
Subject: OK...here's the plan

Posted by [Deej \[5\]](#) on Thu, 20 Mar 2008 18:33:45 GMT

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

http://blog.mlive.com/annarbornews/2007/09/dingell_global_warming_may_req.html

This is the biggest load of disingenuous hubris I've seen in a while. More hypocrisy. Whether you get it or not, your intelligence has just been insulted and be assured that what this is really all about it preparing you to be bent over as consumption falls. Expect more of this BS as gas usage goes down and therefore the tax revenue that a gallon of gas generates is proportionately reduced. To make up for the revenue shortfall, we're going to get taxed into oblivion.....and I was even sorta' thinking about voting for a Democrat for president. The new formula for the American economy is to tax businesses more so that they will continue to go elsewhere while screwing the workers who will be losing their jobs.

Gimme some of that.

Subject: Re: OK...here's the plan

Posted by [Bill L](#) on Thu, 20 Mar 2008 20:12:49 GMT

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

What I liked is the juxtaposition of him saying how this is gonna hurt with the smiling face of the dude.

John wrote:

> there are no shortage of idiots out there. raising taxes does not fix problems

Subject: Re: OK...here's the plan

Posted by [John \[1\]](#) on Thu, 20 Mar 2008 20:25:33 GMT

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

there are no shortage of idiots out there. raising taxes does not fix problems

Subject: Re: OK...here's the plan

Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Thu, 20 Mar 2008 21:27:50 GMT

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

Interesting perspective Deej. I know you are very aware of peak oil. And as oil supply fails to keep up with demand, it's likely that the resulting situation will have tax implications which will need to be faced somehow.

How would you handle the tax implications of the transition to a mix of energy sources? Use it as an opportunity to push for low tax policies? Use it as an opportunity to raise taxes? We'll probably see both of those approaches at least.

It's interesting that Dingle, of all Senators, would be the one to start that conversation, eh? Party aside, he has been one of the chief representatives of the auto industry's interests in Washington.

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKrutz.com

Mr. Simplicity wrote:

> http://blog.mlive.com/annarbornews/2007/09/dingell_global_warming_may_req.html

>

> This is the biggest load of disingenuous hubris I've seen in a while. More
> hypocrisy. Whether you get it or not, your intelligence has just been
> insulted and be assured that what this is really all about it preparing you
> to be bent over as consumption falls. Expect more of this BS as gas usage
> goes down and therefore the tax revenue that a gallon of gas generates is
> proportionately reduced. To make up for the revenue shortfall, we're going
> to get taxed into oblivion.....and I was even sorta' thinking about
> voting for a Democrat for president. The new formula for the American
> economy is to tax businesses more so that they will continue to go elsewhere
> while screwing the workers who will be losing their jobs.

>

> Gimme some of that.

>

>

Subject: Re: OK...here's the plan

Posted by [excelav](#) on Thu, 20 Mar 2008 21:57:38 GMT

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

This is what i've been saying. When Al Gore buys global offsets for ten cents and sells them for a dollar, it's a big bunch of money making bullshit! Now this trilateralist bureaucrat bunch of SOBs are going to try to make it a sin tax that we will all have to pay. You know once the government gets a tax passed through they will never repeal it. We will be paying it for then on! It's a scare tactic to cow the people in to believing this bunch of bullshit. There is no significant man made global warming, it's a lie to shift the wealth out of the United States while these rats and their friends get wealthy doing it.

"Mr. Simplicity" <noway@jose.net> wrote:

> http://blog.mlive.com/annarbornews/2007/09/dingell_global_warming_may_req.html

>

>This is the biggest load of disingenuous hubris I've seen in a while. More

>hypocrisy. Whether you get it or not, your intelligence has just been

>insulted and be assured that what this is really all about it preparing

you

>to be bent over as consumption falls. Expect more of this BS as gas usage

>goes down and therefore the tax revenue that a gallon of gas generates is

>proportionately reduced. To make up for the revenue shortfall, we're going

>to get taxed into oblivion.....and I was even sorta' thinking about

>voting for a Democrat for president. The new formula for the American

>economy is to tax businesses more so that they will continue to go elsewhere

>while screwing the workers who will be losing their jobs.

>

>Gimme some of that.

>

>

Subject: Re: OK...here's the plan

Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Thu, 20 Mar 2008 22:04:54 GMT

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

Let's just say for the moment, for the sake of argument, that Al Gore is a cheese sandwich. OK? And on another side, Let's say Exxon is a tofu burger. Alright? Let's just say they are both inconsequential, however you want to visualize that, so we can let all of that go and talk about something more fundamental.

What if the scientists are right that the greenhouse gases (which actually DO help keep the planet warm enough for human habitation or we wouldn't be here talking about it - those gases) what if they DO retain additional heat when we add to them faster than natural cycles can mitigate?

That's a reasonable possibility. Retaining heat is what greenhouse gases do. As a simple analogy, put on a more insulated blanket at night and you're likely to be warmer, overall.

Possible changes in the atmosphere and the likely repercussions are what

many professional and reasonably sane scientists are reporting and discussing.

There is a real chance something is happening in the atmosphere due to human contributions to greenhouse gases. Which means there's a real chance we have to deal with it one way or another. Proactively or reactively. And it's very likely to be easier to deal with sooner than later.

When a Michigan congressman who is one of the main defenders of the auto industry in Washington starts talking plainly about the ramifications of human contributions to greenhouse gases, that's news.

It's not enough to merely tar him as a Democrat. This is the guy who held up updating CAFE. He has not been shy about representing the auto industry.

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKrutz.com

James McCloskey wrote:

> This is what i've been saying. When Al Gore buys global offsets for ten cents
> and sells them for a dollar, it's a big bunch of money making bullshit!
> Now this trilateralist bureaucrat bunch of SOBs are going to try to make
> it a sin tax that we will all have to pay. You know once the government
> gets a tax passed through they will never repeal it. We will be paying it
> for then on! It's a scare tactic to cow the people in to believing this
> bunch of bullshit. There is no significant man made global warming, it's
> a lie to shift the wealth out of the United States while these rats and their
> friends get wealthy doing it.

>

>

>

> "Mr. Simplicity" <noway@jose.net> wrote:

>> http://blog.mlive.com/annarbornews/2007/09/dingell_global_warming_may_req.html

>>

>> This is the biggest load of disingenuous hubris I've seen in a while. More

>

>> hypocrisy. Whether you get it or not, your intelligence has just been

>> insulted and be assured that what this is really all about it preparing

> you

>> to be bent over as consumption falls. Expect more of this BS as gas usage

>

>> goes down and therefore the tax revenue that a gallon of gas generates is

>

>> proportionately reduced. To make up for the revenue shortfall, we're going
>
>> to get taxed into oblivion.....and I was even sorta' thinking about
>> voting for a Democrat for president. The new formula for the American
>> economy is to tax businesses more so that they will continue to go elsewhere
>
>> while screwing the workers who will be losing their jobs.
>>
>> Gimme some of that.
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: OK...here's the plan
Posted by [erlilo](#) on Thu, 20 Mar 2008 23:02:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

He, he, I must smile a little....isn't it these things that' is allways
called "The American Dream"? Just to be rich in money? I don't know if it's
true but I have read much about this dream up against the years, but didn't
know someone American hated that dream;-)

erlilo

"John" <no@no.com> skrev i en meddelelse news:47e2ed48\$1@linux...
>
> Al Gore has a \$2500 per month electric bill. He can go fuck himself.
>
> John Edwards who preaches about how he cares about the poor has a 28,000
> sq foot house. He can go fuck himself.
>
> Tiger Woods just bought a 65 million dollar house. He can go fuck
> himself.
> These people have WAY too much and never seem to get any humility. Fuck
> em all. Hypocritical assholes.
>
> Still waiting on Hillary's tax returns for last year.

Subject: Re: OK...here's the plan
Posted by [John \[1\]](#) on Thu, 20 Mar 2008 23:59:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I can pick out these ass clowns a mile away. They always sound like they
know what they are talking about and then you listen to the actual words
and they are full of shit. Great politicians.

Subject: Re: OK...here's the plan
Posted by [John \[1\]](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2008 00:03:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Al Gore has a \$2500 per month electric bill. He can go fuck himself.

John Edwards who preaches about how he cares about the poor has a 28,000 sq foot house. He can go fuck himself.

Tiger Woods just bought a 65 million dollar house. He can go fuck himself.

These people have WAY too much and never seem to get any humility. Fuck em all. Hypocritical assholes.

Still waiting on Hillary's tax returns for last year.

Subject: Re: OK...here's the plan
Posted by [John \[1\]](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2008 00:56:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

For me the Dream has always been true freedom, quality health care, food, shelter, minimal government, clean air and neighbors who actually care about each other. Money is just the gambit that has been used to leverage our day to day needs and make us all slaves. Like the bullshit energy crisis. Where are the "new" ideas to decouple us from oil.....fucking nowhere. This government is horseshit.

Subject: Re: OK...here's the plan
Posted by [excelav](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2008 02:56:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>

>Let's just say for the moment, for the sake of argument, that Al Gore is

>a cheese sandwich. OK? And on another side, Let's say Exxon is a tofu

>burger. Alright? Let's just say they are both inconsequential, however

>you want to visualize that, so we can let all of that go and talk about

>something more fundamental.

>

>What if the scientists are right that the greenhouse gases (which

>actually DO help keep the planet warm enough for human habitation or we

>wouldn't be here talking about it - those gases) what if they DO retain

>additional heat when we add to them faster than natural cycles can

>mitigate?

>

>That's a reasonable possibility. Retaining heat is what greenhouse gases

>do. As a simple analogy, put on a more insulated blanket at night and

>you're likely to be warmer, overall.

>

>Possible changes in the atmosphere and the likely repercussions are what

>many professional and reasonably sane scientists are reporting and

>discussing.

>

>There is a real chance something is happening in the atmosphere due to

>human contributions to greenhouse gases. Which means there's a real

>chance we have to deal with it one way or another. Proactively or

>reactively. And it's very likely to be easier to deal with sooner than

>later.

>

>When a Michigan congressman who is one of the main defenders of the auto

>industry in Washington starts talking plainly about the ramifications of

>human contributions to greenhouse gases, that's news.

>

>It's not enough to merely tar him as a Democrat. This is the guy who

>held up updating CAFE. He has not been shy about representing the auto

>industry.

>

>Cheers,

> -Jamie

> www.JamieKrutz.com

>

>

Old thinking new thinking. He is just getting onboard with the new tax plan.

He just telling us to all get ready to bend over!

>

>James McCloskey wrote:

>> This is what i've been saying. When Al Gore buys global offsets for ten cents

>> and sells them for a dollar, it's a big bunch of money making bullshit!

>> Now this trilateralist bureaucrat bunch of SOBs are going to try to make

>> it a sin tax that we will all have to pay. You know once the government

>> gets a tax passed through they will never repeal it. We will be paying it

>> for then on! It's a scare tactic to cow the people in to believing this

>> bunch of bullshit. There is no significant man made global warming, it's

>> a lie to shift the wealth out of the United States while these rats and
their
>> friends get wealthy doing it.
>>
>>
>>
>> "Mr. Simplicity" <noway@jose.net> wrote:
>>> http://blog.mlive.com/annarbornews/2007/09/dingell_global_warming_may_req.html
>>>
>>> This is the biggest load of disingenuous hubris I've seen in a while.
More
>>
>>> hypocrisy. Whether you get it or not, your intelligence has just been

>>> insulted and be assured that what this is really all about it preparing
>> you
>>> to be bent over as consumption falls. Expect more of this BS as gas usage
>>
>>> goes down and therefore the tax revenue that a gallon of gas generates
is
>>
>>> proportionately reduced. To make up for the revenue shortfall, we're
going
>>
>>> to get taxed into oblivion.....and I was even sorta' thinking about

>>> voting for a Democrat for president. The new formula for the American

>>> economy is to tax businesses more so that they will continue to go elsewhere
>>
>>> while screwing the workers who will be losing their jobs.
>>>
>>> Gimme some of that.
>>>
>>>
>>

Subject: Re: OK...here's the plan
Posted by [chuck duffy](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2008 02:59:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You can be truly free in America. You can choose to farm the land, depend on no one and pay no (income) tax. In many rural areas of the country you can pay no or nominal property taxes. It is entirely possible.

This utopian freedom has bounds:

At some point you may get sick.

Chuck

"John" <no@no.com> wrote:

>

>For me the Dream has always been true freedom, quality health care, food,
>shelter, minimal government, clean air and neighbors who actually care about
>each other. Money is just the gambit that has been used to leverage our
>day to day needs and make us all slaves. Like the bullshit energy crisis.
> Where are the "new" ideas to decouple us from oil.....fucking nowhere.

>This government is horseshit.

Subject: Re: OK...here's the plan

Posted by [Deej \[5\]](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2008 06:05:53 GMT

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

I would be happy living in a tent, with something like a Neve 88-RS inside
and drum room and some iso booths.

;o)

"erlilo" <erlingl@tdcadsl.dk> wrote in message news:47e2f00c@linux...

> He, he, I must smile a little....isn't it these things that' is allways
> called "The American Dream"? Just to be rich in money? I don't know if
> it's true but I have read much about this dream up against the years, but
> didn't know someone American hated that dream;-)

>

> erlilo

>

> "John" <no@no.com> skrev i en meddelelse news:47e2ed48\$1@linux...

>>

>> Al Gore has a \$2500 per month electric bill. He can go fuck himself.

>>

>> John Edwards who preaches about how he cares about the poor has a 28,000
>> sq foot house. He can go fuck himself.

>>

>> Tiger Woods just bought a 65 million dollar house. He can go fuck
>> himself.

>> These people have WAY too much and never seem to get any humility. Fuck
>> em all. Hypocritical assholes.

>>

>> Still waiting on Hillary's tax returns for last year.

>

>

Subject: Re: OK...here's the plan
Posted by [Aaron Allen](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2008 06:08:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

That's ISO tents to you, Mr Green Jeans.
AA

"Mr. Simplicity" <noway@jose.net> wrote in message news:47e3533a@linux...
>I would be happy living in a tent, with something like a Neve 88-RS inside
>and drum room and some iso booths.
>
> ;o)
>
> "erlilo" <erlingl@tdcadsl.dk> wrote in message news:47e2f00c@linux...
>> He, he, I must smile a little....isn't it these things that' is allways
>> called "The American Dream"? Just to be rich in money? I don't know if
>> it's true but I have read much about this dream up against the years, but
>> didn't know someone American hated that dream;-)
>>
>> erlilo
>>
>> "John" <no@no.com> skrev i en meddelelse news:47e2ed48\$1@linux...
>>>
>>> Al Gore has a \$2500 per month electric bill. He can go fuck himself.
>>>
>>> John Edwards who preaches about how he cares about the poor has a 28,000
>>> sq foot house. He can go fuck himself.
>>>
>>> Tiger Woods just bought a 65 million dollar house. He can go fuck
>>> himself.
>>> These people have WAY too much and never seem to get any humulity.
>>> Fuck
>>> em all. Hypocritical assholes.
>>>
>>> Still waiting on Hillary's tax returns for last year.
>>
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: OK...here's the plan
Posted by [rick](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2008 08:55:22 GMT

dingle was my little league baseball coach...seriously.

