

The Washington Post

Energy and Environment

Antarctic ice loss has tripled in a decade. If that continues, we are in serious trouble.

by [Chris Mooney](#) June 13 [✉ Email the author](#)

Antarctica's ice sheet is melting at a rapidly increasing rate, now pouring more than 200 billion tons of ice into the ocean annually and raising sea levels a half-millimeter every year, a team of 80 scientists reported Wednesday.

The melt rate has tripled in the past decade, the study concluded. If the acceleration continues, some of scientists' worst fears about rising oceans could be realized, leaving low-lying cities and communities with less time to prepare than they had hoped.

The result also reinforces that nations have a short window — perhaps no more than a decade — to cut greenhouse-gas emissions if they hope to avert some of the worst consequences of climate change.

Antarctica, the planet's largest ice sheet, lost 219 billion tons of ice annually from 2012 through 2017 — approximately triple the 73 billion-ton melt rate of a decade ago, the scientists concluded. From 1992 through 1997, Antarctica lost 49 billion tons of ice annually.

The study is the product of a large group of Antarctic experts who collectively reviewed 24 recent measurements of Antarctic ice loss, reconciling their differences to produce the most definitive figures yet on changes in Antarctica.

Their results — known formally as the “[Ice Sheet Mass Balance Inter-Comparison Exercise](#)” (IMBIE) — were [published Wednesday in the journal Nature](#).

Market Watch

Dow	Today ↓
25,168.22	0.13%
S&P	Today ↑
2,782.04	0.23%
NASDAQ	Today ↑
7,755.56	0.78%

Last Updated: 2:31 PM 06/14/2018

“We took all the estimates across all the different techniques, and we got this consensus,” said Isabella Velicogna, an Antarctic expert at the University of California at Irvine and one of the many authors from institutions in 14 countries. The lead authors was Andrew Shepherd of the University of Leeds in England and Erik Ivins of NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory.

“The detailed record shows an acceleration, starting around 2002,” Beata Csatho, one of the study authors and a glaciologist at the University at Buffalo, said in an email.

Csatho noted that comparing the first and last five-year periods in the record reveals an even steeper acceleration. “Actually, if you compare 1997-2002 to 2012-2017, the increase is even larger, a factor of more than 5!!” she wrote. For the total period from 1992 through the present, the ice sheet has lost nearly 3 trillion tons of ice, equating to just less than 8 millimeters of sea-level rise. Forty percent of that loss has occurred in the past five years.

The rapid, recent changes are almost entirely driven by the West Antarctic ice sheet, which scientists have long viewed as an Achilles’ heel. It is known to be losing ice rapidly because it is being melted from below by warm ocean waters, a process that is rendering its largest glaciers unstable.

West Antarctica lost 159 billion tons of ice a year from 2012 through 2017, compared with 65 billion tons from 2002 through 2007.

The growth is largely attributable to just two huge glaciers: Pine Island and Thwaites. The latter is increasingly being viewed as posing a potential planetary emergency because of its enormous size and its role as a gateway that could allow the ocean to someday access the entirety of West Antarctica, turning the marine-based ice sheet into a new sea.

Pine Island is now losing about [45 billion tons per year](#), and Thwaites is [losing 50 billion](#). Both numbers are higher than the annual losses for any other glacier in the world.

“The increasing mass loss that they’re finding is really worrying, particularly looking at the West Antarctic, the area that’s changing most rapidly,” said Christine Dow, a glaciologist at the University of Waterloo in Ontario who was not involved in the research. “And it’s the area that we’re most worried about, because it’s below sea level.”

“If you start removing mass from there, you can have a very large-scale evacuation of ice into the ocean and significant sea-level rise,” Dow said.

Dow is the lead author of a [just-published study](#) outlining one process that could be driving, and could worsen, some of Antarctica’s ice losses.

She and her co-authors found that at numerous major glaciers including Pine Island, warm ocean waters are helping to carve out deep crevasses underneath the floating ice shelves that brace these glaciers in place. The shelves then tend to crack at these thinned-out points and break off large pieces, weakening their ability to hold back the flow of glacial ice into the ocean.

“Anywhere you have thinner ice, it’s going to be weaker,” Dow said.

In addition to West Antarctica, another increase in ice losses in the past decade came from the smaller glaciers of the Antarctic Peninsula, which are also melting rapidly but contain less potential to raise the sea level.

The largest part of the continent, East Antarctica, has remained more stable and did not contribute much melt to the ocean during the period of study, the assessment says. However, in the past five years, it too has begun to lose ice,

perhaps as much as 28 billion tons per year, although the uncertainty surrounding this number remains high.

What's happening in East Antarctica is important because it has, by far, the most ice to give, being capable of raising sea levels by well over 100 feet. A single East Antarctic glacier, Totten, has the potential to unleash as much total sea-level rise as the entire West Antarctic ice sheet, or more.

"We cannot count on East Antarctica to be the quiet player, and we start to observe change there in some sectors that have potential, and they're vulnerable," Velicogna said.

Scientists have previously raised fears about a scenario in which ice loss from Antarctica takes on an explosive rate.

In a [controversial 2016 study](#), former NASA scientist James Hansen and a team of colleagues, including Velicogna, found that Earth's sea level could rise above one meter (or 3.3 feet) within 50 years if polar ice-sheet loss doubles every 10 years. A tripling every decade, were it to continue, would reach that volume of sea level rise even sooner.

There is no proof the current rate of change in Antarctica will continue.

Scientists can't see the future, but they do fear continuing and even worsening losses.

"I don't know if it's going to keep exactly tripling, but I think it has a lot of potential to keep significantly increasing," Velicogna said.

The changes will not be steady, in any case, said Knut Christianson, an Antarctic researcher at the University of Washington. "We will not necessarily see solely rapid retreat," Christianson in an email, noting that as glaciers such as Pine Island retreat down a submarine, downhill slope, they will sometimes encounter bumps that slow their movement. So we should expect "periods of stability interspersed with rapid retreat," he said.

Under high greenhouse-gas emissions, the worst-case projections of sea-level rise eventually reach over a centimeter each year, said Rob DeConto, an Antarctic expert at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst who was not involved in the new study.

We're nowhere near that point yet.

"We're still talking about roughly a half a millimeter per year," DeConto said.

"That isn't going to sound horribly unmanageable. But remember for the Northern Hemisphere, for North America, the fact that the location in West Antarctica is where the action is amplifies that rate of sea-level rise by up to about an additional 25 percent in a city like Boston or New York."

That's because as Antarctica's mass shrinks, the ice sheet's gravitational pull on the ocean relaxes somewhat, and the seas travel back across the globe to pile up far away — with U.S. coasts being one prime destination.

Whether Antarctic mass loss keeps worsening depends on choices made today, argued DeConto, who [co-authored a separate paper](#) in this week's Nature outlining two visions of Antarctica in 2070.

Continuing high emissions could deliver massive sea-level rise — but strong compliance with the Paris climate agreement, while unable to stop changes

happening now, could help to control how much they worsen.

“The kinds of changes that we see today, if they were not to increase much more . . . then maybe we’re talking about something that is manageable for coastal stakeholders,” DeConto said.

Or alternatively, he continued, Antarctica could drive faster changes, ones that “begin to exceed what we’re going to be able to cope with.”

Read more at Energy & Environment:

[A key Antarctic glacier just lost a huge piece of ice — the latest sign of its worrying retreat](#)

[Unprecedented U.S.-British project launches to study the world’s most dangerous glacier](#)

[The alarming science driving much higher sea level projections for this century](#)

For more, you can sign up for our weekly newsletter [here](#), and follow us on Twitter [here](#).

 **Comments**



Chris Mooney covers climate change, energy, and the environment. He has reported from the 2015 Paris climate negotiations, the Northwest Passage, and the Greenland ice sheet, among other locations, and has written four books about science, politics and climate change.  Follow [@chriscmooney](#)

Kommentare

The conversation here is moderated according to The Post's community rules. Please read the rules before joining the discussion.

Send feedback about the comments section [here](#).

Alle Kommentare (2.8k)

Ansichtsoptionen ▾

**evolvenow** vor 36 Minuten *(Bearbeitet)*

That's OK, Jesus is going to fix it - the solution offered up by the "right".

The fruits of our short-sighted greed: hundreds of millions displaced. We need a law insisting that all deniers live a couple of feet above sea level.

Gefällt mir 👍 Antworten ↩ Link ↻ Melden 🚩

**jtssigman** vor 5 Minuten

The AI will overthrow us well before AGW gets its chance. Just ask any of the programmers in this forum!

Gefällt mir 👍 Antworten ↩ Link ↻ Melden 🚩

**jtssigman** vor 1 Stunde

Bounded rationality is an interesting concept, truly. Especially for an old man like myself who doesn't computer good. The fact of my technological deficiency has been the only thing restraining me from shouting 'Turing Fail' in this forum; I'm increasingly suspicious that people may be programming socbots in here...

