
Subject: GLOBAL WARMING

Posted by [SlikRik](#) on Tue, 24 Jun 2008 18:30:02 GMT

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

Too lazy to look for another thread about this, but seems like it's recently come up again, so it's worth discussing.

Discuss here. Do you believe global warming is majorly caused by human causes or natural causes? Should we be putting in as much time, effort, and money into fighting it as we currently are? Did Al Gore really deserve to win a Nobel Prize for his dumb video and work on global warming? (I guess my side is obvious now)

I'll be posting my findings later on.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 24 Jun 2008 18:36:27 GMT

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

I'm not sure if I would go as far as saying that civilization hasn't had SOME impact on this "climate change", but I'm still convinced that this is just yet another NATURAL climate change that has happened for millenia.

As far as doing something about it, I think we DO need to work towards alternative fuels for the fact that fossil fuels do create a lot of pollution and are high in price. If we can find an abundant, alternative fuel, our air will be cleaner (and this we CAN blame on humanity), and our pockets will be deeper.

I think we, as humans, have a duty to preserve the beauty of our world. I really don't like the concept of breathing in unclean air. Unfortunately, it's been a necessary evil for the longest time, but now progress seems achievable. That's really as far as my environmentalism goes.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING

Posted by [IronWarrior](#) on Tue, 24 Jun 2008 18:41:13 GMT

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

I think it's a factor of both, but mostly us humans has speeded up or caused the problem, you don't have to be smart to understand that releasing so much chemicals in the air is not gonna change anything.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING

Posted by [sadukar09](#) on Tue, 24 Jun 2008 19:26:40 GMT

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

IronWarrior wrote on Tue, 24 June 2008 13:41 I think it's a factor of both, but mostly us humans

has speeded up or caused the problem, you don't have to be smart to understand that releasing so much chemicals in the air is not gonna change anything.
Pretty much summed it up.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING

Posted by [Muad Dib15](#) on Tue, 24 Jun 2008 21:03:05 GMT

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

cheesesoda wrote on Tue, 24 June 2008 13:36 I'm not sure if I would go as far as saying that civilization hasn't had SOME impact on this "climate change", but I'm still convinced that this is just yet another NATURAL climate change that has happened for millenia.

As far as doing something about it, I think we DO need to work towards alternative fuels for the fact that fossil fuels do create a lot of pollution and are high in price. If we can find an abundant, alternative fuel, our air will be cleaner (and this we CAN blame on humanity), and our pockets will be deeper.

I think we, as humans, have a duty to preserve the beauty of our world. I really don't like the concept of breathing in unclean air. Unfortunately, it's been a necessary evil for the longest time, but now progress seems achievable. That's really as far as my environmentalism goes.
I wonder how many people have thought about using water and splitting it to create hydrogen to use as fuel. It's clean, even more powerful than gasoline or diesel, and emits Hydrogen and water as byproducts. Look for a possible hotrod coming your way 2 years from now possibly powered by that.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING

Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Tue, 24 Jun 2008 21:22:46 GMT

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

Muad Dib15 wrote on Tue, 24 June 2008 16:03

I wonder how many people have thought about using water and splitting it to create hydrogen to use as fuel. It's clean, even more powerful than gasoline or diesel, and emits Hydrogen and water as byproducts. Look for a possible hotrod coming your way 2 years from now possibly powered by that.

It's been thought of since the late 1800's. However, the energy required for electrolysis makes it totally unproductive.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING

Posted by [trooprm02](#) on Tue, 24 Jun 2008 21:45:32 GMT

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

cheesesoda wrote on Tue, 24 June 2008 13:36 I'm not sure if I would go as far as saying that civilization hasn't had SOME impact on this "climate change", but I'm still convinced that this is

just yet another NATURAL climate change that has happened for millenia.

Its people like you and the topic starter which prove to the world how arrogant Americans are...have you ever even briefly actually researched you theory? That idea was brought up in like 2001, and shutdown within the same month. A good visual thing that proves how wrong you are, shows that this time it is warming MUCH MUCH MUCH MUCH MUCH MUCH MUCH MUCH more that it has ever before (within the past 1000 years, naturally).

Want to continue using that argument without actually knowing what you are talking about?

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 24 Jun 2008 21:55:56 GMT

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

What, we've seen 2-3 degree increase in temperature over 103 years? OH NOES, EVERYBODY GET YOUR SWIMSUITS READY, WE'RE HEADED FOR A HEATWAVE.

Weren't we concerned with global cooling just a few decades ago? These climate changes REALLY ARE CAUSE FOR CONCERN.

Nikki, it's actually not that bad, at all. GM bought up the patent for it a few years ago, but now that it's in the hands of big oil puppets, it's not likely we'll see that used.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Tue, 24 Jun 2008 22:10:31 GMT

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

Global warming is about as interesting as watching water freeze into ice.... which we can't really do because of global warming.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING

Posted by [sadukar09](#) on Tue, 24 Jun 2008 22:14:28 GMT

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

cheesesoda wrote on Tue, 24 June 2008 16:55What, we've seen 2-3 degree increase in temperature over 103 years? OH NOES, EVERYBODY GET YOUR SWIMSUITS READY, WE'RE HEADED FOR A HEATWAVE.

Weren't we concerned with global cooling just a few decades ago? These climate changes REALLY ARE CAUSE FOR CONCERN.

Nikki, it's actually not that bad, at all. GM bought up the patent for it a few years ago, but now that it's in the hands of big oil puppets, it's not likely we'll see that used.

Remember it takes a LOT of energy for water to even change 1 degree in temperature, if the

ocean temperature changes by 2-3 degrees, a lot of energy must be trapped in the atmosphere, which brings us to the fact, greenhouse gases emitted by developed countries are holding in the heat, thus increasing global temperature.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Tue, 24 Jun 2008 22:20:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Whats the difference between getting killed by a gun or getting killed by a car?

