
Subject: Global warming
Posted by [ohmybad](#) on Mon, 11 Sep 2006 01:52:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Simple question: Do you believe global warming is happening?

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [Matix](#) on Mon, 11 Sep 2006 02:13:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yes. Have you seen those graphs of the average temp in the US, it's growing. And those glaciers or something, is melting really fast, and soon it will be just plain water. I think making this thread is pointless.

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 11 Sep 2006 02:21:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The earth goes through natural and reoccurring warming and cooling. This isn't the first time, and it won't be the last time.

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 11 Sep 2006 02:27:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Is the earth warming? Sure! Were we afraid we were causing global cooling a mere 30-40 years ago? Yep! Are we causing the global warming? Doubtful.

The earth has been going through cycles of warming and cooling ever since the beginning.

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 11 Sep 2006 02:29:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Crimson wrote on Sun, 10 September 2006 22:27: Is the earth warming? Sure! Were we afraid we were causing global cooling a mere 30-40 years ago? Yep! Are we causing the global warming? Doubtful.

The earth has been going through cycles of warming and cooling ever since the beginning. Exactly. The earth has natural cycles. Hell, the (magnetic) poles even switch. North has been South and South has been North.

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [Aprime](#) on Mon, 11 Sep 2006 04:34:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

True, but I believe that we've accelerated the process.

There's a reason why the scientific community calls them greenhouse gases.

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Mon, 11 Sep 2006 05:49:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

And there's a reason many prominent scientists call the science behind it "junk science."
It's all been politicized.

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [Aprime](#) on Mon, 11 Sep 2006 07:38:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Your mom =! prominent scientist.

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [Goztow](#) on Mon, 11 Sep 2006 14:41:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

There has been enough scientific evidence that this is happening. It seems the US is about the only economic super power that still seems to believe it isn't. then again, they also seem to believe that there's an unlimited amount of petrol left. Funny, not?

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 11 Sep 2006 14:59:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'm not vouching for the validity of these sites, nor do I have the time to read them at work, but here they are:

http://www.grida.no/climate/ipcc_tar/wg1/index.htm
<http://chemistry.beloit.edu/warming/index.html>

Subject: Re: Global warming

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Mon, 11 Sep 2006 15:01:43 GMT

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

Goztow There has been enough scientific evidence that this is happening. It seems the US is about the only economic super power that still seems to believe it isn't. then again, they also seem to believe that there's an unlimited amount of petrol left. Funny, not?

Let's see it, then. Let's see how the actions of humans have directly caused an increase in the average temperature of the entire surface of the Earth, and explain to us how this is not being caused by natural cycles occurring on Earth and on the Sun.

Then you can explain to us how it's all the United States' fault and why we should completely ignore the actions of developing third-world nations like China (which, by the way, has the highest annual GDP growth rate and will soon rival the United States for the world's largest economy).

And Al Gore documentaries don't count as evidence because Al Gore doesn't count for a human.

Subject: Re: Global warming

Posted by [Scythar](#) on Mon, 11 Sep 2006 15:08:32 GMT

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

Hydra wrote on Mon, 11 September 2006 11:01 Let's see it, then. Let's see how the actions of humans have directly caused an increase in the average temperature of the entire surface of the Earth, and explain to us how this is not being caused by natural cycles occurring on Earth and on the Sun.

Then you can explain to us how it's all the United States' fault and why we should completely ignore the actions of developing third-world nations like China (which, by the way, has the highest annual GDP growth rate and will soon rival the United States for the world's largest economy).

And Al Gore documentaries don't count as evidence because Al Gore doesn't count for a human.

I don't think anyone here is claiming that. The original poster asked whether we think the climate is warming, which it is. We're not arguing who's causing it as far as I know.

Subject: Re: Global warming

Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 11 Sep 2006 15:09:47 GMT

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

err.. who said it was the fault of the United States?

Subject: Re: Global warming

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 11 Sep 2006 15:29:45 GMT

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

Goztow wrote on Mon, 11 September 2006 10:41 There has been enough scientific evidence that

this is happening. It seems the US is about the only economic super power that still seems to believe it isn't. then again, they also seem to believe that there's an unlimited amount of petrol left. Funny, not?

What evidence? The earth has rising temperatures? Sure, but, as already stated by me and Crimson, the earth goes through natural reoccurring cooling and warming stages.