Gefällt mir 👍 Antworten ↩ Link ↻ Melden 🚩



charles casaburi vor 2 Stunden

In June 1974 time magazine another bunch of leftist know it alls. Confidently predicted the coming ice age sighting “scientists” & claiming that it was caused by greedy corporations blotting out the sun with pollution. Anyone who doubted this was a stupid ignorant denier at best or a propagandist for big business at worst. Later that decade in 1977 they ran a cover article predicting the coming the ice age with even greater exuberance. Newsweek also ran. A similar article on the coming ice in the 1970’s claiming that a nuclear power plant should not be built on Long Island because the advancing glaciers would crush the plant releasing radiation. You would think being chronically wrong would humble leftists. Not a chance in 2006 time ran an article predicting the global apocalypse from global warming. The other favorite apocalyptic theory of the left was the “population bomb” we were having to many kids & would suffer mass death from starvation & pollution. Of course that didn’t happen. Now they claiming that we are not having enough kids & must throw open are borders & flood the country with 3rd world peons. My right wing friends have taken to calling liberals libtards that is a grave insult to Down’s syndrome victims everywhere for them being stupid would be a step up, people who believe in contradictions are delusional & psychotic.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



dadmeister vor 1 Stunde (Bearbeitet)

In the 1970s the idea of a looming ice age was NOT accepted by the majority of atmospheric scientists.

I was in graduate school then and a leading advocate of global cooling was a professor at U. Wisconsin. One of my professors suggested he should be taken out and shot.

The idea of anthropogenic global warming is accepted by the vast majority of atmospheric scientists.

Global warming is an observation.

Charles, thank you for your insults. Insults are not a substitute for reason or for facts; apparently you are unable to summon either.

Gefällt mir 6 Antworten Link Melden



nfnik-washingtonpost vor 1 Stunde

I was in grad school and reading the research lit as well. Warming was always the preferred hypothesis.

Incidentally, charlie, the 1977 Time cover you allude to is a denier fake as Time itself notes here about that alleged story: <http://science.time.com/2013/06/06/sorry-a-time-magazine-cover-did-not-predict-a-coming-ice-age/>

Now that you know you've been taken in by fake information, are you willing to listen to true information? Let me make a scientific prediction: Naahhh.

Gefällt mir 7 Antworten Link Melden



nfnik-washingtonpost vor 1 Stunde (Bearbeitet)

See, for example Broecker, 1975 in Science (the AAAS journal) which discussed aerosols (cooling agents) versus carbon dioxide (heating agent). I cannot find a nonpaywalled source, but the title and abstract are available here <http://science.sciencemag.org/content/189/4201/460>. Any big city library or friendly college library/friendly academic can get it for charlie if he actually wants it which I doubt.

Gefällt mir 6 Antworten Link Melden

larryclyons vor 34 Minuten

So please cite the studies from scientific journals that suggested cooling. IN fact please fine that June 1974 time magazine. Which would be very impressive given that it is a fake story. <https://www.snopes.com/fact-check/the-coming-ice-age/>
<https://www.snopes.com/fact-check/time-magazine-cover-global-cooling/>

There never was such an article nor such a magazine cover.

Not only are you lying but you s uck at the lie.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden

larryclyons vor 33 Minuten

BTW here is some real research, not the Fake News you promote:

Between 1991 and 2012 there have been just under 14,000 articles in scientific journals on climate change. 24 of the 13,950 articles, 0.17% or 1 in 581, clearly reject global warming or endorse a cause other than CO2 emissions for observed warming. The list of articles that reject global warming is here, <http://www.jamespowell.org/Rejections/index.html>.

The 24 articles have been cited a total of 113 times over the nearly 21-year period, for an average of close to 5 citations each. That compares to an average of about 19 citations for articles answering to "global warming," for example. Four of the rejecting articles have never been cited; four have citations in the double-digits. The most-cited has 17.

As an aside my very mediocre Master's thesis to date has over double that number of citations.

Of one thing we can be certain: had any of these articles presented the magic bullet that falsifies human-caused global warming, that article would be on its way to becoming one of the most-cited in the history of science. <https://www.desmogblog.com/2012/11/15/why-climate-deniers-have-no-credibility-science-one-pie-chart>

Gefällt mir  2 Antworten  Link  Melden 



willie earl vor 2 Stunden

Gosh, I'd be sort of worried if it wasn't all just a Chinese hoax. Evidently they're sneaking a few hundred thousand people down there flekin' their Bics to snooker us all. Remember the ancient Chinese proverb: "Yo man, let's get out of here Word to your mother Ice ice baby Too cold Ice ice baby Too cold too cold."

Gefällt mir  1 Antworten  Link  Melden 



jamesdean vor 4 Stunden

Science is your friend. It brought you your smartphone. Now you can follow Trumps tweets in the palm of your hand.

Gefällt mir  1 Antworten  Link  Melden 



jtssigman vor 4 Stunden

Pastor says science makes baby jesus cry

Gefällt mir  4 Antworten  Link  Melden 



nfnik-washingtonpost vor 54 Minuten

Not sure the fact that deniers now have great communication feeds as a result of science makes science our friend!

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



jtssigman vor 38 Minuten

Hey! I made just that observation, just yesterday, in just this forum. Great minds, huh?:

Human/socbot nature is fascinating ... When we humans have access to a magical device (a "computer") that mimics our social interactions so well we ingest the simulacrum as real, and the device offers us a way to connect globally with anyone 24/7 in real-time, we don't use the device to usher in a new and utopian age of Enlightenment understanding, human empathy, and knowledge-sharing communication, as its creators so naively intended. No.

Instead, we use that device to rally ethnic cleansing, advance fantastical and self-serving political agendas, seize on to absurd conspiracy theories, find safe spaces to nurture our paranoia, download porn and otherwise undermine the very intellectual and scientific underpinnings (like a belief in objective, measurable reality) that made the magical device (again, "computer") possible.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



joe american vor 5 Stunden

We'll just adapt as best we can. We survived the last Ice Age and the longer we exist the more we'll experience the normal cyclical nature of the Earth.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



jamesdean vor 4 Stunden

No grasp of the problem... billions of people may find the earth uninhabitable.

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



willie earl vor 2 Stunden

And they'll inhabit another area, that already has people living there. We've seen how well some people take to that.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



jtssigman vor 4 Stunden

I agree with both of you. We'll figure it out when we get there but we also have to prepare. If we don't study the mistakes of the future we're doomed to repeat them for the first time.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



texturepainting vor 4 Stunden

The last Ice Age wasn't much of one... kind of a wimpy one, in fact, compared to others. None of us would have survived the Huronian Glaciation. As for global warming, same problem. What will we eat? Sand?

The Earth and life on it has and will survive all sorts of catastrophic events... even our pollution and destruction. That's not really the problem though, is it? We want to survive. We want T.V., personal cars, large houses and cheeseburgers also. We can adapt to live in a more natural way by hunting and gathering, but is that the plan? Really? I say that we can come up with better plans than that. We can also do better than waiting until all goes south before considering our options.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



willie earl vor 2 Stunden

That's it was called the "Fake Ice Age", unlike the other "Yuge Ice Age".

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden

Weitere Antworten Anzeigen



printsofwhales vor 5 Stunden

Actually it is a double bluff. Global warming IS a serious problem but scientists and publications pump out obviously ridiculous tales of huge rises in sea levels to stop the general public taking it seriously. Rises in sea levels are insignificant compared to the other dangers of climate change but someone somewhere does not want us to take action.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



jtssigman vor 5 Stunden

So the problem is That Guy again. I knew it! He has to be stopped!!!

Gefällt mir 5 Antworten Link Melden



underside of power vor 5 Stunden

Oh man, I must have to level up my Warmer status to get access to the double bluff. I'm still stuck here faking data and making up climate change /s.

Gefällt mir 5 Antworten Link Melden



nfnik-washingtonpost vor 4 Stunden

Soon you may be able to meet Dr. Warm under the secret hollow volcano to plan a world takeover personally!

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



jtssigman vor 5 Minuten

Dr. Warm -- socbots. Google. Ok, now I can call "Turing Fail" on... a lot of y'all, I dont think I'm ready to call out all of y'all (Charles C., supra., seems so downright unpleasant he must be a real boy).

So are y'all separate teams or one team that's part of this annum's big socbot training challenge? As a (slightly) suckered user, I feel entitled to some answers!

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden

Weitere Antworten Anzeigen



willie earl vor 2 Stunden

Unless of course, you happen to have any major city or large population base near a coast, island, or rivers. Or, for that matter, any industry or military bases.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



zipitydoda vor 5 Stunden

Great free show streaming on NOVA right now. Just click play to watch story of climate change, and great explainers of issue.

<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/nova/earth/decoding-weather-machine.html>

First hour is more about what is going on with climate change second hours focuses more on solutions.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



jtssigman vor 4 Stunden

Pastor says the tv is meant for christian fellowship so i cant watch your science. but thanks any way for tempting me with sin. your test makes me shine brighter in the light of jesus.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



soudesuka vor 3 Stunden

"your test makes me shine brighter in the light of jesus."

I congratulate you on your victory candescence.

You will be baked, and then there will be cake.

