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I wonder how many rode in their cars to the rally, one and two at a time?  
Plus, why waste your time, climate is cyclic. There's nothing we can do to change it.

Denial, it's just not a river in Egypt.

Exactly what part of the post is denial?

---
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The real irony comes from the statement about the No-Nukes rally many decades ago. Had we not adopted the cultural stupidity...
The real irony comes from the statement about the No-Nukes rally many decades ago. Had we not adopted the cultural stupidity of being so anti-nuke, our carbon emissions could be far lower today than they are. Nuclear power is the only practical means to achieve that.

I can get you a deal on lots of acreage in Chernobyl.

Fiji - I usually look forward to a reasoned debate when I see you have posted. But the idea that one melt down is worth the risk of nuclear power is absurd.

Not only is the danger unacceptable but so is the shell game. Who financed the Three Mile Island Nuclear Power Plant? Who paid for the clean up?

Who profitted?

There is no conundrum for me. Your pie in the sky horse shut regarding reprocessing nuclear waste and unbreakable reactor cores are unproven science fiction fantasies.

Nice to see you return to posting. Sorry to see you aren't yourself. Get well soon.

Thanks for proving my point about the lunacy of the anti-nuke crowd.

If re-processing is pie-in-the-sky, then why do the French successfully power most of their country with it? If new design, can't melt down nuke plants are fantasy, then why did the Obama administration shut down the demonstration project to do exactly that?

Wanna know what's really pie-in-the-sky? Believing that solar or wind is going to replace coal-fired electric plants. Sure, they might be replaced with natural gas, which is a bit cleaner. But your crowd hates that too. All the while, the simple math on the massive amount of power needed (current use + growth) easily shows that only nuclear can get us there. And it does so with the cleanest footprint of all sources.

On the one hand, climate activists believe in all sorts of pseudo-science that bolsters their cause. They further believe that science can make solar and wind efficient to the point of replacing current sources. But god forbid that science can improve and make safe nuclear technology! Heavens no - there can't possibly be new and improved methods versus the designs of 40-50 years ago! What a farcical belief system.

ObamaCare: To insure the uninsured, we first make the insured uninsured and then make them pay more to be insured again, so the original uninsured can be insured for free.

BillyBlastoff
Maximum Peach
Karma: 8270
Posts: 8270 (8270 all sites)
Registered: 6/9/2002
Status: Offline
posted on 9/27/2014 at 07:13 PM

I don't have a crowd.

I don't want my tax dollars financing nuclear power plants. I don't want my tax dollars paying to get rid of the waste. Do you? All so some corporation can profit?

You know what - I'm tired of all this crap. I hope you get your sick diseased world. I hope you are proud to pass on a toxic environment to your kin.

I'm proud of what I've done and where I stand. On my own. Without a crowd.

Capitalism will always survive, because socialism will be there to save it.

Ralph Nader's Father
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I don't have a crowd.

I don't want my tax dollars financing nuclear power plants. I don't want my tax dollars paying to get rid of the waste. Do you? All so some corporation can profit?

You know what - I'm tired of all this crap. I hope you get your sick diseased world. I hope you are proud to pass on a toxic environment to your kin.
I'm proud of what I've done and where I stand. On my own. Without a crowd.

Of course you were one the the idiots that said that nuclear power plants would kill us all.

Didn't happen.

Same fools that said that the Alaskan pipeline would destroy the ecosystem in Alaska.

Didn't happen.

You really need to read some actual science and put down Rolling Stone.

But your tax dollars going to gov't cronies for solar and wind are just fine, right? Billions wasted in down that rat hole are just dandy.

To be honest, I'm with you on that point. But it must be applied equally. Gov't dollars for basic R&D in gov't sponsored labs - fine. Gov't dollars to support open source industry group or collegiate research - ok, under qualified conditions. Gov't money directly to independent companies - no way. The waste in 'green energy companies' under The Stimulus was obscene.

I don't understand the extreme characterizations whenever it comes to this debate. It's either "you're with us if you agree with our approved green solutions" or "you want a toxic swamp for your children" if you don't think like we do.

Talk about polarization - and about inaccurate perceptions. You think we'll really fare better by putting up hundreds of thousands of wind turbines? Will the planet be better off after the massive lithium mining required for new battery technology? And for every solar plant or wind farm, we still need to build a traditional power plant to back them up when the sun doesn't shine or the wind doesn't blow. How is that efficient, environmentally sound, or fiscally prudent?

If you're open to other viewpoints, I'd suggest the following...

http://windfallthemovie.com/index_1.html

http://www.virgin.com/richard-branson/the-future-of-energy


Obamacare: To insure the uninsured, we first make the insured uninsured and then make them pay more to be insured again, so the original uninsured can be insured for free.

I know that the solution will not be one single source of power. But when one power source has proven itself to be deadly with waste materials that cannot be currently safely disposed of, I think it prudent to take that power source out of the equation.

Of course you were one the the idiots that said that nuclear power plants would kill us all.

Didn't happen.

Idiots? Ask the dead in the following list.

Of course you were one the the idiots that said that nuclear power plants would kill us all.

Didn't happen.
The Kyshtym disaster, which occurred at Mayak in the Soviet Union, was rated as a level 6 on the International Nuclear Event Scale, the third most severe incident after Chernobyl and Fukushima. Because of the intense secrecy surrounding Mayak, it is difficult to estimate the death toll of Kyshtym. One book claims that "in 1992, a study conducted by the Institute of Biophysics at the former Soviet Health Ministry in Chelyabinsk found that 8,015 people had died within the preceding 52 years as a result of the accident."[11] By contrast, only 6,000 death certificates have been found for residents of the Techno riverside between 1950 and 1982 from all causes of death.[12] Though perhaps the Soviet study considered a larger geographic area affected by the airborne plume. The most commonly quoted estimate is 200 deaths due to cancer, but the origin of this number is not clear. More recent epidemiological studies suggest that around 49 to 55 cancer deaths among riverine residents can be associated to radiation exposure.[13] This would include the effects of all radioactive releases into the river, 98% of which happened long before the 1957 accident, but it would not include the effects of the airborne plume that was carried north-east.[13] The area closest to the accident produced 66 diagnosed cases of chronic radiation syndrome, providing the bulk of the data about this condition.[14]

