

Re: Tough time to sell Global Warming theory....

Re: Tough time to sell Global Warming theory....

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.energy.hydrogen/2009-01/msg00151.html>

- *From:* Fred Kasner <fkasner@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sat, 31 Jan 2009 13:50:59 -0600
-

hhc314@xxxxxxxxxx wrote:

On Jan 23, 6:28 pm, Fred Kasner <fkasner@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

BradGuth wrote:

Fred Kasner wrote:

hhc...@xxxxxxxxxx wrote:

http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20090115/ap_on_re_us/winter_weather
Harry C.

Almost certainly there is a component of some global warming that is anthropogenic. However my opinion is that natural agencies over which mankind has no control will be the major source of climatic variation as it has been for a very long time. Note that in a period of about 100 years the eastern third of the USA was essentially denuded of trees when it was heavily forested before the Europeans arrived. Since then this region has become covered by trees and other plants in amounts that even exceed the amount found there at European first incursion. The major contribution has been from burning of coal which appears to be fossilized plant material. A very small fractional change of insolation would swamp the contribution from anthropogenic sources. Note that we were crying polar disaster for several years starting in 1979 because of several years of very cold and extended winter and snows.

Re: Tough time to sell Global Warming theory....

FK

I'd have no problems with 10% AGW, and possibly even accepting as great as 25% AGW, with the remainder and vast bulk of GW contributed as to our moon, sun and a few minor cosmic considerations. In either case, we are not equipped for as little as a one degree shift in average temperature per decade, and many plants are equally unable to adjust in such a short span of time. What's needed is full access to public funded science, with few if any exceptions. We simply can't have our federal executive office in charge of excluding evidence or involved with any kind of infowar diversion tactics in order to benefit politically selective special interest groups. Dirty or clean, we need a whole lot more affordable and reliable energy that's home grown, so to speak, and there certainly are viable alternatives. Federal mandates, public matching funds and if need be nationalizing are essential options if this nation is to survive as intended.
~ BG

Maybe. But it was clear that Bush and his minions were actively engaged in masking scientific data for political purposes in the last 8 years. It was scandalous.
FK– Hide quoted text –

– Show quoted text –

Fred. let me first redirect you to an earlier post you made in this tread, this quote in particular:

"Note that in a period of about 100 years the eastern third of the USA was essentially denuded of trees when it was heavily forested before the Europeans arrived. Since then this region has become covered by trees and other plants in amounts that even exceed the amount found there at European first incursion."

Re: Tough time to sell Global Warming theory....

Re: Tough time to sell Global Warming theory....

Fred, I have no idea what leads you to this belief, but it in fact is contrary to the facts. I've lived in several regions of the northeast, including New Jersey, New England, and western NY (Rochester). While your first statement is true, your second statement is false. While it is true that western New York State was originally heavily forested with hardwoods (mostly sugar maples and oaks), the process of clearing the land for agriculture was generally accomplished girdling and burning, a process that poisoned the land to such an extent with alkaline ash that it hasn't recovered the ability to grow hardwood trees up to this very day. In fact, the only heavily forested regions in New York State are the Northern Adirondacks, which were never cleared for agriculture.

Monroe County, NY, is such an area. In the Town of Henrietta, the local joke is that on Arbor Day, people in the area flock to Henrietta to actually see the Town Tree! Throughout the region, a home with a "treed yard" is a property with one freshly planted nursery pine (pine will grow slowly if planted, however, most hardwoods won't.)

Now where I live today (New England), the situation is very different. Because of the rocky glacial nature of the soil, the land was cleared by hand, and everything removed from the earth was put to practical use. The stones were used to build the familiar stone wall marking property lines, and the cleared trees were cut and employed as fuel to heat the homes of early settlers. Perhaps because of its difficulty to clear, the soil was never poisoned, and what little there is is very rich. So rich that young oaks and maples spring up and grow so quickly that you have to cut them back each year.

The regrowth potential of once forested land evidently has a great deal to do with the way that man has treated the land. At any rate, you are very mistaken about the current forestry situation in the eastern third of the US, particularly the northeast.

Now, returning to Global Warming — From the scientific viewpoint

Right up to this week, based on my readings in peer reviewed professional journals covering various specialties in the physical sciences (including climatology and some of the earth sciences, I come to the following conclusions:

From a purely scientific perspective and extremely accurate measurements, no significant increase in the rate of global warming increase since precise measurements began (roughly 150 years).

This warming rate, when extrapolated backwards in time, appears to linearly extend to a date that is within 15% of the geological date associated with the end of the last ice age, when global perturbations (including both terrestrial and astronomical events) are considered.

Re: Tough time to sell Global Warming theory....

There is no evidence that man or his activities, with the sole exception of deforestation, have had any significant impact on the rate of global warming.

