black Sabbath, "The Mob Rules".
>>
>> I'll try to have a more positive outlook.
>>
>> Tony
>>
>>
>> On 2/5/08 12:35 AM, in article 47a80709@linux, "Jamie K"
>> <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>
>>> Tony Benson wrote:
>>>> So you're saying we're all pretty much f*cked then, huh Jamie.
>>>
>>> Me? No, I'm not saying that.
>>>
>>> We would have been better off not dragging our feet for so long, but
>>> there's still time to make a difference, and people ARE acting on what
>>> we know.
>>>
>>>
>>>> We really are
>>>> our own worst enemies. The problem now is we can't do much to stop it.
>>>
>>> It's important to realize that's not true.
>>>
>>> Doing nothing would be a very risky choice.
>>>
>>> Some warming has happened, some will still happen no matter what we do
>>> because of how long greenhouse gases already added will stay in the
>>> atmosphere.
>>>
>>> But a significant amount of warming can still be prevented. There's a
>>> lot we can do, some of which we are already doing.
>>>
>>>
>>>> Short
>>>> of deciding, as a species, to go back to living "pre-industrialization"

>>>> life
>>>> styles. Wanna place any bets on that happening? ;>)
>>>
>>> I haven't seen that idea proposed in any serious mitigation plan. :^)
>>>

>>>
>>>> Seriously, I don't know if I believe everything the doomsayers are
>>>> preaching.
>>>
>>> Nor I. There are always exaggerations. But if you avoid some of the more
>>> hyperbolic special interest groups and stick closely to the science,
the
>>> more likely range of possible outcomes is worth paying attention to and
>>> working to mitigate.
>>>
>>>
>>>> I also don't think we're doing the world any good though by the
>>>> amount of carbon we pump into the air.
>>>
>>> It might be good for some places where a warmer climate is at least a
>>> superficial improvement, but bad overall for the possible shock of rapid
>>> ecosystem change, threats to coastlines and hard to predict outcomes
>>> like the possible melting of permafrost (which would release methane,
>>> another greenhouse gas), changing of ocean currents and other rolls of
>>> the dice.
>>>
>>>
>>>> Hopefully, we still have enough time
>>>> to figure out a clean way to produce the energy we need to maintain
our
>>>> current and growing rate of consumption. I just don't see us all getting
>>>> around on horses, plowing our fields with oxen, and reading by
>>>> candlelight
>>>> anytime soon.
>>>
>>> I don't know that horses are all that great of a solution, although I
>>> like horses. :^)
>>>
>>> But we have a lot of options. There are a lot of efficiency improvements
>>> we can make in building design, city planning and manufacturing;
>>> logistical improvements to transportation; more efficient uses of fossil
>>> fuels; increased use of renewable energy; and faster adoption of more
>>> efficient technologies.
>>>
>>> Here are a few different perspectives:
>>> [http://carbonsequestration.us/Papers-presentations/htm/Pacal a-Socolow-ScienceM
>>> ag-Aug2004.pdf](http://carbonsequestration.us/Papers-presentations/htm/Pacal_a-Socolow-ScienceMag-Aug2004.pdf)
>>>
>>> <http://www.ases.org/climatechange/>
>>> <http://www.westernresourceadvocates.org/energy/clenergy.php>
>>> <http://www.ipcc.ch/>
>>>
>>> I highly recommend this issue of Scientific American:

>>> <http://www.sciam.com/sciammag/?contents=2006-09>
>>>
>>> Especially this article:
>>> <http://www.sciam.com/article.cfm?id=a-plan-to-keep-carbon-in>
>>>
>>> Worth a trip to the library.
>>>
>>>> Maybe the Mayans's were right? Four years and counting is it? :>o
>>>
>>> What did the Mayan's say?
>>>
>>> Cheers,
>>> -Jamie
>>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>> Tony
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> On 2/4/08 11:33 PM, in article 47a7f891@linux, "Jamie K"
>>>> <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>> Neil wrote:
>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>> Hey Don, it's true that one of the expected byproducts of global

>>>>>>> warming
>>>>>>> is increased extreme weather events, including winter weather events.
>>>>>>> This is like saying that one of the byproducts of global
>>>>>>> stupidity is that people will get more intelligent.
>>>>>>> We can only hope! :^)
>>>>>
>>>>> An increase in extreme weather events is predicted by climate
>>>>> scientists
>>>>> as a consequence of the current climate change event.
>>>>>
>>>>> It may seem counter-intuitive until you really think about it.
>>>>>
>>>>> Warmer ocean water, more evaporation, more energy in weather systems
to
>>>>> carry the moisture farther, this can bring more snow over the
>>>>> mountains.
>>>>>
>>>>> (And again, any single weather event can't be linked to the current
>>>>> climate change by itself. But over time we can measure patterns.)
>>>>>
>>>>> Another recent study shows the possibility for earlier rain and earlier

>>>> snow pack melting leading to quicker snow pack degradation. So even
>>>> though individual weather systems may dump a lot of moisture (hang
in
>>>> there, Deeji!), it may not stay around as long or melt as slowly. Which
>>>> means we may be facing possible water shortages in some areas.
>>>>
>>>> <http://climate.weather.com/articles/watertrends020108.html>
>>>>
>>>> "They found that up to 60 percent of changes in river flow, temperature
>>>> and snow pack between 1950 and 1999 can be attributed to human
>>>> activities, such as driving, that release emissions including carbon
>>>> dioxide and other greenhouse gases into the atmosphere."
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> Let's see, what else can we blame on opposite-cause events like
>>>>> this?
>>>> Don't be confused by the term "global warming." It doesn't mean equal
>>>> heat everywhere on the globe, weather doesn't work like that.
>>>>
>>>> That's one reason to use the "climate change" label instead. It's more
>>>> accurate and less confusing to people. Another is that as the surface
>>>> warms (on average), the mesosphere cools. Both from the same mechanism,
>>>> the additional heat absorption and re-radiation from additional
>>>> greenhouse gases.
>>>>
>>>> It's interesting to read about this stuff.
>>>>
>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Earth%27s_atmosphere
>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Global_warming
>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Greenhouse_effect
>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Atmospheric_chemistry
>>>> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Meteorology>
>>>>
>>>> Cheers,
>>>> -Jamie
>>>> www.JamieKruz.com
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> Neil
>>>>
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this

Posted by [Don Nafe](#) on Wed, 06 Feb 2008 16:35:14 GMT

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

"chuck duffy" <c@c.com> wrote in message news:47a9b880\$1@linux...
>
> Don,
>
> Here's my experience. The last set I put in the basement lasted five
> years.
> When I bought them 5 years ago they were big money. Probably 10 times the
> cost of an incandescent.
>
> When I went to get the replacements a pack of 8 GE CFs was around \$12.00.
> I was shocked at how much they have come down in price.
>
> The 60 watt equivalent uses 13 watts.
>
> So anyway... My house has a basement apartment in it, and has a separate
> electric
> meter. We use the basement for our 'playroom'/tv room/office.
>
> Since switching to CF and LCD TV and Computer monitors the basements
> monthly
> electric bill comes in around \$15 a month. It used to run in the mid 30's.
>
>
> Granted this is not that big of a deal money wise, but I'm clearly seeing
> a directly measurable cut in consumption of over 50%.
>
> Chuck

Excellent! I wish my experience with them was more like yours in terms of reliability and savings but we are such big users of electricity in this house it's hard to say just how much we're saving.

>
>
>
>
>
> "Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote:
>> Intersting note about CF bulbs
>>
>> No one has actually determined whether there is a real overall savings
>> with
>
>> these things as they cost more to make, ship, dispose of and buy. And if
> not

>>used in high traffic areas that need light on for long periods, do not
>>last
>
>>as long as claimed.I know this last bit as fact as I replaced every light
> in
>>our house that wasn't on a dimmer and several of these bulbs lasted barely
>
>>six months...others on the otherhand are on their second year. Good thing
>
>>they go on sale every once in a while otherwise I'd never use them again.
>>
>>
>>"Tony Benson" <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote in message
>>news:C3CE9F9F.16188%tony@standinghampton.com...
>>> The Mayan calendar stops on December 21st, 2012. They thought this was
> the
>>> date the world would end. It was a tongue-in-check reference, but it is
>>> interesting that you pointed out Kyoto expires in 2012. Coincidence? .
> .
>>> I
>>> THINK NOT! ;>)
>>>
>>> Seriously, I think it's great that you're "smallerizing" your carbon
>>> foot
>>> print. It's a good idea for everyone just in terms of pollution, no
>>> matter
>>> what side of the debate you're on. I have switched over many of our
>>> lights
>>> bulb to CF's and installed energy efficient windows, but there is much
>
>>> more
>>> I could do. My fear is that the average person will do little or nothing
>>> simply because it requires too much effort. I think it's true that
>>> individuals can be pretty smart when they need to be, but large groups
> are
>>> generally ignorant. As Ronnie James Dio so elegantly put it when singing
>>> with Black Sabbath, "The Mob Rules".
>>>
>>> I'll try to have a more positive outlook.
>>>
>>> Tony
>>>
>>>
>>> On 2/5/08 12:35 AM, in article 47a80709@linux, "Jamie K"
>>> <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>> Tony Benson wrote:
>>>>> So you're saying we're all pretty much f*cked then, huh Jamie.

>>>>
>>>> Me? No, I'm not saying that.
>>>>
>>>> We would have been better off not dragging our feet for so long, but
>>>> there's still time to make a difference, and people ARE acting on what
>>>> we know.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> We really are
>>>>> our own worst enemies. The problem now is we can't do much to stop it.
>>>>
>>>> It's important to realize that's not true.
>>>>
>>>> Doing nothing would be a very risky choice.
>>>>
>>>> Some warming has happened, some will still happen no matter what we do
>>>> because of how long greenhouse gases already added will stay in the
>>>> atmosphere.
>>>>
>>>> But a significant amount of warming can still be prevented. There's a
>>>> lot we can do, some of which we are already doing.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> Short
>>>>> of deciding, as a species, to go back to living
>>>>> "pre-industrialization"
>
>>>>> life
>>>>> styles. Wanna place any bets on that happening? ;>)
>>>>
>>>> I haven't seen that idea proposed in any serious mitigation plan. :^)
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> Seriously, I don't know if I believe everything the doomsayers are
>>>>> preaching.
>>>>
>>>> Nor I. There are always exaggerations. But if you avoid some of the
>>>> more
>>>> hyperbolic special interest groups and stick closely to the science,
> the
>>>> more likely range of possible outcomes is worth paying attention to and
>>>> working to mitigate.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> I also don't think we're doing the world any good though by the
>>>>> amount of carbon we pump into the air.
>>>>
>>>> It might be good for some places where a warmer climate is at least a

>>>> superficial improvement, but bad overall for the possible shock of
>>>> rapid
>>>> ecosystem change, threats to coastlines and hard to predict outcomes
>>>> like the possible melting of permafrost (which would release methane,
>>>> another greenhouse gas), changing of ocean currents and other rolls of
>>>> the dice.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> Hopefully, we still have enough time
>>>>> to figure out a clean way to produce the energy we need to maintain
> our
>>>>> current and growing rate of consumption. I just don't see us all
>>>>> getting
>>>>> around on horses, plowing our fields with oxen, and reading by
>>>>> candlelight
>>>>> anytime soon.
>>>>
>>>> I don't know that horses are all that great of a solution, although I
>>>> like horses. :^)
>>>>
>>>> But we have a lot of options. There are a lot of efficiency
>>>> improvements
>>>> we can make in building design, city planning and manufacturing;
>>>> logistical improvements to transportation; more efficient uses of
>>>> fossil
>>>> fuels; increased use of renewable energy; and faster adoption of more
>>>> efficient technologies.
>>>>
>>>> Here are a few different perspectives:
>>>> [http://carbonsequestration.us/Papers-presentations/htm/Pacal a-Socolow-ScienceM
>>>> ag-Aug2004.pdf](http://carbonsequestration.us/Papers-presentations/htm/Pacal%20a-Socolow-ScienceMag-Aug2004.pdf)
>>>>
>>>> <http://www.ases.org/climatechange/>
>>>> <http://www.westernresourceadvocates.org/energy/clenergy.php>
>>>> <http://www.ipcc.ch/>
>>>>
>>>> I highly recommend this issue of Scientific American:
>>>> <http://www.sciam.com/sciammag/?contents=2006-09>
>>>>
>>>> Especially this article:
>>>> <http://www.sciam.com/article.cfm?id=a-plan-to-keep-carbon-in>
>>>>
>>>> Worth a trip to the library.
>>>>
>>>>> Maybe the Mayans's were right? Four years and counting is it? :>o
>>>>
>>>> What did the Mayan's say?
>>>>

>>>> Cheers,
>>>> -Jamie
>>>> www.JamieKruz.com
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> Tony
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> On 2/4/08 11:33 PM, in article 47a7f891@linux, "Jamie K"
>>>>> <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>> Neil wrote:
>>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>> Hey Don, it's true that one of the expected byproducts of global
>
>>>>>>>> warming
>>>>>>>> is increased extreme weather events, including winter weather
>>>>>>>> events.
>>>>>>>> This is like saying that one of the byproducts of global
>>>>>>>> stupidity is that people will get more intelligent.
>>>>>>>> We can only hope! :^)
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> An increase in extreme weather events is predicted by climate
>>>>>>>> scientists
>>>>>>>> as a consequence of the current climate change event.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> It may seem counter-intuitive until you really think about it.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Warmer ocean water, more evaporation, more energy in weather systems
> to
>>>>>>>> carry the moisture farther, this can bring more snow over the
>>>>>>>> mountains.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> (And again, any single weather event can't be linked to the current
>>>>>>>> climate change by itself. But over time we can measure patterns.)
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Another recent study shows the possibility for earlier rain and
>>>>>>>> earlier
>>>>>>>> snow pack melting leading to quicker snow pack degradation. So even
>>>>>>>> though individual weather systems may dump a lot of moisture (hang
> in
>>>>>>>> there, Dee!), it may not stay around as long or melt as slowly.
>>>>>>>> Which
>>>>>>>> means we may be facing possible water shortages in some areas.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> <http://climate.weather.com/articles/watertrends020108.html>
>>>>>>>>

>>>>> "They found that up to 60 percent of changes in river flow,
>>>>> temperature
>>>>> and snow pack between 1950 and 1999 can be attributed to human
>>>>> activities, such as driving, that release emissions including carbon
>>>>> dioxide and other greenhouse gases into the atmosphere."
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>> Let's see, what else can we blame on opposite-cause events like
>>>>>> this?
>>>>>> Don't be confused by the term "global warming." It doesn't mean equal
>>>>>> heat everywhere on the globe, weather doesn't work like that.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> That's one reason to use the "climate change" label instead. It's
>>>>>> more
>>>>>> accurate and less confusing to people. Another is that as the surface
>>>>>> warms (on average), the mesosphere cools. Both from the same
>>>>>> mechanism,
>>>>>> the additional heat absorption and re-radiation from additional
>>>>>> greenhouse gases.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> It's interesting to read about this stuff.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Earth%27s_atmosphere
>>>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Global_warming
>>>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Greenhouse_effect
>>>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Atmospheric_chemistry
>>>>>> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Meteorology>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>> www.JamieKruz.com
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Neil
>>>>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: How I spent my day part 1
Posted by [Don Nafe](#) on Wed, 06 Feb 2008 16:41:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Kim" <hidensounds@hotmail.com> wrote in message [news:47a92b2a\\$1@linux...](mailto:news:47a92b2a$1@linux...)
>

> "Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote:
>>...but just to be sure let's pump billions of dollars into useless CO2
>>reductions just in case.
>
> As per Chuck's thread, it's important to realise that a massive number of
> the changes which will reduce climate change are beneficial regardless of
> climate change.
>
> Things like better house insulation and design, more efficient appliances,
> solar and wind power etc all have benefits on many levels whether climate
> change exists or not. Pretty much all of them cost less in the long term.
> They use less resources in the long term (and whether it's in our
> lifetimes
> or not we WILL run out of naturally occurring coal, crude oil etc
> eventually.
> In many cases it takes extra effort to begin with, but this effort does
> return
> in the long term. It seems odd to be passionately against such things.
>
> Not that you are, but I guess I can't see why everybody can't band
> together
> on things when we agree on the direction, even if we have different
> reasons
> for wanting to head that way.
>
> Cheers,
> Kim.

Please don't get me wrong Kim, I'm all for maximizing energy savings, reducing, reusing and recycling etc but that is not what Jamie and I have been discussing...I'm firmly on the side that says Human generated CO2 driven global warming is not the slam dunk the enviro-movement would have us believe.

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Wed, 06 Feb 2008 17:22:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

We've had good luck with CF bulbs, overall. We had a couple of early failures (within 2 years), and a couple that have lasted longer than their rated life and just won't die. The rest are still cruising along so we'll see how long they last. I think some brands are better than others.

Even the duds have lasted longer than an incandescent heat bulb (I hesitate to call incandescents "light bulbs" since they put out more far more heat than light).

Energy Star lists CFs as being about 75% more efficient and lasting 10 times longer than incandescents.

Quote: "If every home in America replaced just one incandescent light bulb with an ENERGY STAR qualified CFL, in one year it would save enough energy to light more than 3 million homes and prevent greenhouse gas emissions equivalent to those of more than 800,000 cars. "

They do make dimmable CFs, but I haven't tried those.