Windscale fire[edit]
33+ cancer fatalities (estimated by UK government)[15][16] – Windscale, United Kingdom. October 8, 1957. The Windscale fire resulted when uranium metal fuel ignited inside plutonium production piles; surrounding dairy farms were contaminated.[15][16]

Other accidents[edit]
13 fatalities – Radiotherapy accident in Costa Rica, 1996. 114 patients received an overdose of radiation from a Cobalt-60 source that was being used for radiotherapy.[19]
11 fatalities – Radiotherapy accident in Zaragoza, Spain, December 1999. Cancer patients receiving radiotherapy; 27 patients were injured.[20]
10 fatalities – Columbus radiotherapy accident, 1974–1976, 88 injuries from Cobalt-60 source.[18][22]
9 fatalities – Soviet submarine K-27 reactor accident, 24 May 1966. 83 people were injured.[18]
8 fatalities – Soviet submarine K-19 reactor accident, July 4, 1961. More than 30 people were over-exposed to radiation.[20]
8 fatalities – Radiation accident in Morocco, March 1984.[23]
7 fatalities – Houston radiotherapy accident, 1980.[18][22]
5 fatalities – Lost radiation source, Baku, Azerbaijan, USSR, October 5, 1982. 13 injuries.[18]
4 fatalities – Mihama Nuclear Power Plant accident, August 9, 2004. Hot water and steam leaked from a broken pipe (not actually a radiation accident).[24]
4 fatalities – Golinia accident, September 13, 1987. 249 people received serious radiation contamination from lost radiotherapy source.[25]
4 fatalities – Radiation accident in Mexico City, 1966.[25]
3 fatalities – SL-1 accident (US Army) 1961.[25]
3 fatalities – Samut Prakan radiation accident: Three deaths and ten injuries when a radiation-therapy unit was dismantled, February 2000.[26]
2 fatalities – Tokaimura nuclear accident, nuclear fuel reprocessing plant, Japan, September 30, 1999.[27]
2 fatalities - Meet Halfa, Egypt, May 2000; two fatalities due to radiography accident.[28]
1 fatality – Mayapuri radiological accident, India, April 2010.[26]
1 fatality – Daigo Fukuryu Maru March 1, 1954
1 fatality – Louis Stotin May 21, 1946
1 fatality – Harry K. Daghlian, Jr., August 21, 1945 at Los Alamos National Laboratory in New Mexico.
1 fatality – Cecil Kelley criticality accident, December 30, 1958 at the Los Alamos National Laboratory.[29]
1 fatality – Operator error at Wood River Junction nuclear facility, 1964. Rhode Island, Robert Peabody dies 49 hours later.[29]
1 fatality – Malfunction HE-5 level 4 at RA4 in Buenos Aires, Argentina, 1993. operator Ovidio Rodriguez dies days later.[29]
1 fatality – San Salvador, El Salvador, 1989; one fatality due to violation of safety rules at 60Co irradiation facility.[28]
1 fatality - Soreq, Israel, 1990; one fatality due to violation of safety rules at 60Co irradiation facility.[28]
1 fatality – Tammiku, Estonia, 1994; one fatality from disposed 137Cs source.[28]
1 fatality – Sarov, Russia, June 1997; one fatality due to violation of safety rules.[28]

Atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki

Lists of nuclear disasters and radioactive incidents

Nevada Test Site

Sempolanski Test Site
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Jump up ^ http://www.unescar/nuclear/fukushima.html

Jump up ^ http://www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2012/05/25/news/radiation-didnt-cause-fukushima-meltdown-no-1-deaths-u-n/#.U2--DyiJvM0


Jump up ^ A book that is perhaps the Worst. Not the First TME magazine, May 12, 1986.


Jump up ^ to: a b c d e Johnston, Robert (September 23, 2007). "Deadliest radiation accidents and other events causing radiation casualties". Database of Radiological Incidents and Related Events.

Jump up ^ to: a b Strengthening the Safety of Radiation Sources p. 15.
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Capitalism will always survive, because socialism will be there to save it.

Ralph Nader’s Father

Muleman1994 posted on 9/28/2014 at 10:59 AM

Not one of the above items are attributable to The U.S. Nuclear Power Plants.

Nice try though. Can't win an argument, throw out a bunch of trash and hope something sticks. Sorta like the global warming hoax.

They are attributable to nuclear power plants of the same design as those existing in the US. You don't live in a vacuum.

In your post you said:

quote:

Of course you were one the the idiots that said that nuclear power plants would kill us all.

You didn't say US nuclear power plants.

For that matter I've never, ever said "that nuclear power plants would kill us all."

I don't know why you think I did.


quote:

Ei and Tomoo Arakawa will serve soup with vegetables from Fukushima at Frieze London

Photo: Frank Gualtieri via Wikimedia Commons
Two Japanese artists are offering visitors to this year's Frieze Art Fair in London the chance to try a soup made from vegetables grown in Fukushima, The Independent has reported.

The soup's main ingredient, daikon radish, was grown in Fukushima where, in March 2011, an earthquake and subsequent tsunami caused a local nuclear power plant to melt down, contaminating the surrounding area with radioactive waste.

Ei Arakawa and his brother Tomoo, who call themselves the United Brothers, were born and raised in the affected Fukushima prefecture. The artists plan to fly their mother from Japan to London to prepare the broth at the art fair. The performance, entitled Does This Soup Taste Ambivalent?, is meant to express the pair's solidarity with those affected by the nuclear disaster.

The artists insist that the soup is safe to eat and have assured Frieze organizers that the vegetables have been approved by the Japanese Farmers' Association. Frieze director Matthew Slotover told The Independent "They are flying in vegetables. They've been tested, they're safe, but there's clearly a psychological barrier."