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



nfnik-washingtonpost vor 1 Stunde

M'mmm cake.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden

Weitere Antworten Anzeigen



texturepainting vor 5 Stunden (Bearbeitet)

Consider this. The elevation of the Pacific Ocean is 10, 911 m. The elevation of the Atlantic Ocean is 3, 646 m. Have you wondered why the Panama canal has to raise and lower ships? That's why.

Gravitational pull, for the most part, is the reason for the difference but another reason is the waters surrounding the Antarctic. People tend to only consider ocean level increases in terms of how much water mass will be added to it because of ice melt. This is not the only problem.

The Antarctic Circumpolar Current is the strongest current system in the world. It's the reason why sailing around the southern tip of South America is so abrupt in elevation. As the Antarctic Ocean warms, that system will weaken and Pacific waters will begin to level with Atlantic waters. This is one consideration that keeps being ignored during these debates.

It's true that the Pacific will always be higher than the Atlantic as long as Central America exists, but nobody knows for sure how much higher. We have no history of our geological configuration without an extremely cold, independent Antarctic current system and we need those cold sheets to keep the current strong.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



jtssigman vor 5 Stunden

But if the Antarctic current gets too strong, wont it wash away all the gravity?

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



texturepainting vor 5 Stunden

That's a joke, right?

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



jtssigman vor 5 Stunden (Bearbeitet)

The Antarctic current is strong, that's what you said right, textureguy? My momma would never let me swim in the drainage ditch when it was raining because flash floods could come at any time and the current would drown me like it did my cat Mrs. Minx onetime. Currents are dangerous!

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



texturepainting vor 5 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

I don't think you understand. Strong currents there are a good thing. They help contain the Antarctic weather system. As the sheets weaken and melt, the currents and the weather change. The currents also help contain the difference between the various ocean levels. Again, a good thing.

It's a bad thing for this to change.
It could be a very bad thing.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



jtssigman vor 5 Stunden

So its a good thing to have strong currents I get it
But isnt it possible to have too much of a good thing? Thats what momma said when I gave myself a sore tummy with her Ben & Jerrys. So if you have too much of a good thing that a bad thing like the current that drowned Mrs. Minx.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



texturepainting vor 5 Stunden

Well, as Santa Claus, I have to disappoint you. The waters surrounding Antarctica will not get colder and will not strengthen. I can only give you warmer water for Xmas.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



goto afterburners vor 5 Stunden

Am I reading your comment correctly? Are you saying that there is a 7,265m elevation difference between the two oceans...the SURFACES of the oceans? And then, are you saying that the Panama Canals need to raise and lower ships THAT MUCH? If so, then you're wrong. The Panama canal raises and lowers ships 26m...That's it. And according to John Mercier, who worked on the canal:

There is a myth that sea level is different at the Pacific and Atlantic ends of the Panama Canal, but then, sea level itself is a myth. Correctly, it is MEAN (or average) sea level. At any given moment, the level of the sea will differ from spot to spot due to tides, air pressure, and water density. That being said, the average tides at the Pacific end are about 18 feet while on the Atlantic end, its 18 inches. The depth of the water, and the shapes of the bottom and coastline have the greatest effect on that. Since the tides aren't coordinated, the relationship is in constant flux. Incidentally, this disparity means that a sea level canal in Panama would still have to have locks.

Just trying to understand your statement.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



jtssigman vor 4 Stunden

You just dont get the gravity problem textureguy explained to you huh?

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



texturepainting vor 4 Stunden (Bearbeitet)

The reason its so much more the same in Panama is because it's near the center of the world where the oceans bulge. But even there, the difference is too much to sail through. It's worse further south and one reason why it's so dangerous to sail around the horn. You're right that it's different everywhere but overall, it's considerably higher in the Pacific than the Atlantic.

The point is that the circumpolar current is also affecting the lack of parity in ocean elevation and we don't know how much. Personally, I don't want to find out. It's like removing a dam between to rivers that are running into each other, one higher than the other.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



jtssigman vor 4 Stunden

thats exactly what i was going to say you beat me to it.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



chris snyder 60 vor 3 Stunden

I confirmed the elevation difference - mindblowing. And yes, I know the Panama Canal raises/lowers ships, but not ~ 7000 meters... it's only 85 ft. So where does the difference go?

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden

Weitere Antworten Anzeigen



chantixer vor 5 Stunden

this is China's fault

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



sean mccorkle vor 5 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

Its ours. And Europe's. And Japan's. And China's. Those are the countries(regions) that have burned the most fossil fuels.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



underside of power vor 5 Stunden

Our resident deniers like to point to a 2015 study authored by Jay Zwally as **PROOF** that Antarctica is actually gaining ice. Here is what Dr. Zwally said about this in 2017:

Zwally notes ... **“When our paper came out, I was very careful to emphasize that this is in no way contradictory to the findings of the IPCC report or conclusions that climate change is a serious problem that we need to do something about,”** he says. He was referring to the panel's 2013 report, which stated not only that Antarctica was losing mass but that the process was accelerating. Zwally knew Antarctica would contribute to sea-level rise in a warming world but simply did not agree that the effect had already kicked in. **He was therefore less than thrilled to see the conservative media having a field day with his study.**

<https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/what-to-believe-in-antarctica-rsquo-s-great-ice-debate/>

This won't matter to those who believe they know more than the scientists but it is important context.

Gefällt mir 5 Antworten Link Melden



sean mccorkle vor 5 Stunden

Thanks for this one - bookmarking it now...

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



nfnik-washingtonpost vor 4 Stunden

So...you think providing a full context to a study means something to a denier???

How touching your naivete is!

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



ncdave4life vor 6 Stunden

Good grief. 362 Gt = 1 mm of sea-level, so 3 trillion Gt = **8.3 mm.**

That's one-third of an inch sea-level change, in 25 years.

And Mr. Mooney calls that *"serious trouble."*

<https://youtube.com/watch?v=G2y8Sx4B2Sk>

Antarctic ice gain and loss trends are so nearly balanced that researchers can't even agree on whether it's gaining or losing. Here's NASA's Jay Zwally discussing ERS & ICESat measurements:

<https://vimeo.com/46429608>

Sea-level trends have been remarkably linear for at least 9 decades. Mankind's carbon emissions have had no detectable effect.

Since precise measurements began, mean CO₂ level has risen every year for 58 consecutive years (from 315 to 407 ppmv). Yet those CO₂ increases caused no measurable acceleration in rate of sea-level rise. That's proof CO₂ emissions from fossil fuels, and rising CO₂ levels, don't appreciably affect ice sheet mass and sea-level.

Here are four graphs of sea-level rise juxtaposed with CO₂ level. The top 2 graphs are of particularly high-quality measurement records from tectonically stable locations on opposite sides of the world, with typical trends (about 1½ mm/year = 6 inches per century). The bottom 2 graphs are atypical: they show sea-level trends at the 2 locations where Nobel Prize Committees meet; sea-level is falling at both of them, due to "post-glacial rebound" (i.e., the land is rising).

The sea-level trends are obviously very different, but they have one thing in common: just like at everywhere else, there's been no acceleration in sea-level rise in more than ninety years:

http://sealevel.info/Wismar_Honolulu_Oslo_Stockholm_vs_CO2_annot1.png

Those Scandinavian measurement records illustrate the important fact that the global sea-level trend is so tiny that in many locations it is exceeded by local factors and/or common coastal processes, like uplift, subsidence, sedimentation, and erosion.

You can look up sea-level trends for other locations here:

<http://www.sealevel.info/data.psp>

Gefällt mir  Antworten  Link  Melden 



underside of power vor 5 Stunden

Wow! We finally hear from the real Dave Burton. Somebody call gpp1111. Dave, you should really buy Geoffrey a beer for all the traffic he sends to your nonsense site.

I appreciate that you reference a Zwally presentation that's even older than the 2015 NASA press release. That's a power move.

Gefällt mir 👍 5 Antworten ↩ Link ↔ Melden 🚩



sean mccorkle vor 5 Stunden

Figure 1 shows how much of an outlier that Zwally work is, and why its cherry picking to single it out.

<http://www.realclimate.org/index.php/archives/2015/11/so-what-is-really-happening-in-antarctica/>

BTW Zwally is also an author on Shepherd et. al. 2012 - a much more comprehensive work that shows that the Antarctic Ice Sheet is clearly losing mass.

Gefällt mir 👍 4 Antworten ↩ Link ↔ Melden 🚩



Yail_Bloor vor 5 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

I notice Sou had a nice writeup concerning your website a couple of years back...