I'm keeping an eye on the progress of LED lighting for home use. It's getting brighter and coming down in price (still more expensive, though), and offers the potential to do color mixing.

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKrutz.com

Don Nafe wrote:

> Intersting note about CF bulbs

>

> No one has actually determined whether there is a real overall savings with
> these things as they cost more to make, ship, dispose of and buy. And if not
> used in high traffic areas that need light on for long periods, do not last
> as long as claimed.I know this last bit as fact as I replaced every light in
> our house that wasn't on a dimmer and several of these bulbs lasted barely
> six months...others on the otherhand are on their second year. Good thing
> they go on sale every once in a while otherwise I'd never use them again.

>

>

> "Tony Benson" <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote in message

> news:C3CE9F9F.16188%tony@standinghampton.com...

>> The Mayan calendar stops on December 21st, 2012. They thought this was the
>> date the world would end. It was a tongue-in-check reference, but it is
>> interesting that you pointed out Kyoto expires in 2012. Coincidence? . . .

>> I

>> THINK NOT! ;>)

>>

>> Seriously, I think it's great that you're "smallerizing" your carbon foot
>> print. It's a good idea for everyone just in terms of pollution, no matter
>> what side of the debate you're on. I have switched over many of our lights
>> bulb to CF's and installed energy efficient windows, but there is much
>> more

>> I could do. My fear is that the average person will do little or nothing

>> simply because it requires too much effort. I think it's true that

>> individuals can be pretty smart when they need to be, but large groups are

>> generally ignorant. As Ronnie James Dio so elegantly put it when singing
>> with Black Sabbath, "The Mob Rules".
>>
>> I'll try to have a more positive outlook.
>>
>> Tony
>>
>>
>> On 2/5/08 12:35 AM, in article 47a80709@linux, "Jamie K"
>> <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>
>>> Tony Benson wrote:
>>>> So you're saying we're all pretty much f*cked then, huh Jamie.
>>>> Me? No, I'm not saying that.
>>>
>>> We would have been better off not dragging our feet for so long, but
>>> there's still time to make a difference, and people ARE acting on what
>>> we know.
>>>
>>>
>>>> We really are
>>>> our own worst enemies. The problem now is we can't do much to stop it.
>>> It's important to realize that's not true.
>>>
>>> Doing nothing would be a very risky choice.
>>>
>>> Some warming has happened, some will still happen no matter what we do
>>> because of how long greenhouse gases already added will stay in the
>>> atmosphere.
>>>
>>> But a significant amount of warming can still be prevented. There's a
>>> lot we can do, some of which we are already doing.
>>>
>>>
>>>> Short
>>>> of deciding, as a species, to go back to living "pre-industrialization"
>>>> life
>>>> styles. Wanna place any bets on that happening? ;>)
>>> I haven't seen that idea proposed in any serious mitigation plan. :^)
>>>
>>>
>>>> Seriously, I don't know if I believe everything the doomsayers are
>>>> preaching.
>>> Nor I. There are always exaggerations. But if you avoid some of the more
>>> hyperbolic special interest groups and stick closely to the science, the
>>> more likely range of possible outcomes is worth paying attention to and
>>> working to mitigate.
>>>

>>>
>>>> I also don't think we're doing the world any good though by the
>>>> amount of carbon we pump into the air.
>>> It might be good for some places where a warmer climate is at least a
>>> superficial improvement, but bad overall for the possible shock of rapid
>>> ecosystem change, threats to coastlines and hard to predict outcomes
>>> like the possible melting of permafrost (which would release methane,
>>> another greenhouse gas), changing of ocean currents and other rolls of
>>> the dice.
>>>
>>>
>>>> Hopefully, we still have enough time
>>>> to figure out a clean way to produce the energy we need to maintain our
>>>> current and growing rate of consumption. I just don't see us all getting
>>>> around on horses, plowing our fields with oxen, and reading by
>>>> candlelight
>>>> anytime soon.
>>> I don't know that horses are all that great of a solution, although I
>>> like horses. :^)
>>>
>>> But we have a lot of options. There are a lot of efficiency improvements
>>> we can make in building design, city planning and manufacturing;
>>> logistical improvements to transportation; more efficient uses of fossil
>>> fuels; increased use of renewable energy; and faster adoption of more
>>> efficient technologies.
>>>
>>> Here are a few different perspectives:
>>> [http://carbonsequestration.us/Papers-presentations/htm/Pacal a-Socolow-ScienceM
>>> ag-Aug2004.pdf](http://carbonsequestration.us/Papers-presentations/htm/Pacal_a-Socolow-ScienceMag-Aug2004.pdf)
>>>
>>> <http://www.ases.org/climatechange/>
>>> <http://www.westernresourceadvocates.org/energy/clenergy.php>
>>> <http://www.ipcc.ch/>
>>>
>>> I highly recommend this issue of Scientific American:
>>> <http://www.sciam.com/sciammag/?contents=2006-09>
>>>
>>> Especially this article:
>>> <http://www.sciam.com/article.cfm?id=a-plan-to-keep-carbon-in>
>>>
>>> Worth a trip to the library.
>>>
>>>> Maybe the Mayans's were right? Four years and counting is it? :>0
>>> What did the Mayan's say?
>>>
>>> Cheers,
>>> -Jamie
>>> www.JamieKrutz.com

>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>> Tony
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> On 2/4/08 11:33 PM, in article 47a7f891@linux, "Jamie K"
>>>> <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>> Neil wrote:
>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>> Hey Don, it's true that one of the expected byproducts of global
>>>>>>> warming
>>>>>>> is increased extreme weather events, including winter weather events.
>>>>>>> This is like saying that one of the byproducts of global
>>>>>>> stupidity is that people will get more intelligent.
>>>>> We can only hope! :^)
>>>>>
>>>>> An increase in extreme weather events is predicted by climate
>>>>> scientists
>>>>> as a consequence of the current climate change event.
>>>>>
>>>>> It may seem counter-intuitive until you really think about it.
>>>>>
>>>>> Warmer ocean water, more evaporation, more energy in weather systems to
>>>>> carry the moisture farther, this can bring more snow over the
>>>>> mountains.
>>>>>
>>>>> (And again, any single weather event can't be linked to the current
>>>>> climate change by itself. But over time we can measure patterns.)
>>>>>
>>>>> Another recent study shows the possibility for earlier rain and earlier
>>>>> snow pack melting leading to quicker snow pack degradation. So even
>>>>> though individual weather systems may dump a lot of moisture (hang in
>>>>> there, Deeji!), it may not stay around as long or melt as slowly. Which
>>>>> means we may be facing possible water shortages in some areas.
>>>>>
>>>>> <http://climate.weather.com/articles/watertrends020108.html>
>>>>>
>>>>> "They found that up to 60 percent of changes in river flow, temperature
>>>>> and snow pack between 1950 and 1999 can be attributed to human
>>>>> activities, such as driving, that release emissions including carbon
>>>>> dioxide and other greenhouse gases into the atmosphere."
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>> Let's see, what else can we blame on opposite-cause events like
>>>>>> this?
>>>>>> Don't be confused by the term "global warming." It doesn't mean equal

>>>> heat everywhere on the globe, weather doesn't work like that.
>>>>
>>>> That's one reason to use the "climate change" label instead. It's more
>>>> accurate and less confusing to people. Another is that as the surface
>>>> warms (on average), the mesosphere cools. Both from the same mechanism,
>>>> the additional heat absorption and re-radiation from additional
>>>> greenhouse gases.
>>>>
>>>> It's interesting to read about this stuff.
>>>>
>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Earth%27s_atmosphere
>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Global_warming
>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Greenhouse_effect
>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Atmospheric_chemistry
>>>> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Meteorology>
>>>>
>>>> Cheers,
>>>> -Jamie
>>>> www.JamieKruz.com
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> Neil
>
>

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Thu, 07 Feb 2008 00:02:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

If your electricity is from coal plants, CF bulbs will actually prevent the release of a lot more mercury into the environment than the bulb is using.

When the bulb finally burns out, you can return it without releasing the mercury. Call the store where you purchased it first. If they don't take them or know who will, check the recycling links below.

More info here, including how to clean up if you accidentally smash one (it doesn't cost \$2500):

http://www.energystar.gov/ia/partners/promotions/change_light/downloads/Fact_Sheet_Mercury.pdf

Recycling info:

<http://www.epa.gov/bulbrecycling/>

<http://www.nema.org/lamprecycle/household.html>

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKrutz.com

James McCloskey wrote:

> I purchased a 5 pack of the Sunbeam bulbs, 4 out of five burned out with in
> a few months.
>
> There was a news story a while back about a lady in NY that dropped one on
> a hard wood floor in her child's room. She called Home Depot to ask how
> to clean up the liquid from the bulb, they informed her that she had to call
> the EPA. The EPA told her she had to contact one of the companies on there
> HazMat list, because the bulbs have mercury in them. The clean up cost \$2500.00.
> So my question is why did our government let these bulbs come on the market
> if they are such a health risk? Just think of what these bulbs will cost
> all of us in bad health and expense when they end up in land fills and contaminate
> ground water.
>
> Just think, everybody is buying them.

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

>> We've had good luck with CF bulbs, overall. We had a couple of early
>> failures (within 2 years), and a couple that have lasted longer than
>> their rated life and just won't die. The rest are still cruising along
>> so we'll see how long they last. I think some brands are better than others.
>>
>> Even the duds have lasted longer than an incandescent heat bulb (I
>> hesitate to call incandescents "light bulbs" since they put out more far
>
>> more heat than light).
>>
>> Energy Star lists CFs as being about 75% more efficient and lasting 10
>> times longer than incandescents.
>>
>> Quote: "If every home in America replaced just one incandescent light
>> bulb with an ENERGY STAR qualified CFL, in one year it would save enough
>
>> energy to light more than 3 million homes and prevent greenhouse gas
>> emissions equivalent to those of more than 800,000 cars. '
>>
>> They do make dimmable CFs, but I haven't tried those.
>>
>> I'm keeping an eye on the progress of LED lighting for home use. It's
>> getting brighter and coming down in price (still more expensive,
>> though), and offers the potential to do color mixing.
>>

>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> www.JamieKruz.com
>>
>>
>> Don Nafe wrote:
>>> Intersting note about CF bulbs
>>>
>>> No one has actually determined whether there is a real overall savings
> with
>>> these things as they cost more to make, ship, dispose of and buy. And
> if not
>>> used in high traffic areas that need light on for long periods, do not
> last
>>> as long as claimed.I know this last bit as fact as I replaced every light
> in
>>> our house that wasn't on a dimmer and several of these bulbs lasted barely
>
>>> six months...others on the otherhand are on their second year. Good thing
>
>>> they go on sale every once in a while otherwise I'd never use them again.
>>>
>>>
>>> "Tony Benson" <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote in message
>>> news:C3CE9F9F.16188%tony@standinghampton.com...
>>>> The Mayan calendar stops on December 21st, 2012. They thought this was
> the
>>>> date the world would end. It was a tongue-in-check reference, but it
> is
>>>> interesting that you pointed out Kyoto expires in 2012. Coincidence?
> . . .
>>>> I
>>>> THINK NOT! ;>)
>>>>
>>>> Seriously, I think it's great that you're "smallerizing" your carbon
> foot
>>>> print. It's a good idea for everyone just in terms of pollution, no matter
>>>> what side of the debate you're on. I have switched over many of our lights
>>>> bulb to CF's and installed energy efficient windows, but there is much
>
>>>> more
>>>> I could do. My fear is that the average person will do little or nothing
>>>> simply because it requires too much effort. I think it's true that
>>>> individuals can be pretty smart when they need to be, but large groups
> are
>>>> generally ignorant. As Ronnie James Dio so elegantly put it when singing
>>>> with Black Sabbath, "The Mob Rules".
>>>>

>>>> I'll try to have a more positive outlook.
>>>>
>>>> Tony
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> On 2/5/08 12:35 AM, in article 47a80709@linux, "Jamie K"
>>>> <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>> Tony Benson wrote:
>>>>>> So you're saying we're all pretty much f*cked then, huh Jamie.
>>>>>> Me? No, I'm not saying that.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> We would have been better off not dragging our feet for so long, but
>>>>>> there's still time to make a difference, and people ARE acting on what
>>>>>> we know.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> We really are
>>>>>>> our own worst enemies. The problem now is we can't do much to stop
> it.
>>>>>>> It's important to realize that's not true.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Doing nothing would be a very risky choice.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Some warming has happened, some will still happen no matter what we
> do
>>>>>>> because of how long greenhouse gases already added will stay in the
>>>>>>> atmosphere.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> But a significant amount of warming can still be prevented. There's
> a
>>>>>>>> lot we can do, some of which we are already doing.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Short
>>>>>>>>>> of deciding, as a species, to go back to living "pre-industrialization"
>
>>>>>>>>>> life
>>>>>>>>>>> styles. Wanna place any bets on that happening? ;>)
>>>>>>>>>>> I haven't seen that idea proposed in any serious mitigation plan. :^)
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Seriously, I don't know if I believe everything the doomsayers are
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> preaching.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Nor I. There are always exaggerations. But if you avoid some of the
> more
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> hyperbolic special interest groups and stick closely to the science,
> the

>>>> more likely range of possible outcomes is worth paying attention to
> and
>>>> working to mitigate.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> I also don't think we're doing the world any good though by the
>>>>> amount of carbon we pump into the air.
>>>>> It might be good for some places where a warmer climate is at least
> a
>>>>> superficial improvement, but bad overall for the possible shock of rapid
>>>>> ecosystem change, threats to coastlines and hard to predict outcomes
>>>>> like the possible melting of permafrost (which would release methane,
>>>>> another greenhouse gas), changing of ocean currents and other rolls
> of
>>>>> the dice.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>> Hopefully, we still have enough time
>>>>>> to figure out a clean way to produce the energy we need to maintain
> our
>>>>>> current and growing rate of consumption. I just don't see us all getting
>>>>>> around on horses, plowing our fields with oxen, and reading by
>>>>>> candlelight
>>>>>> anytime soon.
>>>>> I don't know that horses are all that great of a solution, although
> I
>>>>> like horses. :^)
>>>>>
>>>>> But we have a lot of options. There are a lot of efficiency improvements
>>>>> we can make in building design, city planning and manufacturing;
>>>>> logistical improvements to transportation; more efficient uses of fossil
>>>>> fuels; increased use of renewable energy; and faster adoption of more
>>>>> efficient technologies.
>>>>>
>>>>> Here are a few different perspectives:
>>>>> [http://carbonsequestration.us/Papers-presentations/htm/Pacal a-Socolow-ScienceM
>>>>> ag-Aug2004.pdf](http://carbonsequestration.us/Papers-presentations/htm/Pacal_a-Socolow-ScienceMag-Aug2004.pdf)
>>>>>
>>>>> <http://www.ases.org/climatechange/>
>>>>> <http://www.westernresourceadvocates.org/energy/clenergy.php>
>>>>> <http://www.ipcc.ch/>
>>>>>
>>>>> I highly recommend this issue of Scientific American:
>>>>> <http://www.sciam.com/sciammag/?contents=2006-09>
>>>>>
>>>>> Especially this article:
>>>>> <http://www.sciam.com/article.cfm?id=a-plan-to-keep-carbon-in>
>>>>>

>>>> Worth a trip to the library.
>>>>
>>>>> Maybe the Mayans's were right? Four years and counting is it? :>o
>>>> What did the Mayan's say?
>>>>
>>>> Cheers,
>>>> -Jamie
>>>> www.JamieKruz.com
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> Tony
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> On 2/4/08 11:33 PM, in article 47a7f891@linux, "Jamie K"
>>>>> <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>> Neil wrote:
>>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>> Hey Don, it's true that one of the expected byproducts of global
>
>>>>>>>> warming
>>>>>>>> is increased extreme weather events, including winter weather events.
>>>>>>>> This is like saying that one of the byproducts of global
>>>>>>>> stupidity is that people will get more intelligent.
>>>>>>>> We can only hope! :^)
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> An increase in extreme weather events is predicted by climate
>>>>>>>> scientists
>>>>>>>> as a consequence of the current climate change event.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> It may seem counter-intuitive until you really think about it.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Warmer ocean water, more evaporation, more energy in weather systems
> to
>>>>>>>>> carry the moisture farther, this can bring more snow over the
>>>>>>>>> mountains.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> (And again, any single weather event can't be linked to the current
>>>>>>>>> climate change by itself. But over time we can measure patterns.)
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Another recent study shows the possibility for earlier rain and earlier
>>>>>>>>>> snow pack melting leading to quicker snow pack degradation. So even
>>>>>>>>>> though individual weather systems may dump a lot of moisture (hang
> in
>>>>>>>>>> there, Deeji!), it may not stay around as long or melt as slowly. Which
>>>>>>>>>> means we may be facing possible water shortages in some areas.
>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>> <http://climate.weather.com/articles/watertrends020108.html>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> "They found that up to 60 percent of changes in river flow, temperature
>>>>>> and snow pack between 1950 and 1999 can be attributed to human
>>>>>> activities, such as driving, that release emissions including carbon
>>>>>> dioxide and other greenhouse gases into the atmosphere."
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Let's see, what else can we blame on opposite-cause events like
>>>>>>> this?
>>>>>>> Don't be confused by the term "global warming." It doesn't mean equal
>>>>>>> heat everywhere on the globe, weather doesn't work like that.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> That's one reason to use the "climate change" label instead. It's
> more
>>>>>>> accurate and less confusing to people. Another is that as the surface
>>>>>>> warms (on average), the mesosphere cools. Both from the same mechanism,
>>>>>>> the additional heat absorption and re-radiation from additional
>>>>>>> greenhouse gases.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> It's interesting to read about this stuff.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Earth%27s_atmosphere
>>>>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Global_warming
>>>>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Greenhouse_effect
>>>>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Atmospheric_chemistry
>>>>>>> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Meteorology>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>> www.JamieKruz.com
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Neil
>>>>
>>>>
>

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [excelav](#) on Thu, 07 Feb 2008 00:40:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I purchased a 5 pack of the Sunbeam bulbs, 4 out of five burned out with in a few months.