The Frieze catalogue explains "The gift of food represents the essence of hospitality, sharing and humanity. However, the soup United Brothers offer is laced with the (conceptual) possibility that it may be radioactive."

The artists will be serving the soup daily at Frieze Art Fair, free of charge.


Capitalism will always survive, because socialism will be there to save it.

Ralph Nader's Father

posted on 9/28/2014 at 10:21 PM

Nice attempt to dance around the facts little billy.

So, from what source do you buy your fuel and electricity?

posted on 9/28/2014 at 10:37 PM

The facts are that thousands and thousands have been killed by nuclear energy. You said none. That's a fact Mule. You were WRONG. WRONG... WRONG... WRONG!

My energy comes from many sources, nuclear among them.

The nuclear power plant is older than 35 years. I know that because the demonstrations I took part in helped stop the building of new nuclear power plants in America.

The nuclear power plant near me has already had a couple of "minor" leaks.

I'm looking at buying a lake house. Because homeowners insurance will not cover losses caused by a nuclear power plant, I'm not even looking at Lake Anna, although I've been there and know they have some reasonably priced lake front real estate.

Eat your soup Muleman.

Capitalism will always survive, because socialism will be there to save it.

Ralph Nader's Father

posted on 9/29/2014 at 09:08 AM

quote:

quote:
I wonder how many rode in their cars to the rally, one and two at a time? 
Plus, why waste your time, climate is cyclic. There's nothing we can do to change it.

Denial, it's just not a river in Egypt.

Exactly what part of the post is denial?

I'm still waiting for an answer to the question as to what in the quoted post is denial.

If you can't give a reason for such a juvenile attempt at belittling a post, then you shouldn't be posting.

And, to give you a fact, there is no river in Egypt named Denial, so not only do you have the mind of a child, you also can't research as good as a four year old.

All photos posted of family, friends, and places, including those of historic ABB value, by this poster are copyrighted by the poster, or posted by permission of the copywriter, None of those photos may be reproduced for commercial gain.

Typical comment from the weak global warming crowd. 
Criticize others with incoherent drivel while offering nothing to support their false claims.

From exactly where do you buy your electricity and fuel?
pops42
Maximum Peach
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Posts: 9963
(9962 all sites)
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posted on 9/29/2014 at 09:07 PM
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quote:

I wonder how many rode in their cars to the rally, one and two at a time? Plus, why waste your time, climate is cyclic. There's nothing we can do to change it.

Denial, it's just not a river in Egypt.

Exactly what part of the post is denial?

I'm still waiting for an answer to the question as to what in the quoted post is denial.

If you can't give a reason for such a juvenile attempt at belittling a post, then you shouldn't be posting.

And, to give you a fact, there is no river in Egypt named Denial, so not only do you have the mind of a child, you also can't research as good as a four year old.

Typical comment from the weak global warming crowd. Criticize others with incoherent drivel while offering nothing to support their false claims.

From exactly where do you buy your electricity and fuel?
I wonder how many rode in their cars to the rally, one and two at a time? Plus, why waste your time, climate is cyclic. There's nothing we can do to change it.

Denial, it's just not a river in Egypt.

Exactly what part of the post is denial?

I'm still waiting for an answer to the question as to what in the quoted post is denial.

If you can't give a reason for such a juvenile attempt at belittling a post, then you shouldn't be posting.

And, to give you a fact, there is no river in Egypt named Denial, so not only do you have the mind of a child, you also can't research as good as a four year old.

Typical comment from the weak global warming crowd. Criticize others with incoherent drivel while offering nothing to support their false claims.

From exactly where do you buy your electricity and fuel?

And of course you know more than the world's leading scientists.
Do you mean the "Worlds leading scientists" that took grant money from the global warming wackos to produce reports they wanted?

I believe the actual scientists not the Al Gore pseudo-scientists.

Real scientists have debunked the global warming hype.

---

pops42
Maximum Peach

posted on 9/29/2014 at 10:41 PM

I wonder how many rode in their cars to the rally, one and two at a time?

Plus, why waste your time, climate is cyclic. There's nothing we can do to change it.

Denial, it's just not a river in Egypt.

Exactly what part of the post is denial?

I'm still waiting for an answer to the question as to what in the quoted post is denial.

If you can't give a reason for such a juvenile attempt at belittling a post, then you shouldn't be posting.

And, to give you a fact, there is no river in Egypt named Denial, so not only do you have the mind of a child, you also can't research as good as a four year old.

Typical comment from the weak global warming crowd.

Criticize others with incoherent drivel while offering nothing to support their false claims.

From exactly where do you buy your electricity and fuel?

And of course you know more than the worlds leading scientists. 😊
Do you mean the "Worlds leading scientists" that took grant money from the global warming wackos to produce reports they wanted?

Real scientists have debunked the global warming hype.


________________________

Muleman1994
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posted on 9/29/2014 at 10:51 PM
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I wonder how many rode in their cars to the rally, one and two at a time? Plus, why waste your time, climate is cyclic. There's nothing we can do to change it.

Denial, it's just not a river in Egypt.

Exactly what part of the post is denial?

I'm still waiting for an answer to the question as to what in the quoted post is denial.

If you can't give a reason for such a juvenile attempt at belittling a post, then you shouldn't be posting.

And, to give you a fact, there is no river in Egypt named Denial, so not only do you have the mind of a child, you also can't research as good as a four year old.

Typical comment from the weak global warming crowd.

Typically others with incoherent drivel while offering nothing to support their false claims.

From exactly where do you buy your electricity and fuel?

And of course you know more than the worlds leading scientists.
Do you mean the "Worlds leading scientists" that took grant money from the global warming wackos to produce reports they wanted?

I believe the actual scientists not the Al Gore pseudo-scientists.

Real scientists have debunked the global warming hype.


There is your problem. You actually believe what is written in the dailykos.com, a far left political rag.
No wonder you are so factually wrong.

pops42
Maximum Peach
Karma: Posts: 9963 (9962 all sites)
Registered: 8/16/2005
Status: Offline
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quote:

I wonder how many rode in their cars to the rally, one and two at a time? Plus, why waste your time, climate is cyclic. There's nothing we can do to change it.