The difference doesn't matter, you are dead either way.

What is the difference in the temperature of the globe rising 2-3° when we are able to explain why and we aren't able to explain why?

What does it matter? The end result is the same if we knew the reason why it's increasing or even if we didn't know. What is 2-3° going to do that it hasn't already done in the past?

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Tue, 24 Jun 2008 22:23:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

cheesesoda wrote on Tue, 24 June 2008 16:55

Nikki, it's actually not that bad, at all. GM bought up the patent for it a few years ago, but now that it's in the hands of big oil puppets, it's not likely we'll see that used.

I didn't think it was patented. There are other processes to extract hydrogen that are slightly more efficient anyway.

The best way to get hydrogen will be through nuclear generation, especially with the 'pebble bed breeder reactor' where hydrogen is an actual byproduct of the fission process.

Even then, it looks to be that future automotive travel will rely on 'plug-in hybrids' , much like General Motors' Chevrolet Volt.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 24 Jun 2008 22:59:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

sadukar09Remember it takes a LOT of energy for water to even change 1 degree in temperature, if the ocean temperature changes by 2-3 degrees, a lot of energy must be trapped in the atmosphere, which brings us to the fact, greenhouse gases emitted by developed countries are holding in the heat, thus increasing global temperature.

Yes, I know, high specific heat. Still, the fact that it's only been 2-3 degrees over the course of 103

years is not a whole lot, especially when you take a look at history and the changes in global climate.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING

Posted by [SlikRik](#) on Tue, 24 Jun 2008 23:18:54 GMT

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

troopr02 wrote on Tue, 24 June 2008 17:45cheesesoda wrote on Tue, 24 June 2008 13:36I'm not sure if I would go as far as saying that civilization hasn't had SOME impact on this "climate change", but I'm still convinced that this is just yet another NATURAL climate change that has happened for millenia.

Its people like you and the topic starter which prove to the world how arrogant Americans are...have you ever even briefly actually researched you theory? That idea was brought up in like 2001, and shutdown within the same month. A good visual thing that proves how wrong you are, shows that this time it is warming MUCH MUCH MUCH MUCH MUCH MUCH MUCH more that it has ever before (within the past 1000 years, naturally).

Want to continue using that argument without actually knowing what you are talking about? I'd say you shoot that entire statement back in your own direction.

It's people like YOU who show the rest of the world how gullible and easily led on some Americans are. You take a graph or two and summarize the entire issue with those two piececs of evidence making a generalized and completely uneducated and unresearched statement from those without taking the time to follow up on your on research.

I present this little piece of data that not many people know about:

This is a graph of the average global temperature vs. the number of temperature monitoring stations around the world. Note the sudden decrease of the number of stations at the same time as the suddden increase of global temperature. Coincidence? I think not.

I also present The Petition Project. This is a group of 30000 scientists and doctors who have signed this petition urging the U.S. to reject the global warming agreement written in Japan in December 1997, stating that there is no conclusive evidence that without-a-doubt proves that global warming is mainly due to human cause. Note the petition on the front page signed by Edward Teller, the world famous physicist known for his help with the atomic bomb.

And finally:

Al Gore's house uses 20x the amount of energy an average house would use.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING

Posted by [sadukar09](#) on Tue, 24 Jun 2008 23:20:52 GMT

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

Note the word "Cause".

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING

Posted by [SlikRik](#) on Tue, 24 Jun 2008 23:28:49 GMT

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

sadukar09 wrote on Tue, 24 June 2008 19:20 Note the word "Cause".

I fail to see how this changes anything.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING

Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Tue, 24 Jun 2008 23:45:56 GMT

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

The Global Warming debate left rationality on a melting iceberg long ago. Thoughtful discussion and debate was hijacked by forces who use it for their own means, including anti-globalization, anti-corporate, and environmental retards. Even al-Qaeda is in on the global warming racket.

Half the time now, I can't even listen to someone spouting off about global warming without laughing my ass off, because of all the errors. One chick I work with who's huge into the subject was at a total loss for words when I quipped that global warming is not a new phenomenon, because we've had several ice ages... her mind literally could not process my smart-bomb of clusterfuctivity.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING

Posted by [troopr02](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 00:07:09 GMT

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

So your excuse against global warming is that an American spokesperson house "apparently" uses more energy than it should? Great Argument!

Also, so your ignorance of "not exactly knowing for sure" is also an excuse? Maybe there is a reason why Americans are globally hated so much.....

So there is much shit we can't explain, claiming we can't 100% prove it, therefore it doesn't exist is pretty much the stupidest thing ive heard in a while, congrats! Ok, so DNA doesn't exist? Absolute zero, black matter, atoms, all don't exist because we can't specifically nail down exactly what they are? Smart thinking again!

Anything else you would like to be proven wrong on?

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING

Posted by [SlikRik](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 01:36:27 GMT

troopr02 wrote on Tue, 24 June 2008 20:07 So your excuse against global warming is that an American spokesperson house "apparently" uses more energy than it should? Great Argument!

Also, so your ignorance of "not exactly knowing for sure" is also an excuse? Maybe there is a reason why Americans are globally hated so much.....

So there is much shit we can't explain, claiming we can't 100% prove it, therefore it doesn't exist is pretty much the stupidest thing ive heard in a while, congrats! Ok, so DNA doesn't exist? Absolute zero, black matter, atoms, all don't exist because we can't specifically nail down exactly what they are? Smart thinking again!

Anything else you would like to be proven wrong on?