There was a news story a while back about a lady in NY that dropped one on a hard wood floor in her child's room. She called Home Depot to ask how

to clean up the liquid from the bulb, they informed her that she had to call the EPA. The EPA told her she had to contact one of the companies on there HazMat list, because the bulbs have mercury in them. The clean up cost \$2500.00.

So my question is why did our government let these bulbs come on the market if they are such a health risk? Just think of what these bulbs will cost all of us in bad health and expense when they end up in land fills and contaminate ground water.

Just think, everybody is buying them.

Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>
>We've had good luck with CF bulbs, overall. We had a couple of early
>failures (within 2 years), and a couple that have lasted longer than
>their rated life and just won't die. The rest are still cruising along
>so we'll see how long they last. I think some brands are better than others.
>
>Even the duds have lasted longer than an incandescent heat bulb (I
>hesitate to call incandescents "light bulbs" since they put out more far
>more heat than light).
>
>Energy Star lists CFs as being about 75% more efficient and lasting 10
>times longer than incandescents.
>
>Quote: "If every home in America replaced just one incandescent light
>bulb with an ENERGY STAR qualified CFL, in one year it would save enough
>energy to light more than 3 million homes and prevent greenhouse gas
>emissions equivalent to those of more than 800,000 cars. '
>
>They do make dimmable CFs, but I haven't tried those.
>
>I'm keeping an eye on the progress of LED lighting for home use. It's
>getting brighter and coming down in price (still more expensive,
>though), and offers the potential to do color mixing.
>
>Cheers,
> -Jamie
> www.JamieKrutz.com
>
>
>Don Nafe wrote:
>> Intersting note about CF bulbs
>>
>> No one has actually determined whether there is a real overall savings
with
>> these things as they cost more to make, ship, dispose of and buy. And

if not
>> used in high traffic areas that need light on for long periods, do not
last
>> as long as claimed. I know this last bit as fact as I replaced every light
in
>> our house that wasn't on a dimmer and several of these bulbs lasted barely

>> six months...others on the otherhand are on their second year. Good thing

>> they go on sale every once in a while otherwise I'd never use them again.
>>
>>
>> "Tony Benson" <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote in message
>> news:C3CE9F9F.16188%tony@standinghampton.com...
>>> The Mayan calendar stops on December 21st, 2012. They thought this was
the
>>> date the world would end. It was a tongue-in-check reference, but it
is
>>> interesting that you pointed out Kyoto expires in 2012. Coincidence?
...
>>> I
>>> THINK NOT! ;>)
>>>
>>> Seriously, I think it's great that you're "smallerizing" your carbon
foot
>>> print. It's a good idea for everyone just in terms of pollution, no matter
>>> what side of the debate you're on. I have switched over many of our lights
>>> bulb to CF's and installed energy efficient windows, but there is much

>>> more
>>> I could do. My fear is that the average person will do little or nothing
>>> simply because it requires too much effort. I think it's true that
>>> individuals can be pretty smart when they need to be, but large groups
are
>>> generally ignorant. As Ronnie James Dio so elegantly put it when singing
>>> with Black Sabbath, "The Mob Rules".
>>>
>>> I'll try to have a more positive outlook.
>>>
>>> Tony
>>>
>>>
>>> On 2/5/08 12:35 AM, in article 47a80709@linux, "Jamie K"
>>> <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>> Tony Benson wrote:
>>>>> So you're saying we're all pretty much f*cked then, huh Jamie.
>>>>> Me? No, I'm not saying that.

>>>>
>>>> We would have been better off not dragging our feet for so long, but
>>>> there's still time to make a difference, and people ARE acting on what
>>>> we know.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> We really are
>>>>> our own worst enemies. The problem now is we can't do much to stop
it.
>>>> It's important to realize that's not true.
>>>>
>>>> Doing nothing would be a very risky choice.
>>>>
>>>> Some warming has happened, some will still happen no matter what we
do
>>>> because of how long greenhouse gases already added will stay in the
>>>> atmosphere.
>>>>
>>>> But a significant amount of warming can still be prevented. There's
a
>>>> lot we can do, some of which we are already doing.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> Short
>>>>> of deciding, as a species, to go back to living "pre-industrialization"

>>>>> life
>>>>> styles. Wanna place any bets on that happening? ;>)
>>>> I haven't seen that idea proposed in any serious mitigation plan. :^)
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> Seriously, I don't know if I believe everything the doomsayers are
>>>>> preaching.
>>>> Nor I. There are always exaggerations. But if you avoid some of the
more
>>>> hyperbolic special interest groups and stick closely to the science,
the
>>>> more likely range of possible outcomes is worth paying attention to
and
>>>> working to mitigate.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> I also don't think we're doing the world any good though by the
>>>>> amount of carbon we pump into the air.
>>>> It might be good for some places where a warmer climate is at least
a
>>>> superficial improvement, but bad overall for the possible shock of rapid
>>>> ecosystem change, threats to coastlines and hard to predict outcomes

>>>> like the possible melting of permafrost (which would release methane,
>>>> another greenhouse gas), changing of ocean currents and other rolls
of
>>>> the dice.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> Hopefully, we still have enough time
>>>>> to figure out a clean way to produce the energy we need to maintain
our
>>>>> current and growing rate of consumption. I just don't see us all getting
>>>>> around on horses, plowing our fields with oxen, and reading by
>>>>> candlelight
>>>>> anytime soon.
>>>> I don't know that horses are all that great of a solution, although
I
>>>> like horses. :^)
>>>>
>>>> But we have a lot of options. There are a lot of efficiency improvements
>>>> we can make in building design, city planning and manufacturing;
>>>> logistical improvements to transportation; more efficient uses of fossil
>>>> fuels; increased use of renewable energy; and faster adoption of more
>>>> efficient technologies.
>>>>
>>>> Here are a few different perspectives:
>>>> [http://carbonsequestration.us/Papers-presentations/htm/Pacal a-Socolow-ScienceM
>>>> ag-Aug2004.pdf](http://carbonsequestration.us/Papers-presentations/htm/Pacal%20a-Socolow-ScienceMag-Aug2004.pdf)
>>>>
>>>> <http://www.ases.org/climatechange/>
>>>> <http://www.westernresourceadvocates.org/energy/clenergy.php>
>>>> <http://www.ipcc.ch/>
>>>>
>>>> I highly recommend this issue of Scientific American:
>>>> <http://www.sciam.com/sciammag/?contents=2006-09>
>>>>
>>>> Especially this article:
>>>> <http://www.sciam.com/article.cfm?id=a-plan-to-keep-carbon-in>
>>>>
>>>> Worth a trip to the library.
>>>>
>>>>> Maybe the Mayans's were right? Four years and counting is it? :>o
>>>> What did the Mayan's say?
>>>>
>>>> Cheers,
>>>> -Jamie
>>>> www.JamieKruz.com
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>

>>>> Tony
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> On 2/4/08 11:33 PM, in article 47a7f891@linux, "Jamie K"
>>>> <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>> Neil wrote:
>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>> Hey Don, it's true that one of the expected byproducts of global

>>>>>>> warming
>>>>>>> is increased extreme weather events, including winter weather events.
>>>>>>> This is like saying that one of the byproducts of global
>>>>>>> stupidity is that people will get more intelligent.
>>>>>>> We can only hope! :^)
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> An increase in extreme weather events is predicted by climate
>>>>>>> scientists
>>>>>>> as a consequence of the current climate change event.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> It may seem counter-intuitive until you really think about it.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Warmer ocean water, more evaporation, more energy in weather systems
to
>>>>>>> carry the moisture farther, this can bring more snow over the
>>>>>>> mountains.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> (And again, any single weather event can't be linked to the current
>>>>>>> climate change by itself. But over time we can measure patterns.)
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Another recent study shows the possibility for earlier rain and earlier
>>>>>>> snow pack melting leading to quicker snow pack degradation. So even
>>>>>>> though individual weather systems may dump a lot of moisture (hang
in
>>>>>>> there, Deeji!), it may not stay around as long or melt as slowly. Which
>>>>>>> means we may be facing possible water shortages in some areas.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> <http://climate.weather.com/articles/watertrends020108.html>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> "They found that up to 60 percent of changes in river flow, temperature
>>>>>>> and snow pack between 1950 and 1999 can be attributed to human
>>>>>>> activities, such as driving, that release emissions including carbon
>>>>>>> dioxide and other greenhouse gases into the atmosphere."
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Let's see, what else can we blame on opposite-cause events like
>>>>>>>> this?
>>>>>>>> Don't be confused by the term "global warming." It doesn't mean equal

>>>>> heat everywhere on the globe, weather doesn't work like that.
>>>>>
>>>>> That's one reason to use the "climate change" label instead. It's
more
>>>>> accurate and less confusing to people. Another is that as the surface
>>>>> warms (on average), the mesosphere cools. Both from the same mechanism,
>>>>> the additional heat absorption and re-radiation from additional
>>>>> greenhouse gases.
>>>>>
>>>>> It's interesting to read about this stuff.
>>>>>
>>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Earth%27s_atmosphere
>>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Global_warming
>>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Greenhouse_effect
>>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Atmospheric_chemistry
>>>>> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Meteorology>
>>>>>
>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>> www.JamieKruz.com
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>> Neil
>>
>>

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Thu, 07 Feb 2008 00:48:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hey James, I was just trying to answer your questions.

Like I said below, I'm looking into LEDs for the future, one advantage is no mercury. Plus it might be fun to do colorful mood lighting anywhere in the house if I feel like it. :^)

But the mercury in CF bulbs is not a problem if you dispose of them properly, and the efficiency of the bulbs means they keep mercury pollution out of the air from coal plants. So that's something. As with many things in technology, it's a reasonable compromise for the moment.

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKruz.com

James McCloskey wrote:

> Here's the story, I heard it on the radio. So Jamie, go find an anti Fox
> news site that will say it is a lie. Bottom line, mercury in light bulbs
> is a bad idea! LEDs look to be a much better idea???

>
> <http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,268747,00.html>

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

>> If your electricity is from coal plants, CF bulbs will actually prevent

>> the release of a lot more mercury into the environment than the bulb is

>> using.

>> When the bulb finally burns out, you can return it without releasing the

>> mercury. Call the store where you purchased it first. If they don't take

>> them or know who will, check the recycling links below.

>> More info here, including how to clean up if you accidentally smash one

>> (it doesn't cost \$2500):

>> http://www.energystar.gov/ia/partners/promotions/change_light/downloads/Fact_Sheet_Mercury.pdf

>> Recycling info:

>> <http://www.epa.gov/bulbrecycling/>

>> <http://www.nema.org/lamprecycle/household.html>

>> Cheers,

>> -Jamie

>> www.JamieKruz.com

>> James McCloskey wrote:

>>> I purchased a 5 pack of the Sunbeam bulbs, 4 out of five burned out with
> in

>>> a few months.

>>> There was a news story a while back about a lady in NY that dropped one
> on

>>> a hard wood floor in her child's room. She called Home Depot to ask how
>>> to clean up the liquid from the bulb, they informed her that she had to

> call

>>> the EPA. The EPA told her she had to contact one of the companies on

> there
>>> HazMat list, because the bulbs have mercury in them. The clean up cost
> \$2500.00.
>>> So my question is why did our government let these bulbs come on the
> market
>>> if they are such a health risk? Just think of what these bulbs will cost
>>> all of us in bad health and expense when they end up in land fills and
> contaminate
>>> ground water.
>>>
>>> Just think, everybody is buying them.
>>>
>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>> We've had good luck with CF bulbs, overall. We had a couple of early
>
>>>> failures (within 2 years), and a couple that have lasted longer than
>
>>>> their rated life and just won't die. The rest are still cruising along
>
>>>> so we'll see how long they last. I think some brands are better than
> others.
>>>> Even the duds have lasted longer than an incandescent heat bulb (I
>>>> hesitate to call incandescents "light bulbs" since they put out more
> far
>>>> more heat than light).
>>>>
>>>> Energy Star lists CFs as being about 75% more efficient and lasting 10
>
>>>> times longer than incandescents.
>>>>
>>>> Quote: "If every home in America replaced just one incandescent light
>
>>>> bulb with an ENERGY STAR qualified CFL, in one year it would save enough
>>>> energy to light more than 3 million homes and prevent greenhouse gas
>
>>>> emissions equivalent to those of more than 800,000 cars. '
>>>>
>>>> They do make dimmable CFs, but I haven't tried those.
>>>>
>>>> I'm keeping an eye on the progress of LED lighting for home use. It's
>
>>>> getting brighter and coming down in price (still more expensive,
>>>> though), and offers the potential to do color mixing.
>>>>
>>>> Cheers,
>>>> -Jamie
>>>> www.JamieKruz.com
>>>>

>>>>
>>>> Don Nafe wrote:
>>>>> Intersting note about CF bulbs
>>>>>
>>>>> No one has actually determined whether there is a real overall savings
>>> with
>>>>> these things as they cost more to make, ship, dispose of and buy. And
>>> if not
>>>>> used in high traffic areas that need light on for long periods, do not
>>> last
>>>>> as long as claimed.I know this last bit as fact as I replaced every
> light
>>> in
>>>>> our house that wasn't on a dimmer and several of these bulbs lasted
> barely
>>>>> six months...others on the otherhand are on their second year. Good
> thing
>>>>> they go on sale every once in a while otherwise I'd never use them again.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> "Tony Benson" <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote in message
>>>>> news:C3CE9F9F.16188%tony@standinghampton.com...
>>>>>> The Mayan calendar stops on December 21st, 2012. They thought this
> was
>>> the
>>>>>> date the world would end. It was a tongue-in-check reference, but it
>>> is
>>>>>> interesting that you pointed out Kyoto expires in 2012. Coincidence?
>>> ...
>>>>>> I
>>>>>> THINK NOT! ;>)
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Seriously, I think it's great that you're "smallerizing" your carbon
>>> foot
>>>>>>> print. It's a good idea for everyone just in terms of pollution, no
> matter
>>>>>>> what side of the debate you're on. I have switched over many of our
> lights
>>>>>>> bulb to CF's and installed energy efficient windows, but there is much
>>>>>>> more
>>>>>>> I could do. My fear is that the average person will do little or nothing
>>>>>>> simply because it requires too much effort. I think it's true that
>>>>>>> individuals can be pretty smart when they need to be, but large groups
>>> are
>>>>>>> generally ignorant. As Ronnie James Dio so elegantly put it when singing
>>>>>>> with Black Sabbath, "The Mob Rules".
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I'll try to have a more positive outlook.