<https://blog.hotwhopper.com/2016/04/dave-burton-wants-to-level-seas-at-wuwt.html>

Gefällt mir 👍 3 Antworten ↩ Link ↔ Melden 🚩

Weitere Antworten Anzeigen



David%20Laing vor 6 Stunden

Two important observations: 1) West Antarctica is the locus of significant volcanic activity, which contributes materially to melting, and 2) this result (melting) doesn't necessarily depend on carbon dioxide being the active climate forcing agent. It could well be, and probably is, monatomic chlorine photodissociated from anthropogenic CFCs in the latter decades of the 20th century, thinning the ozone layer. This fits the variable global temperature record much better than CO₂, which is simply going monotonically upward, unlike global temperature, which matched CO₂'s rise from 1975 to 1998, but hasn't since then. A thinned ozone layer permits increased irradiation of Earth's surface by powerful solar UV-B radiation, causing warming. Although the Montreal Protocol stopped further production of CFCs in the 1990s, temperatures from this source could remain elevated for several more decades because monatomic chlorine destroys ozone catalytically, and it has a long residence time in the atmosphere

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



texturepainting vor 5 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

Currently, the Antarctic has, for the most part, its own contained weather cycles because the same water circles around it instead of traveling far away from its origin, like the water and ice in the North pole does. Even if your belief is true and that the warming down there is caused by volcanoes, it doesn't matter. The overall warming of the planet is indisputable and as the waters warm on and under the southern Ice sheets, the climate surrounding Antarctica will change and force storms closer to the south. We know this because it's already happening there and the spread of arctic waters have been pushed further and further south.

You can ignore the science that supports the argument that CO₂ is causing the melting in the south, if you need to. It doesn't matter. Once the ice sheets collapse, there will no longer be a contained system there and warm waters will push south and melt the rest. Co₂ is high everywhere and is contributing drastically to global temperature change, whether in Antarctica or not. The sheets will collapse and the seas will rise. Until then, the question is what sort of world will we prepare for? The same or the one predicted? Most low-lying European countries have been preparing for the worse.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



nfnik-washingtonpost vor 9 Minuten (Bearbeitet)

So, are you (DL) hypothesizing there is an uptick in volcanic activity which is leading to additional uptick in melting in the area? Any evidence at all for your hypothesis? And do you have the slightest evidence that stratospheric HFCs affect subterranean ice? (Hint: The answers are all no.)

If there is no such uptick, of what relevance is your point? (Hint: The answer is of no relevance whatever.)

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



potniatheron vor 6 Stunden

>>The melting would raise sea levels a half-millimeter every year

There are 1000 millimeters in a meter.

If the quoted rate is correct it would take 2000 years to raise the sea levels by one meter (~ 3.3 ft).

I don't think any reasonable person would/should worry too much if the usual horror scenario predicted by these scientists won't materialize until two millennia have passed.

Either the person who wrote this article has no clue about length units and the actual rates at which the sea level will actually raise are more like a centimeter per year (that would mean 1 m in 100 yrs), or this is another example of fear mongering by the global warming fear-monger fanatics with no base on reality.

WaPo should assign these articles to people who did not flunk their basic arithmetic in school.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



underside of power vor 5 Stunden

This was wrong when you posted it last night.

Gefällt mir 5 Antworten Link Melden



rss6551 vor 2 Stunden

Perhaps WaPo should limit comments to readers with good reading comprehension. Your simplistic calculation assumes a linear melt rate that creates a sea level increase of of 0.5 mm per year. Yet the article clearly states that the research shows the annual Antarctic ice melt rate has been increasing each decade from an annual average of 49 billion tons/yr in 1992 - 1997 to 73 billion tons/year in 2002 - 2007 and 219 billion tons/yr in 2012 - 2017. In other words, the rate has gone up a bit under 4.5 times in 20 years. If we simplify and round that down to a 4 times increase in 20 years that works out to an average annual increase in the melt rate of 7.18 percent. So in 10 years the annual Antarctic melt rate will be contributing 1 mm per year to rising sea levels, in 20 years the contribution will be 2 mm per year, in 30 years it will be 4 mm per year, in 40 years it will be 8 mm per year, and so on. Assuming the annual INCREASE in the melt rate continues at 7.18%, then in 71 years Antarctic ice melt will be adding nearly 69 mm per year to the sea level. And, that same year, total accumulated seal level increase from Antarctic ice melt will exceed 1 meter. That is a much much faster 1 meter seal level rise than the 2000 years your simplistic calculation shows.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



abundy vor 6 Stunden

So maybe Russian and America scientists can stop digging there! Opening under ice lakes that were drilled with keroscene oil lubricating the core bit was probably a bad idea. The fuel costs in transporting & heating those adventures has got to be more than all of the pollution from the cars of people reading this article. And if the earth is too warm... maybe you could demand the sun cool a few degrees since it IS the source of all of our heat and power! Your candle wont heat the earth, hanging in space, without that big ball of light!

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



underside of power vor 6 Stunden

None of this is factual.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



nfnik-washingtonpost vor 4 Stunden

Since when has that ever bothered a denier? or single Trump supporter for that matter?

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



knightflyerii vor 7 Stunden

What a joke! The non joke and worry is what you will NOT talk about since it hurts west coast real estate prices and that is the spread of radiation from Fukishima which is as scientist, Dr. Michio Kaku, has come out and stated that Fukushima is an extinction level event...."

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



sean mccorkle vor 7 Stunden

WOW! REALLY!?

So, umm.. what sort of geiger counter readings are they getting out there on the coast?

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



underside of power vor 7 Stunden

I don't know Dr. Kaku but my colleague runs a pretty comprehensive site on Fukushima. You should check it out to prevent future hyperventilation. <https://fukushimainform.ca/>

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



sean mccorkle vor 6 Stunden (Bearbeitet)

Another fine and informative link from UofP.

So a Bq (Becquerel) is one decay per second? And these levels are 3-6 Cs decays per cubic meter of water at British Columbia? Do I read that right?

Not sure exactly how to compare to background, but there's roughly 1 high-energy cosmic ray blasting through your body every second. These numbers seem pretty close to that.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



underside of power vor 5 Stunden

Thanks sean.

Seawater is inherently radioactive from naturally occurring radionuclides. Average activity of all radionuclides in seawater is about 13 Bq/L (13000 Bq/m³) and is mostly from naturally occurring Potassium-40. The activity of Fukushima-derived Cesium-137 measured off of British Columbia is 3.4 Bq/m³. By comparison, EPA drinking water standard for Cesium-137 is 3,700 Bq/m³. Strontium-90 was much lower.

Anecdotally, I know several people who were offshore of Japan with Ken Buessler shortly after the accident to sample for contamination. They were able to do all their work without any protective precautions whatsoever.

<http://www.whoi.edu/oceanus/feature/japan-triple-disaster>

Is radiation a concern along U.S. and Canadian coasts? Although we have found traces of radioactive contamination from Fukushima in samples collected through our citizen-science initiative Our Radioactive Ocean, the concentration of cesium-137 and -134 in these samples is well below levels of concern for humans or marine life. The highest levels of cesium (10 Bq/m³) attributable to Fukushima that we have measured were found 1,500 miles north of Hawaii. Swimming every day in the ocean there would still result in a dose 1,000 times smaller than the radiation we receive with a single dental x-ray. Not zero, but still very low.

<https://www.whoi.edu/page.do?pid=83397&tid=3622&cid=94989>

If you are on the Twitter, follow Jay Cullen from UVic in Canada. He runs the inFORM site and is constantly swatting away BS like our friend here is peddling.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



sean mccorkle vor 5 Stunden

Thanks for the reality check: the Fukushima levels are miniscule as suspected.

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



underside of power vor 5 Stunden

I normally don't do radiochemistry this early in the morning;)

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



sean mccorkle vor 5 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

I could never get passed all the new units that come along everytime I look at a paper dealing with radiation (which is rare, to be honest).

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



jack01webb vor 7 Stunden

A lot of great revelations contained in this study - for example “Anywhere you have thinner ice, it’s going to be weaker,” - who would have believed that to be true before the study?

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



underside of power vor 7 Stunden

We are taught to avoid the use of jargon in conversations with the general public. If her comments were too pedestrian for you then you can click the link to the article in Nature.

Gefällt mir 6 Antworten Link Melden



atom456 vor 6 Stunden

Journalists and scientists have to dumb down the climate change conversation for many people to “get it”!

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden

**rtc1** vor 7 Stunden

It is time we realized that nothing significant will be done to mitigate climate change. The flooding of coastal cities is already "baked in" to the CO2 already in the atmosphere. The coming climate refugee crisis will make our current refugee situation look trivial. Saving New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Washington and other major cities will cost trillions. Miami, Tampa, New Orleans and Houston are write-offs, there is no way to save them.

As a species our ability to cause harm to the planet and to life on the planet has exceeded our ability to organize remedies for such damage. This is not new. We have been drawing credit from the environmental bank account since the dawn of agriculture and the industrial revolution magnified the damage done by orders of magnitude. In the past human societies were kept in check by disease and famine. We have conquered those dangers for the most part yet we haven't learned, nor will we ever learn, to live within the ability of the planet to support us.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden

**sean mccorkle** vor 7 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

Not buying it for a minute, sorry.

We're just getting started doing the conversion to renewables. Things are just ramping up. Trump and his coal fantasy are just that - a fantasy.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden

**outpost** vor 7 Stunden

They're talking of half-millimeter every year. That's 1 inch in 50 years.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden

**underside of power** vor 7 Stunden

Current sea level rise globally is 3.3 mm/yr.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



ncdave4life vor 5 Stunden

The high-quality measurements show only about half that. Here are two sites with particularly long, high-quality, continuous measurement records, from opposite sides of the globe, with very typical trends:

http://sealevel.info/120-022_Wismar_and_1612340_Honolulu_vs_CO2_annot1.png

That 3.3 mm/yr number is from studies of satellite altimetry in the open ocean (not near the coasts), with short, low-quality measurement records. The coastal measurements, which are much more reliable, average around 1½ mm/year.

