

Re: OT: is the AGW bubble about to burst?

Re: OT: is the AGW bubble about to burst?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2007-08/msg04293.html>

- *From:* bill.sloman@xxxxxxxx
 - *Date:* Wed, 22 Aug 2007 07:10:12 -0700
-

On Aug 22, 11:49 am, JosephKK <joseph_barr...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

bill.slo...@xxxxxxxx bill.slo...@xxxxxxxx posted to
sci.electronics.design:

On Aug 21, 8:13 am, JosephKK <joseph_barr...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Don Klipstein d...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx posted to
sci.electronics.design:

In article
<[Nr7yi.18569\\$eY.9...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:Nr7yi.18569$eY.9...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>,
JosephKK wrote:

Don Klipstein
d...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
posted to
sci.electronics.design:

In article
<[rIRxi.1057\\$vU4....@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:rIRxi.1057$vU4....@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>,
JosephKK
wrote:

bill.slo...@xxxxxxxx
bill.slo...@xxxxxxxx
posted
to
sci.electronics.design:

Re: OT: is the AGW bubble about to burst?

On
Aug
17,
2:22
pm,
JosephKK
<joseph_barr...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote:

Don
Klipstein
d...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx
posted
to
sci.electronics.design:

In
article
<46C26978.7CCEB...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
Eeyore
wrote:

Don
Klipstein
wrote:

Eeyore
wrote:

bill.slo...@x
wrote:

Eeyo
wrot

Re: OT: is the AGW bubble about to burst?

Perf
true
and
quite
irrel

So
why
is
there
so
green-inspiu
much
fuss
over
it
?

1.
It

Re: OT: is the AGW bubble about to burst?

is
an
indicator
that
there
is
goobal
warming
that
will
do
worse
things
in
the
future.

Why
do
you
assume
that
a
warming
world
has
to
be
'worse'
?
I'm
enjoying
the
warmer
winters
in
particular
and
it
results
in
reduced
energy
use
too.

Re: OT: is the AGW bubble about to burst?

A
warmer
world
will
also
have
warmer
summers.
Thankfully,
winters
should
warm
more
than
summers
in
most
parts
of
the
world
that
have
both
as
far
as
I
understand
things.

Meanwhile,
there
is
such
a
thing
as
people
and
regions
that
have
a
worse
time
with
summers
than

Re: OT: is the AGW bubble about to burst?

with
winters.

2.
Replacing
sea
ice
with
sea
increases absorption
of
sunlight,
so
this
is
a
positive
feedback
mechanism
for
global
warming.

The
incident
angle
of
sunlight
at
the
poles
means
that
this
is
a
minor
effect.

If
one
merely
neglects
atmospheric
absorption,

Re: OT: is the AGW bubble about to burst?

incoming
radiation
at
the
poles
exceeds
peak
at
the
equator
about
70–72
days
of
the
year
and
average
at
the
equator
about
74–75
days
of
the
year.
After
what
the
atmosphere
does
to
incoming
solar
radiation,
I
surely
expect
this
to
remain
being
significant.

Gee,
neglecting
one
of

Re: OT: is the AGW bubble about to burst?

the
most
important
factors
in
evaluating
ground
received
energy
flux
does
not
sound
like
good
science
to
me.

He
didn't
neglect
it,
merely
estimated
that
the
somewhat
longer
path
length
wasn't
going
to
make
enough
difference
to
matter
in
what
was
an
essentially
qualitative
exposition.

Re: OT: is the AGW bubble about to burst?

I was neglecting longer atmospheric path length only because that causes some reduction of an effect that remains quite significant. So a day's worth of unclouded sunlight on the North Pole in late June may be roughly the same amount of incoming solar radiation, maybe slightly less as opposed to 22–23% more than what the equator gets during an equinox. I think that is still significant.

<SNIP
therefrom>

– Don
Klipstein
(d...@xxxxxxxxxx)

Re: OT: is the AGW bubble about to burst?

You really need to recheck your geometry. Intercept angles.

Sunlight over 1 day at north pole during summer solstice:
1366
watts per square meter, times sine of 23.45 degrees:

Wrong! The correct value is 66.55 degrees. It is the Arctic circle not the tropic circle.

Beginners error.

Not.

The cosine of 66.55 degrees equals the sine of 23.45 degrees.

Actually correct.

You use one or the other depending on your point of view.

WTF? You clearly do not understand when to use either one, nor why.

Provided that you get the right intensity, it doesn't matter what you call the number that you plug in. If you had ever done this kind of calculation, you might understand that.

In fact your 66.55 degree angle represents latitude, and 23.45 degrees corresponds to the angle between the incident light and the relevant bit of the earth's surface, so using the sine of that angle makes the calculation slightly easier to follow, but – as I said – provided that you keep track of what is going on, using sine 23.45 or cosine 66.55 gives exactly the same answer.

Re: OT: is the AGW bubble about to burst?

Re: OT: is the AGW bubble about to burst?

That you thought that the difference was important enough for you to waste bandwidth on an entirely pointless quibble makes it obvious that you haven't got a clue.

The fact that you didn't see this strips you of the last tattered shreds of your credibility.

Speak for yourself, not that you ever had any credibility.

You think that your opinion means anything?

—

Bill Sloman, Nijmegen

.