On Thu, 20 Mar 2008 16:04:54 -0600, Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>
>Let's just say for the moment, for the sake of argument, that Al Gore is
>a cheese sandwich. OK? And on another side, Let's say Exxon is a tofu
>burger. Alright? Let's just say they are both inconsequential, however
>you want to visualize that, so we can let all of that go and talk about
>something more fundamental.
>
>What if the scientists are right that the greenhouse gases (which
>actually DO help keep the planet warm enough for human habitation or we
>wouldn't be here talking about it - those gases) what if they DO retain
>additional heat when we add to them faster than natural cycles can
>mitigate?
>
>That's a reasonable possibility. Retaining heat is what greenhouse gases
>do. As a simple analogy, put on a more insulated blanket at night and
>you're likely to be warmer, overall.
>
>Possible changes in the atmosphere and the likely repercussions are what
>many professional and reasonably sane scientists are reporting and
>discussing.
>
>There is a real chance something is happening in the atmosphere due to
>human contributions to greenhouse gases. Which means there's a real
>chance we have to deal with it one way or another. Proactively or
>reactively. And it's very likely to be easier to deal with sooner than
>later.
>
>When a Michigan congressman who is one of the main defenders of the auto
>industry in Washington starts talking plainly about the ramifications of
>human contributions to greenhouse gases, that's news.
>
>It's not enough to merely tar him as a Democrat. This is the guy who
>held up updating CAFE. He has not been shy about representing the auto
>industry.
>
>Cheers,
> -Jamie
> www.JamieKrutz.com
>
>

>
>James McCloskey wrote:
>> This is what i've been saying. When Al Gore buys global offsets for ten cents
>> and sells them for a dollar, it's a big bunch of money making bullshit!
>> Now this trilateralist bureaucrat bunch of SOBs are going to try to make
>> it a sin tax that we will all have to pay. You know once the government
>> gets a tax passed through they will never repeal it. We will be paying it
>> for then on! It's a scare tactic to cow the people in to believing this
>> bunch of bullshit. There is no significant man made global warming, it's
>> a lie to shift the wealth out of the United States while these rats and their
>> friends get wealthy doing it.
>>
>>
>>
>> "Mr. Simplicity" <noway@jose.net> wrote:
>>> http://blog.mlive.com/annarbornews/2007/09/dingell_global_warming_may_req.html
>>>
>>> This is the biggest load of disingenuous hubris I've seen in a while. More
>>
>>> hypocrisy. Whether you get it or not, your intelligence has just been
>>> insulted and be assured that what this is really all about it preparing
>> you
>>> to be bent over as consumption falls. Expect more of this BS as gas usage
>>
>>> goes down and therefore the tax revenue that a gallon of gas generates is
>>
>>> proportionately reduced. To make up for the revenue shortfall, we're going
>>
>>> to get taxed into oblivion.....and I was even sorta' thinking about
>>> voting for a Democrat for president. The new formula for the American
>>> economy is to tax businesses more so that they will continue to go elsewhere
>>
>>> while screwing the workers who will be losing their jobs.
>>>
>>> Gimme some of that.
>>>
>>>
>>

Subject: Re: OK...here's the plan
Posted by [rick](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2008 09:00:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

i'm rural, live on a dirt road, live on a township line so neither
area police or fire depts. want to respond and oh yeah, they tax the
shit out of me to pay for schools 25 miles away.

On 21 Mar 2008 12:59:19 +1000, "chuck duffy" <c@c.com> wrote:

>
>You can be truly free in America. You can choose to farm the land, depend
>on no one and pay no (income) tax. In many rural areas of the country you
>can pay no or nominal property taxes. It is entirely possible.

>
>This utopian freedom has bounds:

>
>At some point you may get sick.

>
>Chuck

>
>
>
>
>"John" <no@no.com> wrote:

>>
>>For me the Dream has always been true freedom, quality health care, food,
>>shelter, minimal government, clean air and neighbors who actually care about
>>each other. Money is just the gambit that has been used to leverage our
>>day to day needs and make us all slaves. Like the bullshit energy crisis.
>> Where are the "new" ideas to decouple us from oil.....fucking nowhere.

>
>>This government is horseshit.

Subject: Re: OK...here's the plan

Posted by [John](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2008 12:33:45 GMT

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

like i always say: it ain't a service if you didn't ask for it

Subject: Re: OK...here's the plan

Posted by [Miguel Vigil \[1\]](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2008 16:57:54 GMT

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

The humanity is facing it's biggest disaster in 100 000 years. Tax raises
won't solve anything, it demand a lot more action than that..

BR

"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:47e2cfc2\$1@linux...

>
> This is what i've been saying. When Al Gore buys global offsets for ten
cents
> and sells them for a dollar, it's a big bunch of money making bullshit!

> Now this trilateralist bureaucrat bunch of SOBs are going to try to make
> it a sin tax that we will all have to pay. You know once the government
> gets a tax passed through they will never repeal it. We will be paying it
> for then on! It's a scare tactic to cow the people in to believing this
> bunch of bullshit. There is no significant man made global warming, it's
> a lie to shift the wealth out of the United States while these rats and
their
> friends get wealthy doing it.
>
>
>
> "Mr. Simplicity" <noway@jose.net> wrote:
>
> [http://blog.mlive.com/annarbornews/2007/09/dingell_global_warming_may_req.h](http://blog.mlive.com/annarbornews/2007/09/dingell_global_warming_may_req.html)
tml
> >
> >This is the biggest load of disingenuous hubris I've seen in a while.
More
>
> >hypocrisy. Whether you get it or not, your intelligence has just been
> >insulted and be assured that what this is really all about it preparing
> you
> >to be bent over as consumption falls. Expect more of this BS as gas usage
>
> >goes down and therefore the tax revenue that a gallon of gas generates is
>
> >proportionately reduced. To make up for the revenue shortfall, we're
going
>
> >to get taxed into oblivion.....and I was even sorta' thinking about
> >voting for a Democrat for president. The new formula for the American
> >economy is to tax businesses more so that they will continue to go
elsewhere
>
> >while screwing the workers who will be losing their jobs.
> >
> >Gimme some of that.
> >
> >
>

Subject: Re: OK...here's the plan
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2008 18:58:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Wish it were that easy, James. We would be poor stewards of the land
indeed if we carelessly dismissed the evidence to date. It's not

particularly prudent to ignore increasing evidence that shows possible problems.

The atmosphere and our use of it to store increasing amounts of unwanted greenhouse gases is a big enough subject scientifically without being sidetracked by political and economic conspiracy theories.

Even if you enjoy discussing perceived conspiracies, be sure you don't confuse them with the ongoing science.

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKrutz.com

James McCloskey wrote:

> What we need is waders and a big shovel to get rid of this load of crap.

>

>

> "BR" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote:

>> The humanity is facing it's biggest disaster in 100 000 years. Tax raises

>> won't solve anything, it demand a lot more action than that..

>> BR

>>

>> "James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote in message

>> news:47e2cfc2\$1@linux...

>>> This is what i've been saying. When Al Gore buys global offsets for ten

>> cents

>>> and sells them for a dollar, it's a big bunch of money making bullshit!

>>> Now this trilateralist bureaucrat bunch of SOBs are going to try to make

>>> it a sin tax that we will all have to pay. You know once the government

>>> gets a tax passed through they will never repeal it. We will be paying

> it

>>> for then on! It's a scare tactic to cow the people in to believing this

>>> bunch of bullshit. There is no significant man made global warming, it's

>>> a lie to shift the wealth out of the United States while these rats and

>> their

>>> friends get wealthy doing it.

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>> "Mr. Simplicity" <noway@jose.net> wrote:

>>>

>>> http://blog.mlive.com/annarbornews/2007/09/dingell_global_warming_may_req.h

>> tml

>>>> This is the biggest load of disingenuous hubris I've seen in a while.

>> More

>>>> hypocrisy. Whether you get it or not, your intelligence has just been

>>>> insulted and be assured that what this is really all about it preparing
>>> you
>>>> to be bent over as consumption falls. Expect more of this BS as gas usage
>>>> goes down and therefore the tax revenue that a gallon of gas generates
> is
>>>> proportionately reduced. To make up for the revenue shortfall, we're
>> going
>>>> to get taxed into oblivion.....and I was even sorta' thinking about
>>>> voting for a Democrat for president. The new formula for the American
>>>> economy is to tax businesses more so that they will continue to go
>> elsewhere
>>>> while screwing the workers who will be losing their jobs.
>>>>
>>>> Gimme some of that.
>>>>
>>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: OK...here's the plan
Posted by [excelav](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2008 19:07:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

What we need is waders and a big shovel to get rid of this load of crap.

"BR" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote:
>The humanity is facing it's biggest disaster in 100 000 years. Tax raises
>won't solve anything, it demand a lot more action than that..
>BR
>
>"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>news:47e2cfc2\$1@linux...
>>
>> This is what i've been saying. When Al Gore buys global offsets for ten
>cents
>> and sells them for a dollar, it's a big bunch of money making bullshit!
>> Now this trilateralist bureaucrat bunch of SOBs are going to try to make
>> it a sin tax that we will all have to pay. You know once the government
>> gets a tax passed through they will never repeal it. We will be paying
>it
>> for then on! It's a scare tactic to cow the people in to believing this
>> bunch of bullshit. There is no significant man made global warming, it's
>> a lie to shift the wealth out of the United States while these rats and
>their
>> friends get wealthy doing it.
>>

>>
>>
>> "Mr. Simplicity" <noway@jose.net> wrote:
>>
>> http://blog.mlive.com/annarbornews/2007/09/dingell_global_warming_may_req.h
>tml
>> >
>> >This is the biggest load of disingenuous hubris I've seen in a while.
>More
>>
>> >hypocrisy. Whether you get it or not, your intelligence has just been
>> >insulted and be assured that what this is really all about it preparing
>> you
>> >to be bent over as consumption falls. Expect more of this BS as gas usage
>>
>> >goes down and therefore the tax revenue that a gallon of gas generates
is
>>
>> >proportionately reduced. To make up for the revenue shortfall, we're
>going
>>
>> >to get taxed into oblivion.....and I was even sorta' thinking about
>> >voting for a Democrat for president. The new formula for the American
>> >economy is to tax businesses more so that they will continue to go
>elsewhere
>>
>> >while screwing the workers who will be losing their jobs.
>> >
>> >Gimme some of that.
>> >
>> >
>> >
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: OK...here's the plan
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2008 19:19:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

What did you think of him? Good coach?

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKrutz.com

rick wrote:
> dingle was my little league baseball coach...seriously.

>
>
>
> On Thu, 20 Mar 2008 16:04:54 -0600, Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com>
> wrote:
>
>> Let's just say for the moment, for the sake of argument, that Al Gore is
>> a cheese sandwich. OK? And on another side, Let's say Exxon is a tofu
>> burger. Alright? Let's just say they are both inconsequential, however
>> you want to visualize that, so we can let all of that go and talk about
>> something more fundamental.
>>
>> What if the scientists are right that the greenhouse gases (which
>> actually DO help keep the planet warm enough for human habitation or we
>> wouldn't be here talking about it - those gases) what if they DO retain
>> additional heat when we add to them faster than natural cycles can
>> mitigate?
>>
>> That's a reasonable possibility. Retaining heat is what greenhouse gases
>> do. As a simple analogy, put on a more insulated blanket at night and
>> you're likely to be warmer, overall.
>>
>> Possible changes in the atmosphere and the likely repercussions are what
>> many professional and reasonably sane scientists are reporting and
>> discussing.
>>
>> There is a real chance something is happening in the atmosphere due to
>> human contributions to greenhouse gases. Which means there's a real
>> chance we have to deal with it one way or another. Proactively or
>> reactively. And it's very likely to be easier to deal with sooner than
>> later.
>>
>> When a Michigan congressman who is one of the main defenders of the auto
>> industry in Washington starts talking plainly about the ramifications of
>> human contributions to greenhouse gases, that's news.
>>
>> It's not enough to merely tar him as a Democrat. This is the guy who
>> held up updating CAFE. He has not been shy about representing the auto
>> industry.
>>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>>
>>
>>
>> James McCloskey wrote:
>>> This is what i've been saying. When Al Gore buys global offsets for ten cents

>>> and sells them for a dollar, it's a big bunch of money making bullshit!
>>> Now this trilateralist bureaucrat bunch of SOBs are going to try to make
>>> it a sin tax that we will all have to pay. You know once the government
>>> gets a tax passed through they will never repeal it. We will be paying it
>>> for then on! It's a scare tactic to cow the people in to believing this
>>> bunch of bullshit. There is no significant man made global warming, it's
>>> a lie to shift the wealth out of the United States while these rats and their
>>> friends get wealthy doing it.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> "Mr. Simplicity" <noway@jose.net> wrote:
>>>> http://blog.mlive.com/annarbornews/2007/09/dingell_global_warming_may_req.html
>>>>
>>>> This is the biggest load of disingenuous hubris I've seen in a while. More
>>>> hypocrisy. Whether you get it or not, your intelligence has just been
>>>> insulted and be assured that what this is really all about it preparing
>>> you
>>>> to be bent over as consumption falls. Expect more of this BS as gas usage
>>>> goes down and therefore the tax revenue that a gallon of gas generates is
>>>> proportionately reduced. To make up for the revenue shortfall, we're going
>>>> to get taxed into oblivion.....and I was even sorta' thinking about
>>>> voting for a Democrat for president. The new formula for the American
>>>> economy is to tax businesses more so that they will continue to go elsewhere
>>>> while screwing the workers who will be losing their jobs.
>>>>
>>>> Gimme some of that.
>>>>
>>>>
>

Subject: Re: OK...here's the plan
Posted by [Miguel Vigil \[1\]](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2008 20:02:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Look at the facts, use your brains, read the reports. crunch the numbers.
It's not a left or right thing, it's not a conspiracy. Now is the time for
intelligent people to step up to the plate. This is the real challenge of
our generation. The next generations will judge us by this.

Bjorn R

"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:47e40fb3@linux...
>

> The science is about money. The science of man made global warming being
> a major factor is bullshit, and it is not provable. Has the earth heated

> up a bit, yes, the earth goes through changes. Should we as people stop polluting,

> yes. Should we conserve, yes, I'm a conservative, not a liberal. Am I buying

> in to the liberal's sin tax plan their trying to convince the dummies to

> start paying to save the world, NO WAY! I'm I buying in the this trilateralist

> plan to shift more money out of the USA, no way! Back in the 70's, the scientist

> that started this global warming stuff, was predicting that we would be in

> an ice age right now.

>

> You can post all of the contrived research you, it won't change the truth.

> Choose to believe what you want, man made global warming has not been proven.

>

>

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

> >

> >Wish it were that easy, James. We would be poor stewards of the land

> >indeed if we carelessly dismissed the evidence to date. It's not

> >particularly prudent to ignore increasing evidence that shows possible

> >problems.

> >

> >The atmosphere and our use of it to store increasing amounts of unwanted

>

> >greenhouse gases is a big enough subject scientifically without being

> >sidetracked by political and economic conspiracy theories.

> >

> >Even if you enjoy discussing perceived conspiracies, be sure you don't

> >confuse them with the ongoing science.

> >

> >Cheers,

> > -Jamie

> > www.JamieKrutz.com

> >

> >

> >James McCloskey wrote:

> >> What we need is waders and a big shovel to get rid of this load of crap.

>

> >>

> >>

> >> "BR" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote:

> >>> The humanity is facing it's biggest disaster in 100 000 years. Tax raises

> >>> won't solve anything, it demand a lot more action than that..

> >>> BR

> >>>
> >>> "James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> >>> news:47e2cfc2\$1@linux...
> >>>> This is what i've been saying. When Al Gore buys global offsets for
> ten
> >>>> cents
> >>>> and sells them for a dollar, it's a big bunch of money making
bullshit!
> >>>> Now this trilateralist bureaucrat bunch of SOBs are going to try to
> make
> >>>> it a sin tax that we will all have to pay. You know once the
government
> >>>> gets a tax passed through they will never repeal it. We will be
paying
> >> it
> >>>> for then on! It's a scare tactic to cow the people in to believing
> this
> >>>> bunch of bullshit. There is no significant man made global warming,
> it's
> >>>> a lie to shift the wealth out of the United States while these rats
> and
> >>> their
> >>>> friends get wealthy doing it.
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>> "Mr. Simplicity" <noway@jose.net> wrote:
> >>>>
> >>>>
http://blog.mlive.com/annarbornews/2007/09/dingell_global_warming_may_req.h
> >>> tml
> >>>>> This is the biggest load of disingenuous hubris I've seen in a
while.
> >>> More
> >>>>> hypocrisy. Whether you get it or not, your intelligence has just
been
> >>>>> insulted and be assured that what this is really all about it
preparing
> >>>>> you
> >>>>> to be bent over as consumption falls. Expect more of this BS as gas
> usage
> >>>>> goes down and therefore the tax revenue that a gallon of gas
generates
> >> is
> >>>>> proportionately reduced. To make up for the revenue shortfall, we're
> >>> going
> >>>>> to get taxed into oblivion.....and I was even sorta' thinking
about

> >>>> voting for a Democrat for president. The new formula for the American
> >>>> economy is to tax businesses more so that they will continue to go
> >>> elsewhere
> >>>> while screwing the workers who will be losing their jobs.
> >>>>
> >>>> Gimme some of that.
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>
> >>
>

Subject: Re: OK...here's the plan
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2008 20:18:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

James McCloskey wrote:

> The science is about money.