Clearly, you didn't read my first post. I most definately referenced Al Gore as a personal favorite person to hate on. Thusly, the aim of me pointing out Al Gore's home energy usage in my last post was not to emphasize the point that global warming isn't mainly caused by humans, rather to emphasize my hatred.

Second, no where in my last post did I say "not exactly knowing for sure." I didn't even make a reference to people not being sure. Your apparent anti-patriotism is just absolutely disgusting to me, and makes me wonder why you still chose to live in the United States at all, other than you can't get out on your own accord.

Finally, I also never said not being able to prove it 100% means it doesn't exist. Let me restate for you what I did say in terms you might be able to understand:

{{A buncha smart people who know what the fuck they're talking about signed this world-wide paper saying global warming isn't what all these un-informed people are making it out to be.}}

Back to your statement: DNA not existing?? WHAT?? We've fully MODELED the DNA molecule comprised of atoms so get the fuck outta here saying it's not 100% proved and doesn't exist. Absolute zero has been proved through math. Get your facts straight before using them in some half-assed arguement.

But, I'll give you this point you're right on: just because it hasn't been proved doesn't mean it doesn't exist.

Any other way I can prove you're just a dumb twat who as I previously said doesn't take the time to research their arguements first?

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING

Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 01:42:21 GMT

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

Uh, troop's a Canuck...

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [GoArmy44](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 01:42:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I would also like to know where all these temperature monitor stations are exactly, if they are in large metropolises or even fairly large towns something called an Urban Heat Island may distort the temperature record as it is only a local phenomenon.

As for me I really don't care if global warming is real or not since I will be long gone before anything real happens. Global warming enthusiasts bug me with their somewhat trendiness attitude as if it were a fad of some kind. (It makes me wonder how much money is spent and received because of "global warming" or it's acolytes). But on the other hand they do bring an awareness to the environment, albeit one I wish was different.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [sadukar09](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 01:48:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SlikRik wrote on Tue, 24 June 2008 18:28sadukar09 wrote on Tue, 24 June 2008 19:20Note the word "Cause".
I fail to see how this changes anything.
Of course we didn't start global warming, it's natural, however, we sped it up much faster than it would be naturally.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [SlikRik](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 01:57:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

nikki6ixx wrote on Tue, 24 June 2008 21:42Uh, troop's a Canuck...
O shit you're right.

Well, my bad on that. Glad he doesn't live in the US then, otherwise I'd have to boot him out myself.

sadukar09 wrote on Tue, 24 June 2008 21:48SlikRik wrote on Tue, 24 June 2008 18:28sadukar09 wrote on Tue, 24 June 2008 19:20Note the word "Cause".
I fail to see how this changes anything.
Of course we didn't start global warming, it's natural, however, we sped it up much faster than it would be naturally.
Well that's undeniable, the real debate is how much of a role humans have to play in it.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 02:32:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I really don't understand this issue very much.

Would someone care to explain WHY SHOULD WE CARE how much involvement we played, as humans, in global warming?

Does it really make a difference knowing who started it and who continued it and who lead it to where?

The way I see it is that someday or another the global temperature is rising and something should or shouldn't be done about it. Why should we spend so much time pondering who started it? If we think it is a problem, we should try and do something to fix it. If not, we should just leave it alone... end of story.

There have been global temperature increases and decreases hundreds of thousands of times in the history of this planet, so I really do not see what the big deal is..

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING

Posted by [Muad Dib15](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 03:05:12 GMT

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

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 24 June 2008 21:32I really don't understand this issue very much.

Would someone care to explain WHY SHOULD WE CARE how much involvement we played, as humans, in global warming?

Does it really make a difference knowing who started it and who continued it and who lead it to where?

The way I see it is that someday or another the global temperature is rising and something should or shouldn't be done about it. Why should we spend so much time pondering who started it? If we think it is a problem, we should try and do something to fix it. If not, we should just leave it alone... end of story.

There have been global temperature increases and decreases hundreds of thousands of times in the history of this planet, so I really do not see what the big deal is..

Give the man a cookie.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING

Posted by [sadukar09](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 10:50:14 GMT

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

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 24 June 2008 21:32I really don't understand this issue very much.

Would someone care to explain WHY SHOULD WE CARE how much involvement we played, as

humans, in global warming?

Does it really make a difference knowing who started it and who continued it and who lead it to where?

The way I see it is that someway or another the global temperature is rising and something should or shouldn't be done about it. Why should we spend so much time pondering who started it? If we think it is a problem, we should try and do something to fix it. If not, we should just leave it alone... end of story.

There have been global temperature increases and decreases hundreds of thousands of times in the history of this planet, so I really do not see what the big deal is.. Because another ice age will kill MILLIONS of people when it occurs, would you not save a million lives by not...using fossil fuels?

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 12:44:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

R315r4z0rThere have been global temperature increases and decreases hundreds of thousands of times in the history of this planet, so I really do not see what the big deal is.. The big deal is, if it's our fault, then we have idiot environmentalnuts crying for the government to waste billions of dollars in funding to save our poor planet that has destroyed itself time and time again, yet still seems to survive.

Do you environmentalnuts even remember how the dinosaurs died off? It wasn't simply the impact of a meteorite that killed off everything. It was the resulting frying of our atmosphere and the shit after it that created the extinction. If our earth can come back and support abundant life after that, us humans are looking like a bunch of pussies that can only HELP to raise the temperature 2-3 degrees.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 12:53:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Neither of you answered my question.

I asked why should we care WHO STARTED IT. Not if it is something we should be worrying about.

All this time we are wasting arguing if humans started the problem or if humans continued the problem or if humans had little impact on the problem.

