

Re: 'Climate Witnesses' Testify About Warming

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.geo.meteorology/2004-12/0038.html>

From: Carsten Troelsgaard (carsten.troelsgaard_at_mail.dk)

Date: 12/11/04

Date: Sat, 11 Dec 2004 21:55:36 +0100

"Lloyd Parker" <lparker@NOSPAMemory.edu> skrev i en meddelelse
news:cpf95d\$146\$3@puck.cc.emory.edu...

> In article <[41bad6af\\$0\\$141\\$edfadb0f@dread11.news.tele.dk](mailto:41bad6af$0$141$edfadb0f@dread11.news.tele.dk)>,

> "Carsten Troelsgaard" <carsten.troelsgaard@mail.dk> wrote:

>>

>> *Can someone explain to me why "greenhouse gas" is not an artefact of
>> scientific intimidation: As far as I know, any gass in the atmosphere
acts*

>> *as a "greenhouse gas" with it's particular range of low-wave frequencies
>> through which heat radiates off from the ground.*

>

> *Only those gases that absorb IR radiation from the earth (which would
> otherwise escape to space) and re-radiate it in all directions (thus
> warming the earth) are greenhouse gases. N2, for example, is transparent
> to IR radiation.*

Thanks. I've grown to realize that since I posted.

Elifritz is right in the sense that I'm rather unfamiliar with the set of problems that has focus in the climate debate. It doesn't prevent me participating though. One question has come up while reading: The low frequency window that is somewhat central in the wavefrequencies where Earth surface has maximum irradiance seems to be the only radiation conduit through which Earth irradiates energy – or the only one that seems to be calculated on. I haven't had much success in finding sources on irradiation in the transparent parts of the spectrum – and possible mechanisms of transfer of energi from the opaque to the transparent irradiation.

I'll take a look at the links that Graham P. Davis sent.

Carsten

>> *Given the amount of papers that has been made on climatology for the
> passed*

>> *10 years, I should know better and stay off the debate. But I'm a
> geologist*

>> *and cannot be surprised when changing temperatures are registrated.*

>> *I'm in no way trying to neglect the care that we should show our*

>> *environment, but I certainly would consider other options if I should*

> > *approach the problems of receding bio-diversity and lack of fresh water*
in
> > *Bangladesh, than looking at man-made temperature rise. A changing*
> *relative*
> > *sea-level is the geological rule, not the exception.*
>
> *But consider the rate at which it will change.*
>
> > *As for a growing size of a lake in Himalaya, a small tilt of this active*
> > *geological region is likely to have the impact that is seen. A rise of*
> > *lake-level would otherwise enhance the runoff if not the treshold is*
> > *changed.*
> > *As for the human habitats of oceanic reefs, general pollution that*
> *inhibits*
> > *their natural growth seems to me to be a problem with a possible higher*
> > *impact than subtle sealevel changes.*
> > *In all, registrating the subtle changes that is reported is fine, but*
next
> > *to being somewhat dobious, man-made temperature changes has become a hat*
> > *that conviniently covers any odd event.*
> >
> >
> >
> > *Carsten*
> >
> >