

## Re: The Temperature...

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.astro.amateur/2005-03/2265.html>

---

**From:** mikelist (*mutterer\_at\_notime*)

**Date:** 03/20/05

Date: Sun, 20 Mar 2005 13:04:09 -0500

DustyMars wrote:

> *In article <UH2%d.36986\$Q83.8485@bignews5.bellsouth.net>,*

> *smsherm@bellsouth.net says...*

>

>>

>>*SlickWily@kinkyovaloffice.spammola wrote:*

>>

>>

>>>*WEell, my car gets 42 MPG and will, if necessary, go 80MPH. That is*

>>>*wherever the law allows it.*

>>>

>>

>>*If only few hundred million more people would get cars that get 40-80 MPG.*

>>

>>*Then, I can continue driving a gas hog FWD and pay 25 cents a gallon again.*

>>

>>*Buy small cars!!*

>>

>>*Steve*

>>

>

> *The difference between me and those envious small cars users is that I*

> *like my Saturn and could care less what others drive. While I would not*

> *care to calculate what difference 42 MPG cars Vs 25 MPG cars have on the*

> *oil imports I suspect the difference would not be something to worry*

> *about. A more important use of oil may be plastics and I suspect those*

> *"global warming" proponents use as mush plastic as I do. It is nearly*

> *impossible to buy anything these days that isn't wrapped in tough plastic*

> *or some product of oil. I'll bet eve their holy environmental-friendly*

> *hybrid cars are made up of plastic products or something that requires*

> *oil to produce such cars.*

If this is an example of your critical thinking skills, your suspicions aren't very useful. Given the 17mpg increase, assuming that similar miles are travelled by both vehicles, I suspect that your suspicions are mildly askew. AFA plastics go, I think most tree-huggers look at plastics as a mixed blessing, since some types of plastic are not commonly or efficiently recycled, but those that can, make a significant impact. I have worked for two manufacturers of recycled paper products,

and they also make a profound impact on the cost of packaging and use of virgin pulp. I don't know what the preponderance of the vehicles mpg out at, but if the range \*were\* toward the 34mpg and above (I have no idea of where it actually lies), that would be represent significant saving in terms of barrels used.

I have a 5/8 ton Suburban (400+CID) that I use to haul my houseboat (35hp johnson), so I do recognize the necessity of fuel hogs when it is warranted, but would like to spend less overall on my fuel usage, which is why I have two Elantras (current mpg status not calculated, but you can bet the comparison between them and the Suburban is staggering). Nobody wants to ski behind a houseboat, so it does everything I need from it for much less, actually a good skier could get up behind it, if they were that bored. I also recognize the alpha male sensation you (okay most people) get from driving a big truck, but a punk bitch in a monster truck is still a punk bitch, and not necessarily safer, either.

>

> *I also suspect the whinnies that call themselves environmentalists would like us to live like cave men and gals, but most of them could not fend for themselves so we who can will kill them off and take what we need.*

> *They don't like guns, so the ryou have it -- we win again. We won 2000 and 2002 and 2004 and will win 2006 and 2008.*

>

Once again, I suspect that your suspicions are somewhat awry, perhaps you don't realize that most 'eco' types are more outdoorsy than you or I, well maybe not me since I hunted/fished/hiked/camped throughout my youth. The no-guns argument carries some weight, but the unibomber was more of a luddite than most earth-worshipping queers are, and there have been showdowns between ecos and industrial entities that involved guns, with both sides having resorted to violence.

I won't speculate on your election predictions, you must be right \*sometimes\* to be able to justify your suspicions.