Denial, it's just not a river in Egypt.

Exactly what part of the post is denial?

I'm still waiting for an answer to the question as to what in the quoted post is denial.

If you can't give a reason for such a juvenile attempt at belittling a post, then you shouldn't be posting.

And, to give you a fact, there is no river in Egypt named Denial, so not only do you have the mind of a child, you also can't research as good as a four year old.

Typical comment from the weak global warming crowd. Criticize others with incoherent drivel while offering nothing to support their false claims.

From exactly where do you buy your electricity and fuel?

And of course you know more than the worlds leading scientists 😏

Do you mean the "Worlds leading scientists" that took grant money from the global warming wackos to produce reports they wanted?
Do you mean the "Worlds leading scientists" that took grant money from the global warming wackos to produce reports they wanted?

I believe the actual scientists not the Al Gore pseudo-scientists.

Real scientists have debunked the global warming hype.


There is your problem. You actually believe what is written in the dailykos.com, a far left political rag.

No wonder you are so factually wrong.

prove it wrong mule boy or stfu.

________________________

There is your problem. You actually believe what is written in the dailykos.com, a far left political rag.

No wonder you are so factually wrong.

prove it wrong mule boy or stfu.

________________________

Muledung is the same kind of person who would have believed the Tobacco industry hack doctors who said smoking was fine after the government medical researchers had discovered it caused cancer. Fast forward 60 years and he believes the hack Koch Brothers paid fake climate scientists who are paid way more to lie about this then the real NASA and NOAA climate scientists because their bosses profit margin stands to suffer. Of course he’s such a special kind of stupid he can’t connect the dots.

"Capitalism is the extraordinary belief that the nastiest of men for the nastiest of motives will somehow work for the benefit of all", John Maynard Keynes

________________________

I wonder how many rode in their cars to the rally, one and two at a time? Plus, why waste your time, climate is cyclic. There's nothing we can do to change it.
Denial, it's just not a river in Egypt.

Exactly what part of the post is denial?

I'm still waiting for an answer to the question as to what in the quoted post is denial.

If you can't give a reason for such a juvenile attempt at belittling a post, then you shouldn't be posting.

And, to give you a fact, there is no river in Egypt named Denial, so not only do you have the mind of a child, you also can't research as good as a four year old.

Typical comment from the weak global warming crowd. Criticize others with incoherent drivel while offering nothing to support their false claims.

From exactly where do you buy your electricity and fuel?

And of course you know more than the worlds leading scientists 😒

Do you mean the "Worlds leading scientists" that took grant money from the global warming wackos to produce reports they wanted?

I believe the actual scientists not the Al Gore pseudo-scientists.

Real scientists have debunked the global warming hype.


There is your problem. You actually believe what is written in the dailykos.com, a far left political rag. No wonder you are so factually wrong.

prove it wrong mule boy or stfu.

If you don't know that the dalleykos is a left-wing political rag your political ideology blinds you just as Obama's does.

Global Warming, woops, I mean Climate Change (y'all had to change the name after being exposed had liars) is a political ideology and not a factual issue.

Deal with it.
Global Warming, woops, I mean Climate Change (y’ll had to change the name after being exposed had liars) is a political ideology and not a factual issue.

I pledge and support the elimination of the derogatory use of the r-word from everyday speech and promote the acceptance and inclusion of people with intellectual disabilities. http://www.r-word.org/

posted on 9/30/2014 at 03:07 PM

The Greatest Scam In History: Global Warming

August 26, 2013 | By Joe Martino | Environment, Global Warming Fraud, News Articles, Propaganda, Science & Technology, Sleuth Journal, Special Interests

"It is the greatest scam in history. I am amazed, appalled and highly offended by it. Global Warming; it is a scam."

Those are the words of the founder of The Weather Channel, John Coleman.

At this point in time I see there is an overwhelming number of people who are all beginning to see through this manmade Global Warming fib the Elite have created. What a time for it to all come together as the meeting in Copenhagen to discuss climate change and push forward the new carbon tax is only days away.

Many experts in the field are also beginning to really stand up and speak their own truth about global warming, giving the general public a look into "the fast one" the Elite is trying to pull on the collective.

I feel it's amazing to see what is happening around the world right now. The intensity around so many big scale events is building and truth is flowing to the surface about the true agendas behind these events. It is absolutely something we can ALL see the light behind.

I have never seen so much light come out of Elite Agenda events since I started observing and researching 5 years ago. In literally every move they make the collective is beginning to see the truth behind it and their plans are falling apart one day at a time.

For me this is a true measure of how powerful the collective consciousness is when more and more of us begin to speak our truth and share peacefully amongst one another. Global Warming is one of the many issues people are beginning to see more clearly and there are many many more to come. So many that the world we know now, is literally going to be entirely different in a few years as the acceleration of consciousness REALLY picks up.

World's Top Climate Scientists Admit “Computers” Got Global Warming Wrong

October 3, 2013 | By Brandon Smith | Environment, Global Warming Fraud, News Articles, Science & Technology, Special Interests

If Climate Gate didn’t silence the great global warming cult, then perhaps this will. Climate scientists themselves now admit their calculations on global warming were WRONG, though they divert blame to glitchy computer models. The reality is that all mainstream climate science to date has been fraudulent, and the fact that organizations like NASA and the CRU continually refuse to release the source data for their experiments to the public proves that they have been at least partially if not fully aware of the fraud. Man-made climate change has been used as an excuse to fashion draconian environmental regulations that if implemented, will essentially tax the very air we breath, and set into motion the fantastical lie of “carbon pollution”, which regards the very act of human existence as a threat to the stability of the Earth’s biosphere. It’s an elitist’s wet dream. Thankfully, the Liberty Movement and legitimate researchers have exposed the scam, making the enforcement of carbon controls on a wide scale almost impossible.


