
Subject: Re: I hate winter...

Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Wed, 30 Jan 2008 06:03:17 GMT

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

chuck duffy wrote:

> So does this evidence mean that

.....global dimming and greenhouse gas induced warming are two different processes that for a time overlapped. Global dimming is not going to magically save us from the current warming trend. We're on the right track with worldwide plans to slow our contribution of greenhouse gases ASAP.

Cheers,

-Jamie

www.JamieKruz.com

> Chuck

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

>> rick wrote:

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

>>> global dimming...

>> Heh. Mac vs. PC is more benign.

>>

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

>

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

>>

>> From the summary:

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

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

>

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

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

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

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

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

>

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

>

>> disappeared and atmospheres started to clear up.

>>

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

>> genuine reflection of the greenhouse effect than during the decades

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

>

>> to the 1980s, the recent rapid temperature rise therefore no longer
>> underrates the response of the climate system to greenhouse forcing and
>
>> reflects the full magnitude of the greenhouse effect."
>>
>> More discussion here:
>> <http://www.realclimate.org/index.php/archives/2007/11/global-dimming-and-global-warming/>
>>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>>
>>
>>
>>> On Tue, 29 Jan 2008 10:51:55 -0700, Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com>
>>> wrote:
>>>
>>>> James McCloskey wrote:
>>>>> Yep, those scientist don't know what they are talking about,
>>>>> If you're looking for the opinion of scientists, here's a start:
>>>>>
>>>>> From the American Physical Society
>>>>> http://www.aps.org/policy/statements/07_1.cfm
>>>>> "Emissions of greenhouse gases from human activities are changing the
>
>>>>> atmosphere in ways that affect the Earth's climate. Greenhouse gases
>
>>>>> include carbon dioxide as well as methane, nitrous oxide and other
>>>>> gases. They are emitted from fossil fuel combustion and a range of
>>>>> industrial and agricultural processes.
>>>>>
>>>>> The evidence is incontrovertible: Global warming is occurring. If no
>
>
>>>>> physical and ecological systems, social systems, security and human
>>>>> health are likely to occur. We must reduce emissions of greenhouse gases
>
>>>>> beginning now."
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> From the National Academy of Sciences
>>>>> <http://nationalacademies.org/onpi/06072005.pdf>
>>>>> "Climate change is real:
>>>>> There will always be uncertainty in understanding a system as complex
> as

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

>
>>>> measurements of rising surface air temperatures and subsurface ocean
>
>>>> temperatures and from phenomena such as increases in average global sea
>
>>>> levels, retreating glaciers, and changes to many physical and biological
>
>>>> systems. It is likely that most of the warming in recent decades can
> be
>>>> attributed to human activities (IPCC 2001)². This warming has already
>
>>>> led to changes in the Earth's climate.
>>>>
>>>> The existence of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere is vital to life
> on

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

>

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

>
>>>> levels that can be reliably measured (i.e. in the last 420,000 years).
>
>>>> Increasing greenhouse gases are causing

>
>>>> centigrade degrees over the twentieth century. The Intergovernmental
>
>>>> Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) projected that the average global surface
>
>>>> temperatures will continue to increase to between 1.4 centigrade degrees
>
>>>> and 5.8 centigrade degrees above 1990 levels, by 2100."
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> From the American Geophysical Union
>>>> http://www.agu.org/sci_soc/policy/positions/climate_change2008.shtml
>>>> "Human Impacts on Climate:
>>>> The Earth's climate is now clearly out of balance and is warming. Many
>