Just because we consume the most amount of petrol doesn't mean that we automatically think it's an unlimited supply.

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [Scythar](#) on Mon, 11 Sep 2006 15:44:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

j_ball430 wrote on Mon, 11 September 2006 11:29Goztow wrote on Mon, 11 September 2006 10:41There has been enough scientific evidence that this is happening. It seems the US is about the only economic super power that still seems to believe it isn't. then again, they also seem to believe that there's an unlimited amount of petrol left. Funny, not?
What evidence? The earth has rising temperatures? Sure, but, as already stated by me and Crimson, the earth goes through natural reoccurring cooling and warming stages.

Nobody is claiming that Earth isn't going through natural cycles that cause temperatures to change. But it doesn't change the fact that global warming is happening, whatever the cause may be. You're assuming the same as Hydra and turning this into a debate of who is to blame, without any reason. Nobody has claimed here that the US or humans in general are to blame.

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [terminator 101](#) on Mon, 11 Sep 2006 16:07:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ohmybad wrote on Sun, 10 September 2006 21:52Simple question: Do you believe global warming is happening?
That is like Asking if greenhouse effect is happening. Of course it is.

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [Goztow](#) on Mon, 11 Sep 2006 16:08:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I didn't state the US is to blame, I stated their politicians are still ignoring the problem deliberately.

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 11 Sep 2006 17:56:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Goztow wrote on Mon, 11 September 2006 12:08I didn't state the US is to blame, I stated their politicians are still ignoring the problem deliberately.
What problem? If it's just a natural cycle then nothing can be done regardless if the US decides to act like we give a damn.

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [Scythar](#) on Mon, 11 Sep 2006 18:04:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I think it certainly is a problem. Just because we can't do anything to it - which isn't necessarily true - doesn't mean we should ignore it, just like we shouldn't ignore any other natural disasters. USA's help in studying this phenomenon is important. However, that's a completely different matter which doesn't involve lessening "greenhouse gases" but researching ways to evade possible catastrophes before they happen instead. Yes, that's an exaggerated comment and we don't know what exactly might happen in 100 years, but I'm just making a point.

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 11 Sep 2006 18:32:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yes, but if it's a natural cycle that keeps switching (and causes no real harm), what point is there to try and control it? If the earth is going to cool back down, why continue research on it warming up?

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [Scythar](#) on Mon, 11 Sep 2006 18:43:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

j_ball430 wrote on Mon, 11 September 2006 14:32Yes, but if it's a natural cycle that keeps switching (and causes no real harm), what point is there to try and control it? If the earth is going to cool back down, why continue research on it warming up?

True, but we don't really know what kind of effects it could have, do we?. What I was trying to say is that it's important to have large countries such as US help discover the effects. If they prove to be nothing, it's all well. If the effects are found to be disastrous, e.g. global floods, storms or complete lack of food in many areas around the world, then at least we might be able to prepare.

I have no clue at all about this stuff, I don't know what kind of effects a 1-degree increase in climate could cause (I don't have time to read Warranto's links), but that's my point of view nevertheless.

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [Ma1kel](#) on Mon, 11 Sep 2006 18:51:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'll just blame americans and their SUVs for global warming, just like I care a shit that it will be warmer in the winter in Holland. But no I will not, cause good weather makes me happy.)

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 11 Sep 2006 19:10:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Just for reference, the Kyoto Protocol, if followed, would shave 0.11 to 0.20°F off the total projected warming.

30 years ago, it was all about ZGOM GLOBAL COOLING!
http://denisdutton.com/cooling_world.htm

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [jnz](#) on Mon, 11 Sep 2006 19:30:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

no matter how many greenhouse gasses you remove from th atmophere it is still going to happen.

has anyone seen the film "the day after tmorrow"? that is a film all about it.

also lets not turn this into flame wars and keep it a discussion please.

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 11 Sep 2006 19:56:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Crimson wrote on Mon, 11 September 2006 13:10Just for reference, the Kyoto Protocol, if followed, would shave 0.11 to 0.20°F off the total projected warming.

30 years ago, it was all about ZGOM GLOBAL COOLING!
http://denisdutton.com/cooling_world.htm

Pff.. all that means is that we've pumped enough gasses into the atmosphere to counteract the natural cooling trend.

