

## Re: article in latest sci american

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.geo.geology/2005-02/0972.html>

---

**From:** BillC ([joedoakes\\_at\\_compuserve.com](mailto:joedoakes_at_compuserve.com))

**Date:** 02/14/05

Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 04:20:34 GMT

"jonathan" <[Write@Instead.com](mailto:Write@Instead.com)> wrote in message  
news:4210099c\$1\_1@127.0.0.1...

>

> *"Jo Schaper" <[joschapern4ospam@2socketdot.no5net](mailto:joschapern4ospam@2socketdot.no5net)> wrote in message  
> news:110v2bta50811c8@corp.supernews.com...*

>> *Joe Zorzin wrote:*

>> > *The most recent Scientific American (just got it yesterday) has an  
>> > article*

>> > *which says that agriculture and deforestation of the past several  
>> > thousand*

>> > *years have contributed to global warming and countered what otherwise  
>> > would*

>> > *have been slowly lowering temperatures that would have brought us to  
>> > the*

>> > *brink of another ice age. I'm no scientist, but this sounds like a*

>> > *rationalization for global warming.*

>>

>> *Depends what you mean by 'rationalization'. Trees and forests are a  
>> great force for the sequestration of CO2. Grasses (and much agriculture  
>> are grasses) do so on a much smaller scale. Large scale plowing breaks  
>> up the CO2 reservoir in the upper levels of the soil. Animals produce  
>> CO2. Now, I'm not sure how factory farming of cattle, pigs and chickens  
>> and the existence of excess humans compares in CO2/methane production  
>> when balanced against the slaughter of bison and oher large animals, but  
>> it could very well be a factor. Hydrocarbon mining (just bringing  
>> methane, oil and other hydrocarbons to surface from below ground) also  
>> increases surficial CO2 levels, long before it is burned as fuel.*

>>

>> *Therefore, deforestation reduces the rate of CO2 sequestration, repeated  
>> plowing releases CO2, and animal and excess people (not talking about  
>> their industrialization, just breathing) \*might\* increase net CO2  
>> production. While this is rational, (assuming the people have numbers to  
>> back up their claims), I don't see how it is 'rationalization'.*

>>

>> *There actually is a fair amount of research going into CO2 sequestration  
>> strategies by the US DOE.*

>

sci.geo.geology: Re: article in latest sci american

- >
- > *This sort of analysis points out the complexity involved. Countless*
- > *variables that are constantly changing. A deterministic approach*
- > *of real world problems, as always, leads to ever more*
- > *uncertainty as one moves towards ever more detail.*
- >
- > *It's a simple mathematical limit. As one approaches the maximum*
- > *amount of detailed component knowledge, the uncertainty and*
- > *error in the extrapolations back to the whole also moves towards*
- > *maximum.*
- >
- > *In your 'science' by the time you finish, if ever, bickering*
- > *over details and relevance the problem will have moved*
- > *out from under your feet.*

Whatever the hell it is that you're babbling about here, I'll just bet none of it stops you from using all the modern conveniences, not to mention medical science. Or do you live in a hut and travel on foot and go to faith healers? Do you use mental holistic techniques to post to the internet?