

Re: more gw stuff

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2007-12/msg02605.html>

- *From:* Martin Brown <|||newspam|||@nezumi.demon.co.uk>
 - *Date:* Mon, 17 Dec 2007 04:12:56 -0800 (PST)
-

On Dec 14, 4:34 pm, John Larkin
<jjlar...@xx> wrote:

On 14 Dec 2007 08:39:21 GMT, Robert Latest <boblat...@xxxxxxxx>
wrote:

John Larkin wrote:

<http://epw.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?FuseAction=Minority.Blogs&Cont...>

There are some good points in that. Personally I don't think we can do anything significant against climate change (man-made or not), but I think it's good that the "climate panic" is fuelling efforts to move away from wasteful technologies and habits. Even if there were no ill side effects to burning coal, oil or uranium—if we keep depleting natural resources at the (increasing) rate as we're doing today, we'll painfully hit a brick wall sooner or later anyway. Climate-neutral technologies are resource-neutral as well, so nations and societies that invest in such technologies today will be the winners tomorrow.

robert

Not a brick wall. Resources will taper off in availability and increase in price, but not suddenly. All the things the UN wants to force will pretty much happen on their own, at their natural pace, without the UN getting their corrupt hands on trillions in energy taxes.

The trouble is that the first brick wall we will hit is not due to a shortage of fossil fuel – it will be floods from rising sea levels and other unpleasant consequences of climate change like droughts

Re: more gw stuff

(paradoxically). There is about 5–10x the current atmospheric equivalent CO2 level worth of fossil fuel carbon recoverable at a price (and that will increase somewhat as the price increases and presently uneconomic, difficult and dirtier resources get exploited).

Note that I am not advocating zero growth stop everything and live in a cave. But I am advocating the proposition that grossly inefficient cars doing 20mpg or less have had their day and need to be phased out. The simplest way to do this is to gradually increase fuel and energy taxes to encourage less waste. A lot more effort was made to "Save It" in the west during the OPEC induced 1970's oil crisis than has occurred to date for AGW.

And the stakes are much higher now, nature is not amenable to negotiation – you reap what you sow...

<http://epw.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?FuseAction=Minority.Blogs&Cont...>

By inventing new energy technologies today, one ensures that the patents will have run out before they are needed or economically feasible. That's good.

If we can get better energy efficiency now then it will buy us a bit more time. I live a good height above sea level so I should not really be bothered, but it is the next generation who will suffer for our mismanagement. I can see the day when expensive Florida coastal real estate is all surrendered to the rising sea. I doubt if the Neocons will ever admit that AGW is real, but perhaps by then most of the US population will start to realise that nature takes no prisoners. And that scientists are not lying just to get more grants.

Regards,
Martin Brown

.

Re: more gw stuff