Global Warming does occur, at a "normal" rate (normal being used as a reference for what is natural). However, the same gasses that cause the warming trends are the same ones we are putting into the atmosphere as well. The "normal" rate is exponentially lower than the contribution

we are making. Even though it is a normal thing to happen, does that mean we want it to happen?

Subject: Re: Global warming

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Tue, 12 Sep 2006 06:25:05 GMT

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

Oh yeah, well what are we going to do when our sun turns into a red giant and literally engulfs the earth...goodbye humans (like we will even last that long)

Subject: Re: Global warming

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Tue, 12 Sep 2006 08:22:12 GMT

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

help-linux wrote on Mon, 11 September 2006 12:30no matter how many greenhouse gasses you remove from th atmophere it is still going to happen.

has anyone seen the film "the day after tmorrow"? that is a film all about it.

also lets not turn this into flame wars and keep it a discussion please.

You can't honestly bring a fictional movie into a debate.

Subject: Re: Global warming

Posted by [Berkut](#) on Wed, 13 Sep 2006 00:05:39 GMT

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

I seem to remember reading somewhere that the Earth's axial tilt tends to 'wobble' slightly (like, by feet every other decade, or something, nothing severe). Since the tilt of the Earth greatly determines surface climate, I dunno...

Subject: Re: Global warming

Posted by [jnz](#) on Thu, 14 Sep 2006 21:59:13 GMT

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

Crimson wrote on Tue, 12 September 2006 09:22help-linux wrote on Mon, 11 September 2006 12:30no matter how many greenhouse gasses you remove from th atmophere it is still going to happen.

has anyone seen the film "the day after tmorrow"? that is a film all about it.

also lets not turn this into flame wars and keep it a discussion please.

You can't honestly bring a fictional movie into a debate.

lol, i spelt tomorrow wrong. it is fictional yes but i have looked at the idea and something like this could happen.

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 14 Sep 2006 23:03:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It's FICTIONAL. It is quite clearly a scare tactic created by someone with an agenda and too much money. There was very little factual information in that movie.

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [jnz](#) on Thu, 14 Sep 2006 23:15:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Crimson wrote on Fri, 15 September 2006 00:03It's FICTIONAL. It is quite clearly a scare tactic created by someone with an agenda and too much money. There was very little factual information in that movie.

i know it was made up. what i am saying is that i have belived things that could happen before the movie came out, and so it happens some these things were in the movie when it did.

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 14 Sep 2006 23:25:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

help-linux wrote on Thu, 14 September 2006 19:15Crimson wrote on Fri, 15 September 2006 00:03It's FICTIONAL. It is quite clearly a scare tactic created by someone with an agenda and too much money. There was very little factual information in that movie.what i am saying is that i have belived things that could happen before the movie came out, and so it happens some these things were in the movie when it did.

People believe that extra terrestrial's are going to come and attack the Earth, and there have been movies made about that. Does that mean that it justifies any of the claims for ETs attacking us?

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [Aprime](#) on Thu, 14 Sep 2006 23:47:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It's not a fiction movie according to IMDB.

Subject: Re: Global warming

Posted by [Dave Anderson](#) on Fri, 15 Sep 2006 01:03:28 GMT

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

The theory of "Global Warming" is stupid. Just think, in about 30-100 years they will be complaining about "Global Cooling".

Subject: Re: Global warming

Posted by [jn3](#) on Fri, 15 Sep 2006 06:43:33 GMT

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

Comrade wrote on Fri, 15 September 2006 00:47It's not a fiction movie according to IMDB.

i think alot of it has been exagirated to create effect.

Subject: Re: Global warming

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Fri, 15 Sep 2006 07:15:38 GMT

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

Scythar wrote on Mon, 11 September 2006 11:08I don't think anyone here is claiming that. The original poster asked whether we think the climate is warming, which it is. We're not arguing who's causing it as far as I know.

DAMMIT SCYTHAR, WHY WON'T YOU LET ME GET INTO A RED-FACED RANT AND SHOUT WORDS AT PEOPLE OVER THE INTERNET??? NOW THERE'S NO ONE FOR ME TO GET MAD AT!!!

I WANNA CHANGE THE TOPIC TO SOMETHING I CAN GET MAD ABOUT!!!