<http://www.sealevel.info/avgslr.html>

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



underside of power vor 5 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

Sorry Dave, you don't understand how sea level rise works. Or should I say,

Rejected - This is a misunderstanding of the science. Thermal expansion of the ocean results in a dynamic response of the ocean and the flow of additional water onto the shelves immediately adjacent to the coast, thus affecting coastal sea level.

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



nfnik-washingtonpost vor 1 Stunde *(Bearbeitet)*

Reviewer comment on your latest submission to Nature? :-)

[ducking]

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



zipnitiopshov12 vor 8 Stunden

on the other hand, this is great news for real estate agents!

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



john a naples vor 8 Stunden

Please answer some simple questions. What should the ideal temperature of the earth be? Why is mail delivered to homes 6 days a week in polluting vehicles.? Why are private planes allowed? Why does Al Gore fly all over the planet instead of using skype? Why is it a secret how the government determines the temperature of the earth? Should it not be available to climatologists for review and verification?

In the 1970s when species were disappearing there were any number of reasons given, Now there is only one, climate change.

Why do we allow more people into our country if we are trying to lower our carbon footprint?

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



sean mccorkle vor 8 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

Okay - I'll give it a shot:

"What should the ideal temperature of the earth be?"

That question makes no sense. Temperatures vary greatly from place to place over the planet and day-by-day and during the time of day.

When global warming temperatures are said to be rising - as in this graph-

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Global_Temperature_Anomaly.svg

this is the global average of temperature **anomaly** - deviations of temperature at each location from averages at the same location during a baseline period (1951-1980 in this case) with day/night and seasonal variations taken into account.

"Why is mail delivered to homes 6 days a week in polluting vehicles.?"

Good question! it should be done with EVs where possible, with biofuel-powered ICEs where not.

"Why are private planes allowed?"

Because, wasteful as they are, they contribute a tiny amount to the total CO2 concentration. However, they can fly on biofuels, and they should.

"Why does Al Gore fly all over the planet instead of using skype?"

Who cares? Any fossil CO2 he adds to the total is completely negligible.

"Why is it a secret how the government determines the temperature of the earth?"

If you're referring to the temperature anomaly, Its not a secret. NOAA describes the process in detail, in publications and at their website. The Berkeley BEST project has a **nice** writeup on their methods:

<http://static.berkeleyearth.org/papers/Methods-GIGS-1-103.pdf>

"Should it not be available to climatologists for review and verification?"

Yes it should. And indeed it is.

"Why do we allow more people into our country if we are trying to lower our carbon footprint?"

Since its the global total CO2 output that matters, what difference does it make where the person is or what country they're in.

Hope that helps clear up your questions, confusion and misunderstandings!

Gefällt mir  10 Antworten  Link  Melden 



ajnorth vor 9 Stunden

Those who deny the reality of, much less the absolute dire threat from, anthropogenic global climate disruption (including the acidification of Earth's surface waters and rain — and, therefore, her soils) is either ignorant of the facts, incapable of understanding them, blinded by ideology and / or by financial interests or is starkly mentally ill — none of which are mutually exclusive.

As for those who cite such tripe from denialists that CO2 is natural (and helps to promote plant growth), allow me to refer them to this segment from a recent episode of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation weekly radio program "Quirks & Quarks" (broadcasting's longest-running science program): "Rising carbon dioxide levels are turning rice and fish into junk food" — <http://www.cbc.ca/radio/quirks/june-9-2018-rising-co2-levels-make-food-less-nutritious-neonics-and-bees-tricking-facial-recognition-1.4696119/rising-carbon-dioxide-levels-are-turning-rice-and-fish-into-junk-food-1.4696123> (runs 14:13).

Gefällt mir  3 Antworten  Link  Melden 

**outpost** vor 8 Stunden<https://fifthseasongardening.com/regulating-carbon-dioxide>

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden

**underside of power** vor 7 Stunden

CO₂ can fertilize to a point then there are diminishing returns. It also reduces the nutritional value of the plants. High CO₂ also has some negative impacts you may have heard about.

Gefällt mir 7 Antworten Link Melden

**ncdave4life** vor 4 Stunden

For C₃ plants (most important crops, other than corn) the point of diminishing returns is around 1500 ppmv CO₂. (That's a typical target for CO₂ supplementation in commercial greenhouses.)

Unfortunately, we'll never see 1500 ppmv outdoors. We would be lucky to see half that. 1500 ppmv would be about 9 times the increase that mankind has managed in outdoor levels, so far.

CO₂ does not reduce the nutritional value of plants, either. If it did, then food grown in greenhouses at 1200 to 1500 ppmv CO₂ would be less nutritious than food grown outdoors (at ~400 ppmv CO₂). It isn't.

However, faster-growing, healthier, more productive plants require more nutrients. So, anything which makes plants more productive can make crops less nutritious, if you don't follow best agricultural practices, and fertilize adequately. It doesn't matter whether the improvement is due to elevated CO₂, or better hybrid seed, or anything else.

If you grow crops in, for example, iron-poor soil, you can end up with iron-poor crops. Or if you grow crops with inadequate fixed nitrogen, the harvest will contain reduced protein levels (since proteins contain nitrogen, and carbohydrates don't). The solution is proper fertilization (or plant legumes, which fix their own nitrogen).

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



Yail_Bloor vor 4 Stunden

At roughly 525 PPM, growth rate on C3 plants crashed at year 12 during a 20 year experiment.

And yes, heightened CO2 certainly reduces the nutritional value of plants. C3 plants (with the exception of soybeans) have reduced protein as well.

<http://science.sciencemag.org/content/360/6386/317>

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



sean mccorkle vor 4 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

"For C3 plants (most important crops, other than corn) the point of diminishing returns is around 1500 ppmv CO2."

More like 540 ppm

<https://news.harvard.edu/gazette/story/2014/05/rising-co2-poses-significant-threat-to-human-nutrition/>

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



printsofwhales vor 5 Stunden

I think you will find that no-one doubts the facts, only the conclusions. You cannot conclude that sea levels will rise as a result of sea ice melting. It won't. You cannot flood low-lying land masses in any sensible time scale if the seas rise by millimetres each year. You cannot isolate glacial melt without mentioning snowfall changes and you need to factor in those events which result in increases in sea level with those which have the opposite effect. Worry more about the increase in size and frequency of hurricanes which is logically a result of climate change and has a more immediate and damaging effect. You can build houses on stilts if your entire infrastructure has not been irreversibly damaged.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



sean mccorkle vor 5 Stunden

" You can build houses on stilts if your entire infrastructure has not been irreversibly damaged."

Oh goody - we'll send you the bill.

And don't think you won't pay for it, one way or the other. In fact, you already are.

Gefällt mir 5 Antworten Link Melden



underside of power vor 5 Stunden

You cannot conclude that sea levels will rise as a result of sea ice melting. It won't.

That's cool but we aren't talking about sea ice.

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



nfnik-washingtonpost vor 47 Minuten *(Bearbeitet)*

As you know better than I do: thermal expansion still occurs as the entire water column heats up, of course.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



rss6551 vor 2 Stunden

Your are right that sea levels will not rise due to sea ice melting because sea ice is already floating in sea water and when it melts it does not affect sea levels. However, this article is talking about ice sheets and glaciers melting, not sea ice. Ice sheets and glaciers are on land. When they melt, any of the water that reaches the ocean increases sea levels.

Regarding not being able to flood low-lying land masses in any sensible time scale, that depends on how low-lying the land masses are and your definition of a sensible time scale. Data from the article indicates a annual increase in ice melt in Antarctica of about 7.18% per year. Admittedly that could decrease, hold steady or even increase, we don't yet know. But, for the heck of it, assume it holds steady. Now consider Bangladesh, with 20 percent of its land 1 meter or less above sea level. At the current melt rate, in 71 years sea levels would be more than a meter higher and increasing at 2.2 inches a year. Is 71 years a sensible time scale? Is that sufficient time for a very poor country that barely sustains its existing population to build enough dikes and sea walls to protect 20% of its land while trying to deal with an increasing population, increased monsoon flooding and tropical storms? Or failing to stop the loss of the land to the sea, is 71 years enough time to relocate more than 30 million people while finding some way to feed its people using 20% less land?

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



ajnorth vor 10 Stunden (Bearbeitet)

Not long after the close of the second world war, a gathering took place in the upper Mojave Desert; among those in attendance were Dr. Bertrand Russell and Dr. Edmond Jaeger, the dean of American desert naturalists.

Around the campfire one evening, the topic under consideration was Right and Wrong.

After listening to the discussion amongst his distinguished colleagues for a fashion, Jaeger turned to Russell, whose white wispy hair and pipe smoke were outlined in the flames, and said, "The environment, since it cannot run away nor defend itself, must be protected. And THAT, sir, is the difference between what is Right and what is Wrong."

