

Re: But There Ain't No Global Warming.

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.energy/2005-01/0556.html>

From: Robert Sturgeon (*rsturge_at_inreach.com*)

Date: 01/20/05

Date: Thu, 20 Jan 2005 09:18:14 -0800

On Thu, 20 Jan 2005 02:35:55 GMT, Dan Bloomquist
<EXTRApUBLIC21@lakeweb.com> wrote:

>
>
>*Robert Sturgeon wrote:*
>> *On Thu, 20 Jan 2005 01:11:43 GMT, Dan Bloomquist*
>> *<EXTRApUBLIC21@lakeweb.com> wrote:*
>>
>>
>>>*Robert Sturgeon wrote:*
>>>
>>>>*Yes, full of factual data showing that, while "global*
>>>>*warming" is a very popular theory, and scary enough to scare*
>>>>*the bejeebers out of a lot of people, the one thing lacking*
>>>>*is – actual global warming.*
>>>>
>>>><http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/img/climate/globalwarming/ipcc20.gif>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>*It's easy to find data to support the theory of global*
>>>>*warming. It's also easy to find data refuting it.*
>>>>
>>>>*Please provide your study.*

We could both provide 40 or 50 URLs supporting our opinions.
The classic Battle of the URLs. No thanks.

>> (*Why*
>> *isn't Alice Springs, Australia getting hotter??? Why isn't*
>> *Los Banos, California getting hotter???)*
>>
>>*Don't know, do you? Lokal weather has little to do with global climate.*

Then the global climate must have no effect on local
weather, either – in which case, I won't worry about it.

>> *But even in this*
>> *graph, the temperature has only increased by about 1 degree*
>> *C, depending on how you want to read the data.*
>
>*So? (I don't expect an answer.)*

So 1 degree C is very little change – certainly not enough to change economic policy over. And given the difficulty of accurately measuring and ascertaining a 1 degree change, not reliable enough to consider.

>> *Previous*
>> *temperature changes, before the global warming scare, were*
>> *even greater.*
>
>*Where is your data?*

>> *The temperature in northern Europe and*
>> *Greenland was much warmer in 1000 AD than it is now. And*
>> *those places saw their temperatures go way down.*
>
>*Gads, just one link please.*

http://www.geotimes.org/aug04/feature_wineclimate.html

"... For example during the medieval Little Optimum period (roughly A.D. 900 to 1300), temperatures were up to 1 degree Celsius warmer, allowing the planting of vineyards as far north as the coastal zones of the Baltic Sea and southern England. Conversely, temperature declines during the 14th century were dramatic, leading to the Little Ice Age (extending into the late 19th century), and resulted in northern vineyards dying out and growing seasons so short that harvesting grapes in southern Europe was difficult."

http://www.stanford.edu/~moore/Boon_To_Man.html

"In fact, the evidence supporting the claim that the earth has grown warmer is shaky; the theory is weak; and the models on which the conclusions are based cannot even replicate the current climate. It is asserted, for example, that over the last hundred years the average temperature at the earth's surface has gone up by 0.5deg. Centigrade or about 1deg. Fahrenheit. Given the paucity of data in the Southern Hemisphere, the evidence that in the United States, with the best records, temperatures have failed to rise; the British naval records that find no significant change in temperatures at sea since the mid-1800s; and that the reported increases occurred mainly prior to 1940 -- before the rapid rise in CO2 -- the public is entitled to be wary. Moreover, even the National Academy of Sciences is skeptical

of the validity of the computer models and warns that the modeling of clouds — a key factor — is inadequate and poorly understood."

"History provides the best evidence for the effect of climate change on humans, plants and animals, but a few researchers have challenged its relevance. David Rind, a climate modeler and NASA scientist, has questioned the applicability of past warming episodes to the modern issue of climatic alteration caused by increased CO₂ concentrations.[17] He attributes the origin of past periods of warmth and cold to shifts over time in the orbital position of the earth which impose more or less energy on the poles, as contrasted to a general world-wide warming that might result from the addition of man-made greenhouse gases. [See Appendix A on factors determining climate]. He also argues that the swiftness in warming that would occur following increased levels of CO₂ is unprecedented in history. On the latter point, he ignores other research, such as that by a German academic, Burkhard Frenzel, who writes, "During the Holocene, very rapid changes of climate occurred. According to dendroclimatology [tree ring analysis applied to climatology], they often lasted about 20 to 30 years, or [were] even as brief as 2 to 3 years." [18] Other climate historians have found that a rapid cooling in the late glacial period — about 11,000 years ago — took about 100 to 150 years to complete and realized about 5deg.F variation in temperature within 100 years, more than is being forecast for the next century.[19]"

"Studies of climate history show as was mentioned above that sharp changes in temperatures over brief periods of time have occurred frequently without setting into motion any disastrous feedback systems that would lead either to a runaway heating that would cook the earth or a freezing that would eliminate all life. In addition, carbon dioxide levels have varied greatly. Ice core data exhibit fluctuating levels of CO₂ that do not correspond to temperature changes.[22] Most past periods display a positive relationship between CO₂ and temperature, however, with a relationship roughly corresponding to that of the Global Climate Models.[23] During interglacial periods high latitudes enjoyed temperatures that were about 5deg. to 11deg.F warmer than today.[24] Middle latitudes experienced temperatures only about 4deg. to 5deg.F warmer. These warmer periods brought more moisture to the Northern Hemisphere with the exception during the Holocene of central North America. At the time of the medieval warm period, temperatures in Europe, except for the area around the Caspian Sea basin, were 1deg. to 3deg.F higher and rainfall more plentiful than today.[25]"

sci.energy: Re: But There Ain't No Global Warming.