Subject: Re: Global warming

Posted by [Scythar](#) on Fri, 15 Sep 2006 09:10:47 GMT

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

Hydra wrote on Fri, 15 September 2006 03:15Scythar wrote on Mon, 11 September 2006 11:08I don't think anyone here is claiming that. The original poster asked whether we think the climate is warming, which it is. We're not arguing who's causing it as far as I know.

DAMMIT SCYTHAR, WHY WON'T YOU LET ME GET INTO A RED-FACED RANT AND SHOUT WORDS AT PEOPLE OVER THE INTERNET??? NOW THERE'S NO ONE FOR ME TO GET MAD AT!!!

I WANNA CHANGE THE TOPIC TO SOMETHING I CAN GET MAD ABOUT!!!

You just got mad a me you self-contradicting camel's arse!! Careful there or your paradoxal behaviour causes the space-time singularity to dilate and implode!

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [jnz](#) on Fri, 15 Sep 2006 16:55:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Scythar wrote on Fri, 15 September 2006 10:10Hydra wrote on Fri, 15 September 2006 03:15Scythar wrote on Mon, 11 September 2006 11:08I don't think anyone here is claiming that. The original poster asked whether we think the climate is warming, which it is. We're not arguing who's causing it as far as I know.
DAMMIT SCYTHAR, WHY WON'T YOU LET ME GET INTO A RED-FACED RANT AND SHOUT WORDS AT PEOPLE OVER THE INTERNET??? NOW THERE'S NO ONE FOR ME TO GET MAD AT!!!

I WANNA CHANGE THE TOPIC TO SOMETHING I CAN GET MAD ABOUT!!!

You just got mad a me you self-contradicting camel's arse!! Careful there or your paradoxal behaviour causes the space-time singularity to dilate and implode!

a singularaty is an infinitely small point in space it cannot implode. just kidding

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [Berkut](#) on Fri, 15 Sep 2006 17:26:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Global warming? No. Global climate shifts? It's happened. Apparently, at one point in time, the Earth had a slightly more torrid climate, but some cataclysmic event (seismic upheaval causing massive flooding, meteor, what have you...), changed the climate a bit. Anywho, I saved my notes from my topography course. A change in the Earth's axial tilt in one direction by only a few degrees could cause an Ice Age. At the same time, a tilt in the other direction could bake the surface of the Earth into oblivion.

So to be safe, don't just slam down into the back of your couch. Slide into it slowly and you could prevent the Apocalypse!

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [Ryan3k](#) on Sat, 16 Sep 2006 16:43:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well, here's something new to argue about, maybe:

<http://www.cnn.com/2006/TECH/science/09/15/global.warming.su.n.reut/index.html>

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [Ma1kel](#) on Sat, 16 Sep 2006 19:31:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

help-linux wrote on Mon, 11 September 2006 14:30no matter how many greenhouse gasses you remove from th atmophere it is still going to happen.

has anyone seen the film "the day after tmorrow"? that is a film all about it.

also lets not turn this into flame wars and keep it a discussion please.
I've seen Two Days Before The Day After Tomorrow.

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [Steppo](#) on Tue, 26 Sep 2006 02:31:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Just so you guys know, there's more CO2 coming out of limestone and shale beneath your feet than ANYTHING that we could produce.

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [DyingCell](#) on Tue, 26 Sep 2006 03:41:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

A cow produces more gases then a Land Rover Disco...

Proven Fact.

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [msgtpain](#) on Tue, 26 Sep 2006 03:46:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Which is why, in 2004, our wonderful government included in the budget, \$19 million dollars to study the effects of cow flatulence...

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [Berkut](#) on Tue, 26 Sep 2006 15:14:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

msgtpain wrote on Mon, 25 September 2006 22:46 Which is why, in 2004, our wonderful government included in the budget, \$19 million dollars to study the effects of cow flatulence...

...and allowed the Navy to purchase a \$600 welcome mat with our tax dollars.

I have a book on government waste, if you want me to bring it.

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 26 Sep 2006 22:02:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Steppo wrote on Mon, 25 September 2006 20:31 Just so you guys know, there's more CO2 coming out of limestone and shale beneath your feet than ANYTHING that we could produce.

I think the idea is that limestone, shale, cows, etc. + (nothing else) = one "natural release" number, but

limestone, shale, cows, etc. + (everything else) = much greater "excessive release" number, which is related to everyone's concerns.

Yes, others things do it naturally, but that's just it... it's done naturally, and is a "normal" occurrence. Adding to that is what people are concerned about.