No matter who was involved in what, the end result is the same no matter how we look at it, so why should we bother arguing about it? If global warming is such a big deal then lets deal with the

task at hand instead of this pointless bickering about who started it.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 12:58:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Because environmentalnuts think that if we somehow started it or contributed to it, there has to be a way for us to, either, (a) stop adding to the problem, or (b) completely be able to fix the problem we created.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 13:09:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well environmentalists are a bunch of stuck up morons who don't know how to do research on the planet's history.

Do they, like, not believe in ice ages or something?

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 13:26:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

They believe that we're forcing an ice age to be upon us, and as a result, people will die. Unfortunately, they don't realize that it wouldn't be like the movie "Day After Tomorrow". We'd have time to prepare as temperatures plummet.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [trooprm02](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 23:00:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I guess modding video games has rotted his mind L!OL. Ok g33k, other than the fact you have proven my point further, its funny to watch you say, "NOES!!! 30,000 SIGNED TEH PAP3R!!!1one!", um, you do realize there are not only 30,000 people with phd's etc out there? That is a very small % then of people who disagree with it, compare that to the UNIVERSIAL ACCEPTANCE BY THE SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY (<-read that ok?), that it is happening. Now watch, you are going to continue this argument even after being proven wrong, and you will pretend that modding an fps gaming into an rpg mod (LOL), has some how magically given you higher intelligence than them...Awaiting your lols

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING

Posted by [SlikRik](#) on Wed, 25 Jun 2008 23:58:08 GMT

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

trooprm02 wrote on Wed, 25 June 2008 19:00I guess modding video games has rotted his mind L!OL. Ok g33k, other than the fact you have proven my point further, its funny to watch you say, "NOES!!! 30,000 SIGNED TEH PAP3R!!!1one!", um, you do realize there are not only 30,000 people with phd's etc out there? That is a very small % then of people who disagree with it, compare that to the UNIVERSIAL ACCEPTANCE BY THE SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY (<-read that ok?), that it is happening. Now watch, you are going to continue this argument even after being proven wrong, and you will pretend that modding an fps gaming into an rpg mod (LOL), has some how magically given you higher intelligence than them...Awaiting your lols
There are so many things wrong with this post...

1. I fail to see how modding video games has "rotted my mind".

2. 30,000 people isn't NOTHING, I'd say it's a BIG something. And just because other people haven't signed it doesn't mean they're not in support of it.

3. My turn for big letters. STOP PULLING "FACTS" OUT OF YOUR ASS! You keep posting these "facts" about global warming, ex: that it's much much much warmer, that global warming is "unversally accepted" by the scientific community, etc., but you never give a source to your "facts." My knowledge of the subject from my own research leads me to believe that you've barely touched on the subject and are just spouting things you might have heard from biased sources like the news, or Al Gore. Me proven wrong? Hardly...

4. You're damn straight I'm gonna continue the arguement against some misinformed, incompetant, smart-ass, egotistical prick, especially when you continue to put words in my mouth about how supposedly my involvement with Roleplay2 somehow gives me higher intelligence.

Awaiting you sucking my dick. If not, GTFO MY THREAD.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 26 Jun 2008 00:00:22 GMT

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

Troop, you're trying to prove that global warming exists as a man made disaster. Thus, you're trying to prove the positive. The burden of proof is on the one trying to prove the positive. Let's see actual facts.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING

Posted by [trooprm02](#) on Thu, 26 Jun 2008 00:49:55 GMT

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

SHITS GONNA GET REEEEL NASTY

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Thu, 26 Jun 2008 00:56:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dammit, I want a fucking Orange grove in my back yard!

The government issued our 'carbon neutral' tax rebates today, and I'm seriously considering buying a mid-1960's Pontiac Bonneville to celebrate!

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [Rocko](#) on Thu, 26 Jun 2008 02:23:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

A question.

If all the pollutants that go in the air work in trapping sunrays in the earth longer and raise temperature. Can't the pollutants also work like a second ozone layer and also reflect more away? Can anyone tell me if this it works like this?

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Thu, 26 Jun 2008 02:36:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Think of it like a blanket. How come when you are under a blanket you get warmer instead of the outside heat bouncing off?

The heat made inside of it, stays inside of it. The Sun just further heats it up more than it is already. So no, pollution is not a substitute for an Ozone layer.

@ Troop:

I'm sort of confused by your argument. I don't understand what you are trying to say... are you for humans causing global warming or are you for global warming being a natural occurrence on Earth? It's kind of hard to tell being that you never stated:

- Who you are arguing against
 - What your point is
 - What facts you have to prove your argument, if you have one.
-

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [Rocko](#) on Thu, 26 Jun 2008 04:09:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

can you go over the science of it

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [SlikRik](#) on Thu, 26 Jun 2008 04:45:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The basic answer is:

The ozone layer is comprised of the compound ozone (O3). Ozone reflects most of the sun's high intensity ultraviolet light, which is damaging to life. Greenhouse gases (water vapor, carbon dioxide, methane, etc, partially produced from pollution sources) don't reflect any of the sun's light, therefore does not act as a second ozone layer. They merely trap in some of the heat in the earth's atmosphere.

I should also add that greenhouse gases are necessary for survival on earth. Without them, temperatures would be entirely too cold. However excessive amounts of greenhouse gases do lead to higher temperatures on earth.