Read the leaked IPCC Report here:
Climate Scientists in Australia are claiming that the leaked report has been misrepresented by "skeptics".

http://www.stopgreensuicide.com/

Doctor John Cook, Research Fellow in Climate Communication at the Global Change Institute at the University of Queensland claims that news sources misquoted a .2C per decade temperature rise in the 2007 IPCC Report. However, I found this prediction blatantly printed in the 2007 IPCC Report under the section – “Model Based Projections For The Future”. Here is the quote:

“A temperature rise of about 0.2 °C per decade is projected for the next two decades for all SRES scenarios.”


So it would seem that the latest report does indeed contradict the IPCC’s 2007 predictions and cuts temperature increases in half. Cook apparently does not know how to read.

Here are just some of the latest mainstream quotes on the leaked report:

A leaked copy of the world’s most authoritative climate study reveals scientific forecasts of imminent doom were drastically wrong. The Mail on Sunday has obtained the final draft of a report to be published later this month by the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the ultimate watchdog whose massive, six-yearly ‘assessments’ are accepted by environmentalists, politicians and experts as the gospel of climate science. The IPCC recognises the global warming ‘pause’ first reported by The Mail on Sunday last year is real – and concede that their computer models did not predict it. But they cannot explain why world average temperatures have not shown any statistically significant increase since 1997. –David Rose, Mail on Sunday, 15 September 2013

Last night Professor Judith Curry, head of climate science at Georgia Institute of Technology in Atlanta, said the leaked Summary for Policy-makers showed that the science is clearly not settled, and is in a state of flux’. She said it therefore made no sense that the IPCC was claiming that its confidence in its forecasts and conclusions has increased. ‘The consensus-seeking process used by the IPCC creates and amplifies biases in the science. It should be abandoned in favour of a more traditional review that presents arguments for and against – which would better support scientific progress, and be more useful for policy makers.’ –David Rose, Mail on Sunday, 15 September 2013

Dr Benny Peiser, of the Global Warming Policy Foundation, described the leaked report as a ‘staggering concoction of confusion, speculation and sheer ignorance’. As for the pause, he said ‘it would appear that the IPCC is running out of answers … to explain why there is a widening gap between predictions and reality’. –David Rose, Mail on Sunday, 15 September 2013

The British Met Office has issued ‘erroneous statements and misrepresentations’ about the pause in global warming – and its climate computer model is fundamentally flawed, says a new analysis by a leading independent researcher. Nic Lewis, a climate scientist and accredited ‘expert reviewer’ for the IPCC, also points out that Met Office’s flagship climate model suggests the world will warm by twice as much in response to CO2 as some other leading institutes, such as NASA’s climate centre in America. –David Rose, Mail on Sunday, 15 September 2013

Since the last IPCC report in 2007, much has changed. It is now more than 15 years since global average temperature rose significantly. Indeed, the IPCC chairman Rajendra Pachauri has conceded that the “pause” already may have lasted for 17 years, depending on which data set you look at. A recent study in Nature Climate Change by Francis Zwiers and colleagues of the University of Victoria. British Columbia, found that models have overestimated warming by 100% over the past 20 years. Explaining this failure is now a cottage industry in climate science. The most plausible explanation of the pause is simply that climate sensitivity was overestimated in the models because of faulty assumptions about net amplification through water-vapor feedback. This will be a topic of heated debate at the political session to rewrite the report in Stockholm, starting on Sept. 23, at which issues other than the actual science of climate change will be at stake. –Matt Ridley, The Wall Street Journal, 14 September 2013

There is a degree of nervousness internationally that the central climate change message is being lost as efforts are being made to build a global agreement. The concern is the Abbott government’s change of heart on a carbon tax will encourage other countries to delay or weaken their commitment. The election of an Abbott government has focused attention on Australia. Former prime minister John Howard has been booked to deliver this year’s Global Warming Policy Foundation lecture in November. The title of his address: One Religion is Enough. –Graham Lloyd, The Australian, 14 September 2013

A new study in the journal Nature Climate Change that compared 117 climate predictions made in the 1990s to the actual amount of warming finds that 99% of them overestimated the amount of warming. On average, the predictions forecasted two times more global warming than actually occurred. –Maxim Lott, Fox News, 12 September 2013

Scientists have had only limited success persuading us to care about climate change so perhaps it is time to call in the philosophers. That appears to be the approach of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, which has engaged a philosopher to help to produce its forthcoming report on how to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Professor Bronn’s role appears to be to try to win the economists in the IPCC team and remind them to take ethics into account when considering how much governments should spend on cutting emissions. He contributed to Lord Stern’s Review of the Economics of Climate Change, which was criticised by many economists for justifying spending billions of pounds mitigating climate change by attaching a much higher value to goods available in the next century. –Ben Webster, The Times, 11 September 2013
I have never seen so much light come out of Elite Agenda events since I started observing and researching 5 years ago. In literally every move they make the collective is beginning to see the truth behind it and their plans are falling apart one day at a time.

For me this is a true measure of how powerful the collective consciousness is when more and more of us begin to speak our truth and share peacefully amongst one another. Global Warming is one of the many issues people are beginning to see more clearly and there are many many more to come. So many that the world we know now, is literally going to be entirely different in a few years as the acceleration of consciousness REALLY picks up.

World’s Top Climate Scientists Admit “Computers” Got Global Warming Wrong

October 3, 2013 | By Brandon Smith | Environment, Global Warming Fraud, News Articles, Science & Technology, Special Interests

If Climate Gate didn’t silence the great global warming cult, then perhaps this will. Climate scientists themselves now admit their calculations on global warming were WRONG, though they divert blame to glitchy computer models. The reality is that all mainstream climate science to date has been fraudulent, and the fact that organizations like NASA and the CRU continually refuse to release the source data for their experiments to the public proves that they have been at least partially if not fully aware of the fraud. Man-made climate change has been used as an excuse to fashion draconian environmental regulations that it implemented, will essentially tax the very air we breathe, and set into motion the fantastical lie of “carbon pollution”, which regards the very act of human existence as a threat to the stability of the Earth’s biosphere. It’s an elitist’s wet dream. Thankfully, the Liberty Movement and legitimate researchers have exposed the scam, making the enforcement of carbon controls on a wide scale almost impossible.