Example:

Simply to use random numbers for simplicity's sake, lets say the Earth can handle 100 units of CO2 before a "Global Warming" occurs.

Let's combine all the natural sources of CO2, and make it equal to 1 unit released per year. That means it will take 100 years for Global Warming to occur.

Let's now combine all the artificial sources of CO2 and make it equal to 1 unit. By themselves, it also means it will take 100 years for Global Warming to occur.

Not that big of a deal, right? One thing that's missing though:

Because both are occurring simultaneously, we need to add them together. 1 unit of natural + 1 unit of artificial = 2 units released every year. It now only takes 50 years instead of 100 for Global Warming to occur.

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [jnz](#) on Tue, 26 Sep 2006 23:51:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

warranto wrote on Tue, 26 September 2006 23:02
Steppo wrote on Mon, 25 September 2006 20:31
Just so you guys know, there's more CO2 coming out of limestone and shale beneath your feet than ANYTHING that we could produce.

I think the idea is that limestone, shale, cows, etc. + (nothing else) = one "natural release" number, but

limestone, shale, cows, etc. + (everything else) = much greater "excessive release" number, which is related to everyone's concerns.

Yes, others things do it naturally, but that's just it... it's done naturally, and is a "normal" occurrence. Adding to that is what people are concerned about.

Example:

Simply to use random numbers for simplicity's sake, lets say the Earth can handle 100 units of CO2 before a "Global Warming" occurs.

Let's combine all the natural sources of CO2, and make it equal to 1 unit released per year. That means it will take 100 years for Global Warming to occur.

Let's now combine all the artificial sources of CO2 and make it equal to 1 unit. By themselves, it also means it will take 100 years for Global Warming to occur.

Not that big of a deal, right? One thing that's missing though:

Because both are occurring simultaneously, we need to add them together. 1 unit of natural + 1 unit of artificial = 2 units released every year. It now only takes 50 years instead of 100 for Global Warming to occur.

not only that:

100U = earth
-1U = trees plants
1.5U = natural release
1U = our releases

but also if a global warming does occur and we go into an ice-age this is reset. all we are doing is speeding up how long it will take.

some scientists think that we are in a ice age now because it was alot warmer 1000000's of years ago

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [Dave Anderson](#) on Wed, 27 Sep 2006 00:27:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

An ice age now? That is weird.. Where did you hear that at?

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [Steppo](#) on Wed, 27 Sep 2006 02:00:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dave Anderson wrote on Tue, 26 September 2006 20:27An ice age now? That is weird.. Where did you hear that at?

Well, I'd suppose that the existence of glaciers in our current day and age would be a factor... but at the same time there's a helluva lot less glaciation now than there was a few thousand years ago.

Perhaps we're on the tail end of an ice age?

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [Dave Anderson](#) on Wed, 27 Sep 2006 02:16:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I suppose it is possible, and could be happening as we speak. I would think though that it will not happen in my lifetime. It just seems a bit silly to hear people speaking of an ice age when they are talking about global warming. It doesn't seem to add up.

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [jnz](#) on Wed, 27 Sep 2006 20:37:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

i dont understand why some poeple are trying to stop global warming for these reasons:

- 1) it will happen anyway
- 2) people say "Thing of your childeren" but why if it would happen anyway.
- 3) after some though on this i would say that the ice age would bu over then the north atlantic current starts again(or some subsitute) well untill that part of the earth cools it will not. so the green house gasses will have to be destroyed somehow and untill that happens it will not restableize

this means after this ace age is over people in the future will have a second chance, they will not have carbon-based fuels because it will all be burnt up at the rate we use it.

so after this next ice age it will probably be a very long time to the next one.

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [Berkut](#) on Thu, 28 Sep 2006 03:29:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Some call it Global Warming.

I call it Population Control.

Just kidding. Duh.

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [msgtpain](#) on Thu, 28 Sep 2006 03:53:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

help-linux wrote on Wed, 27 September 2006 16:37 this means after this ice age is over people in the future will have a second chance, they will not have carbon-based fuels because it will all be burnt up at the rate we use it.

That is what a lot of eco-freaks would like you to believe, but the truth is, no one knows for sure how much oil and natural gas is really left in the earth today.