I will also add that natural sources produce 20 times the amount of greenhouse gases as humans.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [trooprm02](#) on Thu, 26 Jun 2008 06:28:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

trooprm02 wrote on Wed, 25 June 2008 19:49SHITS GONNA GET REEEEL NASTY

@r34z54564, this basically sums up my point of view real nais like.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Thu, 26 Jun 2008 07:31:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

cheesesoda wrote on Wed, 25 June 2008 19:00Troop, you're trying to prove that global warming exists as a man made disaster. Thus, you're trying to prove the positive. The burden of proof is on the one trying to prove the positive. Let's see actual facts.

trooprm02 wrote on Wed, 25 June 2008 19:49SHITS GONNA GET REEEEL NASTY

gj troopm02.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [Muad Dib15](#) on Thu, 26 Jun 2008 15:16:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SlikRik wrote on Wed, 25 June 2008 23:45The basic answer is:

The ozone layer is comprised of the compound ozone (O₃). Ozone reflects most of the sun's high intensity ultraviolet light, which is damaging to life. Greenhouse gases (water vapor, carbon dioxide, methane, etc, partially produced from pollution sources) don't reflect any of the sun's light, therefore does not act as a second ozone layer. They merely trap in some of the heat in the earth's atmosphere.

I should also add that greenhouse gases are necessary for survival on earth. Without them, temperatures would be entirely too cold. However excessive amounts of greenhouse gases do lead to higher temperatures on earth.

I will also add that natural sources produce 20 times the amount of greenhouse gases as humans.

I love it how people ignore the last part of your post no matter who says it.

EDIT: typo

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [john22395](#) on Thu, 26 Jun 2008 21:08:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I suggest watching the movie 'The day after tomarrow', It seems very true to happen tbh.

But anyway, Global Warming is prob there even if it is just a temperature change of movement, Either way, It can fuck something up badly and anything living on Earth will pay.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 26 Jun 2008 21:28:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yes, let's base our opinions and fears off of a fictional movie that, truthfully, wasn't even that good.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [SlikRik](#) on Thu, 26 Jun 2008 21:33:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Nothing close to "The Day After Tomorrow" would ever occur unless some cataclysmic event took place severely offsetting the earth's natural weather balance. Nothing humans could do would ever produce such an event (cept maybe blowing up the earth with a 100+ megaton nuclear bomb).

No one's denying that global warming exists (and if you are you're an idiot), but it is and has been for millions of years a natural process. The debate is how much humans have to play in the

current trend of warming.

cheesesoda...a movie that, truthfully, wasn't even that good.

Agreed, not the best movie I've ever started watching and not finished due to complete lack of interest.

Personally, if the ice caps did melt, my house would be in prime position to have a nice tropical ocean-front property.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING

Posted by [sadukar09](#) on Thu, 26 Jun 2008 22:13:25 GMT

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

Troop...I agree with some of your opinion, but cut the Ad hominem k?

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING

Posted by [Starbuzzz](#) on Thu, 26 Jun 2008 22:48:50 GMT

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

cheesesoda wrote on Wed, 25 June 2008 07:44Do you environmentalnuts even remember how the dinosaurs died off? It wasn't simply the impact of a meteorite that killed off everything. It was the resulting frying of our atmosphere and the shit after it that created the extinction.

Nobody knows how the dinosaurs died off.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 26 Jun 2008 23:33:27 GMT

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

At least, highly speculated.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING

Posted by [Starbuzzz](#) on Fri, 27 Jun 2008 02:07:49 GMT

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

cheesesoda wrote on Thu, 26 June 2008 18:33At least, highly speculated.

And that makes it the truth.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 27 Jun 2008 02:33:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Makes a pretty fucking strong argument. It's not really worth arguing the small possibility that the earth wasn't hit by a meteorite.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Fri, 27 Jun 2008 02:49:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

cheesesoda wrote on Thu, 26 June 2008 21:33Makes a pretty fucking strong argument. It's not really worth arguing the small possibility that the earth wasn't hit by a meteorite.

You carefully avoid my point.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Fri, 27 Jun 2008 03:00:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Wouldn't it be the small possibility that dinosaurs died by said meteor? Not that there was a meteor?

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [BlueThen](#) on Fri, 27 Jun 2008 03:15:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

R315r4z0r wrote on Thu, 26 June 2008 22:00Wouldn't it be the small possibility that dinosaurs died by said meteor? Not that there was a meteor? or a very large volcano... (yellowstone)

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 27 Jun 2008 03:55:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

pawkyfox wrote on Thu, 26 June 2008 22:49cheesesoda wrote on Thu, 26 June 2008 21:33Makes a pretty fucking strong argument. It's not really worth arguing the small possibility that the earth wasn't hit by a meteorite.

You carefully avoid my point.

What? You want me to admit that we can't claim it as absolute truth? That's a fucking given. There's really no such thing as an absolute truth, anyway.

It's pointless to argue the idea that it wasn't a large impact (or even volcano) that caused the mass extinction because of all of the evidence for it.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [Homey](#) on Fri, 27 Jun 2008 22:15:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I have yet to see enough proof that humans have caused global warming and not enough to say we haven't caused it. Personally I believe we have contributed but it's also natural. We should pursue alternative fuel sources for many reasons, potential global warming is just one of them.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 28 Jun 2008 01:16:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'm all for the maintaining of the Earth's beauty and better economic situations, but I can't jump on the global warming bandwagon for those reasons.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [Ryu](#) on Sat, 28 Jun 2008 02:18:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

cheesesoda wrote on Sat, 28 June 2008 02:16 I'm all for the maintaining of the Earth's beauty and better economic situations, but I can't jump on the global warming bandwagon for those reasons.

You don't have to.

It's natural - Only if Humans didn't burn oil and industrial fumes, cutting down more trees (yes, a certain percent of humans and animals that breath out carbon dioxide contribute a little to global warming) and what not - The next ice age would happen in a few more million years, but because humans are now doing what I stated and more we've gone from a few million years to possible thousands.

again - recycle, try not to drive your car down the street to the store if you can walk it - plant some trees or plants in your back yard, turn off electrical appliances when they're not needed, send angry letters to your Government to look into alternatives like air powered and H2o powered vehicles.

