

## Re: OT: U.S. airstrike kills al-Zarqawi

---

*Source:* <http://newsgroups.derkeiler.com/Archive/Alt/alt.smokers.pipes/2006-06/msg02519.html>

---

- *From:* Tim Daneliuk <[tundra@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:tundra@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* 11 Jun 2006 02:23:33 EDT
- 

Steven Fowler wrote:

Tim Daneliuk wrote:

Steven Fowler wrote:  
<SNIP>

I am unwilling to support policy that is  
\*known to cause harm\* to human interests  
to support action that \*may\* prevent  
\*possible but undemonstrated\* harm  
centuries  
into the future. When real data arrives, I'll  
adjust my worldview as needed.

How can we discuss science? There's no science in your  
post. Just

Yes there is – I cited to recordings of science. One by Milloy who is  
not a scientist but who is documenting the results of what scientists  
have done. The other by two people, Ballings and Michaels, who \*are\*  
scientists. It is likely that none of them (or any of the people you  
like to listen to) are entirely correct. The discussion is quite complex  
and far from clear. But I \*have\* cited science. You sidestepped it and  
went into your religionists argument that "the data can't be right because  
I don't trust the speaker" line of rhetoric.

Still no science.

So what would satisfy you? I've cited the results of \*some\* scientific  
research. Your answer is not to provide countervailing evidence, it's to  
stick your fingers in your ears and go "la la la" at the top of your lungs.

statements of "fact" by you, who seems to get information

Re: OT: U.S. airstrike kills al-Zarqawi

from (based on earlier posts) biased sources. Oh, and I forgot to include your obligatory name-calling. It ain't guilty by association. It's using unreliable sources to support your position.

Please demonstrate they are unreliable by refuting their claims.

The science is clear on this issue. It's now a public policy debate.

It is most certainly not or there would be \*no\* contrary positions being published in the refereed journals. Last I looked there were indeed still contrarians being published. Science is hardly done here.

What journals do you subscribe to? It's very difficult to read science journals unless you live near a research institution or subscribe. If I Google Scholar search, I get abstracts at best unless the study is old.

Are you serious? There is a wealth of data and detail available for the asking in any number of places far away from "research institutions". Now you show your real colors I think. You're not interested in the science or the debate. It would seem you want your environmentalist religious beliefs confirmed regardless of fact. I will thus leave you to your superstitions and withdraw from this subthread with one thought: If human action as a cause of GW is proven tomorrow AND it is shown to be harmful AND a viable alternative exists, I will be the first in line demanding the relevant policy changes. OTOH, will you be ready to acknowledge you were dead wrong in your superstitions when in, say, 20 years, not much has changed? I am willing to be lead by data, you seem to be led by the high priesthood of the greenie movement.

Do we do what we \*can\* to reduce the human contribution to global warming, or do we do nothing? Do I assume you advocate for the latter?

At what cost? Even assuming you're right and GW=Badness=Human Action (far from demonstrated), what are you willing to give up? I say, let's start with the Clinton, Kennedy, Moore fleet of private jets that produce far more emissions than any 10 of our SUVs do. Like all self-anointed saviors of mankind the environs want to impose policy \*on other people\* first.

Re: OT: U.S. airstrike kills al-Zarqawi

Re: OT: U.S. airstrike kills al-Zarqawi

It is a typical religion in that regard.

First, we pursue alternative energy sources. In my research class, one

Like which ones? Can you name one that has the same energy density as petroleum and can be widely distributed in a safe and economically viable fashion without creating a consequent pollution problem greater than petroleum. I can't – and I've done a fair bit of reading on the matter. "Alternative Energy" is mostly a fantasy, at least for the moment (if you don't include nuclear).

girl fermented her family's \*garbage\* and then distilled enough alcohol to support her family's fuel needs for a year. Another student

I don't believe it. Can you arrange for me to get a copy of the paper and the data? If so, she's about to become a multi-billionaire and I want to buy stock in her company.

converted his diesel car to run on alcohol. If high school students can do this, what could publicly supported research do? Why do we want to be dependent on Middle East oil?

