

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/2007-10/msg00252.html>

- *From:* Jonathan Kirwan <jkirwan@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 02 Oct 2007 03:23:53 GMT
-

On Mon, 01 Oct 2007 18:46:23 -0600, KKuurus wrote:

On Mon, 01 Oct 2007 19:55:03 GMT, Jonathan Kirwan
<jkirwan@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Mon, 01 Oct 2007 18:11:30 GMT, Richard The Dreaded Libertarian
<null@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Sat, 29 Sep 2007 04:59:35 +0000, Jonathan Kirwan
wrote:

Just one. If you do that, and if I haven't read
it yet, I'll go ask the
author for a copy and do so. Either way, I
will prepare myself from it
and then we can discuss it and see where you
are coming from.

Here's two:

<http://www.ncpa.org/globalwarming/GlobalWarmingPrimer.pdf>

Nope. I asked:

"Provide me with just one peer-reviewed paper on some technical and
quantitative facet relating to climate science that you have actually
read thoroughly yourself, with good understanding, and which well
supports some conclusion you've made here on the topic that disagrees
with the IPCC AR4. Just one."

You replied with something at a web site that is about "seeking
innovative private sector solutions to public policy problems." That
is not a citation of a peer-reviewed paper, Rich. It's a "primer"
prepared for a 'public policy' purpose.

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

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

Caution: 184 MB video:

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

I already watched the whole thing, long before. One of the scientists who was interviewed on the program insisted that he was lied to by the producers before appearing, that his responses, as edited, were grossly misleading and didn't present his perspective, and demanded to have his presence removed. In later showings, they did that much. Another scientist in England, prepared an analysis of the program for his undergraduate science class, which essentially pointed out that at least one of the graphs presented in the show had to have been doctored up --- and he was able to show how and with which data, they most likely did it.

Again. And I repeat myself, sadly. Provide me with just one peer-reviewed paper on some technical and quantitative facet relating to climate science that you have actually read thoroughly yourself, with good understanding, and which well supports some conclusion you've made here on the topic that disagrees with the IPCC AR4. Just one.

Jon

The problem is Jon the only thing those that believe like you

Not to be argumentative, but "believe?" This is about natural fact and science. Belief has very little to do with it.

that

humans are the cause can come up with to fight the problem is punish the U.S.A. and the E.U. for being able to change our world before the "third world" got it's chance to.

That's a different thing. That is about justice, politics, ethics, morality, etc. Those things, at least for now, are not the domain of science.

I've heard China's representatives, for example, argue almost what you are pointing out. Their gov't made a promise, not so long ago (1980's, I think), to eventually put refrigerators in every home. Now, in the US, this is almost universal. And we depend on them, quite a bit. This point came up during discussions about CFCs and the much higher cost of shifting over to HCFC units. The Chinese delegation argued that the US and EU released tens of millions of tons of CFCs

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

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

annually and, when the world was heading towards a mess because of it, that the US and EU expected the Chinese to "pay the bill" of buying the more expensive equipment — merely because they just happened to be "late to the game." Of course, they wanted the US and the EU to pay the difference (they did not expect the US and the EU to pay all the bill, just the difference in costs.) Of course, that didn't fly far, either.

All that is politics. It's not science. Science provides the theory and result which helps us understand and predict more accurately. The decisions made and paths chosen are then a matter of personal choice, ethics, morality, and politics. Different fields, for now.

When and if China comes to the west
and asks politely for help to clean up thier problem with high sulfur
coal and destructive hydroelectric plans,

Which is, in part, fueled by the US demand for products. I really cannot speak well to the comprehensive dynamics going on here, as I'm barely able to follow some of that. But I can easily imagine the idea that manufacturers take advantage of momentarily (in the grand scheme of economic cycles) cheaper labor in China and thus appear to shift pollution to another venue — all the while pointing at them saying it is all their fault. Of course, the real picture is much, much more complex than that. China has been ramping up major power distribution centers, building distribution power transformer stations like mad, and ramping up power production. None of this started with the US shifting demand some time back, of course. China has it's own disasters it is mostly if not entirely responsible for, as well.

But anthropocentric global warming is everyone's problem, like it or not. Much the same as if my neighbor started taking in nuclear waste for a fee and dumping the liquefied waste into his own land. That would be my problem, even if he were doing that on his land. Soon enough, we'd wind up at war, if nothing short solved the problem.

then we who have the tech
should by all means help.

It's going to take efforts all 'round.

For a price say the loss of all communist
control and free election.

Politics, again. They will look at that as being forced, just as you

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

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

and I might if the tables were turned. And, probably, they will react about as kindly to it. You may have noticed their predilections in the military are of late — satellite shoot down, submarine development, missile development, etc. That isn't happening in a political or economic vacuum.

Therein lies the problems we jointly face. Not an easy picture.

The freeing of Tebit. or perhaps the death of one out of two Chinese, after all they have almost half the world population just breathing they add untold millions of tonnes of CO2 to the atmosphere yearly, but seriously to try and punish the countries that are trying to cut their emissions while allowing developing countries to propagate old technologies is a silly idea. We need a world wide policy in order to make world wide changes.

Yes, I tend to agree. I liken this to the situation in business, as well. If one business in a very competitive field decides to "go green" and pay more for its energy and for its waste disposal, it's costs go up. If the consumers aren't motivated to choose its products at their likely higher prices, or if it keeps its prices competitive but instead decides to forego its profit margin that it might use for future expansion, then it will wither away. The only way you set an even playing field for all is through the setting of public policy via law. In that way, the playing field stays even and the businesses can compete on the basis of safer business practices. But no business is going to want to cut its own throat. Just as no country would do that. If any one country unilaterally decides to make the changes alone, it will find itself cut off from cheap energy and growth. And soon enough, its position in the world will decline relative to that of others.

There is a reason why the US Constitution holds international treaties as the "highest law of the land."

So to cut the west off at the knees while allowing the developing world to pollute even more makes sense how?

My focus is to grasp the scientific facts of the situation as well as we may. Then we can discuss, debate, negotiate, batter about the head and shoulders, kick, scream, gnaw, gnash, etc., amongst each other still — but with better information on the table in plainer view so that we have some grasp of what the risks being taken are.

You and I can participate in the political processes as well as we are allowed then, and to whatever degree we are motivated. But I'm in no

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

position to "allow" or "prohibit" anyone. That's for the big boys who hold the power and almost all of the capital (according to legal papers they possess, anyway.) Outside my league. Also, I know my own guesswork about whose pollution makes sense and whose doesn't, or just trying to outguess others about this in some kind of game, is beyond me. My ability to try and outguess others is about nil.

Bottom line, "the west" is represented by a small number of very powerful people. They will act and I will have very little to say about any of it. Same with the developing world. This is far, far beyond anything in my sphere. It will simply play out as it does and without my say so, one way or another.

In short -- global politics hasn't made much sense to me, anyway. You are free to struggle about it in your own mind. But regarding that kind of politics, I'm mostly just a bystander watching a senseless melee and occasionally spotting something I think I gather. That's about it.

Jon

.