Seven decades later and in the face of the greatest natural calamity facing the Earth since we humans arrived on the scene about 300,000 years ago — including the sixth global mass extinction in the planet's history, now well underway (and our first to experience) — that definition of absolute morality has gained orders of magnitude greater currency.

It is also further proof, if any were needed, that the GOP and Evangelical "Right" are completely and unequivocally morally bankrupt.

Gefällt mir 7 Antworten Link Melden



zipnitiopshov12 vor 8 Stunden

wait, slow down.... i thought the earth was only 6,000 years old!

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



ajnorth vor 10 Stunden (Bearbeitet)

"The grand agents of nature are indestructible."
— James Joule, FRS (1818-1889)

Put another way, nature will have the last laugh. ALWAYS.

(And she does not give a flying [expletive deleted] about anyone's stupid, brain-dead Bronze Age "deeply-held beliefs.")

Gefällt mir 5 Antworten Link Melden



voiceofdog vor 10 Stunden

It would be so fittingly ironic if evolution somehow leads to an animal that eats off only the noses of religious sculptures.
By the year 6451 the Earth is filled with Sphinxes.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



eytek1 vor 11 Stunden

The best part of this,(if one can think of it this way),is that the deniers will find enlightenment.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



chrisbrown12 vor 10 Stunden

I doubt it. The die-hard denier will continue denying up to the point where the water rises above his mouth. Then he'll still blubber, it's a blubbery hoa-oa-oax, bubble bubble.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



wandering_not_lost vor 11 Stunden

Well, I'm glad we didn't elect some orange idiot who would appoint a nonsensical, sycophantic rube from a state that can't make it a week without being a national embarrass.... oh. Dang it.

Gefällt mir 9 Antworten Link Melden



chrisbrown12 vor 10 Stunden

That's what the good ol electrical colleague is fer. Don't stop to think, have another drink.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



cannelle vor 12 Stunden

I am just here to say that if people are really concerned about this, they should pressure their governments (plural) to put more money into natural science research. Though the work is hard and is of great importance, funding rates are low, researchers at all levels are under-paid, and fewer people are going into the fields to tackle these problems. As far as we know, we only have one Earth that sustains us. It's time to act like it.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



witch-hunter vor 11 Stunden

Yep. I'm sure the republicans will want to spend a bunch more on science. As they don't believe in it.

Gefällt mir 6 Antworten Link Melden



chrisbrown12 vor 10 Stunden

"AS far as we know". we have only the one Earth? Of course we only have one. Did someone try to claim differently? The Moon or Mars is just a distraction. They are not sustainable environments and would be a further drain on the motherland.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



justanotherdog vor 9 Stunden

Unlike Denialists, scientists don't make absolute statements without conclusive evidence.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



underside of power vor 7 Stunden

Cannelle gets my vote for featured comment!

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



Igparkes vor 13 Stunden

But, but, but ... I thought Trump said all this science stuff is fake news?

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



krampus911 vor 12 Stunden

It's a Chinese hoax to do...something...to real 'Muricans.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



jack01webb vor 7 Stunden

so if Hillary had won the election we would not have Global Warming???

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



soudesuka vor 2 Stunden

"so if Hillary had won the election we would not have Global Warming???"

We wouldn't have a scientifically illiterate moron claiming it doesn't exist at any top level of government.

Gefällt mir 5 Antworten Link Melden



d edwards vor 13 Stunden

With just a quick look (and an excellent use of graphs) you can compare natural factors, CO2 effects, and current warming:

www.bloomberg.com/graphics/2015-whats-warming-the-world/

Even your crazy uncle would understand it.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



tjrobson vor 15 Stunden

I suggest moving to higher ground.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



krampus911 vor 12 Stunden

So did Stevie Wonder.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



sean mccorkle vor 8 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

Look out - 7 million New Yorkers coming atcha! Going to get awfully crowded up there.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



zipnitiopshov12 vor 8 Stunden

plenty of room in montana and the dakotas.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



sean mccorkle vor 7 Stunden (Bearbeitet)

and plenty of water? (more coastal cities than just NYC will be coming I should add)

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



achem vor 16 Stunden

I'm not sure why conservatives are commenting here. They know as much about science as they do marriage fidelity.

Gefällt mir 17 Antworten Link Melden



witch-hunter vor 12 Stunden

Yet they comment about family planning all the time. Interesting phenomena. Almost as if they *wished* they knew something.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



jmoonscapes vor 16 Stunden

The idea of climate change is exciting. It feeds the human need to feel special and plays with our emotional nature. While it's probably true that we are causing average temperatures to increase by freeing carbon from it's ancient grave, the hubris we exhibit in thinking that something can be done about it is breathtaking.

The likely outcome, if history can be a guide, is we will invent our way out of this problem before we are seriously affected. Adaptation could take several forms, including guided evolution (genetic engineering), planned population reduction, technologies to reduce temperatures not yet known, or even manipulation of gravitational effects. The worst--case scenario is very unlikely.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



underside of power vor 16 Stunden

Uhhh, what's a "planned population reduction"?

Gefällt mir 9 Antworten Link Melden



marcusroland vor 15 Stunden

I'll assume he means government policies to control population and not soylent green factories.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



nfnik-washingtonpost vor 13 Stunden

Well...D-Day was a "planned population reduction".

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



tonysrus vor 12 Stunden

Starvation.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden

Weitere Antworten Anzeigen



von mises vor 16 Stunden

What? You mean we can keep pumping stuff into the air that will stay up there for 3000 years? Whew! That was easy. I feel much better now. Thank you.

Gefällt mir 9 Antworten Link Melden



1elf vor 16 Stunden

I would like to hope you are right. But humans have never been able to keep themselves out of serious trouble. We've managed to survive despite things like bubonic plague, making deserts out of some of the world's once most fertile regions, endless wars including one ended with a nuclear bomb, making areas nearly uninhabitable through chemical/biological pollutants, on the way to causing a mass extinction of much of the world's life other than humans. No reason to think the chaos we're now bringing to the world isn't going to cause a huge loss of human life as other periods in our history have.

But we didn't have to make fertile regions into deserts, wage wars, cause extinctions, pollute our world, etc. Humans have always had a choice. They do now. But like you say, if history is any guide we will ignore what we could have prevented and blindly believe we'll manage to survive anyway. Some of us will, no doubt.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



tonysrus vor 12 Stunden

Self - Don't bet on it. Oops, I guess you already did.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden

Weitere Antworten Anzeigen



decoratedveteranofficer vor 16 Stunden

Antarctica is huge.

Greenland is smaller, and it has an estimated 650,000 cubic miles of ice sheet.

That is melting also.

We do not know, closely, how fast these ice sheets are melting.

We see them melting.

Miami Beach floods now with most full moon cycles. Flooding will become higher.

Gefällt mir 6 Antworten Link Melden



kooltoze vor 15 Stunden

Fort Lauderdale, A1A at Sunrise Blvd...always floods when the tides are high and a full moon arrives...

Gefällt mir 5 Antworten Link Melden



plainapplepie vor 17 Stunden

Ecosystem collapse is a frequent occurrence over geologic time. Many causes. Here the earth goes again. Too bad that evolving large brains didn't result in a species that would act to mitigate it's own role in such a collapse.

Coastal dwellers might consider a summer home on higher ground. If they can afford it.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



jtssigman vor 16 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

"Too bad that evolving large brains didn't result in a species that would act to mitigate it's own role in such a collapse."

Yeah, but there's the inverse danger too: our brains may get so big they become self-aware and take over our bodies.

Two dystopian futures. Who can say which is better?

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



witch-hunter vor 11 Stunden

The one without you?

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



charles casaburi vor 17 Stunden

Ok libtards why is Greenland called Greenland when today it is nothing but a giant ice sheet. Because when the Vikings got there centuries ago it was green. Why because it was warmer much warmer than today. There was no global apocalypse the polar bears made it. Take a Valium. 85 % of the time this planet was warmer much warmer than today. What we are experiencing today may be nothing more than a shift back to a more normal climate. We have been in a period of recurring glaciation for about 100,000 years which is very unusual. Well in the past the climate changed much slower than today that's the problem right wrong!!! The decade that ushered in the little ice age the temperature dropped 3 degrees in a decade according to ice core samples. Today the temperature took over 100 years to rise 1 degree. There is no consensus amongst meteorologists about global warming opinion is divided about 50-50. Climatology is not science it is idle speculation & guesswork masquerading as science any forecast beyond 10 days is little better than guessing. Even if it is true for all we know we could be on the verge of another ice age & global warming might be just what we need. The more intelligent leftists know global warming is bunk that's why they changed it to climate change. Now they can claim to be right no matter what happens climate change isn't a prediction it just stating the obvious. Even if your right about apocalyptic global warming it us still nothing to worry about because one way or another we won't be using fossil fuels much longer in a few decades we will move to something else because we will run out. As we speak we are inventing ways to extract co2 from the atmosphere to make fuels & other carbon based substances. The libtards of the past scared everyone with predictions that cities would disappear because they would be buried in horse pucky which is exactly what leftist are full of. Libtards ignore the fact that people adapt nothing is permanent.

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



underside of power vor 17 Stunden

Don't be afraid to use a hard return every once in a while.