To an extent everything is about money. But that doesn't stop people from doing good, conscientious work.

You yourself require money to live. Should we therefore disbelieve everything you say?

No, I don't think so. That argument is really reaching.

> The science of man made global warming being
> a major factor is bullshit, and it is not provable.

LOL. The science is hardly bullshit.

What scientists are saying is that there is a strong chance that human contributions to greenhouse gases are affecting the climate.

This is because we are dumping large and increasing amounts of greenhouse gases into the atmosphere, above and beyond current natural cycles. Gases that then stay in the atmosphere for extended periods, decades or more.

Keep in mind that greenhouse gases help regulate temperature on earth by reflecting back infrared radiation. This is a good thing for our survival but it can be overdone.

Since only a tiny fraction of the gases in the atmosphere reflect

infrared radiation (nitrogen and oxygen don't), it doesn't take much of an increase in greenhouse gases to noticeably change the amount of heat directed back toward the earth.

There is strong evidence that this is what is happening now, and that our contributions are part of the problem. Based on what we know so far there is a strong chance this problem will increase over time.

Given that information, it's smart to consider the implications now.

> Has the earth heated
> up a bit, yes, the earth goes through changes.

True, and true.

And evidence indicates there's a good chance we're involved in the current climate change event.

> Should we as people stop polluting,
> yes.

We certainly need to be aware of the chemistry around us and how we interact with it.

The ozone situation is a good example. Scientists noticed a change in the ozone layer. A human chemical cause was discovered. Policies were changed to stop human contributions to the problem.

> Should we conserve, yes, I'm a conservative, not a liberal.

Great.

To conserve what we have we need to take into account any evidence that shows we may have a problem.

BTW climate change and conservation are not a partisan issues, in my view. At the very least, most people don't want to screw up the area where they live, no matter their politics.

> Am I buying
> in to the liberal's sin tax plan their trying to convince the dummies to
> start paying to save the world, NO WAY!

That's fine. But don't confuse any perceived conspiracies with ongoing

climate science.

You can promote your political views without attacking climate scientists or dismissing scientific conclusions.

> I'm I buying in the this trilateralist
> plan to shift more money out of the USA, no way!

That's fine. But again you can promote your political views without attacking climate scientists or dismissing scientific conclusions.

> Back in the 70's, the scientist
> that started this global warming stuff, was predicting that we would be in
> an ice age right now.

Who are you talking about?

> You can post all of the contrived research you, it won't change the truth.
> Choose to believe what you want, man made global warming has not been proven.

If someone is exploiting scientific data in a partisan way to push a certain point of view you happen to disagree with, then fine, argue with them.

But don't pretend the data itself doesn't exist. There is a lot of peer-reviewed research out there, and it isn't "contrived."

If the only way to "prove" your point is to continue a risky worldwide experiment until we possibly screw up the planet for future generations, then your proof is too late to be in any way useful.

It's much smarter to look at the decades of evidence we already have and make prudent risk management decisions.

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKrutz.com

> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>> Wish it were that easy, James. We would be poor stewards of the land
>> indeed if we carelessly dismissed the evidence to date. It's not
>> particularly prudent to ignore increasing evidence that shows possible
>> problems.

>>
>> The atmosphere and our use of it to store increasing amounts of unwanted
>
>> greenhouse gases is a big enough subject scientifically without being
>> sidetracked by political and economic conspiracy theories.
>>
>> Even if you enjoy discussing perceived conspiracies, be sure you don't
>> confuse them with the ongoing science.
>>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>>
>>
>> James McCloskey wrote:
>>> What we need is waders and a big shovel to get rid of this load of crap.
>
>>>
>>> "BR" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote:
>>>> The humanity is facing it's biggest disaster in 100 000 years. Tax raises
>>>> won't solve anything, it demand a lot more action than that..
>>>> BR
>>>>
>>>> "James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>>>> news:47e2cfc2\$1@linux...
>>>>> This is what i've been saying. When Al Gore buys global offsets for
> ten
>>>>> cents
>>>>> and sells them for a dollar, it's a big bunch of money making bullshit!
>>>>> Now this trilateralist bureaucrat bunch of SOBs are going to try to
> make
>>>>> it a sin tax that we will all have to pay. You know once the government
>>>>> gets a tax passed through they will never repeal it. We will be paying
>>> it
>>>>> for then on! It's a scare tactic to cow the people in to believing
> this
>>>>> bunch of bullshit. There is no significant man made global warming,
> it's
>>>>> a lie to shift the wealth out of the United States while these rats
> and
>>>> their
>>>>> friends get wealthy doing it.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> "Mr. Simplicity" <noway@jose.net> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>> http://blog.mlive.com/annarbornews/2007/09/dingell_global_warming_may_req.h

>>>> tml
>>>>> This is the biggest load of disingenuous hubris I've seen in a while.
>>>> More
>>>>> hypocrisy. Whether you get it or not, your intelligence has just been
>>>>> insulted and be assured that what this is really all about it preparing
>>>>> you
>>>>> to be bent over as consumption falls. Expect more of this BS as gas
> usage
>>>>> goes down and therefore the tax revenue that a gallon of gas generates
>>> is
>>>>> proportionately reduced. To make up for the revenue shortfall, we're
>>>> going
>>>>> to get taxed into oblivion.....and I was even sorta' thinking about
>>>>> voting for a Democrat for president. The new forumla for the American
>>>>> economy is to tax businesses more so that they will continue to go
>>>> elsewhere
>>>>> while screwing the workers who will be losing their jobs.
>>>>>
>>>>> Gimme some of that.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>

Subject: Re: OK...here's the plan
Posted by [excelav](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2008 20:42:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The science is about money. The science of man made global warming being a major factor is bullshit, and it is not provable. Has the earth heated up a bit, yes, the earth goes threw changes. Should we as people stop polluting, yes. Should we conserve, yes, I'm a conservative, not a liberal. Am I buying in to the liberal's sin tax plan their trying to convince the dummies to start paying to save the world, NO WAY! I'm I buying in the this trilateralist plan to shift more money out of the USA, no way! Back in the 70's, the scientist that started this global warming stuff, was predicting that we would be in an ice age right now.

You can post all of the contrived research you, it won't change the truth.
Choose to believe what you want, man made global warming has not been proven.

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

>Wish it were that easy, James. We would be poor stewards of the land
>indeed if we carelessly dismissed the evidence to date. It's not
>particularly prudent to ignore increasing evidence that shows possible
>problems.

>
>The atmosphere and our use of it to store increasing amounts of unwanted

>greenhouse gases is a big enough subject scientifically without being
>sidetracked by political and economic conspiracy theories.
>
>Even if you enjoy discussing perceived conspiracies, be sure you don't
>confuse them with the ongoing science.
>
>Cheers,
> -Jamie
> www.JamieKrutz.com
>
>
>James McCloskey wrote:
>> What we need is waders and a big shovel to get rid of this load of crap.

>>
>>
>> "BR" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote:
>>> The humanity is facing it's biggest disaster in 100 000 years. Tax raises
>>> won't solve anything, it demand a lot more action than that..
>>> BR
>>>
>>> "James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>>> news:47e2cfc2\$1@linux...
>>>> This is what i've been saying. When Al Gore buys global offsets for
ten
>>>> cents
>>>> and sells them for a dollar, it's a big bunch of money making bullshit!
>>>> Now this trilateralist bureaucrat bunch of SOBs are going to try to
make
>>>> it a sin tax that we will all have to pay. You know once the government
>>>> gets a tax passed through they will never repeal it. We will be paying
>> it
>>>> for then on! It's a scare tactic to cow the people in to believing
this
>>>> bunch of bullshit. There is no significant man made global warming,
it's
>>>> a lie to shift the wealth out of the United States while these rats
and
>>> their
>>>> friends get wealthy doing it.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> "Mr. Simplicity" <noway@jose.net> wrote:
>>>>

>>>> http://blog.mlive.com/annarbornews/2007/09/dingell_global_warming_may_req.h
>>> tml
>>>> This is the biggest load of disingenuous hubris I've seen in a while.
>>> More
>>>> hypocrisy. Whether you get it or not, your intelligence has just been
>>>> insulted and be assured that what this is really all about it preparing
>>>> you
>>>> to be bent over as consumption falls. Expect more of this BS as gas
usage
>>>> goes down and therefore the tax revenue that a gallon of gas generates
>> is
>>>> proportionately reduced. To make up for the revenue shortfall, we're
>>> going
>>>> to get taxed into oblivion.....and I was even sorta' thinking about
>>>> voting for a Democrat for president. The new formula for the American
>>>> economy is to tax businesses more so that they will continue to go
>>> elsewhere
>>>> while screwing the workers who will be losing their jobs.
>>>>
>>>> Gimme some of that.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>

Subject: Re: OK...here's the plan
Posted by [Miguel Vigil \[1\]](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2008 20:43:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

If the global temperature raises with more than 2 degrees celcius, we'll have a global disaster. It's no chance that we are going to avoid that. So beware, the africans, the south asians and the south americans are coming to knock on our door, and they are hungry, they are thirsty, and they are many. And that's just the beginning. This thing is out of control.

Bjorn R

"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:47e41af0@linux...
> James McCloskey wrote:
> > The science is about money.
>
> To an extent everything is about money. But that doesn't stop people
> from doing good, conscientious work.
>
> You yourself require money to live. Should we therefore disbelieve
> everything you say?
>

> No, I don't think so. That argument is really reaching.
>
>
> > The science of man made global warming being
> > a major factor is bullshit, and it is not provable.
>
> LOL. The science is hardly bullshit.
>
> What scientists are saying is that there is a strong chance that human
> contributions to greenhouse gases are affecting the climate.
>
> This is because we are dumping large and increasing amounts of
> greenhouse gases into the atmosphere, above and beyond current natural
> cycles. Gases that then stay in the atmosphere for extended periods,
> decades or more.
>
> Keep in mind that greenhouse gases help regulate temperature on earth by
> reflecting back infrared radiation. This is a good thing for our
> survival but it can be overdone.
>
> Since only a tiny fraction of the gases in the atmosphere reflect
> infrared radiation (nitrogen and oxygen don't), it doesn't take much of
> an increase in greenhouse gases to noticeably change the amount of heat
> directed back toward the earth.
>
> There is strong evidence that this is what is happening now, and that
> our contributions are part of the problem. Based on what we know so far
> there is a strong chance this problem will increase over time.
>
> Given that information, it's smart to consider the implications now.
>
>
> > Has the earth heated
> > up a bit, yes, the earth goes threw changes.
>
> True, and true.
>
> And evidence indicates there's a good chance we're involved in the
> current climate change event.
>
>
> > Should we as people stop polluting,
> > yes.
>
> We certainly need to be aware of the chemistry around us and how we
> interact with it.
>
> The ozone situation is a good example. Scientists noticed a change in

> the ozone layer. A human chemical cause was discovered. Policies were
> changed to stop human contributions to the problem.
>
>
> > Should we conserve, yes, I'm a conservative, not a liberal.
>
> Great.
>
> To conserve what we have we need to take into account any evidence that
> shows we may have a problem.
>
> BTW climate change and conservation are not a partisan issues, in my
> view. At the very least, most people don't want to screw up the area
> where they live, no matter their politics.
>
>
> > Am I buying
> > in to the liberal's sin tax plan their trying to convince the dummies to
> > start paying to save the world, NO WAY!
>
> That's fine. But don't confuse any perceived conspiracies with ongoing
> climate science.
>
> You can promote your political views without attacking climate
> scientists or dismissing scientific conclusions.
>
>
> > I'm I buying in the this trilateralist
> > plan to shift more money out of the USA, no way!
>
> That's fine. But again you can promote your political views without
> attacking climate scientists or dismissing scientific conclusions.
>
>
> > Back in the 70's, the scientist
> > that started this global warming stuff, was predicting that we would be
in
> > an ice age right now.
>
> Who are you talking about?
>
>
> > You can post all of the contrived research you, it won't change the
truth.
> > Choose to believe what you want, man made global warming has not been
proven.
>
> If someone is exploiting scientific data in a partisan way to push a

> certain point of view you happen to disagree with, then fine, argue with
> them.
>
> But don't pretend the data itself doesn't exist. There is a lot of
> peer-reviewed research out there, and it isn't "contrived."
>
> If the only way to "prove" your point is to continue a risky worldwide
> experiment until we possibly screw up the planet for future generations,
> then your proof is too late to be in any way useful.
>
> It's much smarter to look at the decades of evidence we already have and
> make prudent risk management decisions.
>
> Cheers,
> -Jamie
> www.JamieKrutz.com
>
>
>
> > Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
> >> Wish it were that easy, James. We would be poor stewards of the land
> >> indeed if we carelessly dismissed the evidence to date. It's not
> >> particularly prudent to ignore increasing evidence that shows possible
> >> problems.
> >>
> >> The atmosphere and our use of it to store increasing amounts of
unwanted
> >
> >> greenhouse gases is a big enough subject scientifically without being
> >> sidetracked by political and economic conspiracy theories.
> >>
> >> Even if you enjoy discussing perceived conspiracies, be sure you don't
> >> confuse them with the ongoing science.
> >>
> >> Cheers,
> >> -Jamie
> >> www.JamieKrutz.com
> >>
> >>
> >> James McCloskey wrote:
> >>> What we need is waders and a big shovel to get rid of this load of
crap.
> >
> >>>
> >>> "BR" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote:
> >>>> The humanity is facing it's biggest disaster in 100 000 years. Tax
raises
> >>>> won't solve anything, it demand a lot more action than that..

> >>>> BR

> >>>>

> >>>> "James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote in message

> >>>> news:47e2cfc2\$1@linux...

> >>>>> This is what i've been saying. When Al Gore buys global offsets for

> > ten

> >>>> cents

> >>>>> and sells them for a dollar, it's a big bunch of money making

bullshit!

> >>>>> Now this trilateralist bureaucrat bunch of SOBs are going to try to

> > make

> >>>>> it a sin tax that we will all have to pay. You know once the

government

> >>>>> gets a tax passed through they will never repeal it. We will be

paying

> >>> it

> >>>>> for then on! It's a scare tactic to cow the people in to believing

> > this

> >>>>> bunch of bullshit. There is no significant man made global warming,

> > it's

> >>>>> a lie to shift the wealth out of the United States while these rats

> > and

> >>>> their

> >>>>> friends get wealthy doing it.

> >>>>>

> >>>>>

> >>>>>

> >>>>> "Mr. Simplicity" <noway@jose.net> wrote:

> >>>>>

> >>>>>

http://blog.mlive.com/annarbornews/2007/09/dingell_global_warming_may_req.h

> >>>>> tml

> >>>>>> This is the biggest load of disingenuous hubris I've seen in a

while.

> >>>>> More

> >>>>>> hypocrisy. Whether you get it or not, your intelligence has just

been

> >>>>>> insulted and be assured that what this is really all about it

preparing

> >>>>>> you

> >>>>>> to be bent over as consumption falls. Expect more of this BS as gas

> > usage

> >>>>>> goes down and therefore the tax revenue that a gallon of gas

generates

> >>> is

> >>>>>> proportionately reduced. To make up for the revenue shortfall,

we're

> >>>> going

> >>>>> to get taxed into oblivion.....and I was even sorta' thinking
about
> >>>>> voting for a Democrat for president. The new forumla for the
American
> >>>>> economy is to tax businesses more so that they will continue to go
> >>>> elsewhere
> >>>>> while screwing the workers who will be losing their jobs.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> Gimme some of that.
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >

Subject: Re: OK...here's the plan
Posted by [Miguel Vigil \[1\]](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2008 20:50:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

China is one of the countries that's going to suffer most from global
heating. In fact, they already do.
Bjorn R

"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:47e42074\$1@linux...