We all share this planet right? so lets keep it a nice place for you, me, and the next generation.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Sat, 28 Jun 2008 02:20:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I like you views, Ryu! I share the same. All problems can be solved peacefully without any argument if people become a bit more responsible.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 28 Jun 2008 02:23:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ryusend angry letters to your Government to look into alternatives like air powered and H2o powered vehicles.
I don't like the idea of my government dumping funds into something the private sector should be doing.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Sat, 28 Jun 2008 02:34:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

cheesesoda wrote on Fri, 27 June 2008 21:23Ryusend angry letters to your Government to look into alternatives like air powered and H2o powered vehicles.
I don't like the idea of my government dumping funds into something the private sector should be doing.

Private sector will only do something that will bring them money...tut tut Capitalism!

So it is FULLY necessary for the government to step in and start the innovation process. That is how bad the situation stands after a decade of laziness. Once the system is perfected and the project is at a efficient prototype stage, the private sector will come like angry hungry dogs to exploit the technology...making money and also benefiting society.

That is how it works.

EDIT: The private sector will only act IF money is thrown at them. The good thing is that you will see genuine attempts at success and you will see genuine results.

John McCain recently proposed a \$300 Million project aimed at the private sector at who can develop a powerful electric car battery by 2010 (I think). You will see results soon...if the proposal is accepted ofcourse!

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [Homey](#) on Sat, 28 Jun 2008 02:36:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ryu wrote on Fri, 27 June 2008 22:18cheesesoda wrote on Sat, 28 June 2008 02:16I'm all for the maintaining of the Earth's beauty and better economic situations, but I can't jump on the global warming bandwagon for those reasons.

You don't have to.

It's natural - Only if Humans didn't burn oil and industrial fumes, cutting down more trees (yes, a certain percent of humans and animals that breath out carbon dioxide contribute a little to global warming) and what not - The next ice age would happen in a few more million years, but because humans are now doing what I stated and more we've gone from a few million years to possible thousands.

again - recycle, try not to drive your car down the street to the store if you can walk it - plant some trees or plants in your back yard, turn off electrical appliances when they're not needed, send angry letters to your Government to look into alternatives like air powered and H2o powered vehicles.

We all share this planet right? so lets keep it a nice place for you, me, and the next generation. I'm pretty sure our planet's natural cycle is more like 30 000 years. Maybe I'm wrong but I swear I've read that before. Either way speeding it up is your point.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING

Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Sat, 28 Jun 2008 02:37:08 GMT

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

Problem is, the government is fucking retarded with their spending.

For example, this one school in Kansas I think it was got alot of money to improve their education system.

What'd they use it on? An olympic sized pool.

HOORAY FOR SHITTY SERVICES.

I'd have a source on that, but I can't for the life of me remember now. I did do a debate on it though, so yeah. Really not that hard to notice how most of the school spending is outright retarded, because they just think "well, we have money, so if we dump enough into this random thing, it should make it better". That's the basic mentality with the government in general.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING

Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Sat, 28 Jun 2008 02:56:00 GMT

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

The only thing government should be doing, is setting REASONABLE guidelines for pollution.

That's it. Consumer spending, and shareholder interests will drive companies to be greener.

People are demanding 'greener' products, and guess what, the private sector is literally bending over backwards to bring those products to the public. The Chevrolet Volt, a 'plug-in' hybrid is coming out for 2010, and the Honda FCX clarity, a hydrogen vehicle, is already able to be leased. Neither of these vehicles have been funded by the government. Electronics are increasingly using less harmful plastics, and manufacturing processes are getting greener every day.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [Ryu](#) on Sat, 28 Jun 2008 03:09:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

yeah but the Government > you so I applied that logic to a privately owned company.

but I agree also - Governments can be fundamentally retarded with money and spending.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 28 Jun 2008 03:11:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

pawkyfox wrote on Fri, 27 June 2008 22:34cheesesoda wrote on Fri, 27 June 2008 21:23Ryusend angry letters to your Government to look into alternatives like air powered and H2o powered vehicles.

I don't like the idea of my government dumping funds into something the private sector should be doing.

Private sector will only do something that will bring them money...tut tut Capitalism!

So it is FULLY necessary for the government to step in and start the innovation process. That is how bad the situation stands after a decade of laziness. Once the system is perfected and the project is at a efficient prototype stage, the private sector will come like angry hungry dogs to exploit the technology...making money and also benefiting society.

That is how it works.

EDIT: The private sector will only act IF money is thrown at them. The good thing is that you will see genuine attempts at success and you will see genuine results.

John McCain recently proposed a \$300 Million project aimed at the private sector at who can develop a powerful electric car battery by 2010 (I think). You will see results soon...if the proposal is accepted ofcourse!

If the people don't want new fuels badly enough, companies won't change. However, if the market changes to where the majority DO want alternative fuels, things will change. Oh, how I love Capitalism.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Sat, 28 Jun 2008 13:53:56 GMT

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

cheesesoda wrote on Fri, 27 June 2008 22:11pawkyfox wrote on Fri, 27 June 2008 22:34cheesesoda wrote on Fri, 27 June 2008 21:23Ryusend angry letters to your Government to look into alternatives like air powered and H2o powered vehicles. I don't like the idea of my government dumping funds into something the private sector should be doing.

Private sector will only do something that will bring them money...tut tut Capitalism!

So it is FULLY necessary for the government to step in and start the innovation process. That is how bad the situation stands after a decade of laziness. Once the system is perfected and the project is at a efficient prototype stage, the private sector will come like angry hungry dogs to exploit the technology...making money and also benefiting society.

That is how it works.

EDIT: The private sector will only act IF money is thrown at them. The good thing is that you will see genuine attempts at success and you will see genuine results.