>>>>>
>>>>> Tony
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> On 2/5/08 12:35 AM, in article 47a80709@linux, "Jamie K"
>>>>> <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>> Tony Benson wrote:
>>>>>>> So you're saying we're all pretty much f*cked then, huh Jamie.
>>>>>>> Me? No, I'm not saying that.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> We would have been better off not dragging our feet for so long, but
>>>>>>> there's still time to make a difference, and people ARE acting on
> what
>>>>>>> we know.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> We really are
>>>>>>>> our own worst enemies. The problem now is we can't do much to stop
>>> it.
>>>>>>>> It's important to realize that's not true.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Doing nothing would be a very risky choice.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Some warming has happened, some will still happen no matter what we
>>> do
>>>>>>>> because of how long greenhouse gases already added will stay in the
>>>>>>>> atmosphere.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> But a significant amount of warming can still be prevented. There's
>>> a
>>>>>>>>> lot we can do, some of which we are already doing.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Short
>>>>>>>>>>> of deciding, as a species, to go back to living "pre-industrialization"
>>>>>>>>>>> life
>>>>>>>>>>>> styles. Wanna place any bets on that happening? ;>
>>>>>>>>>>>> I haven't seen that idea proposed in any serious mitigation plan.
> :^)
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Seriously, I don't know if I believe everything the doomsayers are
>>>>>>>>>>>>> preaching.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Nor I. There are always exaggerations. But if you avoid some of the
>>> more
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> hyperbolic special interest groups and stick closely to the science,
>>> the
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> more likely range of possible outcomes is worth paying attention to

>>> and
>>>>>> working to mitigate.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> I also don't think we're doing the world any good though by the
>>>>>> amount of carbon we pump into the air.
>>>>>> It might be good for some places where a warmer climate is at least
>>> a
>>>>>> superficial improvement, but bad overall for the possible shock of
> rapid
>>>>>> ecosystem change, threats to coastlines and hard to predict outcomes
>>>>>> like the possible melting of permafrost (which would release methane,
>>>>>> another greenhouse gas), changing of ocean currents and other rolls
>>> of
>>>>>> the dice.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Hopefully, we still have enough time
>>>>>>> to figure out a clean way to produce the energy we need to maintain
>>> our
>>>>>>> current and growing rate of consumption. I just don't see us all
> getting
>>>>>>> around on horses, plowing our fields with oxen, and reading by
>>>>>>> candlelight
>>>>>>> anytime soon.
>>>>>>> I don't know that horses are all that great of a solution, although
>>> I
>>>>>>> like horses. :^)
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> But we have a lot of options. There are a lot of efficiency improvements
>>>>>>> we can make in building design, city planning and manufacturing;
>>>>>>> logistical improvements to transportation; more efficient uses of
> fossil
>>>>>>> fuels; increased use of renewable energy; and faster adoption of more
>>>>>>> efficient technologies.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Here are a few different perspectives:
>>>>>>> [http://carbonsequestration.us/Papers-presentations/htm/Pacal a-Socolow-ScienceM
>>>>>>> ag-Aug2004.pdf](http://carbonsequestration.us/Papers-presentations/htm/Pacal_a-Socolow-ScienceMag-Aug2004.pdf)
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> <http://www.ases.org/climatechange/>
>>>>>>> <http://www.westernresourceadvocates.org/energy/clenergy.php>
>>>>>>> <http://www.ipcc.ch/>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I highly recommend this issue of Scientific American:
>>>>>>> <http://www.sciam.com/sciammag/?contents=2006-09>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Especially this article:

>>>>>>>> there, Dee!), it may not stay around as long or melt as slowly.
> Which
>>>>>>>> means we may be facing possible water shortages in some areas.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> <http://climate.weather.com/articles/watertrends020108.html>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> "They found that up to 60 percent of changes in river flow, temperature
>>>>>>>> and snow pack between 1950 and 1999 can be attributed to human
>>>>>>>> activities, such as driving, that release emissions including carbon
>>>>>>>> dioxide and other greenhouse gases into the atmosphere."
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Let's see, what else can we blame on opposite-cause events like
>>>>>>>>> this?
>>>>>>>>> Don't be confused by the term "global warming." It doesn't mean
> equal
>>>>>>>>> heat everywhere on the globe, weather doesn't work like that.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> That's one reason to use the "climate change" label instead. It's
>>> more
>>>>>>>>> accurate and less confusing to people. Another is that as the surface
>>>>>>>>> warms (on average), the mesosphere cools. Both from the same mechanism,
>>>>>>>>> the additional heat absorption and re-radiation from additional
>>>>>>>>> greenhouse gases.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> It's interesting to read about this stuff.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Earth%27s_atmosphere
>>>>>>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Global_warming
>>>>>>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Greenhouse_effect
>>>>>>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Atmospheric_chemistry
>>>>>>>>> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Meteorology>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Neil
>

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [excelav](#) on Thu, 07 Feb 2008 01:29:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>
>If your electricity is from coal plants, CF bulbs will actually prevent
>the release of a lot more mercury into the environment than the bulb is
>using.
>
>When the bulb finally burns out, you can return it without releasing the
>mercury. Call the store where you purchased it first. If they don't take
>them or know who will, check the recycling links below.
>
>More info here, including how to clean up if you accidentally smash one
>(it doesn't cost \$2500):
>
> http://www.energystar.gov/ia/partners/promotions/change_light/downloads/Fact_Sheet_Mercury.pdf
>
>Recycling info:
><http://www.epa.gov/bulbrecycling/>
><http://www.nema.org/lamprecycle/household.html>
>
>Cheers,
> -Jamie
> www.JamieKruz.com
>

That was the news report.

>
>James McCloskey wrote:
>> I purchased a 5 pack of the Sunbeam bulbs, 4 out of five burned out with
>> in
>> a few months.
>>
>> There was a news story a while back about a lady in NY that dropped one
>> on
>> a hard wood floor in her child's room. She called Home Depot to ask how
>> to clean up the liquid from the bulb, they informed her that she had to
>> call
>> the EPA. The EPA told her she had to contact one of the companies on
>> there
>> HazMat list, because the bulbs have mercury in them. The clean up cost
>> \$2500.00.
>> So my question is why did our government let these bulbs come on the
>> market
>> if they are such a health risk? Just think of what these bulbs will cost

>> all of us in bad health and expense when they end up in land fills and contaminate
>> ground water.
>>
>> Just think, everybody is buying them.
>>
>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>> We've had good luck with CF bulbs, overall. We had a couple of early
>>> failures (within 2 years), and a couple that have lasted longer than
>>> their rated life and just won't die. The rest are still cruising along
>>> so we'll see how long they last. I think some brands are better than others.
>>>
>>> Even the duds have lasted longer than an incandescent heat bulb (I
>>> hesitate to call incandescents "light bulbs" since they put out more
far
>>
>>> more heat than light).
>>>
>>> Energy Star lists CFs as being about 75% more efficient and lasting 10
>>> times longer than incandescents.
>>>
>>> Quote: "If every home in America replaced just one incandescent light
>>> bulb with an ENERGY STAR qualified CFL, in one year it would save enough
>>
>>> energy to light more than 3 million homes and prevent greenhouse gas
>>> emissions equivalent to those of more than 800,000 cars. '
>>>
>>> They do make dimmable CFs, but I haven't tried those.
>>>
>>> I'm keeping an eye on the progress of LED lighting for home use. It's
>>> getting brighter and coming down in price (still more expensive,
>>> though), and offers the potential to do color mixing.
>>>
>>> Cheers,
>>> -Jamie
>>> www.JamieKruz.com
>>>
>>>
>>> Don Nafe wrote:
>>>> Intersting note about CF bulbs

>>>>
>>>> No one has actually determined whether there is a real overall savings
>> with
>>>> these things as they cost more to make, ship, dispose of and buy. And
>> if not
>>>> used in high traffic areas that need light on for long periods, do not
>> last
>>>> as long as claimed. I know this last bit as fact as I replaced every
light
>> in
>>>> our house that wasn't on a dimmer and several of these bulbs lasted
barely
>>
>>>> six months...others on the otherhand are on their second year. Good
thing
>>
>>>> they go on sale every once in a while otherwise I'd never use them again.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> "Tony Benson" <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote in message
>>>> news:C3CE9F9F.16188%tony@standinghampton.com...
>>>>> The Mayan calendar stops on December 21st, 2012. They thought this
was
>> the
>>>>> date the world would end. It was a tongue-in-check reference, but it
>> is
>>>>> interesting that you pointed out Kyoto expires in 2012. Coincidence?
>> . . .
>>>>> I
>>>>> THINK NOT! ;>)
>>>>>
>>>>> Seriously, I think it's great that you're "smallerizing" your carbon
>> foot
>>>>> print. It's a good idea for everyone just in terms of pollution, no
matter
>>>>> what side of the debate you're on. I have switched over many of our
lights
>>>>> bulb to CF's and installed energy efficient windows, but there is much
>>
>>>>> more
>>>>> I could do. My fear is that the average person will do little or nothing
>>>>> simply because it requires too much effort. I think it's true that
>>>>> individuals can be pretty smart when they need to be, but large groups
>> are
>>>>> generally ignorant. As Ronnie James Dio so elegantly put it when singing
>>>>> with Black Sabbath, "The Mob Rules".
>>>>>
>>>>> I'll try to have a more positive outlook.

>>>>
>>>> Tony
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> On 2/5/08 12:35 AM, in article 47a80709@linux, "Jamie K"
>>>> <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>> Tony Benson wrote:
>>>>>> So you're saying we're all pretty much f*cked then, huh Jamie.
>>>>>> Me? No, I'm not saying that.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> We would have been better off not dragging our feet for so long, but
>>>>>> there's still time to make a difference, and people ARE acting on
what
>>>>>> we know.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> We really are
>>>>>>> our own worst enemies. The problem now is we can't do much to stop
>> it.
>>>>>>> It's important to realize that's not true.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Doing nothing would be a very risky choice.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Some warming has happened, some will still happen no matter what we
>> do
>>>>>>> because of how long greenhouse gases already added will stay in the
>>>>>>> atmosphere.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> But a significant amount of warming can still be prevented. There's
>> a
>>>>>>>> lot we can do, some of which we are already doing.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Short
>>>>>>>>>> of deciding, as a species, to go back to living "pre-industrialization"
>>
>>>>>>>>>> life
>>>>>>>>>>> styles. Wanna place any bets on that happening? ;>)
>>>>>>>>>>> I haven't seen that idea proposed in any serious mitigation plan.
:^\)
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Seriously, I don't know if I believe everything the doomsayers are
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> preaching.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Nor I. There are always exaggerations. But if you avoid some of the
>> more
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> hyperbolic special interest groups and stick closely to the science,

>> the
>>>>> more likely range of possible outcomes is worth paying attention to
>> and
>>>>> working to mitigate.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>> I also don't think we're doing the world any good though by the
>>>>>> amount of carbon we pump into the air.
>>>>>> It might be good for some places where a warmer climate is at least
>> a
>>>>>> superficial improvement, but bad overall for the possible shock of
rapid
>>>>>> ecosystem change, threats to coastlines and hard to predict outcomes
>>>>>> like the possible melting of permafrost (which would release methane,
>>>>>> another greenhouse gas), changing of ocean currents and other rolls
>> of
>>>>>> the dice.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Hopefully, we still have enough time
>>>>>>> to figure out a clean way to produce the energy we need to maintain
>> our
>>>>>>> current and growing rate of consumption. I just don't see us all
getting
>>>>>>> around on horses, plowing our fields with oxen, and reading by
>>>>>>> candlelight
>>>>>>> anytime soon.
>>>>>>> I don't know that horses are all that great of a solution, although
>> I
>>>>>>> like horses. :^)
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> But we have a lot of options. There are a lot of efficiency improvements
>>>>>>> we can make in building design, city planning and manufacturing;
>>>>>>> logistical improvements to transportation; more efficient uses of
fossil
>>>>>>> fuels; increased use of renewable energy; and faster adoption of more
>>>>>>> efficient technologies.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Here are a few different perspectives:
>>>>>>> [http://carbonsequestration.us/Papers-presentations/htm/Pacal a-Socolow-ScienceM
>>>>>>> ag-Aug2004.pdf](http://carbonsequestration.us/Papers-presentations/htm/Pacal%20a-Socolow-ScienceMag-Aug2004.pdf)
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> <http://www.ases.org/climatechange/>
>>>>>>> <http://www.westernresourceadvocates.org/energy/clenergy.php>
>>>>>>> <http://www.ipcc.ch/>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I highly recommend this issue of Scientific American:
>>>>>>> <http://www.sciam.com/sciammag/?contents=2006-09>

>>>>>
>>>>> Especially this article:
>>>>> <http://www.sciam.com/article.cfm?id=a-plan-to-keep-carbon-in>
>>>>>
>>>>> Worth a trip to the library.
>>>>>
>>>>>> Maybe the Mayans's were right? Four years and counting is it? :>o
>>>>>> What did the Mayan's say?
>>>>>
>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>> www.JamieKruz.com
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>> Tony
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> On 2/4/08 11:33 PM, in article 47a7f891 @linux, "Jamie K"
>>>>>>> <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Neil wrote:
>>>>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>> Hey Don, it's true that one of the expected byproducts of global
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> warming
>>>>>>>>>>> is increased extreme weather events, including winter weather
events.
>>>>>>>>>>> This is like saying that one of the byproducts of global
>>>>>>>>>>> stupidity is that people will get more intelligent.
>>>>>>>>>>> We can only hope! :^)
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> An increase in extreme weather events is predicted by climate
>>>>>>>>>>> scientists
>>>>>>>>>>> as a consequence of the current climate change event.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> It may seem counter-intuitive until you really think about it.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> Warmer ocean water, more evaporation, more energy in weather systems
>>>>>>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>>>>> carry the moisture farther, this can bring more snow over the
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> mountains.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> (And again, any single weather event can't be linked to the current
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> climate change by itself. But over time we can measure patterns.)
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Another recent study shows the possibility for earlier rain and
earlier

>>>>>>> snow pack melting leading to quicker snow pack degradation. So even
>>>>>>> though individual weather systems may dump a lot of moisture (hang
>> in
>>>>>>> there, Deeji!), it may not stay around as long or melt as slowly.
Which
>>>>>>> means we may be facing possible water shortages in some areas.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> <http://climate.weather.com/articles/watertrends020108.html>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> "They found that up to 60 percent of changes in river flow, temperature
>>>>>>> and snow pack between 1950 and 1999 can be attributed to human
>>>>>>> activities, such as driving, that release emissions including carbon
>>>>>>> dioxide and other greenhouse gases into the atmosphere."
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Let's see, what else can we blame on opposite-cause events like
>>>>>>>> this?
>>>>>>>> Don't be confused by the term "global warming." It doesn't mean
equal
>>>>>>>> heat everywhere on the globe, weather doesn't work like that.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> That's one reason to use the "climate change" label instead. It's
>> more
>>>>>>>> accurate and less confusing to people. Another is that as the surface
>>>>>>>> warms (on average), the mesosphere cools. Both from the same mechanism,
>>>>>>>> the additional heat absorption and re-radiation from additional
>>>>>>>> greenhouse gases.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> It's interesting to read about this stuff.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Earth%27s_atmosphere
>>>>>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Global_warming
>>>>>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Greenhouse_effect
>>>>>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Atmospheric_chemistry
>>>>>>>> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Meteorology>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>> www.JamieKruz.com
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Neil
>>>>
>>

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [excelav](#) on Thu, 07 Feb 2008 01:43:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Here's the story, I heard it on the radio. So Jamie, go find an anti Fox news site that will say it is a lie. Bottom line, mercury in light bulbs is a bad idea! LEDs look to be a much better idea???

<http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,268747,00.html>

Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>

>If your electricity is from coal plants, CF bulbs will actually prevent

>the release of a lot more mercury into the environment than the bulb is

>using.

>

>When the bulb finally burns out, you can return it without releasing the

>mercury. Call the store where you purchased it first. If they don't take

>them or know who will, check the recycling links below.

>

>More info here, including how to clean up if you accidentally smash one

>(it doesn't cost \$2500):

>

> http://www.energystar.gov/ia/partners/promotions/change_light/downloads/Fact_Sheet_Mercury.pdf

>

>Recycling info:

><http://www.epa.gov/bulbrecycling/>

><http://www.nema.org/lamprecycle/household.html>

>

>Cheers,

> -Jamie

> www.JamieKruz.com

>

>

>James McCloskey wrote:

>> I purchased a 5 pack of the Sunbeam bulbs, 4 out of five burned out with in

>> a few months.

>>

>> There was a news story a while back about a lady in NY that dropped one on

>> a hard wood floor in her child's room. She called Home Depot to ask how

>> to clean up the liquid from the bulb, they informed her that she had to

call

>> the EPA. The EPA told her she had to contact one of the companies on there

>> HazMat list, because the bulbs have mercury in them. The clean up cost \$2500.00.

>> So my question is why did our government let these bulbs come on the market

>> if they are such a health risk? Just think of what these bulbs will cost

>> all of us in bad health and expense when they end up in landfills and contaminate

>> ground water.

>>

>> Just think, everybody is buying them.

>>

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

>>> We've had good luck with CF bulbs, overall. We had a couple of early

>>> failures (within 2 years), and a couple that have lasted longer than

>>> their rated life and just won't die. The rest are still cruising along

>>> so we'll see how long they last. I think some brands are better than others.

>>>

>>> Even the duds have lasted longer than an incandescent heat bulb (I

>>> hesitate to call incandescents "light bulbs" since they put out more far

>>

>>> more heat than light).

>>>

>>> Energy Star lists CFs as being about 75% more efficient and lasting 10

>>> times longer than incandescents.

>>>

>>> Quote: "If every home in America replaced just one incandescent light

>>> bulb with an ENERGY STAR qualified CFL, in one year it would save enough

>>

>>> energy to light more than 3 million homes and prevent greenhouse gas

>>> emissions equivalent to those of more than 800,000 cars. '

>>>

>>> They do make dimmable CFs, but I haven't tried those.

>>>

>>> I'm keeping an eye on the progress of LED lighting for home use. It's

>>> getting brighter and coming down in price (still more expensive,

>>> though), and offers the potential to do color mixing.

