

Re: SERIOUS question about CO2 (Sincere Question. Please Help if you can)

Re: SERIOUS question about CO2 (Sincere Question. Please Help if you can)

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.geo.meteorology/2007-07/msg00051.html>

- *From:* Weatherlawyer <Weatherlawyer@xxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 15 Jul 2007 13:59:03 -0700
-

On Jul 15, 6:57 pm, William Asher <gcn...@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Crackles McFarly wrote:

If someone had a LOT of money and we asked them to build a factory to do nothing but pump out extremely gigantic amounts of CO2, would this "speed up" or have any measurable effect on Global Warming ??

Note:I'm speaking of a factory that could produce a daily amount of CO2 in nearly unimaginable amounts 24 hours a day non-stop.

I'd be delighted with a sincere and honest answer to this scenario.

And yes I am being sincere and serious with this question.
I am NOT trying to trip anyone up and have not Biased my question as I am willing to accept any thoughtful answer.

It might actually help some of us understand this topic more, might make one side or the other be more solid in their belief.

The factory would have to use unimaginable amounts of energy to make the CO2. By making all the CO2, you would suck so much heat out of the atmosphere, the planet would freeze solid all the way down to the core. Were this to happen, the expanding cold front from Earth would likely freeze the solar system, stopping planetary motion, causing Mercury, Venus, Mars, Jupiter, Saturn, and Uranus all to plummet into the sun, causing it to go supernova, which would upset the Milky Way, who would then expel the Solar System into the intergalactic void for causing trouble, and when the Earth crossed the galactic boundary we would all be changed into evil

Re: SERIOUS question about CO2 (Sincere Question. Please Help if you can)

Re: SERIOUS question about CO2 (Sincere Question. Please Help if you can)

supermen intent on destroying the Enterprise except first we would nail the hot chick with weird eyes before dying because a big rock fell on us.

Actually there is a way to measure the energy requirement. Just substitute a week's volcanic output for a time there should have been a large magnitude quake or a super tropical storm:

http://groups.google.com/group/sci.geo.earthquakes/browse_frm/thread/155a7e55c054c1b1/#

And you can do it with simple substitution and a lot less vitriol.

When the North Atlantic Oscillation and I presume something similar for other large ocean basins, is negative, we tend to get high volcanic activity at the expense of severe quakes or super-cyclones:

http://groups.google.com/group/sci.geo.earthquakes/browse_frm/thread/4cf2897205cf34db/071b3239dd5a5c28?lnk=g

My definition of a negative oscillation is an earlier rendition of the phenomenon than that which is accepted these days. I require a longish period where cyclones and anticyclones have core pressures not that dissimilar to each other.

.