Quote:A primary source for worldwide reserves estimates is the Oil & Gas Journal (OGJ).[1] OGJ estimates that at the beginning of 2004, worldwide reserves were 1.27 trillion barrels of oil and 6,100 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. These estimates are 53 billion barrels of oil and 575 trillion cubic feet of natural gas higher than the prior year, reflecting additional discoveries, improving technology, and changing economics.

At 2003 consumption levels [2], the remaining reserves represent 44.6 years of oil and 66.2 years of natural gas. Does this mean that the world will be out of fossil fuels in 50 years or so? That theory has been around since the 1970s. In fact, the figures for years of remaining reserves have remained relative constant over the past few decades as the industry has replaced consumption with newly discovered oil and gas deposits and has developed technologies to increase the amount of oil and gas that can be recovered from existing reservoirs.

Quote:But EIA estimates that in 2025, countries around the globe will still have more than 900 billion barrels of oil remaining to be discovered. EIA estimates total world oil resources at more than 2.9 trillion barrels of oil.

http://www.spe.org/spe/jsp/basic/0,,1104_1008218_1109511,00.html

And, these are what they call currently "recoverable" deposits. They also admit that there are trillions of barrels of known deposits which aren't even being considered because they aren't economically logical to pursue. If people are willing to pay for it, they'll find a way to refine it.

By my guesstimates, there will be no "oh shit we're out of oil, what now?" scenarios for at least 100 years. And I'm pretty sure they'll find the next-best-thing by then.

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [jnz](#) on Thu, 28 Sep 2006 07:17:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

msgtpain wrote on Thu, 28 September 2006 04:53help-linux wrote on Wed, 27 September 2006 16:37 this means after this age is over people in the future will have a second chance, they will not have carbon-based fuels because it will all be burnt up at the rate we use it.

That is what a lot of eco-freaks would like you to believe, but the truth is, no one knows for sure how much oil and natural gas is really left in the earth today.

Quote:A primary source for worldwide reserves estimates is the Oil & Gas Journal (OGJ).[1] OGJ estimates that at the beginning of 2004, worldwide reserves were 1.27 trillion barrels of oil and 6,100 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. These estimates are 53 billion barrels of oil and 575 trillion cubic feet of natural gas higher than the prior year, reflecting additional discoveries, improving technology, and changing economics.

At 2003 consumption levels [2], the remaining reserves represent 44.6 years of oil and 66.2 years of natural gas. Does this mean that the world will be out of fossil fuels in 50 years or so? That theory has been around since the 1970s. In fact, the figures for years of remaining reserves have remained relative constant over the past few decades as the industry has replaced consumption with newly discovered oil and gas deposits and has developed technologies to increase the amount of oil and gas that can be recovered from existing reservoirs.

Quote:But EIA estimates that in 2025, countries around the globe will still have more than 900 billion barrels of oil remaining to be discovered. EIA estimates total world oil resources at more than 2.9 trillion barrels of oil.

http://www.spe.org/spe/jsp/basic/0,,1104_1008218_1109511,00.html

And, these are what they call currently "recoverable" deposits. They also admit that there are trillions of barrels of known deposits which aren't even being considered because they aren't economically logical to pursue. If people are willing to pay for it, they'll find a way to refine it.

By my guesstimates, there will be no "oh shit we're out of oil, what now?" scenarios for at least 100 years. And I'm pretty sure they'll find the next-best-thing by then.

when i ment the "fututre" i ment in about 100 years time.

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 29 Sep 2006 15:22:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Interesting topic was posted in the last couple of days over at www.space.com regarding the ozone layer over the poles.

Should be a good read, for those who are interested.

http://www.livescience.com/environment/060928_ozone_update.html

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [jnz](#) on Fri, 29 Sep 2006 16:50:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

read with interest

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [appshot](#) on Sat, 07 Oct 2006 18:07:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

controlling our population maybe more important than global warming . Global warming is going to happen and you can not stop it now. We wont really see the real effects until about 50-100 years from now.

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [Aprime](#) on Sat, 07 Oct 2006 18:11:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The current estimate is 20-30 years.

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [jnz](#) on Sat, 07 Oct 2006 23:23:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

can't wait lol, but do you think there will be drama? or do you think it will just get cold.

