

Re: GLOBAL WARMING

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.astro/2006-10/msg00058.html>

- *From:* Saul Levy <saullevy1@xxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 09 Oct 2006 12:18:01 -0700
-

Do you also believe in the Tooth Fairy, Turdball?

Saul Levy

On 8 Oct 2006 21:07:42 -0700, sir.jpturcaud@xxxxxxx wrote:

Brad Guth a écrit :

"[sir.jpturcaud](mailto:sir.jpturcaud@xxxxxxx)" <sir.jpturcaud@xxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:1159871976.642011.312070@xx

In matter pertaining to real science, one should remember that
Simplicity is the key to Verity ...and in my view the drought &
bushfires are the consequences of ignorance & contempt for Nature
laws. In this regard present fire season as I see it, could well
infringe into city and cut wide swathes of destruction into
Perth,
Melbourne or Sydney.

Sir Jean-Paul Turcaud
Exploration Geologist & Offshore Consultant
Mobile +33 650 171 464

Australia Mining Pioneer
Founder of the True Geology
<http://www.tnet.com.au/~warrigal/grule.html>
<http://users.indigo.net.au/don/tel/index.html>
<http://members.iimetro.com.au/~hubbca/turcaud.htm>
<http://www.abc.net.au/rn/talks/bbing/stories/s28534.htm>

Re: GLOBAL WARMING

As per usual, you are being directly correct, that man's disregard for our environment is multi-fold at nailing our own butts to the cross. However, Earth has also been getting mooned by a great deal of geophysical interaction, and even by way of a little spare IR/FIR energy, that which simply didn't exist prior to the last ice age.

Earth w/o moon, w/o moon god and with less magnetosphere:

Firstly, I'd have to agree with many that Earth is not only quite a rare but a rather damn lucky planet, especially since the gods of 'dumb luck happenstance' gave us such a nifty moon (perhaps having also contributed Venus from Sirius), hosting the right amount of salty ice and representing just enough mascon/tidal energy to gradually thaw Earth once and for all out from those deep cycles of having been so extensively sub-frozen to death.

However, making a go of it without such a moon seems somewhat worse off than merely remaining as extra cold and testy, whereas I'm thinking our Earth would have remained extensively ice covered to nearly the 30 degree mark, of winters being absolutely horrific and of unbroken sea-ice due to having so much less tidal differentials, other than a slight solar tidal influence that simply wouldn't have represented all that much.

Even though our global warming avenger "Roger Coppock" that's up against the likes of most others as having been the typical all-knowing Usenet naysayers of denial being in denial, whereas our Roger may seem a little dumbfounded about the arrival of our somewhat salty and most likely icy proto-moon of perhaps as great as 4000 km worth, that may have been originally situated somewhat Sedna like, and simply affected by some other impacting arrivals or greater mascon encounter as having a sufficient influence. This external influence would have caused the orbital diversion that brought us together, such as via the Sirius star/solar system which I believe gets visited by our solar system roughly every 105,000 years (more frequently in the distant past). After all, Sedna itself gets to within 76 AU as is, and as such it would not take all that much of an impact in order to cause that icy orb to head directly our way, whereas if it were otherwise being dragged along and/or intentionally deployed by an even greater mascon (such as Venus) is only so much better yet.

Obviously something if not several extremely large items had impacted our once upon a time icy moon, and quite possibly there's at least one such impact that may have left it's mark in Earth as perhaps representing the arctic ocean basin, as our arriving moon delivered a glancing sucker punch of a blow to our extensively icy world.

All that Henry Kroll and myself can say with any reasonable certainty is that our moon wasn't with us prior to 10,500 BC. However, I'd be very interested to narrow that down to a specific decade or even a century, whereas if Earth had been impacted by the arrival of such an icy moon,

Re: GLOBAL WARMING

chances are that most of the early human intelligent life upon Earth went as deep as possible into hiding, as I would have, and I'd suppose that the climate of Earth would have remained as somewhat nasty and clouded over for a few centuries thereafter, which might further explain as to why it took so long before that moon of ours to become noticed for what it was.

Come to think (just a little further outside the box), our magnetosphere might not have been nearly as extensive until after that Earth/moon encounter. We've certainly been losing our magnetosphere potency by a good .05%/yr, which might actually help us to establish the initial timeline of the big event, of exactly when that moon of our impacted us.

—

Our moon is geophysically via mascon/tidal friction warming Earth rather nicely as of the last ice age. As to what exact extent these gravitational forces of such mascon induced tidal currents above and below the surface are being converted into thermal energy may remain a little fuzzy, but never the less it's an ongoing global warming factor of such fuzzy logic that's telling us what's perfectly real and happening to us, that's well above and beyond the ongoing impact of modern humanity that has been clearly adding further trauma to our environment.

Up until this last ice age, Earth's environment simply didn't have to contend with that nearby moon of ours as of prior to 10,500 BC, just that of our 100,000 and some odd year orbit of Sirius. If there were a moon prior to 10,500 BC, as such it would have been included within many of the artistic renderings of those tens of centuries of talented artistic and otherwise serious records of those ice age and prior times when humans had existed, and were otherwise good at depicting all that was important to their survival. Some other research placed the earliest depictions of a moon as late as 2000 BC, and for some odd reason in never became a god moon.