Gefällt mir 11 Antworten Link Melden



witch-hunter vor 11 Stunden

Paragraphs are your friends, chuckles.

Then again, so are facts.

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



donladams vor 17 Stunden

Your stupidity has left me wordless.

Gefällt mir 10 Antworten Link Melden



charles casaburi vor 12 Stunden

The Vikings crazed cattle in Greenland & had dairy farms in Greenland something impossible today. Don't worry your as delusional as al gore who left the medieval warm period out of his dumb hockey stick graph. The medevil warm period to tough to grasp. Try this on for size did you ever see anyone in a Roman work of art dressed in overcoat never they are always dressed in togas because 2000 years it was hot in Rome all the time. Today if you spend the winter in Rome you better have an overcoat because Rome is much cooler now because the climate is much cooler. I search the historical record for any global apocalypse & didn't find any. In the 1970's there were front page articles in both time & Newsweek predicting an imminent ice age all of the same organizations and many of the same people who predicted a catastrophic global ice age then are predicting ruinous global warming today. Then as now anyone who doubted this was dumb & ignorant or worse a pawn of sinister greedy rich corporations who wanted to destroy the planet for fun & profit . The reason why leftists love to constantly predict doom is because it feeds their delusions of grandeur & exaggerated sense of self importance.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



witch-hunter vor 12 Stunden

Is that you Senator Inhofe? If not, you should know somebody's stealing your identity. Or at least the rock-stupid part of it.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



margherman vor 4 Stunden

I'd like to see some of those crazed cattles.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



charles casaburi vor 2 Stunden

The fact that Vikings lived & farmed Greenland & briefly colonized Newfoundland which they called vine land because of all the wild grape vines they found there is a matter of historical record. Grapes cannot grow there today because it is too cold the nearest grape vines are hundreds of miles to the south. Your stupidity is exceeded only by your ignorance snowflake.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



soudesuka vor 2 Stunden

"The Vikings crazed cattle in Greenland & had dairy farms in Greenland something impossible today."

Probably not impossible, just inefficient. Sheep graze there.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Economy_of_Greenland#Animal_husbandry

"Grapes cannot grow there today because it is too cold the nearest grape vines are hundreds of miles to the south. Your stupidity is exceeded only by your ignorance snowflake."

Even assuming that the rest of this is true, evidence for historic LOCALIZED warmth doesn't mean that the planet isn't warming now.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



1elf vor 17 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

Too funny that down below another climate denying commenter was using Greenland as an example of the climate warming for the past 100s of years.

Well guess what. Greenland's ice has been melting too, just not yet as rapidly as some other areas of the world. <http://nsidc.org/greenland-today/>

People who use words like "libtards" should be more careful not to make the "libtards" they are mocking look absolutely brilliant in comparison.

Gefällt mir 13 Antworten Link Melden



1elf vor 16 Stunden (Bearbeitet)

Temperatures dropping is not the same phenomenon as temperatures rising. But I'd still like to see your source for the statement about the temperature dropping by 3 degrees in a decade (10 years).

With warming, there has been no 3 degree warming in a short period of time. "when global warming has happened at various times in the past two million years, it has taken the planet about 5,000 years to warm 5 degrees. The predicted rate of warming for the next century is at least 20 times faster." Here's my source.

<https://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/Features/GlobalWarming/page3.php>

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



charles casaburi vor 2 Stunden

Actually humans & life in general does better during warm periods than cold periods. The little ice age was a ruinous period for mankind. The last serious ice age 72000 years ago nearly drove the human race into extinction. The data about the onset of the little ice age comes from Bill Dyson book a short history of nearly he is a noted author who carefully fact checks.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



soudesuka vor 2 Stunden

"Actually humans & life in general does better during warm periods than cold periods."

...which of course means nothing at all in the context of whether current warming will be harmful.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden

Weitere Antworten Anzeigen



akpat vor 17 Stunden

The truth that no one wants to face is that its already to late.

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



donladams vor 17 Stunden

We might have had a fighting chance if Trump hadn't been elected.

Gefällt mir 5 Antworten Link Melden



plainapplepie vor 16 Stunden

But the effects could be mitigated. Delays just run the costs up for our progeny.

Gefällt mir 7 Antworten Link Melden



1elf vor 16 Stunden

Too late for what? I'd rather have us take action now and give the earth a fighting chance than doom the humans who follow us to a world we made no attempt to save.

Gefällt mir 6 Antworten Link Melden

Weitere Antworten Anzeigen



davidincambridge vor 17 Stunden

"Antarctica's ice sheet is melting at a rapidly increasing rate, now pouring more than 200 billion tons of ice into the ocean annually"

Your nerd moment: This is about equal to the flow rate of the Niagara River.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



akpat vor 17 Stunden

"The average elevation in Florida is 6 feet," London said. "Some places are as little as 3 feet above sea level.

Doesnt look good does it ? And then of course there the drinking water and sewage disposal methods, which are both below ground level.

In fact many drinking water wells hve suffered from salt water intrusion.

Spo take it seriously, or leave florida.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden

**kooltoze** vor 15 Stunden

I'm installing pontoons under my mobile home...

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden

**kooltoze** vor 15 Stunden

The Niagara is a product of the Great Lakes system, which recycles water. The Antarctic ice sheets are calving icebergs made of ice millions of years old. Antarctica doesn't come close to replacing what it loses every year. Bigly difference...

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden

**potniatheron** vor 17 Stunden

>>The melting would raise sea levels a half-millimeter every year

There are 1000 millimeters in a meter. If this rate is correct it would take 2000 years to raise the sea levels by one meter. I don't think any reasonable person would/should worry too much if the usual horror scenario predicted by these scientists won't materialize until two millennia have passed.

Either the person who wrote this article has no clue about length units and the actual rates at which the sea level will actually raise, or this is another example of fear mongering by the global war fanatics with no base on reality.

WaPo should assign theses articles to people who did not flunk their basic arithmetic in school.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden

**underside of power** vor 17 Stunden

Oh my, the irony of this post is breathtaking.

Gefällt mir 7 Antworten Link Melden



tonysrus vor 12 Stunden

The half-millimeter applies to the antarctic ice. The total from all sources, including thermal expansion of the water, is between 3 and 4 mm/year. This is a world average. Some areas are higher, some are lower. Maybe WaPo needs to include some pictures for people who can not read.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



aawash vor 17 Stunden

Hey Liberals who dominate the Left Wing Post comments: the article clearly states "the melt rate has tripled in the past decade"----Duh, who was President in 2008???---yep, your savior, the Community Organizer from Chicago, His Majesty Barack---I guess his leafy "green" official Presidential portrait will be his only legacy in saving the earth---now go back to Trump hating and drink your lattes.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



pbjorling vor 17 Stunden

That is just such a dumb comment.

Gefällt mir 13 Antworten Link Melden



underside of power vor 17 Stunden

I do love a latte.

Gefällt mir 6 Antworten Link Melden



justanotherdog vor 16 Stunden

Weaponized Stupid

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



Yail_Bloor vor 17 Stunden

"Duh, who was President in 2008???"

George W. Bush

Gefällt mir 24 Antworten Link Melden



1elf vor 17 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

"Antarctica, the planet's largest ice sheet, lost 219 billion tons of ice annually from 2012 through 2017 – approximately triple the 73 billion-ton melt rate of a decade ago, the scientists concluded."

And who was President in 2017? Trump.

But Obama haters just can't help themselves from blaming him....

Gefällt mir 6 Antworten Link Melden

Weitere Antworten Anzeigen



ghcso vor 18 Stunden

A wise person once said that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. For the science denying right, a ton of cure is well worth the risk.

Gefällt mir 6 Antworten Link Melden



kooltoze vor 15 Stunden

as long as it's the next generation that gets stuck with solving and paying for the problems Grandpa created...

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



ellis boyd redding vor 18 Stunden

All the Trump voters along the shore line can take heart that the water around their knees is a Liberal HOAX!!!!

Gefällt mir 7 Antworten Link Melden



dtiarp1 vor 18 Stunden

I thought it was Chinese, hard to keep up with who is perpetrating the hoax on the right wingers in this country.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



ronrob vor 18 Stunden

There will be a lot more Puerto Rico's in the future while Trump and the West will deny responsibility for the pollution and its extensive victims

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



thusness vor 18 Stunden

Just as cigarette smoke is toxic to the human lungs and will do damage to them and other organs when consumed over a period of time, so CO2 has toxic effects on the organs of the planet and will cause it to die.

Just as a human smoker is in denial that the smoking will decrease the lifespan of the human, climate change deniers say that CO2 has no effect whilst the lifespan is still decreased.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



jiiski vor 17 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

Good analogy. Some smokers do not get cancer and do survive, but the CO2 problem is gradually wreaking havoc over the whole planet. I suppose some humans will survive, but it's going to be very rough in the future with much more flooding and much more drought and less human and animal suitable habitat and fewer crops and more mosquitoes and diseases, etc.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



tonysrus vor 12 Stunden

And you think the human race will survive? Why?

