

---

Subject: Re: Global Warming: Katrina, Rita, Wilma: Whats next?

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Fri, 28 Oct 2005 00:02:19 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:Scientists at NASA and the National Snow and Ice Data Center, which have monitored the ice via satellites since 1978, say the total Arctic ice in 2005 will cover the smallest area since they started measuring.

I'm hearing an awful lot of "Scientists Say" without any actual data attached. Without the numbers, the charts, the studies, what scientists SAY is just another bloody opinion. Nice try, but you have produced no proof.

Not only that, but your "references" come from one of the WORST possible sources- the news media. Just in case you weren't aware, the media has a tendency to publish only the most exciting stories, leaving opposing views that have less shock value in the dust. For an exaggerated example (but not as exaggerated as it might appear), which of these two report titles would more likely be seen on the front page of a newspaper?

A. GLOBAL WARMING DUE TO NATURAL CYCLE

or

B. GLOBAL WARMING IS ALL OUR FAULT

B is more likely to catch a reader's attention and provoke a reaction, therefore B will be closer to the front page- you'd be lucky if you found A in a block below the editorials, as unexciting as it appears. The media caters to ratings and readership, not to balanced, well-delivered, factual information.

Go on- find a trustworthy source. Go dig up the images those satellites recorded, go get graphs depicting findings from examination of core samples (which would be an aid in determining the extent of previous warm/cold cycles), go get a few published reports (and I don't mean reports in the paper) complete with references and detailed experimental procedures. When you've got any of the above, that would be proof.

---