Here's my two ballpark estimates of mascon/tidal warming that's roughly between 0.01% and 0.1% of the $2e20$ J / $9.80665 = 2.0395e19$ kgf. It could be a little greater, but it most certainly isn't anything much less than the 0.01% mark.

0.1% of the associated $2e20$ Joules = 390 w/m² (plus whatever secondary IR/FIR)

0.01% of the associated $2e20$ Joules = 39 w/m² (plus whatever secondary IR/FIR)

Total change in greenhouse forcing from 1985 to 2004, we get 9.35 w/m².

<http://www.worldclimatereport.com/index.php/2005/05/10/global-warming-something-new-under-t>

Re: GLOBAL WARMING

Current Man-made Greenhouse Forcing to be 2.4 – 4.3 W/m², Compared with
7.5 – 10 W/m² Needed for Change of Seasons

http://www.globalwarming.net/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=62&Itemid=27

Of course the really big guns of G8 remain in total denial, other than having insisted it's all the fault of Muslims. There's lots of other data that's nicely compiled by wikipedia.org, such as the 11 year solar cycle that's worth +/- 0.05% or possibly at most +/- 0.1% of solar irradiance, which pretty much eliminates that source of being the problem. Whereas the global dimming via soot and particle factors may be the ultimate culprit that diminishes our global albedo to a sufficient extent that can be directly measured from space on a year by year basis, and best yet as measured from our moon's L1 or alternately via ACE that's halo parked in Earth's L1.

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

Therefore, on behalf of global warming, I'm giving humanity as little credit as having a 10% responsibility, and that nasty moon of ours gets the other 90% which only seems most likely, especially since the energy cycle of having made warm waters to sub-frozen ice and then ice back into warm water is so freaking horrific, especially if we're taking the km³ volumes of said ice and frozen tundra into account.

At the very most I'd be giving humanity 25% responsibility for this ongoing global warming fiasco, although either way of being 25% or as little as 10% is still entirely worth our doing something about, such as cutting that artificial impact in half seems perfectly doable, and as such it's way more than beneficial in so many other positive ways, other than moderating our fair share of this never ending cycle of global warming via human pollution and arrogance. That is unless you're perfectly good with your next 'Happy Meal' being a McJellyfish sandwich, or perhaps biofuel via farmed jellyfish could actually work.

—

Brad Guth

—

Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server – <http://www.Mailgate.ORG>

Dear Brad,

I am overcome by the number of questions you are raising and hence the time necessary to reply in details to each of these. Further I have not as much time on my hand as previously as I am damned busy renovating the house...

Anyway, if you care, I could send you copy of a paper I wrote sometimes back on the True Geology. Although it is incomplete, I am

Re: GLOBAL WARMING

willing to send you copy of it and I am sure it will put you on the right track so a few questions you are asking yourself will be answered indeed.... then we will go further on the track so that you will have the proper understanding what the True Geology is about.

If this agreeable to you, please send me an email confirming yours.

One should realise on the one hand that the whole so-called .Science & whatever discipline is involved (Geology, Archaeology, Physics, Economy, Medecine, Agriculture, History etc) all is underlain by the religious beliefs of the present pre-eminent Semite JIC (Judeo-Islamic-Christian) beliefs. The main aspect of it being that Deus-Ex-Machina response to any nagging problem. Personally I see no difference between the religious Creationists and the Big Bang Creationists Both are calling on a miracle of instantaneity to explain things while the reality is not so, and the creation as all can observe is continuous....and demonstrating such overwhelming intelligence that it is beyond words indeed.

On the other hand we have all those Universities programmed so-called scientists spouting their big mouth forth and considering that they are the ultimate form of intelligence in the whole world. Nothing is even considered as possible unless they have given their agreement that effectively it is indeed.

I have been often amused to listen to young children trying to rationalise the coming of toys at Xmas time, while there is no chimney conduct, nor even fire place at all.... any theory is considered as valid then , from the father Xmas having some special key, to slipping under the door etc

Well the parallel with those brain-washed Universities formatted blokes with what they believe give them authority to debate of what is valid and not, is completely in line with the kindergarten kids 's reasoning mentioned above. Now why do the former quit their certitude and the latest do not ? Simply because an authority gave the kids the answer and because the latest are lost with all kind of authorities given them all types of answers, and obviously they pick and choose what is politically correct under a rule derived from consensus ... and this upon this process that they build their certitudes.

My personal conviction is that only a few visionary (or whatever you want to call them) are able to pave the path to awareness and that the mob of kids or scientists fall in step. Basically a so-called scientist is as childish as Father Xmas believing kid and the proof of this are all those infantile theories to which they cling during their entire lives and which are proven so derisive later ...

WHICH OF PRESENT SCIENTIFIC THEORIES ARE GOING TO BE CONSIDERED DERISIVE TO LATER GENERATIONS ? I have a most informed answer regarding that question in relation to Geology : ALL OF THEM !!!

With best regards

jpturcaud

Re: GLOBAL WARMING