
Subject: Re: Global Warming: Real or Fraud
Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Fri, 18 Dec 2009 13:36:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

nikki6ixx wrote on Thu, 17 December 2009 21:39 Well first off, the hockey stick graph is seriously flawed, and here's why:

The first nine centuries of the millennium were measured by using tree-ring cycles, yet the modern era is represented by temperatures. Why on Earth are they using two totally different measurements in the same graph?

If this were a math question, there'd be a big red 'X' because it wasn't calculated properly. Any scientist knows that you need to maintain the same measurements throughout an experiment. Why is it that this graph hasn't been held to the same standards of a Grade 11 Chemistry experiment? Why didn't they stick with tree rings for the twentieth century, hmm?

I'll tell you why: the tree rings after the 1960's actually show a decline in temperature. This is the same decline that Phil Jones, one of the men who are implicated with the leaked emails had tried to hide. Had this data been included, then it'd actually show that the Medieval Ages had experience a warm period, warmer than today, actually. Of course, a Mr. Steve McIntyre proved to the world that the 'hockey stick' is a fallacy.

Still, the Climatic Research Unit have pressed on with this now discredited graph, and had once again tried to pull the wool over everyone's eyes. They revised the hockey stick graph to now match tree rings for this century, and the results were relatively consistent with their first flawed graph. Unfortunately, it only took a little bit of snooping to realize that the CRU was once again tampering with science, by 'cherry picking' one tree in Siberia whose rings were consistent with the data that the CRU wanted.

I'm no scientist, but in all my biology labs, we have a thing called 'replication' . We're taught that hypotheses, in order to be true, must be replicated successfully time and time again. One tree is NOT replication. These scientists are ignoring their own scientific process. But I guess adhering to scientific process must make me a 'denier,' which brings me to my next point:

What's with all the hate from people towards us so-called 'deniers?' It's like there's a 'Church of Climate Science' now, where the 'believers' will persecute people who think another way. I make a point to call people who suck down all this climate 'science' members of this church, and they get super angry. You should try it; usually they're atheists, so it's fun times.

Great thing this site i keep linking to has this explained TOO! how awesome is that!
<http://www.skepticalscience.com/Hockey-stick-without-tree-rings.html>
<http://www.skepticalscience.com/broken-hockey-stick.htm>

Quote:Here's my biggest beef with the whole situation. Surth keeps linking to this site 'Skeptical Science' which has stock answers for 'climate skeptics' ...

...Aren't scientists supposed to be skeptics? That's the whole point of science, there's always an

air of skepticism, which is why the scientific process exists. That's why everything is a theory: the 'theory of evolution,' 'the theory of magnetism,' 'the theory of relativity' to name just a few. All of them are very rock solid with mountains of evidence, and can be tested, and replicated, and yet are called theories because there's a chance that they may yet be unproven - that's skepticism. you may want to check up on the difference between a scientific theory and a non-scientific one.

Quote:

I'll bet you ten dollars that if you were to have an argument with a warming 'believer' and told them the evidence isn't there nor is it complete, they'd likely pull out the ol' spiel used by those who believe that there's an old dude who lives in clouds and employs people with wings in their backs. However, bring up Evolution, and say it's a lie, and that very same person will point to the mountain of evidence in support of it. Call them on this, and you'll get an awesome reaction. You ever see a person almost melt their face off from a mixture of embarrassment and rage? I have. It's fun. Do it in university or college for even better results. In other news, this anecdotal story here totally unproves global warming!

Guess what, a lot of people are dumb. some people believing in global warming are incidentally dumb too.

Some people who believe in gravity are dumb too, but that doesnt change anything about the theory itself.

Quote:

Finally, let's go right to irony of of Copenhagen:

1,200 limousines

140 private jets flying VIP's in and out of town

A menu that includes: Jumbo Shrimp from the Indian Ocean, Norwegian Salmon, fruits and veggies from Africa, South America and Southern Europe.

All of this is flown in daily to ensure freshness.

The columnist George Will estimates that this conference will add 41,000 tonnes of CO2 to the air. That's the only thing that's going to come from this conference: a ton of useless hot air, with politicians getting fat on our dollar. If they really cared (aka, KNEW global warming was actually true) they would've found a way to telecommute, or lessen the impact.

Agreed for most parts. however, a lot of them actually know global warming is true, they just dont care. I wonder if that is because most politicians are old and thus can afford to not care about the future...