>
> First, I don't think it is only one party that will be on this taxation
band
> wagon, the bush's are trilateralist also, and others. "a thousand points
> of light" " A new world order" That's trilateral talk.
>
> Isn't it funny that China, the biggest polluter on the planet is exempt
from
> the law and rules the world gov. is trying to put in place. Why? This is
> all part of the trilateralist plan to shift the money around. The world
> banks have now set up inside of China.
>
> They are trying to scare people in to a sin tax. It's about money, they
> want a sin tax to build up the rest of the world. It's about controlling
> the world economically. They want to restrict what america can build and
> do in the future.
>
> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
> >James McCloskey wrote:
> >> The science is about money.
> >
> >To an extent everything is about money. But that doesn't stop people
> >from doing good, conscientious work.
> >

> > You yourself require money to live. Should we therefore disbelieve
> > everything you say?
> >
> > No, I don't think so. That argument is really reaching.
> >
> >
> > > The science of man made global warming being
> >> a major factor is bullshit, and it is not provable.
> >
> > LOL. The science is hardly bullshit.
> >
> > What scientists are saying is that there is a strong chance that human
> > contributions to greenhouse gases are affecting the climate.
> >
> > This is because we are dumping large and increasing amounts of
> > greenhouse gases into the atmosphere, above and beyond current natural
> > cycles. Gases that then stay in the atmosphere for extended periods,
> > decades or more.
> >
> > Keep in mind that greenhouse gases help regulate temperature on earth by
>
> > reflecting back infrared radiation. This is a good thing for our
> > survival but it can be overdone.
> >
> > Since only a tiny fraction of the gases in the atmosphere reflect
> > infrared radiation (nitrogen and oxygen don't), it doesn't take much of
>
> > an increase in greenhouse gases to noticeably change the amount of heat
>
> > directed back toward the earth.
> >
> > There is strong evidence that this is what is happening now, and that
> > our contributions are part of the problem. Based on what we know so far
>
> > there is a strong chance this problem will increase over time.
> >
> > Given that information, it's smart to consider the implications now.
> >
> >
> >> Has the earth heated
> >> up a bit, yes, the earth goes threw changes.
> >
> > True, and true.
> >
> > And evidence indicates there's a good chance we're involved in the
> > current climate change event.
> >
> >

> >> Should we as people stop polluting,
> >> yes.
> >
> >We certainly need to be aware of the chemistry around us and how we
> >interact with it.
> >
> >The ozone situation is a good example. Scientists noticed a change in
> >the ozone layer. A human chemical cause was discovered. Policies were
> >changed to stop human contributions to the problem.
> >
> >
> >> Should we conserve, yes, I'm a conservative, not a liberal.
> >
> >Great.
> >
> >To conserve what we have we need to take into account any evidence that
> >
> >shows we may have a problem.
> >
> >BTW climate change and conservation are not a partisan issues, in my
> >view. At the very least, most people don't want to screw up the area
> >where they live, no matter their politics.
> >
> >
> >> Am I buying
> >> in to the liberal's sin tax plan their trying to convince the dummies
> >to
> >> start paying to save the world, NO WAY!
> >
> >That's fine. But don't confuse any perceived conspiracies with ongoing
> >climate science.
> >
> >You can promote your political views without attacking climate
> >scientists or dismissing scientific conclusions.
> >
> >
> >> I'm I buying in the this trilateralist
> >> plan to shift more money out of the USA, no way!
> >
> >That's fine. But again you can promote your political views without
> >attacking climate scientists or dismissing scientific conclusions.
> >
> >
> >> Back in the 70's, the scientist
> >> that started this global warming stuff, was predicting that we would be
> >in
> >> an ice age right now.
> >

> >Who are you talking about?
> >
> >
> >> You can post all of the contrived research you, it won't change the truth.
> >> Choose to believe what you want, man made global warming has not been proven.
> >
> >If someone is exploiting scientific data in a partisan way to push a
> >certain point of view you happen to disagree with, then fine, argue with
>
> >them.
> >
> >But don't pretend the data itself doesn't exist. There is a lot of
> >peer-reviewed research out there, and it isn't "contrived."
> >
> >If the only way to "prove" your point is to continue a risky worldwide
> >experiment until we possibly screw up the planet for future generations,
>
> >then your proof is too late to be in any way useful.
> >
> >It's much smarter to look at the decades of evidence we already have and
>
> >make prudent risk management decisions.
> >
> >Cheers,
> > -Jamie
> > www.JamieKrutz.com
> >
> >
> >
> >> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
> >>> Wish it were that easy, James. We would be poor stewards of the land
>
> >>> indeed if we carelessly dismissed the evidence to date. It's not
> >>> particularly prudent to ignore increasing evidence that shows possible
>
> >>> problems.
> >>>
> >>> The atmosphere and our use of it to store increasing amounts of unwanted
> >>
> >>> greenhouse gases is a big enough subject scientifically without being
>
> >>> sidetracked by political and economic conspiracy theories.
> >>>
> >>> Even if you enjoy discussing perceived conspiracies, be sure you don't
>

> >>> confuse them with the ongoing science.

> >>>

> >>> Cheers,

> >>> -Jamie

> >>> www.JamieKrutz.com

> >>>

> >>>

> >>> James McCloskey wrote:

> >>>> What we need is waders and a big shovel to get rid of this load of
crap.

> >>

> >>>>

> >>>> "BR" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote:

> >>>>> The humanity is facing it's biggest disaster in 100 000 years. Tax
> raises
> >>>>> won't solve anything, it demand a lot more action than that..
> >>>>> BR
> >>>>>

> >>>>> "James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> >>>>> news:47e2cfc2\$1@linux...

> >>>>>> This is what i've been saying. When Al Gore buys global offsets
for
> >> ten
> >>>>> cents
> >>>>>> and sells them for a dollar, it's a big bunch of money making
bullshit!
> >>>>>> Now this trilateralist bureaucrat bunch of SOBs are going to try to
> >> make
> >>>>>> it a sin tax that we will all have to pay. You know once the
government
> >>>>>> gets a tax passed through they will never repeal it. We will be
paying
> >>>>> it
> >>>>>> for then on! It's a scare tactic to cow the people in to believing
> >> this
> >>>>>> bunch of bullshit. There is no significant man made global
warming,
> >> it's
> >>>>>> a lie to shift the wealth out of the United States while these rats
> >> and
> >>>>> their
> >>>>>> friends get wealthy doing it.
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>

> >>>>>> "Mr. Simplicity" <noway@jose.net> wrote:

> >>>>>>

> >>>>>>

http://blog.mlive.com/annarbornews/2007/09/dingell_global_warming_may_req.h

> >>>> tml

> >>>>>> This is the biggest load of disingenuous hubris I've seen in a while.

> >>>> More

> >>>>>> hypocrisy. Whether you get it or not, your intelligence has just been

> >>>>>> insulted and be assured that what this is really all about it preparing

> >>>>> you

> >>>>>> to be bent over as consumption falls. Expect more of this BS as gas

> >> usage

> >>>>>> goes down and therefore the tax revenue that a gallon of gas generates

> >>>> is

> >>>>>> proportionately reduced. To make up for the revenue shortfall, we're

> >>>> going

> >>>>>> to get taxed into oblivion.....and I was even sorta' thinking about

> >>>>>> voting for a Democrat for president. The new formula for the American

> >>>>>> economy is to tax businesses more so that they will continue to go

> >>>>> elsewhere

> >>>>>> while screwing the workers who will be losing their jobs.

> >>>>>>

> >>>>>> Gimme some of that.

> >>>>>>

> >>>>>>

> >>

>

Subject: Re: OK...here's the plan

Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2008 20:56:24 GMT

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

Conspiracies are another matter.

Back to the science: Evidence shows the strong possibility that humans contributions to greenhouse gases are currently affecting the climate.

If you suspect that some groups are trying to exploit this data for nefarious purposes, then fine, take on those groups. Dig into whatever conspiracies you want.

But don't pretend that the scientific data doesn't exist. You can

promote your political views without attacking climate scientists or dismissing scientific conclusions.

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKrutz.com

James McCloskey wrote:

> First, I don't think it is only one party that will be on this taxation band
> wagon, the bush's are trilateralist also, and others. "a thousand points
> of light" " A new world order" That's trilateral talk.
>
> Isn't it funny that China, the biggest polluter on the planet is exempt from
> the law and rules the world gov. is trying to put in place. Why? This is
> all part of the trilateralist plan to shift the money around. The world
> banks have now set up inside of China.
>
> They are trying to scare people in to a sin tax. It's about money, they
> want a sin tax to build up the rest of the world. It's about controlling
> the world economically. They want to restrict what america can build and
> do in the future.

>
> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>> James McCloskey wrote:
>>> The science is about money.
>> To an extent everything is about money. But that doesn't stop people
>>from doing good, conscientious work.
>> You yourself require money to live. Should we therefore disbelieve
>> everything you say?
>>
>> No, I don't think so. That argument is really reaching.
>>
>>
>>> The science of man made global warming being
>>> a major factor is bullshit, and it is not provable.
>> LOL. The science is hardly bullshit.
>>
>> What scientists are saying is that there is a strong chance that human
>> contributions to greenhouse gases are affecting the climate.
>>
>> This is because we are dumping large and increasing amounts of
>> greenhouse gases into the atmosphere, above and beyond current natural
>> cycles. Gases that then stay in the atmosphere for extended periods,
>> decades or more.
>>
>> Keep in mind that greenhouse gases help regulate temperature on earth by

>
 >> reflecting back infrared radiation. This is a good thing for our
 >> survival but it can be overdone.
 >>
 >> Since only a tiny fraction of the gases in the atmosphere reflect
 >> infrared radiation (nitrogen and oxygen don't), it doesn't take much of
 >
 >> an increase in greenhouse gases to noticeably change the amount of heat
 >
 >> directed back toward the earth.
 >>
 >> There is strong evidence that this is what is happening now, and that
 >> our contributions are part of the problem. Based on what we know so far
 >
 >> there is a strong chance this problem will increase over time.
 >>
 >> Given that information, it's smart to consider the implications now.
 >>
 >>
 >>> Has the earth heated
 >>> up a bit, yes, the earth goes through changes.
 >> True, and true.
 >>
 >> And evidence indicates there's a good chance we're involved in the
 >> current climate change event.
 >>
 >>
 >>> Should we as people stop polluting,
 >>> yes.
 >> We certainly need to be aware of the chemistry around us and how we
 >> interact with it.
 >>
 >> The ozone situation is a good example. Scientists noticed a change in
 >> the ozone layer. A human chemical cause was discovered. Policies were
 >> changed to stop human contributions to the problem.
 >>
 >>
 >>> Should we conserve, yes, I'm a conservative, not a liberal.
 >> Great.
 >>
 >> To conserve what we have we need to take into account any evidence that
 >
 >> shows we may have a problem.
 >>
 >> BTW climate change and conservation are not a partisan issues, in my
 >> view. At the very least, most people don't want to screw up the area
 >> where they live, no matter their politics.
 >>

>>
>>> Am I buying
>>> in to the liberal's sin tax plan their trying to convince the dummies
> to
>>> start paying to save the world, NO WAY!
>> That's fine. But don't confuse any perceived conspiracies with ongoing
>> climate science.
>>
>> You can promote your political views without attacking climate
>> scientists or dismissing scientific conclusions.
>>
>>
>>> I'm I buying in the this trilateralist
>>> plan to shift more money out of the USA, no way!
>> That's fine. But again you can promote your political views without
>> attacking climate scientists or dismissing scientific conclusions.
>>
>>
>>> Back in the 70's, the scientist
>>> that started this global warming stuff, was predicting that we would be
> in
>>> an ice age right now.
>> Who are you talking about?
>>
>>
>>> You can post all of the contrived research you, it won't change the truth.
>>> Choose to believe what you want, man made global warming has not been
> proven.
>> If someone is exploiting scientific data in a partisan way to push a
>> certain point of view you happen to disagree with, then fine, argue with
>
>> them.
>>
>> But don't pretend the data itself doesn't exist. There is a lot of
>> peer-reviewed research out there, and it isn't "contrived."
>>
>> If the only way to "prove" your point is to continue a risky worldwide
>> experiment until we possibly screw up the planet for future generations,
>
>> then your proof is too late to be in any way useful.
>>
>> It's much smarter to look at the decades of evidence we already have and
>
>> make prudent risk management decisions.
>>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> www.JamieKrutz.com

>>
>>
>>
>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>> Wish it were that easy, James. We would be poor stewards of the land
>
>>>> indeed if we carelessly dismissed the evidence to date. It's not
>>>> particularly prudent to ignore increasing evidence that shows possible
>
>>>> problems.
>>>>
>>>> The atmosphere and our use of it to store increasing amounts of unwanted
>>>> greenhouse gases is a big enough subject scientifically without being
>
>>>> sidetracked by political and economic conspiracy theories.
>>>>
>>>> Even if you enjoy discussing perceived conspiracies, be sure you don't
>
>>>> confuse them with the ongoing science.
>>>>
>>>> Cheers,
>>>> -Jamie
>>>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> James McCloskey wrote:
>>>>> What we need is waders and a big shovel to get rid of this load of crap.
>>>>> "BR" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote:
>>>>>> The humanity is facing it's biggest disaster in 100 000 years. Tax
> raises
>>>>>> won't solve anything, it demand a lot more action than that..
>>>>>> BR
>>>>>>
>>>>>> "James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>>>>>> news:47e2cfc2\$1@linux...
>>>>>>> This is what i've been saying. When Al Gore buys global offsets for
>>> ten
>>>>>>> cents
>>>>>>> and sells them for a dollar, it's a big bunch of money making bullshit!
>>>>>>> Now this trilateralist bureaucrat bunch of SOBs are going to try to
>>> make
>>>>>>> it a sin tax that we will all have to pay. You know once the government
>>>>>>> gets a tax passed through they will never repeal it. We will be paying
>>>>> it
>>>>>>> for then on! It's a scare tactic to cow the people in to believing
>>> this
>>>>>>> bunch of bullshit. There is no significant man made global warming,
>>> it's

>>>>>> a lie to shift the wealth out of the United States while these rats
>>> and
>>>>>> their
>>>>>> friends get wealthy doing it.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> "Mr. Simplicity" <noway@jose.net> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>> http://blog.mlive.com/annarbornews/2007/09/dingell_global_warming_may_req.h
>>>>>> tml
>>>>>>> This is the biggest load of disingenuous hubris I've seen in a while.
>>>>>> More
>>>>>>> hypocrisy. Whether you get it or not, your intelligence has just
> been
>>>>>>> insulted and be assured that what this is really all about it preparing
>>>>>>> you
>>>>>>> to be bent over as consumption falls. Expect more of this BS as gas
>>> usage
>>>>>>> goes down and therefore the tax revenue that a gallon of gas generates
>>>> is
>>>>>>> proportionately reduced. To make up for the revenue shortfall, we're
>>>>>> going
>>>>>>> to get taxed into oblivion.....and I was even sorta' thinking
> about
>>>>>>> voting for a Democrat for president. The new formula for the American
>>>>>>> economy is to tax businesses more so that they will continue to go
>>>>>> elsewhere
>>>>>>> while screwing the workers who will be losing their jobs.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Gimme some of that.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>

Subject: Re: OK...here's the plan
Posted by [excelav](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2008 21:24:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

If you repeat something enough times it becomes the truth to some people.
Where is the proof? the European space agency has been photographing the
polar caps from satellites for years, they say the caps are melting, and
then they re freeze and are staying the same over all mass. There is evidence
that proves otherwise.