Read the leaked IPCC Report here:

http://www.stopgreensuicide.com/

Climate Scientists in Australia are claiming that the leaked report has been misrepresented by “skeptics”.


Doctor John Cook, Research Fellow in Climate Communication at the Global Change Institute at the University of Queensland claims that news sources misquoted a .2C per decade temperature rise in the 2007 IPCC Report. However, I found this prediction blatantly printed in the 2007 IPCC Report under the section – “Model Based Projections For The Future”. Here is the quote:

“A temperature rise of about 0.2 °C per decade is projected for the next two decades for all SRES scenarios.”


So it would seem that the latest report does indeed contradict the IPCC’s 2007 predictions and cuts temperature increases in half. Cook apparently does not know how to read.

___

Here are just some of the latest mainstream quotes on the leaked report:

A leaked copy of the world’s most authoritative climate study reveals scientific forecasts of imminent doom were drastically wrong. The Mail on Sunday has obtained the final draft of a report to be published later this month by the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the ultimate watchdog whose massive, six-yearly ‘assessments’ are accepted by environmentalists, politicians and experts as the gospel of climate science. The IPCC recognises the global warming ‘pause’ first reported by The Mail on Sunday last year is real – and concede that their computer models did not predict it. But they cannot explain why world average temperatures have not shown any statistically significant increase since 1997. –David Rose, Mail on Sunday, 15 September 2013

Last night Professor Judith Curry, head of climate science at Georgia Institute of Technology in Atlanta, said the leaked Summary for Policy-makers showed that ‘the science is clearly not settled, and is in a state of flux’. She said it therefore made no sense that the IPCC was claiming that its confidence in its forecasts and conclusions has increased. ‘The consensus-seeking process used by the IPCC creates and amplifies biases in the science. It should be abandoned in favour of a more traditional review that presents arguments for and against – which would better support scientific progress, and be more useful for policy makers.’ –David Rose, Mail on Sunday, 15 September 2013

Dr Benny Peiser, of the Global Warming Policy Foundation, described the leaked report as a ‘staggering concoction of confusion, speculation and sheer ignorance’. As for the pause, he said ‘it would appear that the IPCC is running out of answers … to explain why there is a widening gap between predictions and reality’. –David Rose, Mail on Sunday, 15 September 2013

The British Met Office has issued ‘erroneous statements and misrepresentations’ about the pause in global warming – and its climate computer model is fundamentally flawed, says a new analysis by a leading independent researcher. Nic Lewis, a climate scientist and accredited ‘expert reviewer’ for the IPCC, also points out that Met Office’s flagship climate model suggests the world will warm by twice as much in response to CO2 as some other leading institutes, such as NASA’s climate centre in America. –David Rose, Mail on Sunday, 15 September 2013

Since the last IPCC report in 2007, much has changed. It is now more than 15 years since global average temperature rose significantly. Indeed, the IPCC chairman Rajendra Pachauri has conceded that the “pause” already may have lasted for 17 years, depending on which data set you look at. A recent study in Nature Climate Change by Francis Zwiers and colleagues of the University of Victoria, British Columbia, found that models have overestimated warming by 100% over the past 20 years. Explaining this failure is now a cottage industry in climate science. The most plausible explanation of the pause is simply that climate sensitivity was overestimated in the models because of faulty assumptions about net amplification through water-vapor feedback. This will be a topic of heated debate at the political session to rewrite the report in Stockholm, starting on Sept. 23, at which issues other than the actual science of climate change will be at stake. –Matt Ridley, The Wall Street Journal, 14 September 2013

There is a degree of nervousness internationally that the central climate change message is being lost as efforts are being made to build a global agreement. The concern is the Abbott government’s change of heart on a carbon tax will encourage other countries to delay or weaken their commitment. The election of an Abbott government has focused attention on Australia. Former prime minister John Howard has been booked to deliver this year’s Global Warming Policy Foundation lecture in November. The title of his address: One Religion is Enough. – Graham Lloyd, The Australian, 14 September 2013

A new study in the journal Nature Climate Change that compared 117 climate predictions made in the 1990s to the actual amount of warming finds that 99% of them overestimated the amount of warming. On average, the predictions forecasted two times more global warming than actually occurred. –Maxim Lott, Fox News, 12 September 2013

Scientists have had only limited success persuading us to care about climate change so perhaps it is time to call in the philosophers. That appears to be the approach of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, which has engaged a philosopher to help to produce its forthcoming report on how to reduce greenhouse-gas emissions. Professor Broome’s role appears to be to rein in the economists in the IPCC team and remind them to take ethics into account when considering how much governments should spend on cutting emissions. He contributed to Lord Stern’s Review of the Economics of Climate Change, which was criticised by many economists for justifying spending
If Climate Gate didn’t silence the great global warming cult, then perhaps this will. Climate scientists themselves now admit their calculations on global warming were WRONG, though they divert blame to glitchy computer models. The reality is that all mainstream climate science to date has been fraudulent, and the fact that organizations like NASA and the CRU continually refuse to release the source data for their experiments to the public proves that they have been at least partially if not fully aware of the fraud. Man-made climate change has been used as an excuse to fashion draconian environmental regulations that if implemented, will essentially tax the very air we breath, and set into motion the fantastical lie of “carbon pollution”, which regards the very act of human existence as a threat to the stability of the Earth’s biosphere. The reality is that all mainstream climate science to date has been fraudulent, and the fact that organizations like NASA and the CRU continually refuse to release the source data for their experiments to the public proves that they have been at least partially if not fully aware of the fraud. Man-made climate change has been used as an excuse to fashion draconian environmental regulations that if implemented, will essentially tax the very air we breath, and set into motion the fantastical lie of “carbon pollution”, which regards the very act of human existence as a threat to the stability of the Earth’s biosphere. It’s an elitist’s wet dream. Thankfully, the Liberty Movement and legitimate researchers have exposed the scam, making the enforcement of carbon controls on a wide scale almost impossible.


