

Re: NASA's Griffin smoking crack?

Re: NASA's Griffin smoking crack?

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.space.history/2007-06/msg00106.html>

- *From:* fredfighter@xxxxxxxxxxx
 - *Date:* Fri, 08 Jun 2007 10:28:28 -0700
-

On Jun 4, 1:49 am, "Scott Hedrick" <dinehnmNOS...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

<fredfigh...@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message

news:1180891339.265189.315000@xx

Then he should be able to provide verifiable data to that effect.

I would prefer a sound theoretical basis for predicting the future.

That doesn't seem to be necessary for the global warming True Believers.

This would require temperature data taken from hundreds of places over thousands of years.

I disagree. Gathering data on climate change from periods of time when conditions on the earth were much different from today is useful, but not so useful and one cannot do without it.

How can you calibrate the models without data?

You cannot.

Nor can you calibrate a model with data from outside the

Re: NASA's Griffin smoking crack?

Re: NASA's Griffin smoking crack?

range of applicability of the model.

We have good data going back for about a century and fair data for a century before that. Farther back, conditions become considerably less certain, and what is known indicates that there were pretty different.

....

I think we should do a lot of things because we can and because they are good ideas. I think we should reduce CO2 emissions– by we, I mean *the entire planet, including the developing nations*, not merely the United States– or find some way to use them, not because of global warming, but any waste is inefficient. It's time to build more nuclear plants, *as well as* increase the use of wind (even if it's in sight of Ted Kennedy's patio) and solar *as well as* put more oil wells off the coast of Florida. We need to find ways to make vehicles more fuel efficient *without* making them less safe by reducing their weight. We need to build desalinisation plants *as well as* develop more efficient plumbing and better ways of processing waste. We need to greatly increase recycling, even if it costs us a bit more–if we already paid to get stuff out of the ground or to make stuff, it doesn't make sense to throw it away if we can use it again in a new way. We also need to build transmissions lines and pipelines to make better use of what we have so we don't have to build more plants simply because we can't get what we have to where we want it– that is a lot of the problem California has. Mostly, we need to find a way to show that "green"– *real* "green", not simply "fashionable green"– is commercially viable. We need to do these things, not because of global warming or other environmental reasons, but because they are good ideas and the way we do a lot of things now are wasteful and, damnit, where it's practical to make something more efficient, we *ought* to do it– even if it *doesn't* fix global warming.

What do you infer from that?

You've been thinking.

--

FF

.