"BR" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote:

>Look at the facts, use your brains, read the reports. crunch the numbers.
>It's not a left or right thing, it's not a concpiracy. Now is the time for
>intelligent people to step up to the plate. This is the real challenge of
>our generation. The next generations will judge us by this.
>
>Bjorn R
>
>"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>news:47e40fb3@linux...
>>
>> The science is about money. The science of man made global warming being
>> a major factor is bullshit, and it is not provable. Has the earth heated
>> up a bit, yes, the earth goes threw changes. Should we as people stop
>polluting,
>> yes. Should we conserve, yes, I'm a conservative, not a liberal. Am
I
>buying
>> in to the liberal's sin tax plan their trying to convince the dummies
to
>> start paying to save the world, NO WAY! I'm I buying in the this
>trilateralist
>> plan to shift more money out of the USA, no way! Back in the 70's, the
>scientist
>> that started this global warming stuff, was predicting that we would be
in
>> an ice age right now.
>>
>> You can post all of the contrived research you, it won't change the truth.
>> Choose to believe what you want, man made global warming has not been
>proven.
>>
>>
>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>> >
>> >Wish it were that easy, James. We would be poor stewards of the land
>> >indeed if we carelessly dismissed the evidence to date. It's not
>> >particularly prudent to ignore increasing evidence that shows possible
>> >problems.
>> >
>> >The atmosphere and our use of it to store increasing amounts of unwanted
>>
>> >greenhouse gases is a big enough subject scientifically without being
>> >sidetracked by political and economic conspiracy theories.
>> >
>> >Even if you enjoy discussing perceived conspiracies, be sure you don't
>> >confuse them with the ongoing science.
>> >
>> >Cheers,

>> > -Jamie
>> > www.JamieKrutz.com
>> >
>> >
>> >James McCloskey wrote:
>> >> What we need is waders and a big shovel to get rid of this load of
>crap.
>>
>> >>
>> >>
>> >> "BR" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote:
>> >>> The humanity is facing it's biggest disaster in 100 000 years. Tax
>raises
>> >>> won't solve anything, it demand a lot more action than that..
>> >>> BR
>> >>>
>> >>> "James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>> >>> news:47e2cfc2\$1@linux...
>> >>>> This is what i've been saying. When Al Gore buys global offsets
for
>> ten
>> >>> cents
>> >>>> and sells them for a dollar, it's a big bunch of money making
>bullshit!
>> >>>> Now this trilateralist bureaucrat bunch of SOBs are going to try
to
>> make
>> >>>> it a sin tax that we will all have to pay. You know once the
>government
>> >>>> gets a tax passed through they will never repeal it. We will be
>paying
>> >> it
>> >>>> for then on! It's a scare tactic to cow the people in to believing
>> this
>> >>>> bunch of bullshit. There is no significant man made global warming,
>> it's
>> >>>> a lie to shift the wealth out of the United States while these rats
>> and
>> >>> their
>> >>>> friends get wealthy doing it.
>> >>>>
>> >>>>
>> >>>>
>> >>>> "Mr. Simplicity" <noway@jose.net> wrote:
>> >>>>
>> >>>>
> http://blog.mlive.com/annarbornews/2007/09/dingell_global_warming_may_req.h
>> >>>> tml

>> >>>> This is the biggest load of disingenuous hubris I've seen in a
>while.
>> >>> More
>> >>>> hypocrisy. Whether you get it or not, your intelligence has just
>been
>> >>>> insulted and be assured that what this is really all about it
>preparing
>> >>>> you
>> >>>> to be bent over as consumption falls. Expect more of this BS as
>gas
>> usage
>> >>>> goes down and therefore the tax revenue that a gallon of gas
>generates
>> >> is
>> >>>> proportionately reduced. To make up for the revenue shortfall, we're
>> >>> going
>> >>>> to get taxed into oblivion.....and I was even sorta' thinking
>about
>> >>>> voting for a Democrat for president. The new formula for the
>American
>> >>>> economy is to tax businesses more so that they will continue to
>go
>> >>> elsewhere
>> >>>> while screwing the workers who will be losing their jobs.
>> >>>>
>> >>>> Gimme some of that.
>> >>>>
>> >>>>
>> >>>
>> >>
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: OK...here's the plan
Posted by [Miguel Vigil \[1\]](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2008 21:34:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I would have loved this to be a conspiracy, or some politicians agenda. It's not. Nobody benefits from this.

Bjorn R

"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:47e424e1\$1@linux...

>

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

> >
> >Conspiracies are another matter.
> >
> >Back to the science: Evidence shows the strong possibility that humans
> >contributions to greenhouse gases are currently affecting the climate.
> >
> >If you suspect that some groups are trying to exploit this data for
> >nefarious purposes, then fine, take on those groups. Dig into whatever
> >conspiracies you want.
> >
> >But don't pretend that the scientific data doesn't exist. You can
> >promote your political views without attacking climate scientists or
> >dismissing scientific conclusions.
> >
> >Cheers,
> > -Jamie
> > www.JamieKrutz.com
> >
>
> As I've said before, there many scientists that say it is not true. And
> I'll say, look at what is really behind this. People like Al Gore are
profiting
> from this, and hanging on to power.
>
> >
> >
> >James McCloskey wrote:
> >> First, I don't think it is only one party that will be on this taxation
> band
> >> wagon, the bush's are trilateralist also, and others. "a thousand
points
> >> of light" " A new world order" That's trilateral talk.
> >>
> >> Isn't it funny that China, the biggest polluter on the planet is exempt
> from
> >> the law and rules the world gov. is trying to put in place. Why? This
> is
> >> all part of the trilateralist plan to shift the money around. The
world
> >> banks have now set up inside of China.
> >>
> >> They are trying to scare people in to a sin tax. It's about money,
they
> >> want a sin tax to build up the rest of the world. It's about
controlling
> >> the world economically. They want to restrict what america can build
> and
> >> do in the future.

> >>

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

> >>> James McCloskey wrote:

> >>>> The science is about money.

> >>> To an extent everything is about money. But that doesn't stop people

>

> >>> from doing good, conscientious work.

> >>> You yourself require money to live. Should we therefore disbelieve

> >>> everything you say?

> >>>

> >>> No, I don't think so. That argument is really reaching.

> >>>

> >>>

> >>>> The science of man made global warming being

> >>>> a major factor is bullshit, and it is not provable.

> >>> LOL. The science is hardly bullshit.

> >>>

> >>> What scientists are saying is that there is a strong chance that human

>

> >>> contributions to greenhouse gases are affecting the climate.

> >>>

> >>> This is because we are dumping large and increasing amounts of

> >>> greenhouse gases into the atmosphere, above and beyond current natural

>

> >>> cycles. Gases that then stay in the atmosphere for extended periods,

>

> >>> decades or more.

> >>>

> >>> Keep in mind that greenhouse gases help regulate temperature on earth

> by

> >>

> >>> reflecting back infrared radiation. This is a good thing for our

> >>> survival but it can be overdone.

> >>>

> >>> Since only a tiny fraction of the gases in the atmosphere reflect

> >>> infrared radiation (nitrogen and oxygen don't), it doesn't take much

> of

> >>

> >>> an increase in greenhouse gases to noticeably change the amount of

heat

> >>

> >>> directed back toward the earth.

> >>>

> >>> There is strong evidence that this is what is happening now, and that

>

> >>> our contributions are part of the problem. Based on what we know so

far

> >>

> >>> there is a strong chance this problem will increase over time.
> >>>
> >>> Given that information, it's smart to consider the implications now.
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>> Has the earth heated
> >>>> up a bit, yes, the earth goes threw changes.
> >>> True, and true.
> >>>
> >>> And evidence indicates there's a good chance we're involved in the
> >>> current climate change event.
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>> Should we as people stop polluting,
> >>>> yes.
> >>> We certainly need to be aware of the chemistry around us and how we
> >>> interact with it.
> >>>
> >>> The ozone situation is a good example. Scientists noticed a change in
>
> >>> the ozone layer. A human chemical cause was discovered. Policies were
>
> >>> changed to stop human contributions to the problem.
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>> Should we conserve, yes, I'm a conservative, not a liberal.
> >>> Great.
> >>>
> >>> To conserve what we have we need to take into account any evidence
that
> >>
> >>> shows we may have a problem.
> >>>
> >>> BTW climate change and conservation are not a partisan issues, in my
>
> >>> view. At the very least, most people don't want to screw up the area
>
> >>> where they live, no matter their politics.
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>> Am I buying
> >>>> in to the liberal's sin tax plan their trying to convince the dummies
> >> to
> >>>> start paying to save the world, NO WAY!
> >>> That's fine. But don't confuse any perceived conspiracies with ongoing
>
> >>> climate science.
> >>>

> >>> You can promote your political views without attacking climate
> >>> scientists or dismissing scientific conclusions.
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>> I'm I buying in the this trilateralist
> >>>> plan to shift more money out of the USA, no way!
> >>> That's fine. But again you can promote your political views without
> >>> attacking climate scientists or dismissing scientific conclusions.
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>> Back in the 70's, the scientist
> >>>> that started this global warming stuff, was predicting that we would
> be
> >> in
> >>>> an ice age right now.
> >>> Who are you talking about?
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>> You can post all of the contrived research you, it won't change the
> truth.
> >>>> Choose to believe what you want, man made global warming has not
been
> >> proven.
> >>> If someone is exploiting scientific data in a partisan way to push a
>
> >>> certain point of view you happen to disagree with, then fine, argue
with
> >>
> >>> them.
> >>>
> >>> But don't pretend the data itself doesn't exist. There is a lot of
> >>> peer-reviewed research out there, and it isn't "contrived."
> >>>
> >>> If the only way to "prove" your point is to continue a risky worldwide
>
> >>> experiment until we possibly screw up the planet for future
generations,
> >>
> >>> then your proof is too late to be in any way useful.
> >>>
> >>> It's much smarter to look at the decades of evidence we already have
> and
> >>
> >>> make prudent risk management decisions.
> >>>
> >>> Cheers,
> >>> -Jamie
> >>> www.JamieKrutz.com

> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
> >>>>> Wish it were that easy, James. We would be poor stewards of the land
> >>
> >>>>> indeed if we carelessly dismissed the evidence to date. It's not
> >>>>> particularly prudent to ignore increasing evidence that shows
possible
> >>
> >>>>> problems.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> The atmosphere and our use of it to store increasing amounts of
unwanted
> >>>>> greenhouse gases is a big enough subject scientifically without
being
> >>
> >>>>> sidetracked by political and economic conspiracy theories.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> Even if you enjoy discussing perceived conspiracies, be sure you
don't
> >>
> >>>>> confuse them with the ongoing science.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> Cheers,
> >>>>> -Jamie
> >>>>> www.JamieKrutz.com
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>> James McCloskey wrote:
> >>>>>> What we need is waders and a big shovel to get rid of this load of
> crap.
> >>>>>> "BR" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote:
> >>>>>>> The humanity is facing it's biggest disaster in 100 000 years. Tax
> >> raises
> >>>>>>> won't solve anything, it demand a lot more action than that..
> >>>>>>> BR
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>> "James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> >>>>>>> news:47e2cfc2\$1@linux...
> >>>>>>>> This is what i've been saying. When Al Gore buys global offsets
> for
> >>>> ten
> >>>>>>> cents
> >>>>>>>> and sells them for a dollar, it's a big bunch of money making
bullshit!
> >>>>>>>>> Now this trilateralist bureaucrat bunch of SOBs are going to try
> to

> >>>> make
 > >>>>>>> it a sin tax that we will all have to pay. You know once the
 government
 > >>>>>>> gets a tax passed through they will never repeal it. We will be
 > paying
 > >>>>>> it
 > >>>>>>> for then on! It's a scare tactic to cow the people in to
 believing
 > >>>> this
 > >>>>>>> bunch of bullshit. There is no significant man made global
 warming,
 > >>>> it's
 > >>>>>>> a lie to shift the wealth out of the United States while these
 rats
 > >>>> and
 > >>>>>>> their
 > >>>>>>> friends get wealthy doing it.
 > >>>>>>>
 > >>>>>>>
 > >>>>>>>
 > >>>>>>> "Mr. Simplicity" <noway@jose.net> wrote:
 > >>>>>>>
 > >>>>>>>
http://blog.mlive.com/annarbornews/2007/09/dingell_global_warming_may_req.h
 > >>>>>>> tml
 > >>>>>>>> This is the biggest load of disingenuous hubris I've seen in a
 > while.
 > >>>>>>> More
 > >>>>>>>> hypocrisy. Whether you get it or not, your intelligence has just
 > >> been
 > >>>>>>>> insulted and be assured that what this is really all about it
 preparing
 > >>>>>>>> you
 > >>>>>>>> to be bent over as consumption falls. Expect more of this BS as
 > gas
 > >>>> usage
 > >>>>>>>> goes down and therefore the tax revenue that a gallon of gas
 generates
 > >>>>>> is
 > >>>>>>>> proportionately reduced. To make up for the revenue shortfall,
 > we're
 > >>>>>>> going
 > >>>>>>>> to get taxed into oblivion.....and I was even sorta' thinking
 > >> about
 > >>>>>>>> voting for a Democrat for president. The new formula for the
 American
 > >>>>>>>> economy is to tax businesses more so that they will continue to
 > go

> >>>>>> elsewhere
> >>>>>>> while screwing the workers who will be losing their jobs.
> >>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>> Gimme some of that.
> >>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>
> >>
>
>

Subject: Re: OK...here's the plan
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2008 21:42:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Remember where I asked you to put aside Al Gore and Exxon for a moment?
Scientifically they don't matter. Don't get distracted.

The scientific point is this: Evidence exists that shows the strong possibility that humans contributions to greenhouse gases are currently affecting the climate.

If you really care about conservation it would be foolish to ignore decades of data in peer-reviewed scientific journals. It would be extremely limiting to cherrypick a few scientists who disagree (or who you think disagree) and ignore the rest.

At some point you're directly participating in a different conspiracy of sorts, as a member of a group that deliberately ignores evidence and attacks the messengers in the process.

How is that helpful?

It's not.

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKrutz.com

James McCloskey wrote:

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

>> Conspiracies are another matter.

>>

>> Back to the science: Evidence shows the strong possibility that humans

>> contributions to greenhouse gases are currently affecting the climate.