Read the leaked IPCC Report here:
http://www.stopgreensuicide.com/

Climate Scientists in Australia are claiming that the leaked report has been misrepresented by “skeptics”.

http://www.radioaustralia.net.au/international/radio programas/pacificbeat/1191262

Doctor John Cook, Research Fellow in Climate Communication at the Global Change Institute at the University of Queensland claims that news sources misquoted a 2C per decade temperature rise in the 2007 IPCC Report. However, I found this prediction blatantly printed in the 2007 IPCC Report under the section – “Model Based Projections For The Future”. Here is the quote:

“A temperature rise of about 0.2 °C per decade is projected for the next two decades for all SRES scenarios.”


So it would seem that the latest report does indeed contradict the IPCC’s 2007 predictions and cuts temperature increases in half. Cook apparently does not know how to read.

http://www.radioaustralia.net.au/international/radio program/pacificbeat/1191262

...
Last night Professor Judith Curry, head of climate science at Georgia Institute of Technology in Atlanta, said the leaked Summary for Policy-makers showed that ‘the science is clearly not settled, and is in a state of flux’. She said it therefore made no sense that the IPCC was claiming that its confidence in its forecasts and conclusions has ‘increased’. ‘The consensus-seeking process used by the IPCC creates and amplifies biases in the science. It should be abandoned in favour of a more traditional review that presents arguments for and against – which would better support scientific progress, and be more useful for policy makers.’ – David Rose, Mail on Sunday, 15 September 2013

Dr Benny Peiser, of the Global Warming Policy Foundation, described the leaked report as a ‘staggering concoction of confusion, speculation and sheer ignorance’. As for the pause, he said ‘it would appear that the IPCC is running out of answers … to explain why there is a widening gap between predictions and reality’. – David Rose, Mail on Sunday, 15 September 2013

The British Met Office has issued ‘erroneous statements and misrepresentations’ about the pause in global warming – and its climate computer model is fundamentally flawed, says a new analysis by a leading independent researcher. Nic Lewis, a climate scientist and accredited ‘expert reviewer’ for the IPCC, also points out that Met Office’s flagship climate model suggests the world will warm by twice as much in response to CO2 as some other leading institutes, such as NASA’s climate centre in America. – David Rose, Mail on Sunday, 15 September 2013

Since the last IPCC report in 2007, much has changed. It is now more than 15 years since global average temperature rose significantly. Indeed, the IPCC chairman Rajendra Pachauri has conceded that the ‘pause’ already may have lasted for 17 years, depending on which data set you look at. A recent study in Nature Climate Change by Francis Zwiers and colleagues of the University of Victoria, British Columbia, found that models have overestimated warming by 100% over the past 20 years. Explaining this failure is now a cottage industry in climate science. The most plausible explanation of the pause is simply that climate sensitivity was overestimated in the models because of faulty assumptions about net amplification through water-vapor feedback. This will be a topic of heated debate at the political session to rewrite the report in Stockholm, starting on Sept. 23, at which issues other than the actual science of climate change will be at stake. – Matt Ridley, The Wall Street Journal, 14 September 2013

There is a degree of nervousness internationally that the central climate change message is being lost as efforts are being made to build a global agreement. The concern is the Abbott government’s change of heart on a carbon tax will encourage other countries to delay or weaken their commitment. The election of an Abbott government has focused attention on Australia. Former prime minister John Howard has been booked to deliver this year’s Global Warming Policy Foundation lecture in November. The title of his address: One Religion is Enough. – Graham Lloyd, The Australian, 14 September 2013

A new study in the journal Nature Climate Change that compared 117 climate predictions made in the 1990s to the actual amount of warming finds that 99% of them overestimated the amount of warming. On average, the predictions forecasted two times more global warming than actually occurred. – Maxim Loff, Fox News, 12 September 2013

Scientists have had only limited success persuading us to care about climate change so perhaps it is time to call in the philosophers. That appears to be the approach of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, which has engaged a philosopher to help to produce its forthcoming report on how to reduce greenhouse-gas emissions. Professor Broome’s role appears to be to rein in the economists in the IPCC team and remind them to take ethics into account when considering how much governments should spend on cutting emissions. He contributed to Lord Stern’s Review of the Economics of Climate Change, which was criticised by many economists for justifying spending billions of pounds mitigating climate change by attaching a much higher value to goods available in the next century. – Ben Webster, The Times, 11 September 2013

Is joe martino a climate scientist? no he’s a right wing mouthpiece, a shill who also believes the sandy hook shooting was a hoax, are you that gullible, or mentally retarded?. ill let your hero dumbya set you right mule-muffin 😈https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gBG2sb4ty4Y

[Edited on 9/30/2014 by pops42]

How convenient you ignore all the data from the actual scientists.

And yet again, you offer nothing but a foul mouth.
Many experts in the field are also beginning to really stand up and speak their own truth about global warming, giving the general public a look into "the fast one" the Elite is trying to pull on the collective.

I feel it's amazing to see what is happening around the world right now. The intensity around so many big scale events is building and truth is flowing to the surface about the true agendas behind these events. It is absolutely something we can ALL see the light behind.

I have never seen so much light come out of Elite Agenda events since I started observing and researching 5 years ago. In literally every move they make the collective is beginning to see the truth behind it and their plans are falling apart one day at a time.

For me this is a true measure of how powerful the collective consciousness is when more and more of us begin to speak our truth and share peacefully amongst one another. Global Warming is one of the many issues people are beginning to see more clearly and there are many many more to come. So many that the world we know now is literally going to be entirely different in a few years as the acceleration of consciousness REALLY picks up.