Subject: Re: Global warming

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Sun, 08 Oct 2006 03:53:21 GMT

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

It doesn't matter since in the future our sun will become a red giant and completely incinerate the earth...theres "global" warming for ya

Subject: Re: Global warming

Posted by [Renerage](#) on Wed, 11 Oct 2006 03:39:54 GMT

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

Too further reinforce what you just said, there will be a time where life as we know it will not exist, since the universe keeps expanding, the gases that makes stars drift farther and farther apart, so think about it. Grandkids to the power of 10000 generations, will probably be not around, since life will eventually cease to exist.

At least, thats what i heard on discovery channel.
One of those wierd space shows *sigh*

Subject: Re: Global warming

Posted by [jnz](#) on Wed, 11 Oct 2006 06:39:02 GMT

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

im not sure they said "gases makes stars drift

the universe is expanding but the milkyway is hurtling twards another galaxy. and even when they colide, if we suvive that long somehow. the 2 "mixes galaxes would be hurling tward a massive super cluster. so if nothing did die out like the sun kept working, earthes resources just did we would definetly suvive it, just like the last one.

this was on a program called doomsday. xD

Subject: Re: Global warming

Posted by [Broadus](#) on Thu, 12 Oct 2006 07:43:36 GMT

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

LOL I NO WY WUD U WUNT TO STOP EARTH FRUM DESTRUCTION LETS ALL IGNOR IT N GET DRUNK

Subject: Re: Global warming

Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 12 Oct 2006 15:00:39 GMT

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

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [Renegade](#) on Thu, 12 Oct 2006 15:00:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Broadus wrote on Thu, 12 October 2006 03:43LOL I NO WY WUD U WUNT TO STOP EARTH FROM DESTRUCTION LETS ALL IGNORE IT N GET DRUNK

Edit, I think he meant this:

Now why would you want to stop the Earth from Destruction? Lets all ignore it and get drunk.

Spell checks your friend, remember that.

Btw, with that kinda logic, i can bet youll never surmount to anything in life.

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [Broadus](#) on Thu, 12 Oct 2006 19:08:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

cheekay77 wrote on Thu, 12 October 2006 10:00Edit, I think he meant this:

Now why would you want to stop the Earth from Destruction? Lets all ignore it and get drunk.

Spell checks your friend, remember that.

Btw, with that kinda logic, i can bet youll never surmount to anything in life.

Did you really think any of that through, or did your fingers just start spouting crap on your keyboard? Obviously, global warming is real, and I realize it. My sarcastic sentence doesn't make that any different.

"destruction"

"Let's"

I don't know how I could fix all of the wrong in "Spell checks your friend, remember that" sentence. I don't spell checkS my friend(s).

"By the way"

"kinda" or "kind of"

"I"

"you'll"

"surmount"

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [Renegade](#) on Fri, 13 Oct 2006 04:32:49 GMT

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

Broadus wrote on Thu, 12 October 2006 15:08
cheekay77 wrote on Thu, 12 October 2006 10:00
Edit, I think he meant this:

Now why would you want to stop the Earth from Destruction? Lets all ignore it and get drunk.

Spell checks your friend, remember that.

Btw, with that kinda logic, i can bet youll never sirmound to anything in life.
Did you really think any of that through, or did your fingers just start spouting crap on your keyboard? Obviously, global warming is real, and I realize it. My sarcastic sentence doesn't make that any different.

"destruction"

"Let's"

I don't know how I could fix all of the wrong in "Spell checks your friend, remember that" sentence.
I don't spell checkS my friend(s).

"By the way"

"kinda" or "kind of"

"I"

"you'll"

"surmount"

Lol I had a feeling i spelt surmount wrong Meh, doesnt surprise me that you would come back with a sarcastic remark. All i was stating that there was no need for a "sarcastic post"

Even when you think that theres time to look like an idiot, even if you not, there usually isn't

Once again, not calling you an idiot. Just dont post stupid/sarcastic posts. Speak what you mean, if you meant sarcasm, type it normally, then put sarcasm. Its not hard.

Subject: Re: Global warming

Posted by [Broadus](#) on Fri, 13 Oct 2006 05:01:49 GMT

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

Type sarcasm normally, then put sarcasm? What does that even mean?

""Sarcastic remark!' That was sarcasm, folks!"

Subject: Re: Global warming

Posted by [Renerage](#) on Fri, 13 Oct 2006 05:46:42 GMT

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

Broadus wrote on Fri, 13 October 2006 01:01
Type sarcasm normally, then put sarcasm? What does that even mean?