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

>>>> the sea level, the distribution of precipitation, and the length of
>
>>>> and are best explained by the increased atmospheric abundances of
>>>> greenhouse gases and aerosols generated by human activity during the
>
>>>> 20th century. Global average surface temperatures increased on average
>
>>>> previous twelve years were warmer than any others since 1850. The
>>>> observed rapid retreat of Arctic sea ice is expected to continue and
>
>>>> lead to the disappearance of summertime ice within this century.
>>>> Evidence from most oceans and all continents except Antarctica shows
>
>>>> warming attributable to human activities. Recent changes in many
>>>> physical and biological systems are linked with this regional climate
>
>>>> change. A sustained research effort, involving many AGU members and
>>>> summarized in the 2007 assessments of the Intergovernmental Panel on
>
>>>> Climate Change, continues to improve our scientific understanding of
> the
>>>> climate.
>>>>
>>>> During recent millennia of relatively stable climate, civilization
>>>> became established and populations have grown rapidly. In the next 50
>
>
>
>>>> of climate variability experienced during the past thousand years and
>
>>>> poses global problems in planning for and adapting to it. Warming
>>>> disruptive, reducing global agricultural productivity, causing
>
>>>> much of the Greenland ice sheet with ensuing rise in sea level of
>>>> annual emissions of CO2 must be reduced by more than 50 percent within
>
>>>> this century. With such projections, there are many sources of
>>>> scientific uncertainty, but none are known that could make the impact
> of
>>>> climate change inconsequential. Given the uncertainty in climate
>>>> projections, there can be surprises that may cause more dramatic

>>>> disruptions than anticipated from the most probable model projections.
>>>>
>>>> With climate change, as with ozone depletion, the human footprint on
>
>>>> Earth is apparent. The cause of disruptive climate change, unlike ozone
>
>>>> depletion, is tied to energy use and runs through modern society.
>>>> Solutions will necessarily involve all aspects of society. Mitigation
>
>>>> strategies and adaptation responses will call for collaborations across
>
>>>> science, technology, industry, and government. Members of the AGU, as
>
>>>> part of the scientific community, collectively have special
>>>> responsibilities: to pursue research needed to understand it; to educate
>
>>>> the public on the causes, risks, and hazards; and to communicate clearly
>
>>>> and objectively with those who can implement policies to shape future
>
>>>> climate."
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> From The Geological Society of America
>>>> <http://www.geosociety.org/positions/position10.htm>
>>>> "The Geological Society of America (GSA) supports the scientific
>
>>>> due in part to human activities; and the probable consequences of the
>
>>>> climate changes will be significant and blind to geopolitical
>>>> boundaries. Furthermore, the potential implications of global climate
>
>>>> change and the time scale over which such changes will likely occur
>>>> require active, effective, long-term planning. GSA also supports
>>>> statements on the global climate change issue made by the joint national
>
>>>> academies of science (June 2005), American Geophysical Union (December,
>
>>>> 2003), and American Chemical Society (2004). GSA strongly encourages
>
>>>> that the following efforts be undertaken internationally: (1) adequately
>
>>>> research climate change at all time scales, (2) develop thoughtful,
>>>> science-based policy appropriate for the multifaceted issues of global
>
>>>> climate change, (3) organize global planning to recognize, prepare for,
>

>>>> and adapt to the causes and consequences of global climate change, and
>
>>>> (4) organize and develop comprehensive, long-term strategies for
>>>> sustainable energy, particularly focused on minimizing impacts on global
>
>>>> climate."
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> From the American Meteorological Society
>>>> <http://www.ametsoc.org/POLICY/2007climatechange.html>
>>>> "Why is climate changing?
>>>> Climate has changed throughout geological history, for many natural

>

>
>>>> have increasingly affected local, regional, and global climate by
>>>> altering the flows of radiative energy and water through the Earth
>>>> system (resulting in changes in temperature, winds, rainfall, etc.),
>
>>>> which comprises the atmosphere, land surface, vegetation, ocean, land
>
>>>> ice, and sea ice. Indeed, strong observational evidence and results from
>
>>>> modeling studies indicate that, at least over the last 50 years, human
>
>>>> activities are a major contributor to climate change.
>>>>
>>>> Direct human impact is through changes in the concentration of certain
>
>>>> trace gases such as carbon dioxide, chlorofluorocarbons, methane,
>>>> nitrous oxide, ozone, and water vapor, known collectively as greenhouse
>
>>>> gases. Enhanced greenhouse gases have little effect on the incoming
>>>> energy of the sun, but they act as a blanket to reduce the outgoing
>>>> infrared radiation emitted by Earth and its atmosphere; the surface and
>
>>>> atmosphere therefore warm so as to increase the outgoing energy until
>
>>>> the outgoing and incoming flows of energy are equal. Carbon dioxide
>>>> accounts for about half of the human-induced greenhouse gas contribution
>
>>>> to warming since the late 1800s, with increases in the other greenhouse
>
>>>> gases accounting for the rest; changes in solar output may have provided
>
>>>> an augmentation to warming in the first half of the 20th century.