>>

>> If you suspect that some groups are trying to exploit this data for
>> nefarious purposes, then fine, take on those groups. Dig into whatever
>> conspiracies you want.
>>
>> But don't pretend that the scientific data doesn't exist. You can
>> promote your political views without attacking climate scientists or
>> dismissing scientific conclusions.
>>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>>
>
> As I've said before, there many scientists that say it is not true. And
> I'll say, look at what is really behind this. People like Al Gore are profiting
> from this, and hanging on to power.
>
>>
>> James McCloskey wrote:
>>> First, I don't think it is only one party that will be on this taxation
> band
>>> wagon, the bush's are trilateralist also, and others. "a thousand points
>>> of light" " A new world order" That's trilateral talk.
>>>
>>> Isn't it funny that China, the biggest polluter on the planet is exempt
> from
>>> the law and rules the world gov. is trying to put in place. Why? This
> is
>>> all part of the trilateralist plan to shift the money around. The world
>>> banks have now set up inside of China.
>>>
>>> They are trying to scare people in to a sin tax. It's about money, they
>>> want a sin tax to build up the rest of the world. It's about controlling
>>> the world economically. They want to restrict what america can build
> and
>>> do in the future.
>>>
>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>> James McCloskey wrote:
>>>>> The science is about money.
>>>>> To an extent everything is about money. But that doesn't stop people
>
>>>> >from doing good, conscientious work.
>>>>> You yourself require money to live. Should we therefore disbelieve
>>>>> everything you say?
>>>>
>>>>> No, I don't think so. That argument is really reaching.
>>>>>

>>>>
>>>>> The science of man made global warming being
>>>>> a major factor is bullshit, and it is not provable.
>>>> LOL. The science is hardly bullshit.
>>>>
>>>> What scientists are saying is that there is a strong chance that human
>
>>>> contributions to greenhouse gases are affecting the climate.
>>>>
>>>> This is because we are dumping large and increasing amounts of
>>>> greenhouse gases into the atmosphere, above and beyond current natural
>
>>>> cycles. Gases that then stay in the atmosphere for extended periods,
>
>>>> decades or more.
>>>>
>>>> Keep in mind that greenhouse gases help regulate temperature on earth
> by
>>>> reflecting back infrared radiation. This is a good thing for our
>>>> survival but it can be overdone.
>>>>
>>>> Since only a tiny fraction of the gases in the atmosphere reflect
>>>> infrared radiation (nitrogen and oxygen don't), it doesn't take much
> of
>>>> an increase in greenhouse gases to noticeably change the amount of heat
>>>> directed back toward the earth.
>>>>
>>>> There is strong evidence that this is what is happening now, and that
>
>>>> our contributions are part of the problem. Based on what we know so far
>>>> there is a strong chance this problem will increase over time.
>>>>
>>>> Given that information, it's smart to consider the implications now.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> Has the earth heated
>>>>> up a bit, yes, the earth goes threw changes.
>>>> True, and true.
>>>>
>>>> And evidence indicates there's a good chance we're involved in the
>>>> current climate change event.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> Should we as people stop polluting,
>>>>> yes.
>>>> We certainly need to be aware of the chemistry around us and how we
>>>> interact with it.
>>>>

>>>> The ozone situation is a good example. Scientists noticed a change in
>
>>>> the ozone layer. A human chemical cause was discovered. Policies were
>
>>>> changed to stop human contributions to the problem.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> Should we conserve, yes, I'm a conservative, not a liberal.
>>>> Great.
>>>>
>>>> To conserve what we have we need to take into account any evidence that
>>>> shows we may have a problem.
>>>>
>>>> BTW climate change and conservation are not a partisan issues, in my
>
>>>> view. At the very least, most people don't want to screw up the area
>
>>>> where they live, no matter their politics.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> Am I buying
>>>>> in to the liberal's sin tax plan their trying to convince the dummies
>>> to
>>>>> start paying to save the world, NO WAY!
>>>> That's fine. But don't confuse any perceived conspiracies with ongoing
>
>>>> climate science.
>>>>
>>>> You can promote your political views without attacking climate
>>>> scientists or dismissing scientific conclusions.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> I'm I buying in the this trilateralist
>>>>> plan to shift more money out of the USA, no way!
>>>> That's fine. But again you can promote your political views without
>>>> attacking climate scientists or dismissing scientific conclusions.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> Back in the 70's, the scientist
>>>>> that started this global warming stuff, was predicting that we would
> be
>>> in
>>>>> an ice age right now.
>>>> Who are you talking about?
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> You can post all of the contrived research you, it won't change the
> truth.

>>>>> Choose to believe what you want, man made global warming has not been
>>> proven.
>>>> If someone is exploiting scientific data in a partisan way to push a
>
>>>> certain point of view you happen to disagree with, then fine, argue with
>>>> them.
>>>>
>>>> But don't pretend the data itself doesn't exist. There is a lot of
>>>> peer-reviewed research out there, and it isn't "contrived."
>>>>
>>>> If the only way to "prove" your point is to continue a risky worldwide
>
>>>> experiment until we possibly screw up the planet for future generations,
>>>> then your proof is too late to be in any way useful.
>>>>
>>>> It's much smarter to look at the decades of evidence we already have
> and
>>>> make prudent risk management decisions.
>>>>
>>>> Cheers,
>>>> -Jamie
>>>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>> Wish it were that easy, James. We would be poor stewards of the land
>>>>>> indeed if we carelessly dismissed the evidence to date. It's not
>>>>>> particularly prudent to ignore increasing evidence that shows possible
>>>>>> problems.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> The atmosphere and our use of it to store increasing amounts of unwanted
>>>>>> greenhouse gases is a big enough subject scientifically without being
>>>>>> sidetracked by political and economic conspiracy theories.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Even if you enjoy discussing perceived conspiracies, be sure you don't
>>>>>> confuse them with the ongoing science.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> James McCloskey wrote:
>>>>>>> What we need is waders and a big shovel to get rid of this load of
> crap.
>>>>>>> "BR" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>> The humanity is facing it's biggest disaster in 100 000 years. Tax

>>> raises
 >>>>>>> won't solve anything, it demand a lot more action than that..
 >>>>>>> BR
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>> "James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote in message
 >>>>>>> news:47e2cfc2\$1@linux...
 >>>>>>> This is what i've been saying. When Al Gore buys global offsets
 > for
 >>>>> ten
 >>>>>>> cents
 >>>>>>> and sells them for a dollar, it's a big bunch of money making bullshit!
 >>>>>>> Now this trilateralist bureaucrat bunch of SOBs are going to try
 > to
 >>>>> make
 >>>>>>> it a sin tax that we will all have to pay. You know once the government
 >>>>>>> gets a tax passed through they will never repeal it. We will be
 > paying
 >>>>>>> it
 >>>>>>> for then on! It's a scare tactic to cow the people in to believing
 >>>>> this
 >>>>>>> bunch of bullshit. There is no significant man made global warming,
 >>>>> it's
 >>>>>>> a lie to shift the wealth out of the United States while these rats
 >>>>> and
 >>>>>>> their
 >>>>>>> friends get wealthy doing it.
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>> "Mr. Simplicity" <noway@jose.net> wrote:
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>> [http://blog.mlive.com/annarbornews/2007/09/dingell_global_warming_may_req.h](http://blog.mlive.com/annarbornews/2007/09/dingell_global_warming_may_req.html)
 >>>>>>> tml
 >>>>>>>> This is the biggest load of disingenuous hubris I've seen in a
 > while.
 >>>>>>> More
 >>>>>>>> hypocrisy. Whether you get it or not, your intelligence has just
 >>> been
 >>>>>>>> insulted and be assured that what this is really all about it preparing
 >>>>>>>> you
 >>>>>>>> to be bent over as consumption falls. Expect more of this BS as
 > gas
 >>>>> usage
 >>>>>>>> goes down and therefore the tax revenue that a gallon of gas generates
 >>>>>>> is
 >>>>>>>> proportionately reduced. To make up for the revenue shortfall,
 > we're
 >>>>>>>> going

>>>>>>>> to get taxed into oblivion.....and I was even sorta' thinking
>>> about
>>>>>>>> voting for a Democrat for president. The new forumla for the American
>>>>>>>> economy is to tax businesses more so that they will continue to
> go
>>>>>>>> elsewhere
>>>>>>>> while screwing the workers who will be losing their jobs.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Gimme some of that.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>

Subject: Re: OK...here's the plan
Posted by [excelav](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2008 21:54:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

First, I don't think it is only one party that will be on this taxation band wagon, the bush's are trilateralist also, and others. "a thousand points of light" " A new world order" That's trilateral talk.

Isn't it funny that China, the biggest polluter on the planet is exempt from the law and rules the world gov. is trying to put in place. Why? This is all part of the trilateralist plan to shift the money around. The world banks have now set up inside of China.

They are trying to scare people in to a sin tax. It's about money, they want a sin tax to build up the rest of the world. It's about controlling the world economically. They want to restrict what america can build and do in the future.

Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>James McCloskey wrote:

>> The science is about money.

>

>To an extent everything is about money. But that doesn't stop people
>from doing good, conscientious work.

>

>You yourself require money to live. Should we therefore disbelieve
>everything you say?

>

>No, I don't think so. That argument is really reaching.

>

>

> > The science of man made global warming being
>> a major factor is bullshit, and it is not provable.

>

>LOL. The science is hardly bullshit.
>
>What scientists are saying is that there is a strong chance that human
>contributions to greenhouse gases are affecting the climate.
>
>This is because we are dumping large and increasing amounts of
>greenhouse gases into the atmosphere, above and beyond current natural
>cycles. Gases that then stay in the atmosphere for extended periods,
>decades or more.
>
>Keep in mind that greenhouse gases help regulate temperature on earth by

>reflecting back infrared radiation. This is a good thing for our
>survival but it can be overdone.
>
>Since only a tiny fraction of the gases in the atmosphere reflect
>infrared radiation (nitrogen and oxygen don't), it doesn't take much of

>an increase in greenhouse gases to noticeably change the amount of heat

>directed back toward the earth.
>
>There is strong evidence that this is what is happening now, and that
>our contributions are part of the problem. Based on what we know so far

>there is a strong chance this problem will increase over time.
>
>Given that information, it's smart to consider the implications now.
>
>
>> Has the earth heated
>> up a bit, yes, the earth goes threw changes.
>
>True, and true.
>
>And evidence indicates there's a good chance we're involved in the
>current climate change event.
>
>
>> Should we as people stop polluting,
>> yes.
>
>We certainly need to be aware of the chemistry around us and how we
>interact with it.
>
>The ozone situation is a good example. Scientists noticed a change in
>the ozone layer. A human chemical cause was discovered. Policies were
>changed to stop human contributions to the problem.

>
>
>> Should we conserve, yes, I'm a conservative, not a liberal.
>
>Great.
>
>To conserve what we have we need to take into account any evidence that

>shows we may have a problem.
>
>BTW climate change and conservation are not a partisan issues, in my
>view. At the very least, most people don't want to screw up the area
>where they live, no matter their politics.
>
>
>> Am I buying
>> in to the liberal's sin tax plan their trying to convince the dummies
to
>> start paying to save the world, NO WAY!
>
>That's fine. But don't confuse any perceived conspiracies with ongoing
>climate science.
>
>You can promote your political views without attacking climate
>scientists or dismissing scientific conclusions.
>
>
>> I'm I buying in the this trilateralist
>> plan to shift more money out of the USA, no way!
>
>That's fine. But again you can promote your political views without
>attacking climate scientists or dismissing scientific conclusions.
>
>
>> Back in the 70's, the scientist
>> that started this global warming stuff, was predicting that we would be
in
>> an ice age right now.
>
>Who are you talking about?
>
>
>> You can post all of the contrived research you, it won't change the truth.
>> Choose to believe what you want, man made global warming has not been
proven.
>
>If someone is exploiting scientific data in a partisan way to push a
>certain point of view you happen to disagree with, then fine, argue with

>them.
>
>But don't pretend the data itself doesn't exist. There is a lot of
>peer-reviewed research out there, and it isn't "contrived."
>
>If the only way to "prove" your point is to continue a risky worldwide
>experiment until we possibly screw up the planet for future generations,

>then your proof is too late to be in any way useful.
>
>It's much smarter to look at the decades of evidence we already have and

>make prudent risk management decisions.
>
>Cheers,
> -Jamie
> www.JamieKrutz.com
>
>
>
>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>> Wish it were that easy, James. We would be poor stewards of the land

>>> indeed if we carelessly dismissed the evidence to date. It's not
>>> particularly prudent to ignore increasing evidence that shows possible

>>> problems.
>>>
>>> The atmosphere and our use of it to store increasing amounts of unwanted
>>
>>> greenhouse gases is a big enough subject scientifically without being

>>> sidetracked by political and economic conspiracy theories.
>>>
>>> Even if you enjoy discussing perceived conspiracies, be sure you don't

>>> confuse them with the ongoing science.
>>>
>>> Cheers,
>>> -Jamie
>>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>
>>>
>>> James McCloskey wrote:
>>>> What we need is waders and a big shovel to get rid of this load of crap.
>>
>>>>

>>>> "BR" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote:
>>>> The humanity is facing it's biggest disaster in 100 000 years. Tax
raises
>>>> won't solve anything, it demand a lot more action than that..
>>>> BR
>>>>
>>>> "James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>>>> news:47e2cfc2\$1@linux...
>>>>> This is what i've been saying. When Al Gore buys global offsets for
>> ten
>>>>> cents
>>>>> and sells them for a dollar, it's a big bunch of money making bullshit!
>>>>> Now this trilateralist bureaucrat bunch of SOBs are going to try to
>> make
>>>>> it a sin tax that we will all have to pay. You know once the government
>>>>> gets a tax passed through they will never repeal it. We will be paying
>>>> it
>>>>> for then on! It's a scare tactic to cow the people in to believing
>> this
>>>>> bunch of bullshit. There is no significant man made global warming,
>> it's
>>>>> a lie to shift the wealth out of the United States while these rats
>> and
>>>>> their
>>>>> friends get wealthy doing it.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> "Mr. Simplicity" <noway@jose.net> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>> [http://blog.mlive.com/annarbornews/2007/09/dingell_global_warming_may_req.h](http://blog.mlive.com/annarbornews/2007/09/dingell_global_warming_may_req.html)
>>>>> tml
>>>>>> This is the biggest load of disingenuous hubris I've seen in a while.
>>>>> More
>>>>>> hypocrisy. Whether you get it or not, your intelligence has just
been
>>>>>> insulted and be assured that what this is really all about it preparing
>>>>> you
>>>>>> to be bent over as consumption falls. Expect more of this BS as gas
>> usage
>>>>>> goes down and therefore the tax revenue that a gallon of gas generates
>>>> is
>>>>>> proportionately reduced. To make up for the revenue shortfall, we're
>>>>> going
>>>>>> to get taxed into oblivion.....and I was even sorta' thinking
about
>>>>>> voting for a Democrat for president. The new formula for the American
>>>>>> economy is to tax businesses more so that they will continue to go

>>>>> elsewhere
>>>>>> while screwing the workers who will be losing their jobs.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Gimme some of that.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>

Subject: Re: OK...here's the plan
Posted by [excelav](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2008 21:56:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

There has always been global disasters.

"BR" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote:

>If the global temperature raises with more than 2 degrees celcius, we'll
>have a global disaster. It's no chance that we are going to avoid that.
So
>beware, the africans, the south asians and the south americans are coming
to
>knock on our door, and they are hungry, they are thirsty, and they are many.
>And that's just the beginning. This thing is out of control.

>
>Bjorn R
>

>"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:47e41af0@linux...

>> James McCloskey wrote:

>> > The science is about money.

>>

>> To an extent everything is about money. But that doesn't stop people
>> from doing good, conscientious work.

>>

>> You yourself require money to live. Should we therefore disbelieve
>> everything you say?

>>

>> No, I don't think so. That argument is really reaching.

>>

>>

>> > The science of man made global warming being
>> > a major factor is bullshit, and it is not provable.

>>

>> LOL. The science is hardly bullshit.

>>

>> What scientists are saying is that there is a strong chance that human
>> contributions to greenhouse gases are affecting the climate.

>>

>> This is because we are dumping large and increasing amounts of

>> greenhouse gases into the atmosphere, above and beyond current natural
>> cycles. Gases that then stay in the atmosphere for extended periods,
>> decades or more.
>>
>> Keep in mind that greenhouse gases help regulate temperature on earth
by
>> reflecting back infrared radiation. This is a good thing for our
>> survival but it can be overdone.
>>
>> Since only a tiny fraction of the gases in the atmosphere reflect
>> infrared radiation (nitrogen and oxygen don't), it doesn't take much of
>> an increase in greenhouse gases to noticeably change the amount of heat
>> directed back toward the earth.
>>
>> There is strong evidence that this is what is happening now, and that
>> our contributions are part of the problem. Based on what we know so far
>> there is a strong chance this problem will increase over time.
>>
>> Given that information, it's smart to consider the implications now.
>>
>>
>> > Has the earth heated
>> > up a bit, yes, the earth goes threw changes.
>>
>> True, and true.
>>
>> And evidence indicates there's a good chance we're involved in the
>> current climate change event.
>>
>>
>> > Should we as people stop polluting,
>> > yes.
>>
>> We certainly need to be aware of the chemistry around us and how we
>> interact with it.
>>
>> The ozone situation is a good example. Scientists noticed a change in
>> the ozone layer. A human chemical cause was discovered. Policies were
>> changed to stop human contributions to the problem.
>>
>>
>> > Should we conserve, yes, I'm a conservative, not a liberal.
>>
>> Great.
>>
>> To conserve what we have we need to take into account any evidence that
>> shows we may have a problem.
>>

>> BTW climate change and conservation are not a partisan issues, in my
>> view. At the very least, most people don't want to screw up the area
>> where they live, no matter their politics.
>>
>>
>> > Am I buying
>> > in to the liberal's sin tax plan their trying to convince the dummies
to
>> > start paying to save the world, NO WAY!
>>
>> That's fine. But don't confuse any perceived conspiracies with ongoing
>> climate science.
>>
>> You can promote your political views without attacking climate
>> scientists or dismissing scientific conclusions.
>>
>>
>> > I'm I buying in the this trilateralist
>> > plan to shift more money out of the USA, no way!
>>
>> That's fine. But again you can promote your political views without
>> attacking climate scientists or dismissing scientific conclusions.
>>
>>
>> > Back in the 70's, the scientist
>> > that started this global warming stuff, was predicting that we would
be
>in
>> > an ice age right now.
>>
>> Who are you talking about?
>>
>>
>> > You can post all of the contrived research you, it won't change the
>truth.
>> > Choose to believe what you want, man made global warming has not been
>proven.
>>
>> If someone is exploiting scientific data in a partisan way to push a
>> certain point of view you happen to disagree with, then fine, argue with
>> them.
>>
>> But don't pretend the data itself doesn't exist. There is a lot of
>> peer-reviewed research out there, and it isn't "contrived."
>>
>> If the only way to "prove" your point is to continue a risky worldwide
>> experiment until we possibly screw up the planet for future generations,
>> then your proof is too late to be in any way useful.