World’s Top Climate Scientists Admit “Computers” Got Global Warming Wrong

October 3, 2013 | By Brandon Smith | Environment, Global Warming Fraud, News Articles, Science & Technology, Special Interests

If Climate Gate didn’t silence the great global warming cult, then perhaps this will. Climate scientists themselves now admit their calculations on global warming were WRONG, though they divert blame to glitchy computer models. The reality is that all mainstream climate science to date has been fraudulent, and the fact that organizations like NASA and the CRU continually refuse to release the source data for their experiments to the public proves they have been at least partially if not fully aware of the fraud. Man-made climate change has been an excuse to fashion draconian environmental regulations that if implemented, will essentially tax the very air we breathe, and set into motion the fantastical lie of "carbon pollution", which regards the very act of human existence as a threat to the stability of the Earth’s biosphere. It’s an elitist’s wet dream. Thankfully, the Liberty Movement and legitimate researchers have exposed the scam, making the enforcement of carbon controls on a wide scale almost impossible.


Read the leaked IPCC Report here:

http://www.stophgreensuicide.com/

Climate Scientists in Australia are claiming that the leaked report has been misrepresented by “skeptics”.


Doctor John Cook, Research Fellow in Climate Communication at the Global Change Institute at the University of Queensland claims that news sources misquoted a .2C per decade temperature rise in the 2007 IPCC Report.


"A temperature rise of about 0.2 °C per decade is projected for the next two decades for all SRES scenarios."


So it would seem that the latest report does indeed contradict the IPCC’s 2007 predictions and cuts temperature increases in half. Cook apparently does not know how to read.

Here are just some of the latest mainstream quotes on the leaked report:

A leaked copy of the world’s most authoritative climate study reveals scientific forecasts of imminent doom were drastically wrong. The Mail on Sunday has obtained the final draft of a report to be published later this month by the UK-based Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the ultimate watchdog whose massive, yearly ‘assessments’ are accepted by environmentalists, politicians and experts as the gospel of climate science. The IPCC recognises the global warming ‘pause’ first reported by The Mail on Sunday last year is real – and concede that their computer models did not predict it. But they cannot explain why world average temperatures have not shown any statistically significant increase since 1997. –David Rose, Mail on Sunday, 15 September 2013

Last night Professor Judith Curry, head of climate science at Georgia Institute of Technology in Atlanta, said the leaked Summary for Policy-makers showed that ‘the science is clearly not settled, and is in a state of flux’. She said it therefore made no sense that the IPCC was claiming that its confidence in its forecasts and conclusions has increased. ‘The consensus-seeking process used by the IPCC creates and amplifies biases in the science. It should be abandoned in favour of a more traditional review that presents arguments for and against – which would better support scientific progress, and be more useful for policy makers.’ –David Rose, Mail on Sunday, 15 September 2013

Dr Benny Peiser, of the Global Warming Policy Foundation, described the leaked report as a ‘staggering concoction of confusion, speculation and sheer ignorance’. As for the pause, he said ‘it would appear that the IPCC is running out of answers … to explain why there is a widening gap between predictions and reality’. –David Rose, Mail on Sunday, 15 September 2013

The British Met Office has issued ‘erroneous statements and misrepresentations’ about the pause in global warming – and its climate computer model is fundamentally flawed, says a new analysis by a leading independent researcher. Nic Lewis, a climate scientist and accredited ‘expert reviewer’ for the IPCC, also points out that Met Office’s flagship climate model suggests the world will warm by twice as much in response to CO2 as some other leading institutes, such as NASA’s climate centre in America. –David Rose, Mail on Sunday, 15 September 2013

Since the last IPCC report in 2007, much has changed. It is now more than 15 years since global average temperature rose significantly. Indeed, the IPCC chairman Rajendra Pachauri has conceded that the "pause" allegedly lasted for 17 years, depending on which data set you look at. A recent study in Nature Climate Change by Francis Zwiers and colleagues of the University of Victoria, British Columbia, found that models have
Change by Francis Zwiers and colleagues of the University of Victoria, British Columbia, found that models have overestimated warming by 100% over the past 20 years. Explaining this failure is now a cottage industry in climate science. The most plausible explanation of the pause is simply that climate sensitivity was overestimated in the models because of faulty assumptions about net amplification through water-vapor feedback. This will be a topic of heated debate at the political session to rewrite the report in Stockholm, starting on Sept. 23, at which issues other than the actual science of climate change will be at stake. –Matt Ridley, The Wall Street Journal, 14 September 2013

There is a degree of nervousness internationally that the central climate change message is being lost as efforts are being made to build a global agreement. The concern is the Abbott government’s change of heart on a carbon tax will encourage other countries to delay or weaken their commitment. The election of an Abbott government has focused attention on Australia. Former prime minister John Howard has been booked to deliver this year’s Global Warming Policy Foundation lecture in November. The title of his address: One Religion is Enough. –Graham Lloyd, The Australian, 14 September 2013

A new study in the journal Nature Climate Change that compared 117 climate predictions made in the 1990s to the actual amount of warming finds that 99% of them overestimated the amount of warming. On average, the predictions forecasted two times more global warming than actually occurred. –Maxim Lott, Fox News, 12 September 2013

Scientists have had only limited success persuading us to care about climate change so perhaps it is time to call in the philosophers. That appears to be the approach of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, which has engaged a philosopher to help to produce its forthcoming report on how to reduce greenhouse-gas emissions. Professor Broome’s role appears to be to rein in the economists in the IPCC team and remind them to take ethics into account when considering how much governments should spend on cutting emissions. He contributed to Lord Stern’s Review of the Economics of Climate Change, which was criticised by many economists for justifying spending billions of pounds mitigating climate change by attaching a much higher value to goods available in the next century. –Ben Webster, The Times, 11 September 2013

Is Joe Martino a climate scientist? No he’s a right wing mouthpiece, a shill who also believes the Sandy Hook shooting was a hoax, are you that gullible, or mentally retarded? I’ll let your hero dumbya set you right mule-muffin. 😄
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=g8G2zb4ly4Y

[Edited on 9/30/2014 by pops42]

How convenient you ignore all the data from the actual scientists.
And yet again, you offer nothing but a foul mouth.

You are a chicken voting for colonial sanders. A dope voting for his own demise. Good luck.
I pledge and support the elimination of the derogatory use of the r-word from everyday speech and promote the acceptance and inclusion of people with intellectual disabilities. http://www.r-word.org/