John McCain recently proposed a \$300 Million project aimed at the private sector at who can develop a powerful electric car battery by 2010 (I think). You will see results soon...if the proposal is accepted ofcourse!

If the people don't want new fuels badly enough, companies won't change. However, if the market changes to where the majority DO want alternative fuels, things will change. Oh, how I love Capitalism.

Touché

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Sat, 28 Jun 2008 22:24:48 GMT

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

cheesesoda wrote on Thu, 26 June 2008 22:55pawkyfox wrote on Thu, 26 June 2008 22:49cheesesoda wrote on Thu, 26 June 2008 21:33Makes a pretty fucking strong argument. It's not really worth arguing the small possibility that the earth wasn't hit by a meteorite.

You carefully avoid my point.

What? You want me to admit that we can't claim it as absolute truth? That's a fucking given. There's really no such thing as an absolute truth, anyway.

It's pointless to argue the idea that it wasn't a large impact (or even volcano) that caused the mass extinction because of all of the evidence for it.

And then what about humans? Were they wiped out too?

pawkyfox wrote on Sat, 28 June 2008 08:53cheesesoda wrote on Fri, 27 June 2008 22:11pawkyfox wrote on Fri, 27 June 2008 22:34cheesesoda wrote on Fri, 27 June 2008 21:23Ryusend angry letters to your Government to look into alternatives like air powered and H2o powered vehicles.
I don't like the idea of my government dumping funds into something the private sector should be doing.

Private sector will only do something that will bring them money...tut tut Capitalism!

So it is FULLY necessary for the government to step in and start the innovation process. That is how bad the situation stands after a decade of laziness. Once the system is perfected and the project is at a efficient prototype stage, the private sector will come like angry hungry dogs to exploit the technology...making money and also benefiting society.

That is how it works.

EDIT: The private sector will only act IF money is thrown at them. The good thing is that you will see genuine attempts at success and you will see genuine results.

John McCain recently proposed a \$300 Million project aimed at the private sector at who can develop a powerful electric car battery by 2010 (I think). You will see results soon...if the proposal is accepted ofcourse!

If the people don't want new fuels badly enough, companies won't change. However, if the market changes to where the majority DO want alternative fuels, things will change. Oh, how I love Capitalism.

Touché

I am taking back my Touché due to my small misunderstanding.
The "private sector" nowadays I thought were the smaller organizations and other individuals with some sort of initiative. It is them I was referring to. Also, I hold nothing against Capitalism. Therefore, your statement is not needed.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 28 Jun 2008 22:41:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'll let you in on a little secret: humans didn't exist with dinosaurs. Humans evolved from the burrowing mammals that survived the mass extinction of surface dwelling creatures.

As far as I'm concerned with research, the government throwing money doesn't do jack shit as long as the oil companies have a firm grasp on the balls of the car industry. Even government-mandated deadlines won't get the results they want, unless they expect the car companies to just fold under the pressure of both the federal government and Big Oil.

The reason why we ARE seeing a move to alternative fuels (or an attempt, anyway) is because of the consumer base wanting cleaner, renewable fuels.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Sun, 29 Jun 2008 02:10:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

cheesesoda wrote on Sat, 28 June 2008 17:41'll let you in on a little secret: humans didn't exist with dinosaurs. Humans evolved from the burrowing mammals that survived the mass extinction of surface dwelling creatures.

That is the biggest bile I had ever seen...just another pawn of the elite all-knowing scientific community.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sun, 29 Jun 2008 06:18:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'll quote what I said to this one chick the other day...

"What I love is how most Christians accept the science that brings us medicine, but anything that tries to tell us about the past outside of the '6,000 to 10,000 year' existence of the universe is somehow false. Talk about being closed-minded."

I'm sorry, but the scientific method isn't only accurate if it follows what mainstream Christianity teaches. The Scientific Method exists for a reason. It works, and it's damn sure reliable.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Sun, 29 Jun 2008 08:16:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

pawkyfox wrote on Sat, 28 June 2008 21:10cheesesoda wrote on Sat, 28 June 2008 17:41'll let you in on a little secret: humans didn't exist with dinosaurs. Humans evolved from the burrowing mammals that survived the mass extinction of surface dwelling creatures.

That is the biggest bile I had ever seen...just another pawn of the elite all-knowing scientific community.
BAHAHAHA.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Sun, 29 Jun 2008 08:23:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

pawkyfox wrote on Sat, 28 June 2008 21:10

That is the biggest bile I had ever seen...just another pawn of the elite all-knowing scientific community.

Yeah, because fossilized remains of prehistoric animals are total 'bile' ...

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sun, 29 Jun 2008 14:32:02 GMT

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

It's funny how he wants to fight global warming that science has "proven" (yet it has reasonable dissent), yet he ignores Evolution which has an overwhelming majority of people in the scientific community accepting.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING

Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Sun, 29 Jun 2008 16:39:53 GMT

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

What I don't get is why it's so fucking hard to maybe, just MAYBE, believe that God could have used evolution to create the world. Y'know, the one that started that spark and guided it along.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING

Posted by [Ryu](#) on Sun, 29 Jun 2008 18:33:15 GMT

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

THIS TOPIC IS ABOUT A NATURAL EARTH PROCESS, NOT GOD.

BOTH OF YOU SHUT THE FUCK UP AND STAY ON TOPIC PLEASE.

Thanks.

Edit: Page 4.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING

Posted by [cnc95fan](#) on Sun, 29 Jun 2008 18:35:10 GMT

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

Meh, I think we should paint everything white.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [sadukar09](#) on Sun, 29 Jun 2008 18:39:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

pawkyfox wrote on Sat, 28 June 2008 21:10cheesesoda wrote on Sat, 28 June 2008 17:41I'll let you in on a little secret: humans didn't exist with dinosaurs. Humans evolved from the burrowing mammals that survived the mass extinction of surface dwelling creatures.