>>>
>>> Cheers,
>>> -Jamie
>>> www.JamieKruz.com
>>>
>>>
>>> Don Nafe wrote:
>>>> Intersting note about CF bulbs
>>>>
>>>> No one has actually determined whether there is a real overall savings
>> with
>>>> these things as they cost more to make, ship, dispose of and buy. And
>> if not
>>>> used in high traffic areas that need light on for long periods, do not
>> last
>>>> as long as claimed.I know this last bit as fact as I replaced every
light
>> in
>>>> our house that wasn't on a dimmer and several of these bulbs lasted
barely
>>
>>>> six months...others on the otherhand are on their second year. Good
thing
>>
>>>> they go on sale every once in a while otherwise I'd never use them again.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> "Tony Benson" <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote in message
>>>> news:C3CE9F9F.16188%tony@standinghampton.com...
>>>>> The Mayan calendar stops on December 21st, 2012. They thought this
was
>> the
>>>>> date the world would end. It was a tongue-in-check reference, but it
>> is
>>>>> interesting that you pointed out Kyoto expires in 2012. Coincidence?
>> . . .
>>>>> I
>>>>> THINK NOT! ;>)
>>>>>
>>>>> Seriously, I think it's great that you're "smallerizing" your carbon
>> foot
>>>>> print. It's a good idea for everyone just in terms of pollution, no
matter
>>>>> what side of the debate you're on. I have switched over many of our
lights
>>>>> bulb to CF's and installed energy efficient windows, but there is much
>>
>>>>> more

>>>>> I could do. My fear is that the average person will do little or nothing
>>>>> simply because it requires too much effort. I think it's true that
>>>>> individuals can be pretty smart when they need to be, but large groups
>> are
>>>>> generally ignorant. As Ronnie James Dio so elegantly put it when singing
>>>>> with Black Sabbath, "The Mob Rules".
>>>>>
>>>>> I'll try to have a more positive outlook.
>>>>>
>>>>> Tony
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> On 2/5/08 12:35 AM, in article 47a80709@linux, "Jamie K"
>>>>> <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>> Tony Benson wrote:
>>>>>>> So you're saying we're all pretty much f*cked then, huh Jamie.
>>>>>>> Me? No, I'm not saying that.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> We would have been better off not dragging our feet for so long, but
>>>>>>> there's still time to make a difference, and people ARE acting on
what
>>>>>>> we know.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> We really are
>>>>>>>> our own worst enemies. The problem now is we can't do much to stop
>> it.
>>>>>>> It's important to realize that's not true.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Doing nothing would be a very risky choice.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Some warming has happened, some will still happen no matter what we
>> do
>>>>>>>> because of how long greenhouse gases already added will stay in the
>>>>>>>> atmosphere.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> But a significant amount of warming can still be prevented. There's
>> a
>>>>>>>>> lot we can do, some of which we are already doing.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Short
>>>>>>>>>>> of deciding, as a species, to go back to living "pre-industrialization"
>>
>>>>>>>>>>> life
>>>>>>>>>>>> styles. Wanna place any bets on that happening? ;>)
>>>>>>>>>>>> I haven't seen that idea proposed in any serious mitigation plan.

:^)

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>> Seriously, I don't know if I believe everything the doomsayers are
>>>>>> preaching.

>>>>> Nor I. There are always exaggerations. But if you avoid some of the
>> more

>>>>> hyperbolic special interest groups and stick closely to the science,
>> the

>>>>> more likely range of possible outcomes is worth paying attention to
>> and

>>>>> working to mitigate.

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>> I also don't think we're doing the world any good though by the
>>>>>> amount of carbon we pump into the air.

>>>>> It might be good for some places where a warmer climate is at least
>> a

>>>>> superficial improvement, but bad overall for the possible shock of
rapid

>>>>> ecosystem change, threats to coastlines and hard to predict outcomes

>>>>> like the possible melting of permafrost (which would release methane,

>>>>> another greenhouse gas), changing of ocean currents and other rolls

>> of

>>>>> the dice.

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>> Hopefully, we still have enough time

>>>>>> to figure out a clean way to produce the energy we need to maintain
>> our

>>>>>> current and growing rate of consumption. I just don't see us all
getting

>>>>>> around on horses, plowing our fields with oxen, and reading by

>>>>>> candlelight

>>>>>> anytime soon.

>>>>> I don't know that horses are all that great of a solution, although
>> I

>>>>> like horses. :^)

>>>>>

>>>>> But we have a lot of options. There are a lot of efficiency improvements

>>>>> we can make in building design, city planning and manufacturing;

>>>>> logistical improvements to transportation; more efficient uses of
fossil

>>>>> fuels; increased use of renewable energy; and faster adoption of more

>>>>> efficient technologies.

>>>>>

>>>>> Here are a few different perspectives:

>>>>> [http://carbonsequestration.us/Papers-presentations/htm/Pacal a-Socolow-ScienceM](http://carbonsequestration.us/Papers-presentations/htm/Pacal-a-Socolow-ScienceM)

>>>>> ag-Aug2004.pdf
>>>>>
>>>>> <http://www.ases.org/climatechange/>
>>>>> <http://www.westernresourceadvocates.org/energy/clenergy.php>
>>>>> <http://www.ipcc.ch/>
>>>>>
>>>>> I highly recommend this issue of Scientific American:
>>>>> <http://www.sciam.com/sciammag/?contents=2006-09>
>>>>>
>>>>> Especially this article:
>>>>> <http://www.sciam.com/article.cfm?id=a-plan-to-keep-carbon-in>
>>>>>
>>>>> Worth a trip to the library.
>>>>>
>>>>>> Maybe the Mayans's were right? Four years and counting is it? :>o
>>>>> What did the Mayan's say?
>>>>>
>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>> www.JamieKruz.com
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>> Tony
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> On 2/4/08 11:33 PM, in article 47a7f891@linux, "Jamie K"
>>>>>>> <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Neil wrote:
>>>>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>> Hey Don, it's true that one of the expected byproducts of global
>>
>>>>>>>>>> warming
>>>>>>>>>>> is increased extreme weather events, including winter weather
events.
>>>>>>>>>>> This is like saying that one of the byproducts of global
>>>>>>>>>>> stupidity is that people will get more intelligent.
>>>>>>>>>>> We can only hope! :^)
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> An increase in extreme weather events is predicted by climate
>>>>>>>>>>> scientists
>>>>>>>>>>> as a consequence of the current climate change event.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> It may seem counter-intuitive until you really think about it.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Warmer ocean water, more evaporation, more energy in weather systems
>> to

>>>>>>> carry the moisture farther, this can bring more snow over the
>>>>>>> mountains.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> (And again, any single weather event can't be linked to the current
>>>>>>> climate change by itself. But over time we can measure patterns.)
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Another recent study shows the possibility for earlier rain and
earlier
>>>>>>> snow pack melting leading to quicker snow pack degradation. So even
>>>>>>> though individual weather systems may dump a lot of moisture (hang
>> in
>>>>>>> there, Deeji!), it may not stay around as long or melt as slowly.
Which
>>>>>>> means we may be facing possible water shortages in some areas.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> <http://climate.weather.com/articles/watertrends020108.html>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> "They found that up to 60 percent of changes in river flow, temperature
>>>>>>> and snow pack between 1950 and 1999 can be attributed to human
>>>>>>> activities, such as driving, that release emissions including carbon
>>>>>>> dioxide and other greenhouse gases into the atmosphere."
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Let's see, what else can we blame on opposite-cause events like
>>>>>>>> this?
>>>>>>>> Don't be confused by the term "global warming." It doesn't mean
equal
>>>>>>>> heat everywhere on the globe, weather doesn't work like that.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> That's one reason to use the "climate change" label instead. It's
>> more
>>>>>>>> accurate and less confusing to people. Another is that as the surface
>>>>>>>> warms (on average), the mesosphere cools. Both from the same mechanism,
>>>>>>>> the additional heat absorption and re-radiation from additional
>>>>>>>> greenhouse gases.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> It's interesting to read about this stuff.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Earth%27s_atmosphere
>>>>>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Global_warming
>>>>>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Greenhouse_effect
>>>>>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Atmospheric_chemistry
>>>>>>>> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Meteorology>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>> www.JamieKruz.com
>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Neil
>>>>
>>

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [Aaron Allen](#) on Fri, 08 Feb 2008 00:11:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I've had much better luck with them. When I bought this house over 2 years ago I replaced almost every bulb in the place (no dimmers) with CF's and I've yet to lose one of them. Some are in night time lighting that runs 8-12 hours a day, every day.
I guess YMMV?

AA

"Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote in message <news:47a9a6b2@linux...>
> Intersting note about CF bulbs
>
> No one has actually determined whether there is a real overall savings
> with these things as they cost more to make, ship, dispose of and buy. And
> if not used in high traffic areas that need light on for long periods, do
> not last as long as claimed.I know this last bit as fact as I replaced
> every light in our house that wasn't on a dimmer and several of these
> bulbs lasted barely six months...others on the otherhand are on their
> second year. Good thing they go on sale every once in a while otherwise
> I'd never use them again.
>
>
> "Tony Benson" <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote in message
> <news:C3CE9F9F.16188%tony@standinghampton.com...>
>> The Mayan calendar stops on December 21st, 2012. They thought this was
>> the
>> date the world would end. It was a tongue-in-check reference, but it is
>> interesting that you pointed out Kyoto expires in 2012. Coincidence? . .
>> . I
>> THINK NOT! ;>)
>>
>> Seriously, I think it's great that you're "smallerizing" your carbon foot
>> print. It's a good idea for everyone just in terms of pollution, no
>> matter
>> what side of the debate you're on. I have switched over many of our
>> lights
>> bulb to CF's and installed energy efficient windows, but there is much

>> more
>> I could do. My fear is that the average person will do little or nothing
>> simply because it requires too much effort. I think it's true that
>> individuals can be pretty smart when they need to be, but large groups
>> are
>> generally ignorant. As Ronnie James Dio so elegantly put it when singing
>> with Black Sabbath, "The Mob Rules".
>>
>> I'll try to have a more positive outlook.
>>
>> Tony
>>
>>
>> On 2/5/08 12:35 AM, in article 47a80709@linux, "Jamie K"
>> <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>
>>> Tony Benson wrote:
>>>> So you're saying we're all pretty much f*cked then, huh Jamie.
>>>
>>> Me? No, I'm not saying that.
>>>
>>> We would have been better off not dragging our feet for so long, but
>>> there's still time to make a difference, and people ARE acting on what
>>> we know.
>>>
>>>
>>>> We really are
>>>> our own worst enemies. The problem now is we can't do much to stop it.
>>>
>>> It's important to realize that's not true.
>>>
>>> Doing nothing would be a very risky choice.
>>>
>>> Some warming has happened, some will still happen no matter what we do
>>> because of how long greenhouse gases already added will stay in the
>>> atmosphere.
>>>
>>> But a significant amount of warming can still be prevented. There's a
>>> lot we can do, some of which we are already doing.
>>>
>>>
>>>> Short
>>>> of deciding, as a species, to go back to living "pre-industrialization"
>>>> life
>>>> styles. Wanna place any bets on that happening? ;>)
>>>
>>> I haven't seen that idea proposed in any serious mitigation plan. :^)
>>>

>>>
>>>> Seriously, I don't know if I believe everything the doomsayers are
>>>> preaching.
>>>
>>> Nor I. There are always exaggerations. But if you avoid some of the more
>>> hyperbolic special interest groups and stick closely to the science, the
>>> more likely range of possible outcomes is worth paying attention to and
>>> working to mitigate.
>>>
>>>
>>>> I also don't think we're doing the world any good though by the
>>>> amount of carbon we pump into the air.
>>>
>>> It might be good for some places where a warmer climate is at least a
>>> superficial improvement, but bad overall for the possible shock of rapid
>>> ecosystem change, threats to coastlines and hard to predict outcomes
>>> like the possible melting of permafrost (which would release methane,
>>> another greenhouse gas), changing of ocean currents and other rolls of
>>> the dice.
>>>
>>>
>>>> Hopefully, we still have enough time
>>>> to figure out a clean way to produce the energy we need to maintain our
>>>> current and growing rate of consumption. I just don't see us all
>>>> getting
>>>> around on horses, plowing our fields with oxen, and reading by
>>>> candlelight
>>>> anytime soon.
>>>
>>> I don't know that horses are all that great of a solution, although I
>>> like horses. :^)
>>>
>>> But we have a lot of options. There are a lot of efficiency improvements
>>> we can make in building design, city planning and manufacturing;
>>> logistical improvements to transportation; more efficient uses of fossil
>>> fuels; increased use of renewable energy; and faster adoption of more
>>> efficient technologies.
>>>
>>> Here are a few different perspectives:
>>> [http://carbonsequestration.us/Papers-presentations/htm/Pacal a-Socolow-ScienceM
>>> ag-Aug2004.pdf](http://carbonsequestration.us/Papers-presentations/htm/Pacal%20a-Socolow-ScienceMag-Aug-2004.pdf)
>>>
>>> <http://www.ases.org/climatechange/>
>>> <http://www.westernresourceadvocates.org/energy/clenergy.php>
>>> <http://www.ipcc.ch/>
>>>
>>> I highly recommend this issue of Scientific American:
>>> <http://www.sciam.com/sciammag/?contents=2006-09>

>>>
>>> Especially this article:
>>> <http://www.sciam.com/article.cfm?id=a-plan-to-keep-carbon-in>
>>>
>>> Worth a trip to the library.
>>>
>>>> Maybe the Mayans's were right? Four years and counting is it? :>o
>>>
>>> What did the Mayan's say?
>>>
>>> Cheers,
>>> -Jamie
>>> www.JamieKruz.com
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>> Tony
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> On 2/4/08 11:33 PM, in article 47a7f891@linux, "Jamie K"
>>>> <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>> Neil wrote:
>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>> Hey Don, it's true that one of the expected byproducts of global
>>>>>>> warming
>>>>>>> is increased extreme weather events, including winter weather
>>>>>>> events.
>>>>>>> This is like saying that one of the byproducts of global
>>>>>>> stupidity is that people will get more intelligent.
>>>>>>> We can only hope! :^)
>>>>>
>>>>>> An increase in extreme weather events is predicted by climate
>>>>>>> scientists
>>>>>>> as a consequence of the current climate change event.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> It may seem counter-intuitive until you really think about it.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Warmer ocean water, more evaporation, more energy in weather systems
>>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>> carry the moisture farther, this can bring more snow over the
>>>>>>>> mountains.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> (And again, any single weather event can't be linked to the current
>>>>>>>>> climate change by itself. But over time we can measure patterns.)
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Another recent study shows the possibility for earlier rain and
>>>>>>>>>>> earlier

>>>> snow pack melting leading to quicker snow pack degradation. So even
>>>> though individual weather systems may dump a lot of moisture (hang in
>>>> there, Dee!), it may not stay around as long or melt as slowly. Which
>>>> means we may be facing possible water shortages in some areas.

>>>>

>>>> <http://climate.weather.com/articles/watertrends020108.html>

>>>>

>>>> "They found that up to 60 percent of changes in river flow,

>>>> temperature

>>>> and snow pack between 1950 and 1999 can be attributed to human

>>>> activities, such as driving, that release emissions including carbon

>>>> dioxide and other greenhouse gases into the atmosphere."

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>> Let's see, what else can we blame on opposite-cause events like

>>>>> this?

>>>>> Don't be confused by the term "global warming." It doesn't mean equal

>>>>> heat everywhere on the globe, weather doesn't work like that.

>>>>>

>>>>> That's one reason to use the "climate change" label instead. It's more

>>>>> accurate and less confusing to people. Another is that as the surface

>>>>> warms (on average), the mesosphere cools. Both from the same

>>>>> mechanism,

>>>>> the additional heat absorption and re-radiation from additional

>>>>> greenhouse gases.

>>>>>

>>>>> It's interesting to read about this stuff.

>>>>>

>>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Earth%27s_atmosphere

>>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Global_warming

>>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Greenhouse_effect

>>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Atmospheric_chemistry

>>>>> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Meteorology>

>>>>>

>>>>> Cheers,

>>>>> -Jamie

>>>>> www.JamieKruz.com

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>> Neil

>>>>>

>>

>

>

>

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [Aaron Allen](#) on Fri, 08 Feb 2008 00:14:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Great info, this I was not aware of

AA

"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:47aa4df3@linux...

>

> If your electricity is from coal plants, CF bulbs will actually prevent
> the release of a lot more mercury into the environment than the bulb is
> using.

>

> When the bulb finally burns out, you can return it without releasing the
> mercury. Call the store where you purchased it first. If they don't take
> them or know who will, check the recycling links below.

>

> More info here, including how to clean up if you accidentally smash one
> (it doesn't cost \$2500):

>

> http://www.energystar.gov/ia/partners/promotions/change_light/downloads/Fact_Sheet_Mercury.pdf

>

> Recycling info:

> <http://www.epa.gov/bulbrecycling/>

> <http://www.nema.org/lamprecycle/household.html>

>

> Cheers,

> -Jamie

> www.JamieKruz.com

>

>

> James McCloskey wrote:

>> I purchased a 5 pack of the Sunbeam bulbs, 4 out of five burned out with
>> in

>> a few months. There was a news story a while back about a lady in NY
>> that dropped one on

>> a hard wood floor in her child's room. She called Home Depot to ask how
>> to clean up the liquid from the bulb, they informed her that she had to
>> call

>> the EPA. The EPA told her she had to contact one of the companies on
>> there

>> HazMat list, because the bulbs have mercury in them. The clean up cost
>> \$2500.00.