Most physical scientists realize that although only limited evidence exists, the commonly accepted belief is that the earth has experienced a number of extended duration heating and cooling periods throughout its history, as supported by the geological and biological evidence. Many believe that a point of inflection will occur in the slope of GW, but few are willing to speculate as to when this will take place. Still, many scientists tend to believe that the earth will go through another tropical era before this will occur, largely based on observed history of the earth's climate cycles.

The explanation for these rather long cycles is commonly based on astronomical observations and orbital perturbation concepts.

Now, returning to Global Warming -- From the political viewpoint

I observe that the strongest believers in the reality of GW, and also that man is the cause are (1) non-scientists [non-physical scientists] and (2) politicians.

It is unclear where either of these groups obtain their information, because it certainly does not originate with anything even approximating actual research studies performed by competent scientific professionals.

Laymen appear to embrace GW beliefs to the same extent that they embrace a belief in UFOs, paranormal experiences, homeopathic medications, cult religious beliefs and other subjects that critical trained minds would consider to be irrational nonsense and reject. There is a very good reason why some laymen embrace these wacky concepts...and a psychologist can explain why. I'm no psychologist, but as explained to me it is a mechanism through which people who have absolutely no idea of what is going on, can obtain some degree of comfort and cope with reality, by believing that they can somehow mystically control their fate. With GW, for example, it is unacceptable for them to believe that eventually much of the present land surface of the earth will eventually be covered by water, and what dry land remains will be tropical, just as it once was. They don't want to believe that earth's climate is cyclic, even though they are aware of a bit of history, they don't want to become part of it, even though this is how the earth is resculpted and renewed over millions of years.

Politicians, on the other hand, embrace GW for entirely different reasons. Politicians employ GW simply as a device to secure votes from the many who are totally convinced that GW exists, and that it is caused by man. It's simply good politics to propose solutions to GW, although on critical examination, most of the politically proposed

Re: Tough time to sell Global Warming theory....

solutions are silly. Silly, even if GW were caused by man. Solutions are easy to propose for non-existing problems, even if they fly in the face of thermodynamic principles, the conservation of energy, and other basic principles of the hard sciences.

Of course none of the currently proposed GW solutions have any chance of working, but when someone claims that the signs of GW are becoming less, then like the purveyors of classical medical quackery devices, the politicians like the quack will stand up and claim to have healed the patient, even though the patient was never really ill.

It's silly, but it does get votes, and to the politician, that's all that matters!

Nuff said, besides I have to back and fix that damn Ozone Layer Hole again. Darn this is still there, even after a billion-dollars was expended for replacements for CFCs, and skin cancer rates have not decreased.

Harry C.

Harry,

The increase in tree cover in the Eastern US is because the process that was employed to build towns was not so much to clear forested areas as to start a town in a meadow (a natural clearing produced by a cyclical death of trees whose climax left it open as well as the clearing of parts of forests by natural forest fire production). The surroundings were cleared of trees by later building of towns. However food crops were placed there as in those days people in small towns grew much of their own food. As population increased and more dwellings were installed less land was used for agriculture and more was used for decorative purposes and grasses and trees were planted to absorb slowly absorbing ground moisture from rains and snows. Muddy streets are never popular. As large cities grew less and less of surface was needed to house the very big populations. A big thing in late 19th century USA was the building of parks and planting of trees in "back yards" as some kind of back to nature idea was thought to be beneficial. As roads (both for surface transportation [e.g., interurban street cars] proliferated trees were found useful to keep moisture down to keep such roads from washing out after every rain. So inter-town areas were populated with trees in great numbers. Within the towns a big notion was to plant trees along very street that was wide enough to tolerate them. Every private residence was led to believe that English grasses (not native grasses) were the thing to decorate their "front" area. I've noted that even "factory towns" in Pennsylvania and Ohio succumbed to this notion of planting the public way. As worn out land in the eastern states were abandoned from agriculture poor quality trees sprung up on the unused land even if hardwoods no longer could tolerate the poor soil and the air pollution from coal burning. This is no place for a monograph on the reforestation of the eastern USA but it did happen. Many areas that were never forested became mini-forests as marginal trees were placed to hold back bare soil since we never have come close to paving over the whole country (even if the tree huggers would have us believe so.)

As for your diatribe against the politicians it is not so much that they are as evil as you make them appear. It is just that they are frequently so stupid that they will believe almost any crackpot theory and embrace it because they haven't the intelligence to see the faults in the theory. Actually the political class of our country is on average more stupid than the rest of the population. Most of the population does not wish to have to think about complex issues because they understand their own shortcomings. Never was a politician fazed by his

Re: Tough time to sell Global Warming theory....

inabilities to understand an issue. And never let it be said the Thomas Jefferson was ever one to reserve an opinion on an issue because of lack of understanding of the details in question.

He was a critical and sometimes clever thinker. However he was no polymath.

FK

.