

Re: Global Warming: Junk science at it's [best] worst

# Re: Global Warming: Junk science at it's [best] worst

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2007-09/msg02348.html>

---

- *From:* [bill.sloman@xxxxxxxx](mailto:bill.sloman@xxxxxxxx)
  - *Date:* Wed, 12 Sep 2007 18:12:30 -0700
- 

On Sep 12, 4:25 am, Simon S Aysdie <gwh...@xxxxxx> wrote:

On Sep 10, 6:09 pm, bill.slo...@xxxxxxxx wrote:

On Sep 11, 10:26 am, Simon S Aysdie <gwh...@xxxxxx> wrote:

On Sep 10, 12:37 am, bill.slo...@xxxxxxxx wrote:

On Sep 10, 4:25 am, Richard The Dreaded  
Libertarian <n...@xxxxxxxxxxxx>  
wrote:

On Sun, 09 Sep 2007  
02:45:42 -0700, bill.sloman  
wrote:

On Sep 9,  
9:26 am,  
Richard The  
Dreaded  
Libertarian  
<n...@xxxxxxxxxxxx>

<snip>

Re: Global Warming: Junk science at it's [best] worst

At the moment., U.K. residents average 9.5 tons per year (US residents produce about 20 tons).

I take that as evidence that US residents are more productive. You have to be more productive, and thus richer, to generate that amount of waste.

It's evidence that they are more extravagant. You don't evaluate productivity from the volume of waste produced.

In fact you have to live in a poorly insulated house,...

Who decides what "poorly insulated" is?

Architects, amongst others. Search on "passivhaus" or "super-insulated house". One operational definition of "poor insulation" in a house is that the house needs active heating or cooling. A less stringent definition would cover houses that can be adequately heated or cooled by reverse cycle air-conditioning. The heat pump at the heat of a reverse cycle air-conditioning unit is usually only good for a few kilowatts before it gets too big, and noisy to be practical, but that is enough for a well-insulated house.

"Wise" tax-payer paid "scientists" and legislators? No house insulates perfectly, so it is inherently a value-laden assertion. It could be a simple rationale (made locally, by the people paying the bill) that the capital costs of retrofitting are too much more than the recurring costs of the energy bill. The ability to have and heat a house is regarded as wealth.

"Passivhaus" construction adds about 10% to the cost of building a house. Builders don't want to send the extra time or money, and buyers mostly don't know that it is possible.

...use the air-conditioner a lot,...

Re: Global Warming: Junk science at it's [best] worst

That is regarded as wealth.

... drive to work in a car on your own...

That is regarded as wealth.

... and fly overseas when you tke a vacation.

That is regarded as wealth. So you are making my point.

European productivity per worker in the richer Europea countries isn't wildly different from U.S. figures – it basically reflects

capital investment per worker ...

I agree that capital investment per worker is probably the most dominant factor. However, I have no inherent trust in government generated productivity stats. I said that already, so citing government stats isn't going to convince me of much along those lines.

So you won't argue with my claim because you can't be bothered to dig out figures that you can trust.

In a modern society, manufacturers manipulate people's ideas of what is desirable – in your terms, what constitutes wealth – in order to persuade people to buy the stuff that the manufacturers want to sell.

It shouldn't be too difficult to manipulate public opinion away from carbon–extravagant options.

—

Bill Sloman, Nijmegen

.