>> So my question is why did our government let these bulbs come on the
>> market

>> if they are such a health risk? Just think of what these bulbs will cost

>> all of us in bad health and expense when they end up in land fills and
>> contaminate
>> ground water. Just think, everybody is buying them.
>>
>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>> We've had good luck with CF bulbs, overall. We had a couple of early
>>> failures (within 2 years), and a couple that have lasted longer than
>>> their rated life and just won't die. The rest are still cruising along
>>> so we'll see how long they last. I think some brands are better than
>>> others.
>>>
>>> Even the duds have lasted longer than an incandescent heat bulb (I
>>> hesitate to call incandescents "light bulbs" since they put out more far
>>
>>> more heat than light).
>>>
>>> Energy Star lists CFs as being about 75% more efficient and lasting 10
>>> times longer than incandescents.
>>>
>>> Quote: "If every home in America replaced just one incandescent light
>>> bulb with an ENERGY STAR qualified CFL, in one year it would save enough
>>
>>> energy to light more than 3 million homes and prevent greenhouse gas
>>> emissions equivalent to those of more than 800,000 cars. '
>>>
>>> They do make dimmable CFs, but I haven't tried those.
>>>
>>> I'm keeping an eye on the progress of LED lighting for home use. It's
>>> getting brighter and coming down in price (still more expensive,
>>> though), and offers the potential to do color mixing.
>>>
>>> Cheers,
>>> -Jamie
>>> www.JamieKruz.com
>>>
>>>
>>> Don Nafe wrote:
>>>> Intersting note about CF bulbs
>>>>
>>>> No one has actually determined whether there is a real overall savings
>> with
>>>> these things as they cost more to make, ship, dispose of and buy. And
>> if not
>>>> used in high traffic areas that need light on for long periods, do not
>> last
>>>> as long as claimed.I know this last bit as fact as I replaced every
>>>> light
>> in

>>>> our house that wasn't on a dimmer and several of these bulbs lasted
>>>> barely
>>
>>>> six months...others on the otherhand are on their second year. Good
>>>> thing
>>
>>>> they go on sale every once in a while otherwise I'd never use them
>>>> again.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> "Tony Benson" <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote in message
>>>> news:C3CE9F9F.16188%tony@standinghampton.com...
>>>>> The Mayan calendar stops on December 21st, 2012. They thought this was
>> the
>>>>> date the world would end. It was a tongue-in-check reference, but it
>> is
>>>>> interesting that you pointed out Kyoto expires in 2012. Coincidence?
>> . . .
>>>>> I
>>>>> THINK NOT! ;>)
>>>>>
>>>>> Seriously, I think it's great that you're "smallerizing" your carbon
>> foot
>>>>> print. It's a good idea for everyone just in terms of pollution, no
>>>>> matter
>>>>> what side of the debate you're on. I have switched over many of our
>>>>> lights
>>>>> bulb to CF's and installed energy efficient windows, but there is much
>>
>>>>> more
>>>>> I could do. My fear is that the average person will do little or
>>>>> nothing
>>>>> simply because it requires too much effort. I think it's true that
>>>>> individuals can be pretty smart when they need to be, but large groups
>> are
>>>>> generally ignorant. As Ronnie James Dio so elegantly put it when
>>>>> singing
>>>>> with Black Sabbath, "The Mob Rules".
>>>>>
>>>>> I'll try to have a more positive outlook.
>>>>>
>>>>> Tony
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> On 2/5/08 12:35 AM, in article 47a80709@linux, "Jamie K"
>>>>> <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>> Tony Benson wrote:

>>>>>> So you're saying we're all pretty much f*cked then, huh Jamie.
>>>>>> Me? No, I'm not saying that.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> We would have been better off not dragging our feet for so long, but
>>>>>> there's still time to make a difference, and people ARE acting on
>>>>>> what
>>>>>> we know.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> We really are
>>>>>>> our own worst enemies. The problem now is we can't do much to stop
>> it.
>>>>>>> It's important to realize that's not true.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Doing nothing would be a very risky choice.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Some warming has happened, some will still happen no matter what we
>> do
>>>>>>> because of how long greenhouse gases already added will stay in the
>>>>>>> atmosphere.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> But a significant amount of warming can still be prevented. There's
>> a
>>>>>>> lot we can do, some of which we are already doing.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Short
>>>>>>>> of deciding, as a species, to go back to living
>>>>>>>> "pre-industrialization"
>>
>>>>>>>> life
>>>>>>>> styles. Wanna place any bets on that happening? ;>)
>>>>>>>> I haven't seen that idea proposed in any serious mitigation plan. :^)
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Seriously, I don't know if I believe everything the doomsayers are
>>>>>>>>> preaching.
>>>>>>>>> Nor I. There are always exaggerations. But if you avoid some of the
>> more
>>>>>>>>> hyperbolic special interest groups and stick closely to the science,
>> the
>>>>>>>>> more likely range of possible outcomes is worth paying attention to
>> and
>>>>>>>>> working to mitigate.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> I also don't think we're doing the world any good though by the
>>>>>>>>>>> amount of carbon we pump into the air.

>>>>> It might be good for some places where a warmer climate is at least
>> a
>>>>> superficial improvement, but bad overall for the possible shock of
>>>>> rapid
>>>>> ecosystem change, threats to coastlines and hard to predict outcomes
>>>>> like the possible melting of permafrost (which would release methane,
>>>>> another greenhouse gas), changing of ocean currents and other rolls
>> of
>>>>> the dice.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>> Hopefully, we still have enough time
>>>>>> to figure out a clean way to produce the energy we need to maintain
>> our
>>>>>> current and growing rate of consumption. I just don't see us all
>>>>>> getting
>>>>>> around on horses, plowing our fields with oxen, and reading by
>>>>>> candlelight
>>>>>> anytime soon.
>>>>>> I don't know that horses are all that great of a solution, although
>> I
>>>>>> like horses. :^)
>>>>>>
>>>>>> But we have a lot of options. There are a lot of efficiency
>>>>>> improvements
>>>>>> we can make in building design, city planning and manufacturing;
>>>>>> logistical improvements to transportation; more efficient uses of
>>>>>> fossil
>>>>>> fuels; increased use of renewable energy; and faster adoption of more
>>>>>> efficient technologies.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Here are a few different perspectives:
>>>>>> [http://carbonsequestration.us/Papers-presentations/htm/Pacal a-Socolow-ScienceM
>>>>>> ag-Aug2004.pdf](http://carbonsequestration.us/Papers-presentations/htm/Pacal_a-Socolow-ScienceMag-Aug2004.pdf)
>>>>>>
>>>>>> <http://www.ases.org/climatechange/>
>>>>>> <http://www.westernresourceadvocates.org/energy/clenergy.php>
>>>>>> <http://www.ipcc.ch/>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> I highly recommend this issue of Scientific American:
>>>>>> <http://www.sciam.com/sciammag/?contents=2006-09>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Especially this article:
>>>>>> <http://www.sciam.com/article.cfm?id=a-plan-to-keep-carbon-in>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Worth a trip to the library.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Maybe the Mayans's were right? Four years and counting is it? :>o

>>>>> What did the Mayan's say?
>>>>>
>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>> www.JamieKruz.com
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>> Tony
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> On 2/4/08 11:33 PM, in article 47a7f891@linux, "Jamie K"
>>>>>> <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Neil wrote:
>>>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>> Hey Don, it's true that one of the expected byproducts of global
>>
>>>>>>>>> warming
>>>>>>>>> is increased extreme weather events, including winter weather
>>>>>>>>> events.
>>>>>>>>> This is like saying that one of the byproducts of global
>>>>>>>>> stupidity is that people will get more intelligent.
>>>>>>>>> We can only hope! :^)
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> An increase in extreme weather events is predicted by climate
>>>>>>>>> scientists
>>>>>>>>> as a consequence of the current climate change event.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> It may seem counter-intuitive until you really think about it.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Warmer ocean water, more evaporation, more energy in weather
>>>>>>>>> systems
>> to
>>>>>>>>> carry the moisture farther, this can bring more snow over the
>>>>>>>>> mountains.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> (And again, any single weather event can't be linked to the current
>>>>>>>>>> climate change by itself. But over time we can measure patterns.)
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Another recent study shows the possibility for earlier rain and
>>>>>>>>>> earlier
>>>>>>>>>> snow pack melting leading to quicker snow pack degradation. So even
>>>>>>>>>> though individual weather systems may dump a lot of moisture (hang
>> in
>>>>>>>>>> there, Deeji!), it may not stay around as long or melt as slowly.
>>>>>>>>>> Which
>>>>>>>>>> means we may be facing possible water shortages in some areas.

>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> <http://climate.weather.com/articles/watertrends020108.html>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> "They found that up to 60 percent of changes in river flow,
>>>>>>> temperature
>>>>>>> and snow pack between 1950 and 1999 can be attributed to human
>>>>>>> activities, such as driving, that release emissions including
>>>>>>> carbon
>>>>>>> dioxide and other greenhouse gases into the atmosphere."
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Let's see, what else can we blame on opposite-cause events like
>>>>>>>> this?
>>>>>>>> Don't be confused by the term "global warming." It doesn't mean
>>>>>>>> equal
>>>>>>>> heat everywhere on the globe, weather doesn't work like that.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> That's one reason to use the "climate change" label instead. It's
>> more
>>>>>>>> accurate and less confusing to people. Another is that as the
>>>>>>>> surface
>>>>>>>> warms (on average), the mesosphere cools. Both from the same
>>>>>>>> mechanism,
>>>>>>>> the additional heat absorption and re-radiation from additional
>>>>>>>> greenhouse gases.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> It's interesting to read about this stuff.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Earth%27s_atmosphere
>>>>>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Global_warming
>>>>>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Greenhouse_effect
>>>>>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Atmospheric_chemistry
>>>>>>>> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Meteorology>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>> www.JamieKruz.com
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Neil
>>>>>
>>

Subject: Re: OK.....I've had enough of this
Posted by [AlexPlasko](#) on Fri, 08 Feb 2008 03:06:32 GMT

being an electrical contractor and dealing with thousands of fluorescent lamps I can tell you that recycling for mercury is a disaster. It cost under \$1.00 for a T-12 or T-8 lamp and \$1.75 to recycle it(each!). Try getting that from your customers. I'm all for saving the planet and being able to eat more fish without heavy metals but it isn't working. Don't know about your states ,but enforcement is lacking here ,and I wouldn't be surprised if the lamps being returned are ending up in dumpsters anyway.

sad but true

"Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote in message news:47aba22d@linux...

> Great info, this I was not aware of

>

> AA

>

>

> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:47aa4df3@linux...

>>

>> If your electricity is from coal plants, CF bulbs will actually prevent the release of a lot more mercury into the environment than the bulb is using.

>>

>> When the bulb finally burns out, you can return it without releasing the mercury. Call the store where you purchased it first. If they don't take them or know who will, check the recycling links below.

>>

>> More info here, including how to clean up if you accidentally smash one (it doesn't cost \$2500):

>>

>> http://www.energystar.gov/ia/partners/promotions/change_light/downloads/Fact_Sheet_Mercury.pdf

>>

>> Recycling info:

>> <http://www.epa.gov/bulbrecycling/>

>> <http://www.nema.org/lamprecycle/household.html>

>>

>> Cheers,

>> -Jamie

>> www.JamieKruz.com

>>

>>

>> James McCloskey wrote:

>>> I purchased a 5 pack of the Sunbeam bulbs, 4 out of five burned out with

>>> in

>>> a few months. There was a news story a while back about a lady in NY

>>> that dropped one on

>>> a hard wood floor in her child's room. She called Home Depot to ask how
>>> to clean up the liquid from the bulb, they informed her that she had to
>>> call
>>> the EPA. The EPA told her she had to contact one of the companies on
>>> there
>>> HazMat list, because the bulbs have mercury in them. The clean up cost
>>> \$2500.00.
>>> So my question is why did our government let these bulbs come on the
>>> market
>>> if they are such a health risk? Just think of what these bulbs will
>>> cost
>>> all of us in bad health and expense when they end up in land fills and
>>> contaminate
>>> ground water. Just think, everybody is buying them.
>>>
>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>> We've had good luck with CF bulbs, overall. We had a couple of early
>>>> failures (within 2 years), and a couple that have lasted longer than
>>>> their rated life and just won't die. The rest are still cruising along
>>>> so we'll see how long they last. I think some brands are better than
>>>> others.
>>>>
>>>> Even the duds have lasted longer than an incandescent heat bulb (I
>>>> hesitate to call incandescents "light bulbs" since they put out more
>>>> far
>>>>
>>>> more heat than light).
>>>>
>>>> Energy Star lists CFs as being about 75% more efficient and lasting 10
>>>> times longer than incandescents.
>>>>
>>>> Quote: "If every home in America replaced just one incandescent light
>>>> bulb with an ENERGY STAR qualified CFL, in one year it would save
>>>> enough
>>>>
>>>> energy to light more than 3 million homes and prevent greenhouse gas
>>>> emissions equivalent to those of more than 800,000 cars. '
>>>>
>>>> They do make dimmable CFs, but I haven't tried those.
>>>>
>>>> I'm keeping an eye on the progress of LED lighting for home use. It's
>>>> getting brighter and coming down in price (still more expensive,
>>>> though), and offers the potential to do color mixing.
>>>>
>>>> Cheers,
>>>> -Jamie
>>>> www.JamieKruz.com
>>>>

>>>>
>>>> Don Nafe wrote:
>>>>> Intersting note about CF bulbs
>>>>>
>>>>> No one has actually determined whether there is a real overall savings
>>> with
>>>>> these things as they cost more to make, ship, dispose of and buy. And
>>> if not
>>>>> used in high traffic areas that need light on for long periods, do not
>>> last
>>>>> as long as claimed.I know this last bit as fact as I replaced every
>>>>> light
>>> in
>>>>> our house that wasn't on a dimmer and several of these bulbs lasted
>>>>> barely
>>>
>>>>> six months...others on the otherhand are on their second year. Good
>>>>> thing
>>>
>>>>> they go on sale every once in a while otherwise I'd never use them
>>>>> again.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> "Tony Benson" <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote in message
>>>>> news:C3CE9F9F.16188%tony@standinghampton.com...
>>>>>> The Mayan calendar stops on December 21st, 2012. They thought this
>>>>>> was
>>> the
>>>>>> date the world would end. It was a tongue-in-check reference, but it
>>> is
>>>>>> interesting that you pointed out Kyoto expires in 2012. Coincidence?
>>> . . .
>>>>>> I
>>>>>> THINK NOT! ;>)
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Seriously, I think it's great that you're "smallerizing" your carbon
>>> foot
>>>>>> print. It's a good idea for everyone just in terms of pollution, no
>>>>>> matter
>>>>>> what side of the debate you're on. I have switched over many of our
>>>>>> lights
>>>>>> bulb to CF's and installed energy efficient windows, but there is
>>>>>> much
>>>
>>>>>> more
>>>>>> I could do. My fear is that the average person will do little or
>>>>>> nothing
>>>>>> simply because it requires too much effort. I think it's true that

>>>>> individuals can be pretty smart when they need to be, but large
>>>>> groups
>>> are
>>>>> generally ignorant. As Ronnie James Dio so elegantly put it when
>>>>> singing
>>>>> with Black Sabbath, "The Mob Rules".
>>>>>
>>>>> I'll try to have a more positive outlook.
>>>>>
>>>>> Tony
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> On 2/5/08 12:35 AM, in article 47a80709@linux, "Jamie K"
>>>>> <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>> Tony Benson wrote:
>>>>>>> So you're saying we're all pretty much f*cked then, huh Jamie.
>>>>>>> Me? No, I'm not saying that.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> We would have been better off not dragging our feet for so long, but
>>>>>>> there's still time to make a difference, and people ARE acting on
>>>>>>> what
>>>>>>> we know.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> We really are
>>>>>>>> our own worst enemies. The problem now is we can't do much to stop
>>> it.
>>>>>>> It's important to realize that's not true.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Doing nothing would be a very risky choice.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Some warming has happened, some will still happen no matter what we
>>> do
>>>>>>>>> because of how long greenhouse gases already added will stay in the
>>>>>>>>> atmosphere.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> But a significant amount of warming can still be prevented. There's
>>> a
>>>>>>>>>>> lot we can do, some of which we are already doing.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> Short
>>>>>>>>>>>>> of deciding, as a species, to go back to living
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> "pre-industrialization"
>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> life
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> styles. Wanna place any bets on that happening? ;>)

>>>>>> I haven't seen that idea proposed in any serious mitigation plan.
>>>>>> :^)
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Seriously, I don't know if I believe everything the doomsayers are
>>>>>> preaching.
>>>>>> Nor I. There are always exaggerations. But if you avoid some of the
>>> more
>>>>>> hyperbolic special interest groups and stick closely to the science,
>>> the
>>>>>> more likely range of possible outcomes is worth paying attention to
>>> and
>>>>>> working to mitigate.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> I also don't think we're doing the world any good though by the
>>>>>> amount of carbon we pump into the air.
>>>>>> It might be good for some places where a warmer climate is at least
>>> a
>>>>>> superficial improvement, but bad overall for the possible shock of
>>>>>> rapid
>>>>>> ecosystem change, threats to coastlines and hard to predict outcomes
>>>>>> like the possible melting of permafrost (which would release
>>>>>> methane,
>>>>>> another greenhouse gas), changing of ocean currents and other rolls
>>> of
>>>>>> the dice.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Hopefully, we still have enough time
>>>>>> to figure out a clean way to produce the energy we need to maintain
>>> our
>>>>>> current and growing rate of consumption. I just don't see us all
>>>>>> getting
>>>>>> around on horses, plowing our fields with oxen, and reading by
>>>>>> candlelight
>>>>>> anytime soon.
>>>>>> I don't know that horses are all that great of a solution, although
>>> I
>>>>>> like horses. :^)
>>>>>>
>>>>>> But we have a lot of options. There are a lot of efficiency
>>>>>> improvements
>>>>>> we can make in building design, city planning and manufacturing;
>>>>>> logistical improvements to transportation; more efficient uses of
>>>>>> fossil
>>>>>> fuels; increased use of renewable energy; and faster adoption of
>>>>>> more

>>>>>> efficient technologies.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Here are a few different perspectives:
>>>>>> http://carbonsequestration.us/Papers-presentations/htm/Pacal_a-Socolow-ScienceMag-Aug2004.pdf
>>>>>>
>>>>>> <http://www.ases.org/climatechange/>
>>>>>> <http://www.westernresourceadvocates.org/energy/clenergy.php>
>>>>>> <http://www.ipcc.ch/>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> I highly recommend this issue of Scientific American:
>>>>>> <http://www.sciam.com/sciammag/?contents=2006-09>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Especially this article:
>>>>>> <http://www.sciam.com/article.cfm?id=a-plan-to-keep-carbon-in>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Worth a trip to the library.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Maybe the Mayans's were right? Four years and counting is it? :>o
>>>>>>> What did the Mayan's say?
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>> www.JamieKruz.com
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Tony
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> On 2/4/08 11:33 PM, in article 47a7f891@linux, "Jamie K"
>>>>>>>>>> <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> Neil wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Hey Don, it's true that one of the expected byproducts of global
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> warming
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> is increased extreme weather events, including winter weather
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> events.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> This is like saying that one of the byproducts of global
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> stupidity is that people will get more intelligent.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> We can only hope! :^)
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> An increase in extreme weather events is predicted by climate
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> scientists
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> as a consequence of the current climate change event.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> It may seem counter-intuitive until you really think about it.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Warmer ocean water, more evaporation, more energy in weather
>>>>>>> systems
>>> to
>>>>>>> carry the moisture farther, this can bring more snow over the
>>>>>>> mountains.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> (And again, any single weather event can't be linked to the
>>>>>>> current
>>>>>>> climate change by itself. But over time we can measure patterns.)
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Another recent study shows the possibility for earlier rain and
>>>>>>> earlier
>>>>>>> snow pack melting leading to quicker snow pack degradation. So
>>>>>>> even
>>>>>>> though individual weather systems may dump a lot of moisture (hang
>>> in
>>>>>>> there, Deeji!), it may not stay around as long or melt as slowly.
>>>>>>> Which
>>>>>>> means we may be facing possible water shortages in some areas.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> <http://climate.weather.com/articles/watertrends020108.html>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> "They found that up to 60 percent of changes in river flow,
>>>>>>> temperature
>>>>>>> and snow pack between 1950 and 1999 can be attributed to human
>>>>>>> activities, such as driving, that release emissions including
>>>>>>> carbon
>>>>>>> dioxide and other greenhouse gases into the atmosphere."
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Let's see, what else can we blame on opposite-cause events like
>>>>>>>> this?
>>>>>>>> Don't be confused by the term "global warming." It doesn't mean
>>>>>>>> equal
>>>>>>>> heat everywhere on the globe, weather doesn't work like that.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> That's one reason to use the "climate change" label instead. It's
>>> more
>>>>>>>> accurate and less confusing to people. Another is that as the
>>>>>>>> surface
>>>>>>>> warms (on average), the mesosphere cools. Both from the same
>>>>>>>> mechanism,
>>>>>>>> the additional heat absorption and re-radiation from additional
>>>>>>>> greenhouse gases.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> It's interesting to read about this stuff.