""Sarcastic remark!' That was sarcasm, folks!"

Your not getting what im saying.

Im saying, if you typed that jibberish sarcasm, you shoul da put lol then what you had USEful to put into the topic (not saying my last 4 or 5 posts are useful)

Subject: Re: Global warming

Posted by [Broadus](#) on Fri, 13 Oct 2006 06:15:59 GMT

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

Why would I want to add to my sarcasm? ESPECIALLY with something serious? Or "lol". What would be the point in that? Is someone going to read it and be like, "WELL, I GUESS THE EARTH IS GETTING UNNATURALLY HOTTER! MAYBE I SHOULD DO SOMETHING!" No, more like they'd go, "Meh, I don't care. In fact, I'll type something annoying purely for the enjoyment of being against someone."

Nobody would pay attention to or think about my two cents, so what would be the point? I mean, what does talking about political issues in a Renegade forum do for anything?

Subject: Re: Global warming

Posted by [Renerage](#) on Fri, 13 Oct 2006 06:42:42 GMT

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

Broadus wrote on Fri, 13 October 2006 02:15 Why would I want to add to my sarcasm? ESPECIALLY with something serious? Or "lol". What would be the point in that? Is someone going to read it and be like, "WELL, I GUESS THE EARTH IS GETTING UNNATURALLY HOTTER! MAYBE I SHOULD DO SOMETHING!" No, more like they'd go, "Meh, I don't care. In fact, I'll type something annoying purely for the enjoyment of being against someone." Nobody would pay attention to or think about my two cents, so what would be the point? I mean, what does talking about political issues in a Renegade forum do for anything?

1. Your a dumbass
2. If no one thinks about your two cents, maybe start putting in something worth thinking about. If people dont pay attention, get their attention.
3. And talking about political issues in the world expand our minds and give us new opinions on how the worlds done. Think of all the websites that people have posted about bush lying, the war on iraq useless,same with afghan. It goes to show, that without half of these people and their searching, that US would be made out to look like gods to the eyes of other countries. Your saying youd rather not know NK has nukes then one day, your house is blown to ashes? Not saying it would happen, just saying stop being a retard and post something that people can relate to, then youll find that youll get more response, whether or not your right. You can always fight your way out of a battle.

END OF DISCUSSION. I dont want to talk to you any longer. So dont even bother posting to this because i doubt youll have anything useful to say.

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [Broadus](#) on Fri, 13 Oct 2006 07:32:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Boohoo! It's about time you surrendered, seeing as how the argument you started was pointless to begin with.

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [Renegade](#) on Fri, 13 Oct 2006 07:39:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Broadus wrote on Fri, 13 October 2006 03:32Boohoo! It's about time you surrendered, seeing as how the argument you started was pointless to begin with.

Funny, as to how feeble your mind that you have to feel that you "won" arguments to make yourself feel better.

Its alright. Thats like 95% of the people here. Not naming names.

Anywhos, fine, w/e you "win" this "argument"

Feel any better?

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [Broadus](#) on Fri, 13 Oct 2006 07:50:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Whoa, what's this? I believe you said:

Quote:END OF DISCUSSION. I dont want to talk to you any longer. So dont even bother posting to this because i doubt youll have anything useful to say.

Going back on your word? Talking to me, now? So dishonest of you. Obviously, I must've had something useful to say, since you came running back to sling some pitiful insults at me because you absolutely must get the last word in. If it so pleases you, I'll let you have the last word. But, yeah. I won. You know how I know? Because here you are, even after saying you wouldn't respond anymore. I'm just that irresistible!

Subject: Re: Global warming
Posted by [Renegade](#) on Fri, 13 Oct 2006 07:51:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Broadus wrote on Fri, 13 October 2006 03:50Whoa, what's this? I believe you said:

Quote:END OF DISCUSSION. I dont want to talk to you any longer. So dont even bother posting to this because i doubt youll have anything useful to say.

Going back on your word? Talking to me, now? So dishonest of you. Obviously, I must've had

something useful to say, since you came running back to sling some pitiful insults at me because you absolutely must get the last word in. If it so pleases you, I'll let you have the last word. But, yeah. I won. You know how I know? Because here you are, even after saying you wouldn't respond anymore. I'm just that irresistible!

OT: I like ham and cheese bagels
