

## Re: AMD's well may be running dry

---

*Source:* <http://unix.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/comp.os.vms/2007-03/msg00897.html>

---

- *From:* "Dr. Dweeb" <[spam@xxxxxxxx](mailto:spam@xxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Sat, 17 Mar 2007 02:44:08 +0100
- 

JF Mezei wrote:

Dr. Dweeb wrote:

What is needed is real science instead of "climatologists" postulating cause-effect and then trying to prove it, and having failed, using the political process to sell the idea anyway.

Are you able to disprove the fact that when water goes from -0 to +0, it melts ?

Are you able to diprove the number on the amount of ice on land in both the arctic/greenland as well as antarctica ?

Are you able to disprove the fact that more and more of the arctic ocean becomes open water in the summer and that the summer (in terms of navication) is longer now than it was before ? Are you able to disprove that this ice is currently melting and are you able to provide that satellite imaging showing ice covered surfaces schrinking ?

Are you able to disprove the fact that darker substances aborb more heat than white snow ? (aka: open ocean water versus ice/snow covered ocean) ?

Are you aware of El Ninio and the destructive nature of the weather that accompanies it ? It is caused by minute temperature changes in ocean water. Imagine how much a more significant change in ocean temperature and water levels would do.

How much in terms of assets and infrastructure in the USA are near sea level ? How much or that would be destroyed by rising sea levels which would bring more destruction/flooding/erosion during storms ?

Can you really afford to ignore the scientific facts ?

You are an intellectually incapable fool (this is is a personal opinion

Re: AMD's well may be running dry

based on your postings)

You need to distinguish observation and cause-effect – something which you amply demonstrate here that you are incapable of doing.

Again, forget the USA's weather. You need to consider the border zones where the average temperature is near the freezing point. Raise the average temperature by a couple of degrees and all of a sudden, you have a lot of ice melting into the ocean.

Your reaction is akin to homeowners near a river being warned of possible flooding in the spring and refuse to sand bag their property because they see no scientific evidence that this will happen since those are just predictions.

You are correct. This isn't hard evidence like the knowledge that mixing glycerine with nitro something creates a mighty explosive.

But the humanity has moved beyond just empirical evidence a LONG LONG time ago. We have the power of reason and deduction. And we can predict certain things. Einstein was pretty good and coming up with theories that have been accepted.

Based on what we are seeing happen today (weather data, and those are factual), we can reason/deduct that we are headed towards something really really bad if nothing is done with it.

We also know that CO<sub>2</sub> is a greenhouse gas (as well as others). Humans have that uncanny ability to test CO<sub>2</sub> in a lab and find that it lets light through, but reflects infrared, AND they are able to deduct what happens on a planetary scale.

We also know that humans have recently begun to introduce large quantities of CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere (previously sequestered for millions of years underground), and that the weather DATA starts to match CO<sub>2</sub> emissions starting at a certain point. (aka: when CO<sub>2</sub> production exceeded plant consumption of CO<sub>2</sub>). Consider also that airlines dump CO<sub>2</sub> in upper atmosphere where plants can't get to it. The minute it goes out the jet engines, it is contributing to rising temperatures. At least the gas that comes out of the SUV/Hummers people drive takes a number of years before it reaches the upper atmosphere, and at least while still near the ground, those gases have a chance to be captured by plants. Sorry, but people who refuse to accept the fact that CO<sub>2</sub> is harming the planet are like ultra religious people who refused to accept the fact that the earth is not the centre of the universe.

You would be a failure as a scientist. This post is flawed at so many

Re: AMD's well may be running dry

Re: AMD's well may be running dry

levels it is difficult to know where to start.

You take a set of selected observed events, and ascribe them all to a single cause with no theoretical basis upon which to do so. You then posit a solution based on this faulty logic.

It is as logically flawed to list the same set of observed events, ascribe them to a supernatural being, and claim that burning cows at the altar will solve the problem!!!

The bottom line is that climatological models are incapable of predicting the past, where all the data is known, and relying on them to predict the future is of the same level of folly as relying upon prayer – ie. an act of faith.

If it can be predicted accurately, that global temperatures will fluctuate in certain cycles based on the physics of planetary movement and the observed behaviour of the physics of the power source etc., and these predictions concord closely with the past and measurements in real time, then the theory has merit and is likely to have a high degree of predictive reliability.

A scientific theory that has no predictive capability is useless and will be discarded by a scientist as a futile pursuit.

Climatology has essentially zero credibility at present. Current models are incapable of predicting the past when all the inputs and outputs are known. Why do you think that climatological models might accurately predict the future, or even explain the present, when they are incapable of predicting known history? There are plenty of theories with large bodies of scientific and empirical research that accurately predict the past and present which clearly are better choices upon which to base policy.

The politics of alarmism or whatever you wish to call it is not serving science, or humanity.

There are environmental issues that are more important, where the cause–effect is demonstrated and provable, and where mankind's actions (or inactions) can affect the state. In these areas there is a cost benefit for expending energy and money.

Yelling and screaming about the end of life as we know it because of a very dubious cause–effect ascription to CO2 emissions is a waste of breath and effort.

Dweeb

Re: AMD's well may be running dry

Re: AMD's well may be running dry

When you drill for oil, you sell the oil with a fossil fuel tax on it. The refiner buys oil to be refined and buys oil to fuel the refining process. The refined product is sold with a tax that combines both. The steel maker buys refined oil and pays that fossil fuel tax. When it sells the steel to the car manufacturer, it includes that fossil fuel tax. The car manufacturer then also buys oil to fuel its car assembly plants and the fossil fuel taxes from all the products that go into the car are combined.

When the car is sold, the owner ends up paying for the total carbon footprint that was used to manufacture the car. The beauty of this is that if that car is exported to another country, it is the person in the other country that inherits the responsibility for the car's carbon footprint and it affects that country's per capita carbon footprint. (just discussing manufacture it, not use). Similarly, when someone buys fuel at a petrol station to power his/her car, they pay the end carbon tax on the refined fuel (just like the steel maker did). But being the end user, they can't deduct it and it goes against that country's per capita CO2 consumption.

Lets assume for a minute that the USA had a positive trade balance, and generated 25% of the world's pollution. Americans citizens should not be penalised for the carbon emissions generated when producing widgets that are exported to canada, mexico or anywhere else. It is the importers that should be penalised.

Re: AMD's well may be running dry

But a company that is highly inefficient and which consumes a lot of oil to produce a widget will not be as competitive as one which is far more efficient since the more efficient one will have a smaller carbon tax attached to the product. There would have to be some exceptions such as companies that sequester oil products (plastics, vaseline, lubricants etc). Those do not get burned so they should get a refund on the carbon tax for the amount of fuel they sequester (but still pay the carbon tax generated when the raw oil was refined before being delivered to them).