>>>>
>>>> Carbon dioxide concentration is rising mostly as a result of fossil-fuel
>
>>>> burning and partly from clearing of vegetation; about 50% of the
>>>> enhanced emissions remain in the atmosphere, while the rest of the Earth
>
>>>> system continues to absorb the remaining 50%. In the last 50 years
>>>> atmospheric CO2 concentration has been increasing at a rate much faster
>
>>>> than any rates observed in the geological record of the past several
>
>>>> thousand years. Global annual-mean surface temperatures are rising at
> a
>>>> rapid rate to values higher than at any time in the last 400 (and
>>>> probably in the last 1000) years. Once introduced in the atmosphere,
>
>>>> carbon dioxide remains for at least a few hundred years and implies a
>
>>>> lengthy guarantee of sustained future warming. Further, increases in
>
>>>> greenhouse gases are nearly certain to produce continued increases in
>
>>>> temperature. Such changes in temperature lead to changes in clouds,
>>>> pressure, winds, and rainfall in a complex sequence of further effects."
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> Al Gore does,
>>>>> after all he invented the internet.
>>>> Here's what snopes has to say about that:
>>>>
>>>> <http://www.snopes.com/quotes/internet.asp>
>>>> "Despite the derisive references that continue even today, Al Gore did
>
>>>> not claim he "invented" the Internet, nor did he say anything that could
>
>>>> reasonably be interpreted that way. The "Al Gore said he 'invented' the
>
>>>> Internet" put-downs were misleading, out-of-context distortions of
>>>> something he said during an interview with Wolf Blitzer on CNN's "Late
>
>>>> Edition" program on 9 March 1999."
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> Besides, Al Gore is not the point, he's just one guy. Love him or hate
>
>>>> him, the climate will do what it does with or without him. It's best
> to
>>>> look to the actual science.

>>>>
>>>>
>>>> Nothing like trying to shift the wealth
>>>>> of the world and making money doing it by selling global offsets and
> taxing
>>>>> the shit out of stupid people with a lie!
>>>> That the climate is currently changing is not a lie, it's a measurable
>
>>>> phenomenon we are currently experiencing on our planet.
>>>>
>>>> A lot of evidence points to human contributions to the current climate
>
>>>> change event. So again, this is not a lie.
>>>>
>>>> Your problem is with politics and economics, not with science. Blaming
>
>>>> the science does not help your cause. You have political and economic
>
>>>> objections to some of the proposed solutions, so by all means take them
>
>>>> on. If you don't like using a market mechanism to regulate carbon
>>>> emissions, which is just one idea that's been proposed, there are other
>
>>>> options on the table.
>>>>
>>>> Do your best to move the solutions conversation in a direction you're
>
>>>> more comfortable with. But simple blanket denial of actual evidence and
>
>>>> peer reviewed science won't get you there.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> The Bush's, the Clinton's, and
>>>>> the Gore's are all Trilateralists, they have done a fine job of lowering
>>>>> the standard of living here in the USA! Long live the CFR, the world
> banks
>>>>> and man made Global warming.
>>>> You can believe what you like about all that, except that there is
>>>> actual evidence supporting human contributions to the current climate
>
>>>> change event. Again, ignoring evidence won't get you very far.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> By the way, if you buy the man made global warming lie, I got some swamp
>>>>> land I'd like to sell you!
>>>> You're being sold swamp land already, possibly by the fossil fuels
>>>> industry, and by people who want to maintain power and income.
>>>>

