

---

Subject: The Bush Administration Distorts Science to fit its agenda

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Sat, 06 Mar 2004 23:42:12 GMT

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

---

Gizbotvas<http://www.guardian.co.uk/usa/story/0,1227...1151187,00.html>

<http://www.nola.com/news/t-p/index.ssf?/ba...87160101560.xml>

<http://www.dfw.com/mld/dfw/news/opinion/8093990.htm>

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/science/nature/3502867.stm>

The first two articles are editorials and mean absolutely nothing.

The third article is biased.

The Reuters article didn't even load correctly, so I couldn't read it.

The BBC article is really the only credible article you have posted there, and even THAT is a little biased, though not as prevalent as the others.

The report itself is a joke. You said it was written by scientists? Nobel prize-winning ones, at that? You'd think a Nobel prize-winning scientist can write a concise report about the problems it's dealing with :rolleyes:. Half of the report is made up of crap like, UCS report, page 7, first paragraph

Researchers at the National Weather Service gather and analyze meteorological data to know when to issue severe-weather advisories.

Specialists at the Federal Reserve Board collect and analyze economic data to determine when to raise

or lower interest rates Well no fuckin' duh! Can you get to your point, PLEASE??? But no, crap like that goes on for pages and pages. Not until page 11 does it even BEGIN to make its case against the Bush administration. What you've learned up to that point is, "The Bush administration lies!" That statement is restated over and over again in many different ways. Oh no, they wouldn't add any evidence to support that conviction within the first three pages of writing now, would they?

And the point made on page 11 is crap, too. It's about the farce called "global warming." Here's a priceless quote, found on page 12:

UCS report The deletion of a temperature record covering 1,000 years in order to, according to the EPA

has been an increase in the average temperature of the world? :rolleyes:

Accurate temperature recording didn't start until about 100 years ago, if I remember correctly what my biology teacher told me.

Even if there were accurate temperature recordings of the last 1000 years, what's to say global warming is not a natural process of the earth? 1000 years is barely the blink of an eye, geologically speaking.

If I'm not mistaken, about thirty years ago, all of the eco-terrorists and tree-hugging hippies were afraid of global cooling, saying if humans kept on doing whatever it was they were mad about that the world would be plunged into another ice age. :rolleyes:

Here's an article explaining the truth about global warming.

Did I mention the evidence used in the report consisted mostly of biased and opinionated documents?

---