
Subject: Re: Global Warming: Real or Fraud
Posted by [SPIKDUM](#) on Fri, 25 Dec 2009 14:45:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

<http://www.skepticalscience.com/climate-change-little-ice-age-medieval-warm-period.htm>

1. Their data is flawed. In terms of Ice ages (like the Last Glacial Maximum) they're off by thousands of years.

2. Once again, climate is a combination of thousands of elements, yet:

Quote:Our climate is governed by the following principle: when you add more heat to our climate, global temperatures rise. Conversely, when the climate loses heat, temperatures fall.

If temperatures rise, they are balanced out somewhere else. If they drop, they are balanced out somewhere else. They assume that there is one global climate, while earth is a patchwork of thousands of climates. When climate change occurs, it is best seen on the EDGES of those climates, because climate zones start to shift (actually, climate change just IS the shifting of climate zones to other positions, Polar, Mid-latitude, Sub-Tropical and Tropical, and their sub-zones. As I said, during Glacials ICE SHEETS grow, meaning that the Polar zones are far larger. Understanding this leads to understanding why there is no single global climate.). THAT'S how you measure climate sensitivity.

Not by:

Quote:Once you have the change in temperature and radiative forcing, climate sensitivity can be calculated.

The fact that there is no global climate that can kill off everything is proven by for instance, Sequoia trees in the USA. These are so-called "Tertiary Relicts", trees that should have been extinct after the Tertiary period ended, yet still flourish. Why? Because of the western mountain ranges in the USA their ecological niches were protected from climate change, thus, the climate zone stayed the same, and the trees survived.

Yet, in all these articles, every argument is based on the assumption that there is a global, fragile, climate that is changing due to CO2 emissions. Through their reasoning, Sequoia trees should not exist, because apparently climate does not occur as a local/regional phenomenon.

<http://www.skepticalscience.com/empirical-evidence-for-global-warming.htm>

Based on the assumption that CO2 is the main cause for climate change. Refer to fourth link comment.

<http://www.skepticalscience.com/Are-humans-too-insignificant-to-affect-global-climate.htm>

Funny, they use two different ice cores from two different regions for three different periods to show the rise of CO2 levels. Quite a coincidence that they don't have one SINGLE ice core that shows the CO2 levels over a longer period of time. Also, the readings from Hawaii show a massive increase over the past 100 years or so. HAWAII IS A VOLCANO. Those readings are utterly worthless. Fail.

<http://www.skepticalscience.com/CO2-is-not-the-only-driver-of-climate.htm>

Reversal of cause and effect. CO2 does not cause climate change, it's an effect of it and further enhances it. Fail.

As you see here (in a PROPER ice core data set) rising CO2 concentrations are an echo, an

aftereffect of rising temperatures and climate changes.

Why this is so is not known, but one plausible explanation is: Less ice sheets, more inhabitable areas of the earth for flora/fauna > More CO2 production. This is probably just one of many causes for CO2 increases though.

The current rising CO2 levels fit in perfectly with the rest of the graph. So if it's our fault that CO2 levels are rising we should go back to the early middle-eastern civilizations 10,000 years ago because look, when humans first started making houses CO2 levels begin to rise! Because they didn't ban housebuilding we now have an unstoppable greenhouse effect!

Also, every 90,000-100,000 years the earth gets far closer to the sun due to changes in its orbit (one of the Milankovitch cycles). When the temperatures start to rise? Every 90,000-100,000 years. In addition to that the earth's tilt changes every 40,000 years, making it more angled towards or away from the sun within its orbit. So when the earth's eccentricity and its obliquity coincide in stages where they are both "forcing" the earth closer to the sun, we have even higher temperature increases. The temperature rises we are experiencing now are nothing compared to the temperature heights in the past.

Same as I said in my first post. All this is BIASED data. Carefully selected to prove a point, not to gain insight into a process.

surth? / surth! wrote on Fri, 25 December 2009 07:47

IM STUDYING SO I KNOW IT BETTER K

Nope. It's my business to understand what's going on. Knowledge is useless if you don't understand why and how things happen.


You obviously don't know and don't understand.

File Attachments


1) [WHAT NAO.jpg](#), downloaded 533 times

Temperature and CO₂ concentration in the atmosphere over the past 400 000 y (from the Vostok ice core)

CO₂ concentration, ppmv



Temperature change from present, °C



GRID Arendal UNEP

GRAPHIC DESIGN

Source: J.R. Petit, J. Jouzel, et al. Climate and atmospheric history of the past 420 000 years from the Vostok ice core in Antarctica, *Nature* 399 (3June), pp 429-436, 1999.