>>>> <http://www.cbc.ca/fifth/denialmachine/index.html>
>>>> "The Denial Machine investigates the roots of the campaign to negate
> the
>>>> science and the threat of global warming. It tracks the activities of
> a
>>>> group of scientists, some of whom previously consulted for Big Tobacco,
>
>>>> and who are now receiving donations from major coal and oil companies."
>>>>
>>>> <http://www.exxonsecrets.org/>
>>>> "The database compiles Exxon Foundation and corporate funding to a
>>>> series of institutions who have worked to undermine solutions to global
>
>>>> warming and climate change. It details the working relationships of
>>>> individuals associated with these organizations and their global warming
>
>>>> quotes and deeds."
>>>>
>>>> Cheers,
>>>> -Jamie
>>>> www.JamieKruz.com
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>> Rich Lamanna wrote:
>>>>>>> Must be global warming. Anyone seen this? If you've got an hour check
>>>>>>> it
>>>>>>> out. It may take a minute or two to load.
>>>>>>> Yep, the swindle movie is old news, we even discussed it here.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> As I mentioned at the time, it ignores the main body of peer-reviewed
>
>>>>>>> scientific evidence for the sake of sensationalism. It was done that
> way
>>>>>>> deliberately by the producers, with no attempt at an objective look
> at
>>>>>>> the actual scientific evidence. Fair and balanced it ain't.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I do like the breathless announcer, fast cuts and dramatic music. It's
>
>>>>>>> always fun to see a one-sided polemic that ironically accuses others
> of
>>>>>>> being one-sided. I doubt anyone here is gullible enough to take it
> as an
>>>>>>> objective authority.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> But anyway, here's more (follow the links):

>>>>>
>>>>> From:
>>>>> <http://climatedenial.org/2007/05/01/why-was-the-great-global-warming-swindle-so-persuasive/>
>>>>> "The fans of the film would argue that it has been effective because
> it
>>>>> is true. But truth is not, of itself, persuasive. When we receive new
>
>>>>> information on a topic we have no idea whether it is true or not. We
>
>>>>> base our conclusions on how it was presented to us, whether it concurs
>
>>>>> with what we already know about that topic, how far we trust the person
>>>>> telling us, and how well that information fits inside our world view.
> We
>>>>> then seek to match our initial conclusions against the conclusions
> of
>>>>> our peers. So, although we think we seek truth, the process by which
> we
>>>>> reach opinions is equally capable of leading us in the wrong direction.
>>>>> It turns out that Swindle was a collection of rather crude distortions
>
>>>>> in an elegant package. We now know that the data was misrepresented,
> the
>>>>> charts re-arranged, and the interviews edited in ways that were designed
>>>>> to mislead."
>>>>>
>>>>> From: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Great_Global_Warming_Swindle
>>>>> "Although the documentary was welcomed by global warming sceptics,
> it
>>>>> was criticised heavily by many scientific organisations and individual
>
>>>>> scientists (including two of the film's contributors[3][4]). The film's
>>>>> critics argued that it had misused data, relied on out-of-date research,
>>>>> employed misleading arguments, and misrepresented the position of the
>
>>>>> Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change."
>>>>>
>>>>> From: <http://www.climateofdenial.net/?q=node/7>

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

>>>>> programme giving a factual account of something, using film,
>
>>>>> contains at least five major misrepresentations of the scientific

>>>>> presents details of the five misrepresentations."

>>>>>

>>>>> From http://www.medialens.org/alerts/07/0313pure_propaganda_the.p hp

>>>>> "What we now have is an out-and-out propaganda piece, in which there
> is

>>>>> not even a gesture toward balance or explanation of why many of the
>

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

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

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

>

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

>

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

>

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

> A

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

> to

>>>>> papersonline/channel4response)"

>>>>>

>>>>> Cheers,

>>>>> -Jamie

>>>>> www.JamieKruz.com

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>> Rich Lamanna wrote:

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

>>>>> it

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

>>>>>>

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

>>>>>>

>>>>>> Rich

>>>>>>

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

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

>>>>>>>

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

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>> David.

>