>>
>> It's much smarter to look at the decades of evidence we already have and
>> make prudent risk management decisions.
>>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>>
>>
>>
>> > Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>> >> Wish it were that easy, James. We would be poor stewards of the land
>> >> indeed if we carelessly dismissed the evidence to date. It's not
>> >> particularly prudent to ignore increasing evidence that shows possible
>> >> problems.
>> >>
>> >> The atmosphere and our use of it to store increasing amounts of
>unwanted
>> >
>> >> greenhouse gases is a big enough subject scientifically without being
>> >> sidetracked by political and economic conspiracy theories.
>> >>
>> >> Even if you enjoy discussing perceived conspiracies, be sure you don't
>> >> confuse them with the ongoing science.
>> >>
>> >> Cheers,
>> >> -Jamie
>> >> www.JamieKrutz.com
>> >>
>> >>
>> >> James McCloskey wrote:
>> >>> What we need is waders and a big shovel to get rid of this load of
>crap.
>> >
>> >>>
>> >>> "BR" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote:
>> >>>> The humanity is facing it's biggest disaster in 100 000 years. Tax
>raises
>> >>>> won't solve anything, it demand a lot more action than that..
>> >>>> BR
>> >>>>
>> >>>> "James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>> >>>> news:47e2cfc2\$1@linux...
>> >>>>> This is what i've been saying. When Al Gore buys global offsets
for
>> > ten
>> >>>> cents
>> >>>>> and sells them for a dollar, it's a big bunch of money making

>bullshit!

>> >>>> Now this trilateralist bureaucrat bunch of SOBs are going to try to

>> > make

>> >>>> it a sin tax that we will all have to pay. You know once the

>government

>> >>>> gets a tax passed through they will never repeal it. We will be

>paying

>> >>> it

>> >>>> for then on! It's a scare tactic to cow the people in to believing

>> > this

>> >>>> bunch of bullshit. There is no significant man made global warming,

>> > it's

>> >>>> a lie to shift the wealth out of the United States while these rats

>> > and

>> >>>> their

>> >>>> friends get wealthy doing it.

>> >>>>

>> >>>>

>> >>>>

>> >>>> "Mr. Simplicity" <noway@jose.net> wrote:

>> >>>>

>> >>>>

> http://blog.mlive.com/annarbornews/2007/09/dingell_global_warming_may_req.h

>> >>>> tml

>> >>>>> This is the biggest load of disingenuous hubris I've seen in a

>while.

>> >>>> More

>> >>>>> hypocrisy. Whether you get it or not, your intelligence has just

>been

>> >>>>> insulted and be assured that what this is really all about it

>preparing

>> >>>>> you

>> >>>>> to be bent over as consumption falls. Expect more of this BS as

gas

>> > usage

>> >>>>> goes down and therefore the tax revenue that a gallon of gas

>generates

>> >>> is

>> >>>>> proportionately reduced. To make up for the revenue shortfall,

>we're

>> >>>> going

>> >>>>> to get taxed into oblivion.....and I was even sorta' thinking

>about

>> >>>>> voting for a Democrat for president. The new formula for the

>American

>> >>>>> economy is to tax businesses more so that they will continue to

go

>> >>>> elsewhere
>> >>>>> while screwing the workers who will be losing their jobs.
>> >>>>>>
>> >>>>>> Gimme some of that.
>> >>>>>>
>> >>>>>>
>> >
>
>

Subject: Re: OK...here's the plan
Posted by [excelav](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2008 22:13:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>
>Conspiracies are another matter.
>
>Back to the science: Evidence shows the strong possibility that humans
>contributions to greenhouse gases are currently affecting the climate.
>
>If you suspect that some groups are trying to exploit this data for
>nefarious purposes, then fine, take on those groups. Dig into whatever
>conspiracies you want.
>
>But don't pretend that the scientific data doesn't exist. You can
>promote your political views without attacking climate scientists or
>dismissing scientific conclusions.
>
>Cheers,
> -Jamie
> www.JamieKrutz.com
>

As I've said before, there many scientists that say it is not true. And
I'll say, look at what is really behind this. People like Al Gore are profiting
from this, and hanging on to power.

>
>
>James McCloskey wrote:
>> First, I don't think it is only one party that will be on this taxation
band
>> wagon, the bush's are trilateralist also, and others. "a thousand points
>> of light" " A new world order" That's trilateral talk.
>>
>> Isn't it funny that China, the biggest polluter on the planet is exempt

from

>> the law and rules the world gov. is trying to put in place. Why? This is

>> all part of the trilateralist plan to shift the money around. The world
>> banks have now set up inside of China.

>>

>> They are trying to scare people in to a sin tax. It's about money, they
>> want a sin tax to build up the rest of the world. It's about controlling
>> the world economically. They want to restrict what america can build
and

>> do in the future.

>>

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

>>> James McCloskey wrote:

>>>> The science is about money.

>>>> To an extent everything is about money. But that doesn't stop people

>>>>from doing good, conscientious work.

>>>> You yourself require money to live. Should we therefore disbelieve
>>>> everything you say?

>>>>

>>>> No, I don't think so. That argument is really reaching.

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>> The science of man made global warming being
>>>>> a major factor is bullshit, and it is not provable.

>>> LOL. The science is hardly bullshit.

>>>>

>>>> What scientists are saying is that there is a strong chance that human

>>>> contributions to greenhouse gases are affecting the climate.

>>>>

>>>> This is because we are dumping large and increasing amounts of
>>>> greenhouse gases into the atmosphere, above and beyond current natural

>>>> cycles. Gases that then stay in the atmosphere for extended periods,

>>>> decades or more.

>>>>

>>>> Keep in mind that greenhouse gases help regulate temperature on earth
by

>>>>

>>>> reflecting back infrared radiation. This is a good thing for our
>>>> survival but it can be overdone.

>>>>

>>>> Since only a tiny fraction of the gases in the atmosphere reflect
>>>> infrared radiation (nitrogen and oxygen don't), it doesn't take much
of

>>
>>> an increase in greenhouse gases to noticeably change the amount of heat
>>
>>> directed back toward the earth.
>>>
>>> There is strong evidence that this is what is happening now, and that

>>> our contributions are part of the problem. Based on what we know so far
>>
>>> there is a strong chance this problem will increase over time.
>>>
>>> Given that information, it's smart to consider the implications now.
>>>
>>>
>>>> Has the earth heated
>>>> up a bit, yes, the earth goes threw changes.
>>> True, and true.
>>>
>>> And evidence indicates there's a good chance we're involved in the
>>> current climate change event.
>>>
>>>
>>>> Should we as people stop polluting,
>>>> yes.
>>> We certainly need to be aware of the chemistry around us and how we
>>> interact with it.
>>>
>>> The ozone situation is a good example. Scientists noticed a change in

>>> the ozone layer. A human chemical cause was discovered. Policies were

>>> changed to stop human contributions to the problem.
>>>
>>>
>>>> Should we conserve, yes, I'm a conservative, not a liberal.
>>> Great.
>>>
>>> To conserve what we have we need to take into account any evidence that
>>
>>> shows we may have a problem.
>>>
>>> BTW climate change and conservation are not a partisan issues, in my

>>> view. At the very least, most people don't want to screw up the area

>>> where they live, no matter their politics.
>>>
>>>

>>>> Am I buying
 >>>> in to the liberal's sin tax plan their trying to convince the dummies
 >> to
 >>>> start paying to save the world, NO WAY!
 >>> That's fine. But don't confuse any perceived conspiracies with ongoing

 >>> climate science.
 >>>
 >>> You can promote your political views without attacking climate
 >>> scientists or dismissing scientific conclusions.
 >>>
 >>>> I'm I buying in the this trilateralist
 >>>> plan to shift more money out of the USA, no way!
 >>> That's fine. But again you can promote your political views without
 >>> attacking climate scientists or dismissing scientific conclusions.
 >>>
 >>>> Back in the 70's, the scientist
 >>>> that started this global warming stuff, was predicting that we would
 be
 >> in
 >>>> an ice age right now.
 >>> Who are you talking about?
 >>>
 >>>> You can post all of the contrived research you, it won't change the
 truth.
 >>>> Choose to believe what you want, man made global warming has not been
 >> proven.
 >>> If someone is exploiting scientific data in a partisan way to push a

 >>> certain point of view you happen to disagree with, then fine, argue with
 >>
 >>> them.
 >>>
 >>>> But don't pretend the data itself doesn't exist. There is a lot of
 >>> peer-reviewed research out there, and it isn't "contrived."
 >>>
 >>>> If the only way to "prove" your point is to continue a risky worldwide

 >>> experiment until we possibly screw up the planet for future generations,
 >>
 >>>> then your proof is too late to be in any way useful.
 >>>
 >>>> It's much smarter to look at the decades of evidence we already have
 and
 >>

>>> make prudent risk management decisions.
>>>
>>> Cheers,
>>> -Jamie
>>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>> Wish it were that easy, James. We would be poor stewards of the land
>>
>>>>> indeed if we carelessly dismissed the evidence to date. It's not
>>>>> particularly prudent to ignore increasing evidence that shows possible
>>
>>>>> problems.
>>>>>
>>>>> The atmosphere and our use of it to store increasing amounts of unwanted
>>>>> greenhouse gases is a big enough subject scientifically without being
>>
>>>>> sidetracked by political and economic conspiracy theories.
>>>>>
>>>>> Even if you enjoy discussing perceived conspiracies, be sure you don't
>>
>>>>> confuse them with the ongoing science.
>>>>>
>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> James McCloskey wrote:
>>>>>> What we need is waders and a big shovel to get rid of this load of
crap.
>>>>>> "BR" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote:
>>>>>>> The humanity is facing it's biggest disaster in 100 000 years. Tax
>> raises
>>>>>>> won't solve anything, it demand a lot more action than that..
>>>>>>> BR
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> "James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>>>>>>> news:47e2cfc2\$1@linux...
>>>>>>>> This is what i've been saying. When Al Gore buys global offsets
for
>>>> ten
>>>>>>> cents
>>>>>>>> and sells them for a dollar, it's a big bunch of money making bullshit!
>>>>>>>>> Now this trilateralist bureaucrat bunch of SOBs are going to try
to

>>>> make
>>>>>>> it a sin tax that we will all have to pay. You know once the government
>>>>>>> gets a tax passed through they will never repeal it. We will be
paying
>>>>>>> it
>>>>>>> for then on! It's a scare tactic to cow the people in to believing
>>>> this
>>>>>>> bunch of bullshit. There is no significant man made global warming,
>>>> it's
>>>>>>> a lie to shift the wealth out of the United States while these rats
>>>> and
>>>>>>> their
>>>>>>> friends get wealthy doing it.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> "Mr. Simplicity" <noway@jose.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> [http://blog.mlive.com/annarbornews/2007/09/dingell_global_warming_may_req.h](http://blog.mlive.com/annarbornews/2007/09/dingell_global_warming_may_req.html)
>>>>>>> tml
>>>>>>>> This is the biggest load of disingenuous hubris I've seen in a
while.
>>>>>>> More
>>>>>>>> hypocrisy. Whether you get it or not, your intelligence has just
>> been
>>>>>>>> insulted and be assured that what this is really all about it preparing
>>>>>>>> you
>>>>>>>> to be bent over as consumption falls. Expect more of this BS as
gas
>>>> usage
>>>>>>>> goes down and therefore the tax revenue that a gallon of gas generates
>>>>>>> is
>>>>>>>> proportionately reduced. To make up for the revenue shortfall,
we're
>>>>>>> going
>>>>>>>> to get taxed into oblivion.....and I was even sorta' thinking
>> about
>>>>>>>> voting for a Democrat for president. The new formula for the American
>>>>>>>> economy is to tax businesses more so that they will continue to
go
>>>>>>> elsewhere
>>>>>>>> while screwing the workers who will be losing their jobs.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Gimme some of that.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>

Subject: Re: OK...here's the plan

Posted by [Miguel Vigil \[1\]](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2008 22:14:12 GMT

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

I don't think we're going to convince James, but it's a lot of other thinking members of this group. I hope some of them take the message, it's not about left or right, it's about doing the right thing. This group know about science (recorded music is mainly about physics and technology, right?), and the world need that kind of people right now, to cut the crap and focus on the facts given us by the scientists, and the facts tells us that we are facing rough times, even in our lifetime. So, as I said, step up to the plate, this is not religion, this is facts. This is not the end of the world, this is not the end of humanity, but this may be the end of our civilisation. In other words: no nurcery homes for you , no healthcare for your children, no law, no order ...

Bjorn R

"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:47e42e99@linux...

>

> Remember where I asked you to put aside Al Gore and Exxon for a moment?

> Scientifically they don't matter. Don't get distracted.

>

> The scientific point is this: Evidence exists that shows the strong

> possibility that humans contributions to greenhouse gases are currently

> affecting the climate.

>

> If you really care about conservation it would be foolish to ignore

> decades of data in peer-reviewed scientific journals. It would be

> extremely limiting to cherrypick a few scientists who disagree (or who

> you think disagree) and ignore the rest.

>

> At some point you're directly participating in a different conspiracy of

> sorts, as a member of a group that deliberately ignores evidence and

> attacks the messengers in the process.

>

> How is that helpful?

>

> It's not.

>

> Cheers,

> -Jamie

> www.JamieKrutz.com

>

>

>

> James McCloskey wrote:

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

> >> Conspiracies are another matter.

> >>

> >> Back to the science: Evidence shows the strong possibility that humans
> >> contributions to greenhouse gases are currently affecting the climate.
> >>

> >> If you suspect that some groups are trying to exploit this data for
> >> nefarious purposes, then fine, take on those groups. Dig into whatever
> >> conspiracies you want.
> >>

> >> But don't pretend that the scientific data doesn't exist. You can
> >> promote your political views without attacking climate scientists or
> >> dismissing scientific conclusions.
> >>

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

> >

> > As I've said before, there many scientists that say it is not true. And
> > I'll say, look at what is really behind this. People like Al Gore are
profiting
> > from this, and hanging on to power.
> >

> >>

> >> James McCloskey wrote:
> >>> First, I don't think it is only one party that will be on this
taxation
> > band
> >>> wagon, the bush's are trilateralist also, and others. "a thousand
points
> >>> of light" " A new world order" That's trilateral talk.
> >>>

> >>> Isn't it funny that China, the biggest polluter on the planet is
exempt
> > from
> >>> the law and rules the world gov. is trying to put in place. Why?
This
> > is
> >>> all part of the trilateralist plan to shift the money around. The
world
> >>> banks have now set up inside of China.
> >>>

> >>> They are trying to scare people in to a sin tax. It's about money,
they
> >>> want a sin tax to build up the rest of the world. It's about
controlling
> >>> the world economically. They want to restrict what america can build
> > and
> >>> do in the future.