"Around 9,000 to 5,000 years ago the earth was much warmer than today; perhaps 4deg.F hotter, about the average of the various predictions for global warming after a doubling of CO2.[59] Although the climate cooled a bit after 3000 B.C., it stayed relatively warmer than the modern world until sometime after 1000 B.C., when chilly temperatures became more common. During this Climatic Optimum epoch, Europe enjoyed mild winters and warm summers with a storm belt far to the north. Not only was the country less subject to severe storms, but the skies were less cloudy and the days sunnier."

I could go on with this. A Google search of "global warming europe wine england" returns 103,000 URLs. I have better things to do. Don't you?

>> *How could*
>> *that be? Was there some secret burning of fossil fuels then*
>> *that we don't know about?*
>
>*Strawman.*

Can you show that the previous warm period was caused by burning fossil fuels? Or was there another cause? If so, you'll have to prove that the current warming (if it's even happening, which many doubt) is not caused by something other than burning fossil fuels. Correlation does not prove cause and effect.

>> *Even if temperatures are*
>> *increasing (which I don't believe), I'm unwilling to undergo*
>> *an economic catastrophe based on a theory that burning*
>> *fossil fuels is causing something now which happened before*
>> *when there was no significant burning of fossil fuels.*
>
>*Did I say that?! I don't think global warming is the biggy. I think*
>*mankind will go to war when it is time to fight over what's left of the*
>*oil in the world.*

And I don't think global warming is even occurring.

<http://www.his.com/~sepp/scirsrch/amsglwarm.html>

"Why Are We Not Seeing Global Warming?
Accepted for presentation at the Ninth Symposium on Global
Change Studies
January 11–16, 1998, Phoenix, Arizona

S. Fred Singer, Ph.D.

Re: But There Ain't No Global Warming.

sci.energy: Re: But There Ain't No Global Warming.

Conventional General Circulation Models, quoted by the IPCC, predict a current "best" warming rate of 0.3°C per decade. Satellite and balloon observations, however, show a slight cooling rate since 1979. Surface observations show no warming trend in the last decade.

The explanation for this discrepancy, put forth by the IPCC, has been an assumed cooling from sulfate aerosols. That this is insufficient can readily be seen from graphs published recently by Hasselman (Science, 1997). The calculated warming rate is only slightly reduced—to about 0.25°C per decade. In addition, publications by Tett et al. (Science, 1996) and Hansen et al. (JGR, 1997) show that the negative forcing from aerosols is quite insufficient.

Perhaps the strongest argument against the aerosol model comes from satellite observations; they show a cooling trend everywhere except at northern mid-latitudes. They show a warming trend there—just where the aerosol cooling effect should be most important.

The discrepancy between models and observations must therefore be ascribed to other exogenous factors (solar variations) or to endogenous factors that are poorly treated in climate models, such as details of clouds and the vertical distribution of water vapor. Clearly, climate science is neither "settled" nor "compelling"—as often claimed by politicians—but remains a challenging field for research. "

>> *It*

>> *is more likely that if the temperatures are increasing, it is a natural occurrence instead of "Global Warming" because of burning fossil fuels.*

>

> *Show your study. I don't know. I only know that most scientist find the warming threat credible. Why should I buy into your rhetoric?*

You shouldn't. There's plenty more from better sources. Here's one source to mull over for a while, if you're able to consider other possibilities:

<http://www.john-daly.com/#1905>

>> *But there would be less money to*

>> *study that, and no power given to activists to counter it.*

>

> *Back to the SiFi. I love sifi, but manage to keep it in its place.*

Global Warming has become the official doctrine. It commands money and power. It is similar to the Lysenkoism

Re: But There Ain't No Global Warming.

sci.energy: Re: But There Ain't No Global Warming.

which did so much harm in the USSR. It is so popular that anyone who contests it is labeled some kind of kook.

If a person is biased to finding a given result, he will find it. In the temperature studies, data that doesn't "fit" is ignored or changed. The Global Warming "community" is already convinced of the reality of global warming and cannot even SEE evidence to the contrary.

I have spent considerable time lately looking up information on global warming and it is VERY easy to find evidence supporting it. It is also VERY easy to find evidence refuting it. It is NOT universally accepted, even among climatologists. There is plenty of real-world evidence to the effect that it isn't happening at all, and even more that to the extent it is happening, its causes cannot be laid to burning fossil fuels.

There is no sci-fi involved in all this. There is, however, a great deal of politically-motivated rhetoric and dubious science all around. I refuse to be duped by any of it.

I'll repeat a telling quote I have found so far: "In fact, the evidence supporting the claim that the earth has grown warmer is shaky; the theory is weak; and the models on which the conclusions are based cannot even replicate the current climate." Sorry – no sale.

--

Robert Sturgeon
Summum ius summa inuria.
<http://www.vistech.net/users/rsturge/>