Ahh, now it's coming clearer. You're in high school. Are you a teacher or a student? It could explain a lot about your POV. And yes, since it's so obviously easy, I recommend your highly innovative students/classmates \*Start A Company\* to displace all that evil petroleum. Oh, by the way, just so you know, when you burn alcohol, it um, produces, well ... \*emissions\*.

Next we could mandate better fuel efficiency. Time traffic lights in

That's right. The physical universe obeys Congress. All we need to do is pass a law demanding better fuel efficiency and it will happen like magic. The laws of physics do not apply. The tradeoffs between mass, energy density, safety, and utility are irrelevant. Let's all just pass a law. Why didn't all those idiot engineers at GM, Ford, Toyota, et al think of this? They could have saved themselves years of useless schooling.

Here's a clue: Large mass improves safety to humans in vehicles. It does so at the cost of energy efficiency. Modern vehicles are incredibly efficient in their use of the (relatively) high energy density found in gasoline. Can it be better – yes, incrementally, no in any big step

Re: OT: U.S. airstrike kills al-Zarqawi

Re: OT: U.S. airstrike kills al-Zarqawi

function kind of way. Unless you can come up with an ultra-light material that is stronger than big chunks of steel to protect the precious human cargo in cars and trucks, you're going to have to live with this reality. And, no, Congress passing more laws won't change it.

major cities. Increase public transportation. A total overhaul of our

You betcha, because "public transportation" is free, efficient, doesn't use any form of energy, and we can trust government officials more than we can those eeeeevvvill corporate monkeys. We have proof of this. Look at how well the publicly owned and run Amtrak rail system has been. Let's do lots more of this.

energy policy, one not run by oil companies.

Yeah, those big eeeeevvvill oil companies – the ones that will or already do have your money in them (in the form of retirement and pension money) should be punished for their forward investement and be made to be break even or less. Then when no one has anything left in their 401ks, IRA,s and union pensions, let's punish them again for failing to deliver the magic that keeps folks like you afloat.

Work with developing nations to encourage efficient energy policy. Have

Yes, because our diplomacy is \*soooo\* effective in other areas, this ought to work real well too. That's how we got terrorism erradicated, the oppression of minority tribes around the world stopped, and the sharing of wealth, power, and food widely accepted as a model in various "developing nations". You are living in a particularly vile (albeit entertaining) corner of policy Fantasy Land. You need to do just a slight reading of history to grasp how the rest of the world operated when faced with our formidable policy "encouragement".

you read anything about Brazil's energy policy? We'll (the US) be more affected by thugs like Chavez than Brazil.

You, of all people, should be rejoicing. He got rid of the Eeeeevvvil Biiiii Oiiiiil Companies and collectivized it. That's more or less what you want here if I understand you correctly.

Re: OT: U.S. airstrike kills al-Zarqawi

Oh there's lots we could do.

Yes there is. And let me help you understand it:

- 1) Regulate energy markets only insofar as needed to ensure safety.
- 2) Remove all impediments beyond 1) for the initiating of any source of energy, new- or old, but especially nuclear.
- 3) Start drill in ANWR \*now\*
- 4) Tell the world that we intend to be 100% nuclear for electricity within a generation and that anyone who builds good electric cars for local commuting is going to make a fortune.
- 5) Quit underwriting energy wet dreams like solar and wind
- 6) Let prices fall where they may. Quit whining about "gouging" and "over pricing" and other similar collectivist fantasies. The sooner energy reaches its natural market price, the better. Price is a measure of scarcity and serves to encourage efficient distribution. If gas is \$10 a gallon here, it encourages oil producers to ship their product here over places where it will only yield \$1.
- 7) Cease all foreign aid and prohibit any US charity money from flowing into any oil producing nation that wants to do business with us. They already get our money in the oil markets, we ought not to have to subsidize them.

Steven

--

---

Tim Daneliuk tundra@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx  
PGP Key: <http://www.tundraware.com/PGP/>