>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Earth%27s_atmosphere
>>>>>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Global_warming
>>>>>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Greenhouse_effect
>>>>>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Atmospheric_chemistry
>>>>>>>> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Meteorology>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Neil
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>
>

Subject: Re: How I spent my day part 1
Posted by [Rich Lamanna](#) on Sat, 09 Feb 2008 19:09:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jamie are you a scientist? From what theories or rather maybe fantasies do you concoct your "scientific", and I use the term loosely, rantings. It is the height of narcissistic paranoia and ignorance to claim global warming is irrefutably anthropogenic. There is no consensus among all scientists, that is a fact. There is only a consensus among those who would like to shove their ideology and mantra and polemic down the throats of those who disagree. There is only a consensus that there is no consensus.

Michael Crichton said it best:

"Historically, the claim of consensus has been the first refuge of scoundrels; it is a way to avoid debate by claiming that the matter is already settled. Whenever you hear the consensus of scientists agrees on something or other, reach for your wallet, because you're being had.

"Let's be clear: the work of science has nothing whatever to do with consensus.

"Consensus is the business of politics. Science, on the contrary, requires only one investigator who happens to be right, which means that he or she has results that are verifiable by reference to the real world. In science consensus is irrelevant. What is relevant is reproducible results. The greatest scientists in history are great precisely because they broke with the consensus."

<http://www.globalwarmingskeptics.info/>

In an article published in the Wall Street Journal Prof. Lindzen, Alfred P. Sloan Professor of Atmospheric Science at MIT, discusses the controversy around global warming. He was involved with the IPCC Report, by the way he was a contributor to Chapter 4 of the "IPCC Second Assessment"
<http://www.opinionjournal.com/extra/?id=110008220>

Here's a little pattern called the Milankovich Variation, which can explain the variations in ice ages every 100,000 and 400,000 years.
http://www.space.com/scienceastronomy/planetearth/iceage_orbit_wg.html

An interesting and complicated discussion by regarding a letter published in the journal Nature, discloses how really biased and unscientific some arguments are regarding climate change data. And how the publishing editors are colossal morons in disregarding criticism of colossal scientific errors, by rejecting such criticism outright.
<http://www.climateaudit.org/?p=782>

Here's some more cherry picked info for ya Jamie. Oh, excuse me it was written by a conservative congressman. It must be suspect! Oh and worse yet, he's optimistic. What a stooge.
<http://archive.newsmax.com/archives/articles/2001/6/13/190522.shtml>

Just keeping it real,
Rich

"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:47a8c1bd\$1@linux...
> Neil wrote:
> > Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
> >> LOL You're kidding, right?
> >
> > Of course not - I'm actually just trying to put things in
> > perspective... it's winter, meaning: sometimes it snows in
> > some areas - sometimes it snows a lot. What I find amazing is
> > that if it snows only a little, you're gonna say it's due to
> > global warming... if it snows a lot - global warming.
>
> That's not at all what I said. Maybe it's what you expected me to say?
>
> What I said in my last post to you was:
>
> "And, again, no specific weather event can be tied to the current
> climate change event. But over time we can look for patterns."
>
> Which is the opposite of what you think I said. Weird.
>
> Before that I wrote:

>
> "An increase in extreme weather events is predicted by climate
> scientists as a consequence of the current climate change event.
>
> It may seem counter-intuitive until you really think about it.
>
> Warmer ocean water, more evaporation, more energy in weather systems to
> carry the moisture farther, this can bring more snow over the mountains.
>
> (And again, any single weather event can't be linked to the current
> climate change by itself. But over time we can measure patterns.)"
>
>
> Read that last paragraph again.
>
>
> > Do I think that, knowing that emissions of various types affect
> > the atmosphere in a negative way, we should ignore it & not try
> > to do something about it? No.
>
> Agreed.
>
>
> > But I also don't think we should
> > slaughter every cow in India just because their aggregate
> > greenhouse gas output in the form of methane surpasses that
> > of the five or six largest cities on the planet combined;
>
> I haven't heard anyone suggest slaughtering every cow in India. Who is
> proposing that one?
>
> Also what is the source for your methane statistic?
>
>
> > and
> > when you tend to blame everything on global warming, from the
> > fact that it's snowing in Durango, to the problem someone's
> > having with their PC overheating when they try to run five EDS
> > cards in it, you've kinda gone way past the "cry wolf" zone in
> > terms of credibility.
>
> Right. Except you're wrong. Maybe you're not reading what I wrote
> because I haven't been saying that.
>
> Maybe you're thinking of someone else. I believe it was Don N. who
> implied that DJ's snow was a result of GW, but he was being completely
> facetious.
>

> So no, I didn't blame the snow in Durango on global warming. Nor the
> thunder snow here. We won't know that about any specific event until we
> can look back and see what the pattern is, and take into account other
> cycles and patterns like (for North America) El Nino, La Nina, etc.
>
> However, it is true that an increase in extreme weather events is one
> possible consequence of the current climate change event. It's just that
> we can't look at a specific weather event and say, yeah, that one is
> from climate change.
>
> What we can do is keep track of the data and look for longer term trends.
>
> And finally, I'm pretty sure that running 5 EDS cards in one computer is
> THE major contributor to the current climate change event. FOR GOD'S
> SAKE, NEIL, UNPLUG THAT PARIS BOX!!!
>
> LOL! ;^)
>
> Cheers,
> -Jamie
> www.JamieKruz.com
>
>
>
> > Neil
> >

Subject: Re: How I spent my day part 1
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Sat, 09 Feb 2008 23:47:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hey Rich,

Thanks for asking.

Rich Lamanna wrote:

> Jamie are you a scientist?

No, although I have some scientific education and plenty of curiosity about many things.

How about you?

> From what theories or rather maybe fantasies do
> you concoct your "scientific", and I use the term loosely, rantings.

Heh. Rantings. Fantasies. Concoct. Nice. :^)

I now concede that you are right about everything and have now put me in my place. ;^)

> It is

> the height of narcissistic paranoia and ignorance to claim global warming is

> irrefutably anthropogenic.

If you actually read my "rantings" you'll see that I agree with the consensus, which is that the scientific evidence shows a strong possibility that we are contributing to the current climate change event.

There's no narcissistic paranoia and ignorance there. Maybe you're projecting. Or maybe you have me confused with someone else.

Ignorance would be to ignore the entire breadth of scientific evidence (a hallmark of many denialists).

Paranoia would be, for example, to think that the only reason for policy changes is to transfer wealth from the USA to third world countries (seems to be one of the main fears of some denialists).

Narcissism would be to prioritize the short term profits of a few companies over the long term benefit of everyone (possibly why certain fossil fuel companies fund denialist FUD).

> There is no consensus among all scientists, that

> is a fact.

If your plan is to wait for ALL scientists to agree about everything, you will wait forever.

I haven't heard anyone claim that the consensus on climate change means that every scientist agrees. Science is always full of disagreement on various levels. Which leads to more research, generally leading to more certainty, but rarely 100% agreement.

Where we are now is at a point where the overall evidence shows a strong possibility for human contribution to the current climate change event.

If you want to count up who agrees with that, you'll find that it includes most of the scientific organizations around the world. And even, at this point, major parts of the fossil fuels industry such as Shell and BP.

> There is only a consensus among those who would like to shove
> their ideology and mantra and polemic down the throats of those who
> disagree. There is only a consensus that there is no consensus.

That's the main meme of the lobbying effort, to "teach the controversy."
It's a distraction from decades of research that already exists.

I've seen plenty of "polemic" style of debate from denialists. Although
I'll grant you there is some of that from some of the more strident
environmental organizations.

As far as ideology goes, none of that matters to the physical processes
being studied. What matters, in studying what's actually happening, is
the data.

Ideology is more appropriately considered in the solutions debate, as
part of the pesky political side of that.

> Michael Crichton said it best:

Michael Crichton is not a scientist. Now why would you believe him
instead of me? :^)

Or better yet, why would you believe him instead of the National Science
Foundation or the long list of other mainstream scientific organizations?

Could it be your own confirmation bias that prevents you from looking at
ALL the evidence?

> "Historically, the claim of consensus has been the first refuge of
> scoundrels;

Actually, the claim of "controversy" is a better candidate as the first
refuge of scoundrels.

For example the Tobacco industry used that exact same delaying tactic by
denying the demonstrated health hazards of smoking. They attacked
research, amplified contrarian views and spread money around to keep the
FUD going.

> it is a way to avoid debate by claiming that the matter is
> already settled. Whenever you hear the consensus of scientists agrees on
> something or other, reach for your wallet, because you're being had.

Yes, right, absolutely. LOL!

The discovery of microbes as a source of disease, and the effort to get doctors to wash their hands in hospitals, was a horrible attempt to steal from the public. Not.

The ozone layer consensus and change in policy to keep from losing our protection from UV radiation was a mere grab for your money. Not.

Also, what's with this whole gravity thing? Obviously a clever con by those evil, evil scientists. Heh.

Chrichton is not making much sense here. He's overreaching.

And BTW scientists do not deserve such general vilification.

> "Let's be clear: the work of science has nothing whatever to do with
> consensus.

In fact, science is a process of posing hypotheses and testing them. And then testing the results. Of course this creates consensus and a body of knowledge that has survived repeated testing.

If there were no consensus on how processes work, airplanes would not fly.

> "Consensus is the business of politics. Science, on the contrary, requires
> only one investigator who happens to be right, which means that he or she
> has results that are verifiable by reference to the real world. In science
> consensus is irrelevant.

He's redefining words to suit his purpose. In science, consensus is the result of testing and evidence. And it never implies that there is zero disagreement.

> What is relevant is reproducible results. The
> greatest scientists in history are great precisely because they broke with
> the consensus."
> <http://www.globalwarmingskeptics.info/>

What he's saying is that consensus can be wrong. This is correct but he draws the wrong conclusion from it.

For example, it was wrong when the consensus was based on an interpretation of Catholicism that claimed earth had to be the center of the universe. Contrary evidence was available at the time (1616) but

those in power felt the truth threatened the Catholic church, and so it was repressed. The Pope didn't come around until 1992!

From:

<http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9E0CE1DA1F31F932A35752C1A964958260>

"Moving formally to rectify a wrong, Pope John Paul II acknowledged in a speech today that the Roman Catholic Church had erred in condemning Galileo 359 years ago for asserting that the Earth revolves around the Sun.

The address by the Pope before the Pontifical Academy of Sciences closed a 13-year investigation into the Church's condemnation of Galileo in 1633, one of history's most notorious conflicts between faith and science. Galileo was forced to recant his scientific findings to avoid being burned at the stake and spent the remaining eight years of his life under house arrest.

John Paul said the theologians who condemned Galileo did not recognize the formal distinction between the Bible and its interpretation.

"This led them unduly to transpose into the realm of the doctrine of the faith, a question which in fact pertained to scientific investigation."

Back to the climate change topic: The consensus _used to be_ that we could pump greenhouse gases into the atmosphere as much as we want with no repercussions to the climate system.

It now looks like THAT consensus was wrong, based on the evidence. And because of the compelling evidence for human contribution to the current climate change event, the consensus has changed.

And yet Chrichton missed this latest validation of the one thing he's right about (so far, from your quotes).

Ironic...

> In an article published in the Wall Street Journal

Science central.

> Prof. Lindzen, Alfred P.

> Sloan Professor of Atmospheric Science at MIT, discusses the controversy
> around global warming. He was involved with the IPCC Report, by the way he
> was a contributor to Chapter 4 of the "IPCC Second Assessment"

> <http://www.opinionjournal.com/extra/?id=110008220>

First, scientists ought not be intimidated merely because they hold a particular theory. But any theory has to stand up on its own feet.

If you want to talk about intimidation of scientists, you don't have to look too hard to find the opposite complaint. Scientists claiming to have been attacked for political reasons, reports edited by non-scientist political appointees to water down the conclusions, that sort of thing. As long as you're looking for a conspiracy against scientists, look into that one, too.

BTW, Lindzen is one of the most well known and oft quoted contrarians on climate change. You're welcome to agree with him, but you should know that most climate scientists do not, based on the evidence. Opposite of the assertion of his article, Lindzen hasn't been "intimidated" into silence about his position. And obviously he wasn't shut out of IPCC participation.

> Here's a little pattern called the Milankovich Variation, which can explain
> the variations in ice ages every 100,000 and 400,000 years.
> http://www.space.com/scienceastronomy/planetearth/iceage_orbit_wg.html

"A little pattern" - good one. :^) The Milankovich Variation is a long term pattern in terms of human life spans. It is one of many factors climate scientists look at when considering what is happening now.

The MV doesn't explain the current climate change event. But if you want to talk about when the next ice age may be coming, the MV could be a factor. We may want to save some of our fossil fuels so that 50,000 years from now our descendants can burn them to counter the Milankovich Variation with some good old anthropogenic global warming. :^)

<http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/paleo/milankovitch.html>

"Astronomical calculations show that 65N summer insolation should increase gradually over the next 25,000 years, and that no 65N summer insolation declines sufficient to cause an ice age are expected in the next 50,000 - 100,000 years (Hollan 2000, Berger 2002)."

> An interesting and complicated discussion by regarding a letter published in
> the journal Nature, discloses how really biased and unscientific some
> arguments are regarding climate change data. And how the publishing editors
> are colossal morons in disregarding criticism of colossal scientific errors,
> by rejecting such criticism outright.
> <http://www.climateaudit.org/?p=782>

Interesting. The disputes between McIntyre and Mann go back a few years.

But if this is really about questioning the "hockey stick" graph, then read:

<http://www.realclimate.org/index.php?p=11>

> Here's some more cherry picked info for ya Jamie.

You oughta make a pie! ;^)

> Oh, excuse me it was

> written by a conservative congressman. It must be suspect! Oh and worse yet,

> he's optimistic. What a stooge.

> http://archive.newsmax.com/archives/articles/2001/6/13/19052_2.shtml

That was a fun read. :^)

First, after the missile stuff, he confuses CO2 output with other forms of pollution. Weird. The rest of his attempted scientific arguments seems to have a similar uniformed grasp on the science. The most accurate statement in his rambling discourse is " I do not know."

Second, he's defending Bush for denying human contributions to the current climate change event. But in 2001, Bush himself said this:

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/06/20010611-2.html>
"The issue of climate change respects no border. Its effects cannot be reined in by an army nor advanced by any ideology. Climate change, with its potential to impact every corner of the world, is an issue that must be addressed by the world."

"My Cabinet-level working group has met regularly for the last 10 weeks to review the most recent, most accurate, and most comprehensive science. They have heard from scientists offering a wide spectrum of views. They have reviewed the facts, and they have listened to many theories and suppositions. The working group asked the highly-respected National Academy of Sciences to provide us the most up-to-date information about what is known and about what is not known on the science of climate change.

First, we know the surface temperature of the earth is warming. It has risen by .6 degrees Celsius over the past 100 years. There was a warming trend from the 1890s to the 1940s. Cooling from the 1940s to the 1970s. And then sharply rising temperatures from the 1970s to today.