> >>>

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

> >>> James McCloskey wrote:

> >>>> The science is about money.

> >>>> To an extent everything is about money. But that doesn't stop people

> >

> >>> >from doing good, conscientious work.

> >>> You yourself require money to live. Should we therefore disbelieve

> >>> everything you say?

> > > > >

> >>> No, I don't think so. That argument is really reaching.

> > > > >

> > > > >

> >>>> The science of man made global warming being

> >>>> a major factor is bullshit, and it is not provable.

> >>>> LOL. The science is hardly bullshit.

> > > > >

> >>> What scientists are saying is that there is a strong chance that

human

>>

> >>> contributions to greenhouse gases are affecting the climate.

> > > > >

> >>> This is because we are dumping large and increasing amounts of

> >>> greenhouse gases into the atmosphere, above and beyond current

natural

 $\geq \geq$

> >>> cycles. Gases that then stay in the atmosphere for extended periods,

 $\gg$

> >>> decades or more.

> > > > >

> >>> Keep in mind that greenhouse gases help regulate temperature on earth

> > by

> >>> reflecting back infrared radiation. This is a good thing for our

> >>>> survival but it can be overdone.

> >>>>

> >>> Since only a tiny fraction of the gases in the atmosphere reflect

> >>> infrared radiation (nitrogen and oxygen don't), it doesn't take much

> > of

> >>> an increase in greenhouse gases to noticeably change the amount of heat

> >>>> directed back toward the earth.

> >>>>

> >>> There is strong evidence that this is what is happening now, and that

 $\gg$

> >>> our contributions are part of the problem. Based on what we know so far

> >>> there is a strong chance this problem will increase over time.

> > > > >

> >>>> Given that information, it's smart to consider the implications now.
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>> Has the earth heated
> >>>> up a bit, yes, the earth goes threw changes.
> >>>> True, and true.
> >>>>
> >>>> And evidence indicates there's a good chance we're involved in the
> >>>> current climate change event.
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>> Should we as people stop polluting,
> >>>> yes.
> >>>> We certainly need to be aware of the chemistry around us and how we
> >>>> interact with it.
> >>>>
> >>>> The ozone situation is a good example. Scientists noticed a change in
> >
> >>>> the ozone layer. A human chemical cause was discovered. Policies were
> >
> >>>> changed to stop human contributions to the problem.
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>> Should we conserve, yes, I'm a conservative, not a liberal.
> >>>> Great.
> >>>>
> >>>> To conserve what we have we need to take into account any evidence
that
> >>>> shows we may have a problem.
> >>>>
> >>>> BTW climate change and conservation are not a partisan issues, in my
> >
> >>>> view. At the very least, most people don't want to screw up the area
> >
> >>>> where they live, no matter their politics.
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>> Am I buying
> >>>>> in to the liberal's sin tax plan their trying to convince the
dummies
> >>> to
> >>>>> start paying to save the world, NO WAY!
> >>>> That's fine. But don't confuse any perceived conspiracies with
ongoing
> >
> >>>> climate science.
> >>>>
> >>>> You can promote your political views without attacking climate

> >>>> scientists or dismissing scientific conclusions.
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>> I'm I buying in the this trilateralist
> >>>>> plan to shift more money out of the USA, no way!
> >>>> That's fine. But again you can promote your political views without
> >>>> attacking climate scientists or dismissing scientific conclusions.
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>> Back in the 70's, the scientist
> >>>>> that started this global warming stuff, was predicting that we would
> > be
> >>> in
> >>>>> an ice age right now.
> >>>> Who are you talking about?
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>> You can post all of the contrived research you, it won't change the
> > truth.
> >>>>> Choose to believe what you want, man made global warming has not
been
> >>>> proven.
> >>>> If someone is exploiting scientific data in a partisan way to push a
> >
> >>>>> certain point of view you happen to disagree with, then fine, argue
with
> >>>>> them.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> But don't pretend the data itself doesn't exist. There is a lot of
> >>>>> peer-reviewed research out there, and it isn't "contrived."
> >>>>>
> >>>>> If the only way to "prove" your point is to continue a risky
worldwide
> >
> >>>>> experiment until we possibly screw up the planet for future
generations,
> >>>>> then your proof is too late to be in any way useful.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> It's much smarter to look at the decades of evidence we already have
> > and
> >>>>> make prudent risk management decisions.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> Cheers,
> >>>>> -Jamie
> >>>>> www.JamieKrutz.com
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>

> >>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
> >>>>> Wish it were that easy, James. We would be poor stewards of the
land
> >>>>> indeed if we carelessly dismissed the evidence to date. It's not
> >>>>> particularly prudent to ignore increasing evidence that shows
possible
> >>>>> problems.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> The atmosphere and our use of it to store increasing amounts of
unwanted
> >>>>> greenhouse gases is a big enough subject scientifically without
being
> >>>>> sidetracked by political and economic conspiracy theories.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> Even if you enjoy discussing perceived conspiracies, be sure you
don't
> >>>>> confuse them with the ongoing science.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> Cheers,
> >>>>> -Jamie
> >>>>> www.JamieKrutz.com
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>> James McCloskey wrote:
> >>>>>> What we need is waders and a big shovel to get rid of this load of
> > crap.
> >>>>>> "BR" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote:
> >>>>>>> The humanity is facing it's biggest disaster in 100 000 years.
Tax
> >>> raises
> >>>>>>> won't solve anything, it demand a lot more action than that..
> >>>>>>> BR
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>> "James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> >>>>>>> news:47e2cfc2\$1@linux...
> >>>>>>>> This is what i've been saying. When Al Gore buys global offsets
> > for
> >>>>> ten
> >>>>>>>> cents
> >>>>>>>>> and sells them for a dollar, it's a big bunch of money making
bullshit!
> >>>>>>>>> Now this trilateralist bureaucrat bunch of SOBs are going to try
> > to
> >>>>> make
> >>>>>>>>> it a sin tax that we will all have to pay. You know once the
government
> >>>>>>>>> gets a tax passed through they will never repeal it. We will be
> > paying

> >>>>>> it
 > >>>>>>> for then on! It's a scare tactic to cow the people in to
 believing
 > >>>> this
 > >>>>>>> bunch of bullshit. There is no significant man made global
 warming,
 > >>>> it's
 > >>>>>>> a lie to shift the wealth out of the United States while these
 rats
 > >>>> and
 > >>>>>>> their
 > >>>>>>> friends get wealthy doing it.
 > >>>>>>>
 > >>>>>>>
 > >>>>>>>
 > >>>>>>> "Mr. Simplicity" <noway@jose.net> wrote:
 > >>>>>>>
 > >>>>>>>
 > http://blog.mlive.com/annarbornews/2007/09/dingell_global_warming_may_req.h
 > >>>>>>> tml
 > >>>>>>>> This is the biggest load of disingenuous hubris I've seen in a
 > > while.
 > >>>>>>> More
 > >>>>>>>> hypocrisy. Whether you get it or not, your intelligence has
 just
 > >>> been
 > >>>>>>>> insulted and be assured that what this is really all about it
 preparing
 > >>>>>>>> you
 > >>>>>>>> to be bent over as consumption falls. Expect more of this BS as
 > > gas
 > >>>> usage
 > >>>>>>>> goes down and therefore the tax revenue that a gallon of gas
 generates
 > >>>>>> is
 > >>>>>>>> proportionately reduced. To make up for the revenue shortfall,
 > > we're
 > >>>>>>> going
 > >>>>>>>> to get taxed into oblivion.....and I was even sorta'
 thinking
 > >>> about
 > >>>>>>>> voting for a Democrat for president. The new formula for the
 American
 > >>>>>>>> economy is to tax businesses more so that they will continue to
 > > go
 > >>>>>>> elsewhere
 > >>>>>>>> while screwing the workers who will be losing their jobs.
 > >>>>>>>>

> >>>>>>>>> Gimme some of that.
> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>
> >

Subject: Re: OK...here's the plan
Posted by [rick](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2008 23:47:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

but if we can for the first time be a part a mitigating it's efx.
then why the hell not try.

On 22 Mar 2008 07:56:11 +1000, "James McCloskey"
<excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:

>
>There has always been global disasters.
>
>"BR" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote:
>>If the global temperature raises with more than 2 degrees celcius, we'll
>>have a global disaster. It's no chance that we are going to avoid that.
>So
>>beware, the africans, the south asians and the south americans are coming
>to
>>knock on our door, and they are hungry, they are thirsty, and they are many.
>>And that's just the beginning. This thing is out of control.
>>
>>Bjorn R
>>
>>"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:47e41af0@linux...
>>> James McCloskey wrote:
>>> > The science is about money.
>>>
>>> To an extent everything is about money. But that doesn't stop people
>>> from doing good, conscientious work.
>>>
>>> You yourself require money to live. Should we therefore disbelieve
>>> everything you say?
>>>
>>> No, I don't think so. That argument is really reaching.
>>>
>>>
>>> > The science of man made global warming being
>>> > a major factor is bullshit, and it is not provable.
>>>

>>> LOL. The science is hardly bullshit.
>>>
>>> What scientists are saying is that there is a strong chance that human
>>> contributions to greenhouse gases are affecting the climate.
>>>
>>> This is because we are dumping large and increasing amounts of
>>> greenhouse gases into the atmosphere, above and beyond current natural
>>> cycles. Gases that then stay in the atmosphere for extended periods,
>>> decades or more.
>>>
>>> Keep in mind that greenhouse gases help regulate temperature on earth
>by
>>> reflecting back infrared radiation. This is a good thing for our
>>> survival but it can be overdone.
>>>
>>> Since only a tiny fraction of the gases in the atmosphere reflect
>>> infrared radiation (nitrogen and oxygen don't), it doesn't take much of
>>> an increase in greenhouse gases to noticeably change the amount of heat
>>> directed back toward the earth.
>>>
>>> There is strong evidence that this is what is happening now, and that
>>> our contributions are part of the problem. Based on what we know so far
>>> there is a strong chance this problem will increase over time.
>>>
>>> Given that information, it's smart to consider the implications now.
>>>
>>>
>>> > Has the earth heated
>>> > up a bit, yes, the earth goes threw changes.
>>>
>>> True, and true.
>>>
>>> And evidence indicates there's a good chance we're involved in the
>>> current climate change event.
>>>
>>>
>>> > Should we as people stop polluting,
>>> > yes.
>>>
>>> We certainly need to be aware of the chemistry around us and how we
>>> interact with it.
>>>
>>> The ozone situation is a good example. Scientists noticed a change in
>>> the ozone layer. A human chemical cause was discovered. Policies were
>>> changed to stop human contributions to the problem.
>>>
>>>
>>> > Should we conserve, yes, I'm a conservative, not a liberal.

>>>
>>> Great.
>>>
>>> To conserve what we have we need to take into account any evidence that
>>> shows we may have a problem.
>>>
>>> BTW climate change and conservation are not a partisan issues, in my
>>> view. At the very least, most people don't want to screw up the area
>>> where they live, no matter their politics.
>>>
>>>
>>> > Am I buying
>>> > in to the liberal's sin tax plan their trying to convince the dummies
>to
>>> > start paying to save the world, NO WAY!
>>>
>>> That's fine. But don't confuse any perceived conspiracies with ongoing
>>> climate science.
>>>
>>> You can promote your political views without attacking climate
>>> scientists or dismissing scientific conclusions.
>>>
>>>
>>> > I'm I buying in the this trilateralist
>>> > plan to shift more money out of the USA, no way!
>>>
>>> That's fine. But again you can promote your political views without
>>> attacking climate scientists or dismissing scientific conclusions.
>>>
>>>
>>> > Back in the 70's, the scientist
>>> > that started this global warming stuff, was predicting that we would
>be
>>in
>>> > an ice age right now.
>>>
>>> Who are you talking about?
>>>
>>>
>>> > You can post all of the contrived research you, it won't change the
>>truth.
>>> > Choose to believe what you want, man made global warming has not been
>>proven.
>>>
>>> If someone is exploiting scientific data in a partisan way to push a
>>> certain point of view you happen to disagree with, then fine, argue with
>>> them.
>>>

>>> But don't pretend the data itself doesn't exist. There is a lot of
>>> peer-reviewed research out there, and it isn't "contrived."
>>>
>>> If the only way to "prove" your point is to continue a risky worldwide
>>> experiment until we possibly screw up the planet for future generations,
>>> then your proof is too late to be in any way useful.
>>>
>>> It's much smarter to look at the decades of evidence we already have and
>>> make prudent risk management decisions.
>>>
>>> Cheers,
>>> -Jamie
>>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> > Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>> >> Wish it were that easy, James. We would be poor stewards of the land
>>> >> indeed if we carelessly dismissed the evidence to date. It's not
>>> >> particularly prudent to ignore increasing evidence that shows possible
>>> >> problems.
>>> >>
>>> >> The atmosphere and our use of it to store increasing amounts of
>>unwanted
>>> >
>>> >> greenhouse gases is a big enough subject scientifically without being
>>> >> sidetracked by political and economic conspiracy theories.
>>> >>
>>> >> Even if you enjoy discussing perceived conspiracies, be sure you don't
>>> >> confuse them with the ongoing science.
>>> >>
>>> >> Cheers,
>>> >> -Jamie
>>> >> www.JamieKrutz.com
>>> >>
>>> >>
>>> >> James McCloskey wrote:
>>> >>> What we need is waders and a big shovel to get rid of this load of
>>crap.
>>> >
>>> >>>
>>> >>> "BR" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote:
>>> >>>> The humanity is facing it's biggest disaster in 100 000 years. Tax
>>raises
>>> >>>> won't solve anything, it demand a lot more action than that..
>>> >>>> BR
>>> >>>>
>>> >>>> "James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote in message

```

>>> >>>> news:47e2cfc2$1@linux...
>>> >>>>> This is what i've been saying. When Al Gore buys global offsets
>for
>>> > ten
>>> >>>> cents
>>> >>>>> and sells them for a dollar, it's a big bunch of money making
>>bullshit!
>>> >>>>> Now this trilateralist bureaucrat bunch of SOBs are going to try
>to
>>> > make
>>> >>>>> it a sin tax that we will all have to pay. You know once the
>>government
>>> >>>>> gets a tax passed through they will never repeal it. We will be
>>paying
>>> >>> it
>>> >>>>> for then on! It's a scare tactic to cow the people in to believing
>>> > this
>>> >>>>> bunch of bullshit. There is no significant man made global warming,
>>> > it's
>>> >>>>> a lie to shift the wealth out of the United States while these rats
>>> > and
>>> >>>> their
>>> >>>>> friends get wealthy doing it.
>>> >>>>>
>>> >>>>>
>>> >>>>>
>>> >>>>> "Mr. Simplicity" <noway@jose.net> wrote:
>>> >>>>>
>>> >>>>>
>> http://blog.mlive.com/annarbornews/2007/09/dingell_global_warming_may_req.h
>>> >>>> tml
>>> >>>>>> This is the biggest load of disingenuous hubris I've seen in a
>>while.
>>> >>>> More
>>> >>>>>> hypocrisy. Whether you get it or not, your intelligence has just
>>been
>>> >>>>>>> insulted and be assured that what this is really all about it
>>preparing
>>> >>>>>> you
>>> >>>>>>> to be bent over as consumption falls. Expect more of this BS as
>gas
>>> > usage
>>> >>>>>>> goes down and therefore the tax revenue that a gallon of gas
>>generates
>>> >>> is
>>> >>>>>>> proportionately reduced. To make up for the revenue shortfall,
>>we're
>>> >>>> going

```

>>> >>>>>> to get taxed into oblivion.....and I was even sorta' thinking
>>about
>>> >>>>>> voting for a Democrat for president. The new forumla for the
>>American
>>> >>>>>> economy is to tax businesses more so that they will continue to
>go
>>> >>>> elsewhere
>>> >>>>>> while screwing the workers who will be losing their jobs.
>>> >>>>>>
>>> >>>>>> Gimme some of that.
>>> >>>>>>
>>> >>>>>>
>>> >
>>
>>