That is the biggest bile I had ever seen...just another pawn of the elite all-knowing scientific community.

.....
.....Die please.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Sun, 29 Jun 2008 18:41:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Fuck, even in the Bible, I don't really recall mentions of dinosaurs.

I should probably read through it again to be sure, but yeah...

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Sun, 29 Jun 2008 19:39:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ryu wrote on Sun, 29 June 2008 13:33THIS TOPIC IS ABOUT A NATURAL EARTH PROCESS, NOT GOD.

BOTH OF YOU SHUT THE FUCK UP AND STAY ON TOPIC PLEASE.

Thanks.

Edit: Page 4.
You cant claim a page with Edit!

Therefore, I will do that now.
PAGE 4

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [Muad Dib15](#) on Mon, 30 Jun 2008 02:59:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

dinosaurs = dragons in bible

<http://www.answersingenesis.org/Docs/2.asp>

<http://www.genesispark.org/genpark/bible/bible.htm>

<http://www.angelfire.com/mi/dinosaurs/behemoth.html>

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Mon, 30 Jun 2008 03:23:43 GMT

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

@ cheesesda:

Going back to what I said and your response, you see, that is not what I meant. You see when an animal falls down dead, its remains get eaten by insects and then rots away...even the bones. It does not fossilize.

But in the remains of the dinosaurs, we only find fossils of them. A fossil is made when the animal is completely covered in mud after which the minerals in the mud and sediment replace the tissue and other soft parts of the dead animal. It will take massive amounts of mud and sediment to cover large dinosaurs...and yet they are found this way.

Holding that thought, refer to this page very quickly:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Deluge_%28mythology%29

Funny how it is conveniently branded as "mythology"...myths covering and spanning across several cultures independent of each other just are not made up all of a sudden.

Today, when crap happens, Hollywood makes a movie. It was no different in the ancient times...they wrote it down and told stories. There is no denying that a massive flood took place. It is quite rational to believe that it was this flood that wiped out the bigger life-forms such as dinosaurs.

Heck, I am not even using the Bible here! The media conveniently always presents the Bible as the sole source of all flood related stories while it misrepresents the flood stories of many different cultures. This is done to both undermine the flood story (and its threat to evolutionary chain) and the Christian religion also. It is completely possible that groups of humanity survived the flood...again, it DOES NOT have to be Noah on his Ark. You can even rationalize that they took many animals with them...to eat and feed.

How the flood happened? We don't know...could be rain, or an asteroid impact on the oceans. Think about the massive mudslides and shifts of sediment.

If a meteor hit and the resulting dust clouds choked off the dinosaurs, we wouldn't be finding that MANY dinosaur "fossils"...they would have rot away. But we can most certainly rationalize that some did get preserved but not in the amounts we see now. You need those 65 million years for it to work.

The funny thing about evolution is that dogs are allowed to have different species (breeds) but when it comes to upright walking bipeds, it is automatically branded as a continuation of a evolving group of mammals! There WERE different species of man...Neanderthals and Cro Magnon...and there were many more kinds. It is highly unlikely that it was part of a evolutionary chain of homo sapiens.

I have high respect for those who are smarter than me but I also understand the fragility of the human mind. Science is nothing but a record of the organized discoveries of man...discoveries of objects and phenomonen that were/are already there but left only to be found and "intelluctually catalogued" and added to the knowledge base of a arrogant sentient species.

NOTE: I edited my post changing minor sentences. Sorry for inconvenience.

EDIT FINAL: Fixed errors...no more edits. Apologies.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 30 Jun 2008 03:36:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

There is evidence of a flood in the Middle East, but it's not the same catastrophic flood that killed off most creatures.

There's plenty of good explanations as to why dinosaur bones were fossilized. You don't think that a meteor crashing into the earth would just dig a huge hole without throwing up debris, right? The fact that the sun would have been blacked out for weeks, and the intense heat generated would have been a good start for the preservation of the bones.

Not to mention that there are plenty of examples of newer skeletons being dug up.

Of course there were more than one species of humans. We know they even co-existed at one point. They just didn't exist until after the dinosaurs were extinct.

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [Rocko](#) on Mon, 30 Jun 2008 04:35:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Muad Dib15 wrote on Sun, 29 June 2008 22:59dinosaurs = dragons in bible

<http://www.answersingenesis.org/Docs/2.asp>
<http://www.genesispark.org/genpark/bible/bible.htm>
<http://www.angelfire.com/mi/dinosaurs/behemoth.html>
LMAO

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Tue, 08 Jul 2008 05:25:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Cabal8616 wrote on Sun, 29 June 2008 13:41 Fuck, even in the Bible, I don't really recall mentions of dinosaurs.

I should probably read through it again to be sure, but yeah...

So if chickens are not mentioned in the Bible...then...yeah...lololololol

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [kikiller](#) on Thu, 17 Jul 2008 23:08:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I believe its a natural cycle, I beleive in climate change not global warming, Just look whats happening right now we are breaking the records in temps that were set like 100 years ago..

Subject: Re: GLOBAL WARMING
Posted by [Rocko](#) on Sat, 19 Jul 2008 04:06:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

pawkyfox wrote on Tue, 08 July 2008 00:25 Cabal8616 wrote on Sun, 29 June 2008 13:41 Fuck, even in the Bible, I don't really recall mentions of dinosaurs.

I should probably read through it again to be sure, but yeah...

So if chickens are not mentioned in the Bible...then...yeah...lololololol
watever go have sex with a fox