There is a natural greenhouse effect that contributes to warming. Greenhouse gases trap heat, and thus warm the earth because they prevent

a significant proportion of infrared radiation from escaping into space. Concentration of greenhouse gases, especially CO₂, have increased substantially since the beginning of the industrial revolution. And the National Academy of Sciences indicate that the increase is due in large part to human activity."

If you read on, you'll see that Bush's main objection to Kyoto was that China and India were treated differently than the USA:

"Our country, the United States is the world's largest emitter of manmade greenhouse gases. We account for almost 20 percent of the world's man-made greenhouse emissions. We also account for about one-quarter of the world's economic output. We recognize the responsibility to reduce our emissions. We also recognize the other part of the story -- that the rest of the world emits 80 percent of all greenhouse gases. And many of those emissions come from developing countries.

This is a challenge that requires a 100 percent effort; ours, and the rest of the world's. The world's second-largest emitter of greenhouse gases is China. Yet, China was entirely exempted from the requirements of the Kyoto Protocol.

India and Germany are among the top emitters. Yet, India was also exempt from Kyoto. These and other developing countries that are experiencing rapid growth face challenges in reducing their emissions without harming their economies. We want to work cooperatively with these countries in their efforts to reduce greenhouse emissions and maintain economic growth."

You could accuse Bush of dragging his feet on policy. But based on his speech you can't say he's denying the current climate change event or the strong chance that we are contributing to it. He listens to the National Academy of Sciences, something you might consider.

From: <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 Earth. Without them, the average temperature would be about 33 centigrade degrees lower than they are today. But human activities are causing levels to rise well above pre-industrial levels.

Carbon dioxide levels have increased from 280 ppm in 1750 to over 375 ppm measured (i.e. in the last 420,000 years). Increasing greenhouse gases have caused the Earth to warm approximately 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."

Consider that.

> Just keeping it real,

"Real" means looking at ALL the evidence. Anything less is surreal.

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKruz.com

> Rich

>

> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:47a8c1bd\$1@linux...

>> Neil wrote:

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

>>>> LOL You're kidding, right?

>>> Of course not - I'm actually just trying to put things in

>>> perspective... it's winter, meaning: sometimes it snows in

>>> some areas - sometimes it snows a lot. What I find amazing is

>>> that if it snows only a little, you're gonna say it's due to

>>> global warming... if it snows a lot - global warming.

>> That's not at all what I said. Maybe it's what you expected me to say?

>>
>> What I said in my last post to you was:
>>
>> "And, again, no specific weather event can be tied to the current
>> climate change event. But over time we can look for patterns."
>>
>> Which is the opposite of what you think I said. Weird.
>>
>> Before that I wrote:
>>
>> "An increase in extreme weather events is predicted by climate
>> scientists as a consequence of the current climate change event.
>>
>> It may seem counter-intuitive until you really think about it.
>>
>> Warmer ocean water, more evaporation, more energy in weather systems to
>> carry the moisture farther, this can bring more snow over the mountains.
>>
>> (And again, any single weather event can't be linked to the current
>> climate change by itself. But over time we can measure patterns.)"
>>
>>
>> Read that last paragraph again.
>>
>>
>>> Do I think that, knowing that emissions of various types affect
>>> the atmosphere in a negative way, we should ignore it & not try
>>> to do something about it? No.
>> Agreed.
>>
>>
>>> But I also don't think we should
>>> slaughter every cow in India just because their aggregate
>>> greenhouse gas output in the form of methane surpasses that
>>> of the five or six largest cities on the planet combined;
>> I haven't heard anyone suggest slaughtering every cow in India. Who is
>> proposing that one?
>>
>> Also what is the source for your methane statistic?
>>
>>
>>> and
>>> when you tend to blame everything on global warming, from the
>>> fact that it's snowing in Durango, to the problem someone's
>>> having with their PC overheating when they try to run five EDS
>>> cards in it, you've kinda gone way past the "cry wolf" zone in
>>> terms of credibility.
>> Right. Except you're wrong. Maybe you're not reading what I wrote

>> because I haven't been saying that.
>>
>> Maybe you're thinking of someone else. I believe it was Don N. who
>> implied that DJ's snow was a result of GW, but he was being completely
>> facetious.
>>
>> So no, I didn't blame the snow in Durango on global warming. Nor the
>> thunder snow here. We won't know that about any specific event until we
>> can look back and see what the pattern is, and take into account other
>> cycles and patterns like (for North America) El Nino, La Nina, etc.
>>
>> However, it is true that an increase in extreme weather events is one
>> possible consequence of the current climate change event. It's just that
>> we can't look at a specific weather event and say, yeah, that one is
>> from climate change.
>>
>> What we can do is keep track of the data and look for longer term trends.
>>
>> And finally, I'm pretty sure that running 5 EDS cards in one computer is
>> THE major contributor to the current climate change event. FOR GOD'S
>> SAKE, NEIL, UNPLUG THAT PARIS BOX!!!
>>
>> LOL! ;^)
>>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>>
>>
>>
>>> Neil
>>>
>
>

Subject: Re: How I spent my day part 1
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Sat, 09 Feb 2008 23:52:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hey Rich,

Kim's right, so go ahead and move this to General, if you want to continue.

I'll look for your next reply there.

Thanks,
-Jamie

Kim wrote:

> Rich,

>

> To try and keep this channel clear for music topics I've responded on general:

>

> http://news.parisnewsgroup.com/cgi-bin/dnewsweb?cmd=article&group=IDEA.emuensoniqparis-general&item=3074&uta_g=

>

> Cheers,

> Kim.

> "Rich Lamanna" <richard.lamanna@verizon.net> wrote:

>> Jamie are you a scientist? From what theories or rather maybe fantasies

> do

>> you concoct your "scientific", and I use the term loosely, rantings. It

> is

>> the height of narcissistic paranoia and ignorance to claim global warming

> is

>> irrefutably anthropogenic. There is no consensus among all scientists, that

>> is a fact. There is only a consensus among those who would like to shove

>> their ideology and mantra and polemic down the throats of those who

>> disagree. There is only a consensus that there is no consensus.

>>

>> Michael Crichton said it best:

>>

>> "Historically, the claim of consensus has been the first refuge of

>> scoundrels; it is a way to avoid debate by claiming that the matter is

>> already settled. Whenever you hear the consensus of scientists agrees on

>> something or other, reach for your wallet, because you're being had.

>>

>> "Let's be clear: the work of science has nothing whatever to do with

>> consensus.

>>

>> "Consensus is the business of politics. Science, on the contrary, requires

>> only one investigator who happens to be right, which means that he or she

>> has results that are verifiable by reference to the real world. In science

>> consensus is irrelevant. What is relevant is reproducible results. The

>> greatest scientists in history are great precisely because they broke with

>> the consensus."

>> <http://www.globalwarmingskeptics.info/>

>>

>> In an article published in the Wall Street Journal Prof. Lindzen, Alfred

> P.

>> Sloan Professor of Atmospheric Science at MIT, discusses the controversy

>> around global warming. He was involved with the IPCC Report, by the way

> he

>> was a contributor to Chapter 4 of the "IPCC Second Assessment"
>> <http://www.opinionjournal.com/extra/?id=110008220>
>>
>> Here's a little pattern called the Milankovich Variation, which can explain
>> the variations in ice ages every 100,000 and 400,000 years.
>> http://www.space.com/scienceastronomy/planetearth/iceage_orbit_wg.html
>>
>> An interesting and complicated discussion by regarding a letter published
> in
>> the journal Nature, discloses how really biased and unscientific some
>> arguments are regarding climate change data. And how the publishing editors
>> are colossal morons in disregarding criticism of colossal scientific errors,
>> by rejecting such criticism outright.
>> <http://www.climateaudit.org/?p=782>
>>
>> Here's some more cherry picked info for ya Jamie. Oh, excuse me it was
>> written by a conservative congressman. It must be suspect! Oh and worse
> yet,
>> he's optimistic. What a stooge.
>> <http://archive.newsmax.com/archives/articles/2001/6/13/190522.shtml>
>>
>> Just keeping it real,
>> Rich
>>
>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:47a8c1bd\$1@linux...
>>> Neil wrote:
>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>> LOL You're kidding, right?
>>>>> Of course not - I'm actually just trying to put things in
>>>>> perspective... it's winter, meaning: sometimes it snows in
>>>>> some areas - sometimes it snows a lot. What I find amazing is
>>>>> that if it snows only a little, you're gonna say it's due to
>>>>> global warming... if it snows a lot - global warming.
>>> That's not at all what I said. Maybe it's what you expected me to say?
>>>
>>> What I said in my last post to you was:
>>>
>>> "And, again, no specific weather event can be tied to the current
>>> climate change event. But over time we can look for patterns."
>>>
>>> Which is the opposite of what you think I said. Weird.
>>>
>>> Before that I wrote:
>>>
>>> "An increase in extreme weather events is predicted by climate
>>> scientists as a consequence of the current climate change event.
>>>
>>> It may seem counter-intuitive until you really think about it.

>>>
>>> Warmer ocean water, more evaporation, more energy in weather systems to
>>> carry the moisture farther, this can bring more snow over the mountains.
>>>
>>> (And again, any single weather event can't be linked to the current
>>> climate change by itself. But over time we can measure patterns.)"
>>>
>>>
>>> Read that last paragraph again.
>>>
>>>
>>>> Do I think that, knowing that emissions of various types affect
>>>> the atmosphere in a negative way, we should ignore it & not try
>>>> to do something about it? No.
>>> Agreed.
>>>
>>>
>>>> But I also don't think we should
>>>> slaughter every cow in India just because their aggregate
>>>> greenhouse gas output in the form of methane surpasses that
>>>> of the five or six largest cities on the planet combined;
>>> I haven't heard anyone suggest slaughtering every cow in India. Who is
>>> proposing that one?
>>>
>>> Also what is the source for your methane statistic?
>>>
>>>
>>>> and
>>>> when you tend to blame everything on global warming, from the
>>>> fact that it's snowing in Durango, to the problem someone's
>>>> having with their PC overheating when they try to run five EDS
>>>> cards in it, you've kinda gone way past the "cry wolf" zone in
>>>> terms of credibility.
>>> Right. Except you're wrong. Maybe you're not reading what I wrote
>>> because I haven't been saying that.
>>>
>>> Maybe you're thinking of someone else. I believe it was Don N. who
>>> implied that DJ's snow was a result of GW, but he was being completely
>>> facetious.
>>>
>>> So no, I didn't blame the snow in Durango on global warming. Nor the
>>> thunder snow here. We won't know that about any specific event until we
>>> can look back and see what the pattern is, and take into account other
>>> cycles and patterns like (for North America) El Nino, La Nina, etc.
>>>
>>> However, it is true that an increase in extreme weather events is one
>>> possible consequence of the current climate change event. It's just that
>>> we can't look at a specific weather event and say, yeah, that one is

>>> from climate change.
>>>
>>> What we can do is keep track of the data and look for longer term trends.
>>>
>>> And finally, I'm pretty sure that running 5 EDS cards in one computer
> is
>>> THE major contributor to the current climate change event. FOR GOD'S
>>> SAKE, NEIL, UNPLUG THAT PARIS BOX!!!
>>>
>>> LOL! ;^)
>>>
>>> Cheers,
>>> -Jamie
>>> www.JamieKruz.com
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>> Neil
>>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: How I spent my day part 1
Posted by [Kim](#) on Sun, 10 Feb 2008 00:39:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Rich,

To try and keep this channel clear for music topics I've responded on general:

http://news.parisnewsgroup.com/cgi-bin/dnewsweb?cmd=article&group=IDEA.emuensoniqparis-general&item=3074&uta_g=

Cheers,

Kim.

"Rich Lamanna" <richard.lamanna@verizon.net> wrote:

>Jamie are you a scientist? From what theories or rather maybe fantasies
>do

>you concoct your "scientific", and I use the term loosely, rantings. It
>is

>the height of narcissistic paranoia and ignorance to claim global warming
>is

>irrefutably anthropogenic. There is no consensus among all scientists, that

>is a fact. There is only a consensus among those who would like to shove

>their ideology and mantra and polemic down the throats of those who

>disagree. There is only a consensus that there is no consensus.

>

>Michael Crichton said it best:

>

>"Historically, the claim of consensus has been the first refuge of
>scoundrels; it is a way to avoid debate by claiming that the matter is
>already settled. Whenever you hear the consensus of scientists agrees on
>something or other, reach for your wallet, because you're being had.

>

>"Let's be clear: the work of science has nothing whatever to do with
>consensus.

>

>"Consensus is the business of politics. Science, on the contrary, requires
>only one investigator who happens to be right, which means that he or she
>has results that are verifiable by reference to the real world. In science
>consensus is irrelevant. What is relevant is reproducible results. The
>greatest scientists in history are great precisely because they broke with
>the consensus."

><http://www.globalwarmingskeptics.info/>

>

>In an article published in the Wall Street Journal Prof. Lindzen, Alfred
P.

>Sloan Professor of Atmospheric Science at MIT, discusses the controversy
>around global warming. He was involved with the IPCC Report, by the way
he

>was a contributor to Chapter 4 of the "IPCC Second Assessment"

><http://www.opinionjournal.com/extra/?id=110008220>

>

>Here's a little pattern called the Milankovich Variation, which can explain
>the variations in ice ages every 100,000 and 400,000 years.

> http://www.space.com/scienceastronomy/planetearth/iceage_orbit_wg.html

>

>An interesting and complicated discussion by regarding a letter published
in

>the journal Nature, discloses how really biased and unscientific some
>arguments are regarding climate change data. And how the publishing editors
>are colossal morons in disregarding criticism of colossal scientific errors,
>by rejecting such criticism outright.

><http://www.climateaudit.org/?p=782>

>

>Here's some more cherry picked info for ya Jamie. Oh, excuse me it was
>written by a conservative congressman. It must be suspect! Oh and worse
yet,

>he's optimistic. What a stooge.

> <http://archive.newsmax.com/archives/articles/2001/6/13/190522.shtml>

>

>Just keeping it real,

>Rich

>

>"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:47a8c1bd\$1@linux...

>> Neil wrote:
>> > Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>> >> LOL You're kidding, right?
>> >
>> > Of course not - I'm actually just trying to put things in
>> > perspective... it's winter, meaning: sometimes it snows in
>> > some areas - sometimes it snows a lot. What I find amazing is
>> > that if it snows only a little, you're gonna say it's due to
>> > global warming... if it snows a lot - global warming.
>>
>> That's not at all what I said. Maybe it's what you expected me to say?
>>
>> What I said in my last post to you was:
>>
>> "And, again, no specific weather event can be tied to the current
>> climate change event. But over time we can look for patterns."
>>
>> Which is the opposite of what you think I said. Weird.
>>
>> Before that I wrote:
>>
>> "An increase in extreme weather events is predicted by climate
>> scientists as a consequence of the current climate change event.
>>
>> It may seem counter-intuitive until you really think about it.
>>
>> Warmer ocean water, more evaporation, more energy in weather systems to
>> carry the moisture farther, this can bring more snow over the mountains.
>>
>> (And again, any single weather event can't be linked to the current
>> climate change by itself. But over time we can measure patterns.)"
>>
>>
>> Read that last paragraph again.
>>
>>
>> > Do I think that, knowing that emissions of various types affect
>> > the atmosphere in a negative way, we should ignore it & not try
>> > to do something about it? No.
>>
>> Agreed.
>>
>>
>> > But I also don't think we should
>> > slaughter every cow in India just because their aggregate
>> > greenhouse gas output in the form of methane surpasses that
>> > of the five or six largest cities on the planet combined;
>>

>> I haven't heard anyone suggest slaughtering every cow in India. Who is
>> proposing that one?
>>
>> Also what is the source for your methane statistic?
>>
>>
>> > and
>> > when you tend to blame everything on global warming, from the
>> > fact that it's snowing in Durango, to the problem someone's
>> > having with their PC overheating when they try to run five EDS
>> > cards in it, you've kinda gone way past the "cry wolf" zone in
>> > terms of credibility.
>>
>> Right. Except you're wrong. Maybe you're not reading what I wrote
>> because I haven't been saying that.
>>
>> Maybe you're thinking of someone else. I believe it was Don N. who
>> implied that DJ's snow was a result of GW, but he was being completely
>> facetious.
>>
>> So no, I didn't blame the snow in Durango on global warming. Nor the
>> thunder snow here. We won't know that about any specific event until we
>> can look back and see what the pattern is, and take into account other
>> cycles and patterns like (for North America) El Nino, La Nina, etc.
>>
>> However, it is true that an increase in extreme weather events is one
>> possible consequence of the current climate change event. It's just that
>> we can't look at a specific weather event and say, yeah, that one is
>> from climate change.
>>
>> What we can do is keep track of the data and look for longer term trends.
>>
>> And finally, I'm pretty sure that running 5 EDS cards in one computer
is
>> THE major contributor to the current climate change event. FOR GOD'S
>> SAKE, NEIL, UNPLUG THAT PARIS BOX!!!
>>
>> LOL! ;^)
>>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>>
>>
>> > Neil
>> >
>

>

Subject: Re: How I spent my day part 1
Posted by [Kim](#) on Sun, 10 Feb 2008 01:13:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>

>Hey Rich,

>

>Kim's right, so go ahead and move this to General, if you want to continue.

Thanks Jamie. :o)

Cheers,
Kim.