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



grappapost vor 17 Stunden

CO2 in the atmosphere is not melting the Antarctic ice sheet. Read the article.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



jiiski vor 17 Stunden

What do you think is causing the ocean waters below Antarctica to warm? Greenhouse gas emissions includes CO₂, which causes the long-term warming. The air warms the surface waters and the currents mix the water. "Warm" ocean, by the way, is above freezing; that's all it takes to melt ice shelves and sheets. It would still freeze you to death, but it's not cold enough to protect the ice.

Paragraph three:

"The result also reinforces that nations have a short window — perhaps no more than a decade — to cut greenhouse-gas emissions if they hope to avert some of the worst consequences of climate change."

Further down: ". . . warm ocean waters are helping to carve out deep crevasses underneath the floating ice shelves that brace these glaciers in place. The shelves then tend to crack at these thinned-out points and break off large pieces, weakening their ability to hold back the flow of glacial ice into the ocean."

And again, further down: "Under high greenhouse-gas emissions, the worst-case projections of sea-level rise eventually reach over a centimeter each year, said Rob DeConto, an Antarctic expert at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst who was not involved in the new study."

Of the greenhouse gas emissions, the worst one is CO₂ because it stays in the atmosphere for centuries. Warm air warms the ocean. That is melting the ice sheets. We have to stop burning so much fossil fuel.

Gefällt mir 5 Antworten Link Melden



grappapost vor 17 Stunden

CO₂ does not warm the ocean. The sun does. The most that CO₂ does is slow the lapse rate in the troposphere.

The oceans have 2,000x the energy of the atmosphere, it is not the CO₂ in the atmosphere causing the melting, it is the sun.

Residence time for CO₂ is 10 years.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



underside of power vor 17 Stunden

CO2 residence time in the atmosphere is 5-200 years.

<https://www.ipcc.ch/ipccreports/tar/wg1/o16.htm>

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



grappapost vor 17 Stunden

Yet mankind is only responsible for 4% of all CO2 in the atmosphere in any year.
The environment produces the other 96%.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



underside of power vor 17 Stunden

Where does the CO2 that the environment "produces" come from?

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



wpete vor 16 Stunden

Holy cow, dude:

"CO2 does not warm the ocean. The sun does."

That's like writing, "My brain doesn't say stupid things. My mouth does."

Gefällt mir 7 Antworten Link Melden



sean mccorkle vor 8 Stunden

"The most that CO2 does is slow the lapse rate in the troposphere."

CO2 intercepts most of the outgoing IR thermal radiation from the planet - heating the atmosphere - and much of that radiation comes right back to ocean, heating it further.

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden

Weitere Antworten Anzeigen



1elf vor 17 Stunden

Grappa--you go back and reread the article. You'll find this statement: "The result also reinforces that nations have a short window — perhaps no more than a decade — to cut greenhouse-gas emissions if they hope to avert some of the worst consequences of climate change."

So if greenhouse-gas emissions, the only one cited as a problem in the article, aren't causing the ice melt, what is?

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



grappapost vor 17 Stunden

Natural causes, since CO₂ is a minor radiative gas. Second to water vapor.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



1elf vor 17 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

What are the natural causes? Still waiting for your response on what natural causes are the reason for a tripling in melting over a single decade. The article says greenhouse-gas emissions. Your take on why this is incorrect (backed up by any scientific reports/data/evidence you can provide, not just your musings)?

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



grappapost vor 17 Stunden

The 20th century was the most active solar period for the last 1,000 years. Read further down on my post regarding PDO, volcanoes, end of LIA, etc;

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



underside of power vor 17 Stunden

The IPCC disagrees with your assessment.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



1elf vor 16 Stunden (Bearbeitet)

Where's the science saying solar activity is the reason for are currently rising tempatures? That's a decade old possible theory that hasn't held up in the 21st century where record warming is still occurring.

Where's your sources for showing a recent huge rise rise in volcanoes, without which there is negligible affect on climate (From Scientific America: "There is no doubt that volcanic eruptions add CO2 to the atmosphere, but compared to the quantity produced by human activities, their impact is virtually trivial: volcanic eruptions produce about 110 million tons of CO2 each year, whereas human activities contribute almost 10,000 times that quantity")

We've had ice ages in the past end, just none of them resulting in quick rises of temperature such as we are experiencing now. What makes the LIA any different?

Got any answers?

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



underside of power vor 17 Stunden

This is some retro denialism. grappapost likes to kick it old school.

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



Yail_Bloor vor 16 Stunden (Bearbeitet)

Do you know what happens to water vapor if the CO2 is removed? It rains out...then the planet decreases to an average -18C and is covered in ice nearly to the equator. We've known this since the late 19th century.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden

Weitere Antworten Anzeigen



charles casaburi vor 17 Stunden

There was many times in the history of this planet when co2 levels were higher than o2 levels. Stupid & ignorant is no way to go through life.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



underside of power vor 16 Stunden

I am struggling to recognize the point of this statement.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



1elf vor 16 Stunden

How many of those times of high co2 levels were during a time when humans walking the earth? I'll wait.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



ralph2016 vor 18 Stunden

Silence! Enough Fake News! The Great Leader has told us, this is a Chinese Hoax!

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



jackthelad vor 18 Stunden

I live on a clifftop, close to 200' above the river below. If people have chosen to live at sea level, their problem. And if the Feds insure them against flooding, more fool them - except it's our tax \$\$\$ being wasted.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



cbells vor 18 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

If the solution is "we should all live on clifftops" then you're either a full fledged moron or just like posting laughable statements to irk people.

Gefällt mir 7 Antworten Link Melden



ralph2016 vor 18 Stunden

Congratulations.

Do you have any idea how much land is within 200' of sea level?

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



pbjorling vor 17 Stunden

And yet another dumb comment. Yes, it is only about you, jackth..., and your property, and nothing else matters. To heck with every other living thing. Not to mention economies dependent on people and industries in low-lying areas, etc. etc. No wonder you probably believe everything that comes out of some politicians' mouths. You are not engaging in complex thinking. TRY IT.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



spiderl vor 18 Stunden

Many have been worried about polar bears, but according to the Canada Free Press, they are doing well:

"Scientists are increasingly realizing that polar bears are much more resilient to changing levels of sea ice than environmentalists previously believed as numerous populations are thriving. 1 As a result, scientists have been questioning alarmist as there are way more polar bears alive today than 40 years ago. Predictions that bears would die due to a lack of sea ice have continuously not come to pass. Another new study, this time by Canadian researchers, showed the creatures possess higher resilience to changing levels of sea ice than previously believed. The scientists found 'no evidence' polar bears are currently threatened by global warming."

Animals are very intelligent and can often adapt. Not always, but often.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



underside of power vor 18 Stunden

Melting in Antarctica does not make me worry about polar bear populations.

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



spiderl vor 18 Stunden

Yeah, I know. Only the Arctic has mammal populations, but people have really been concerned about the Arctic ice melting as well.

Antarctica has average temperatures of about negative 74 degrees Fahrenheit, while the Arctic averages somewhere around negative 4 degrees Fahrenheit.

Although both are cold, why are the poles so different from each other?

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



tonysrus vor 12 Stunden

I found the answer on Climate Kids <https://climatekids.nasa.gov/polar-temperatures/>

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



superkludge vor 18 Stunden

Many penguins keep polar bears as pets.

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



pbjorling vor 17 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

Since they live in the Arctic.

There are about 20 island nations that will cease to exist.... I guess according to some of the commenters here it is their misfortune or bad choice to have been born in such places. Tough luck for them. And I suppose these same folk would not want to grant them refugee status in the U.S. -- because, you know...brown people, no skills, probably terrorists, and stealing our jobs.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



superkludge vor 18 Stunden

Polar bears don't live in Antarctica. Thanks for playing.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



spiderl vor 18 Stunden

Yes, I know. I was commenting on the topic at hand, i. e. global warming. The climate isn't just changing in Antarctica, it's also affecting the Arctic.

Only penguins live in Antarctica, and it's the only place on earth with no signs of previous human habitation.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



1elf vor 18 Stunden

And that proves what? That if polar bears can adapt, than surely a supposedly higher intelligence species like human can as well? I.e., adaptation is how your children or their children will have to resolve whatever problems we leave them by doing nothing now.

Of course, if you don't believe climate change is happening, then in reality those polar bears were never in great danger and so no adaptation was really necessary.

You can't have it both ways.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



spiderl vor 18 Stunden

I am certain the climate is changing. It always has been. We cannot stop it. We will need to adapt to it or die, just like the polar bears. In Africa, some bugs stay under ground for years until the climate is conducive to their emergence. Similarly, we will need to learn how to adapt as the climate will change no matter what we do.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



1elf vor 18 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

Sure the climate has always been changing here and there. But never at the rapid rate we have seen in the past 150 years. It's the rapidity of the change that is a primary issue.

As for polar bears, well no, they aren't doing so well. Read here:

https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/01/09/without-action-on-climate-change-say-goodbye-to-polar-bears/?utm_term=.dcobaec4d011

Got something more up-to-date and based on science to say otherwise? Post a link please.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



spiderl vor 18 Stunden

<https://canadafreepress.com/article/polar-bears-doing-well-say-the-natives>

It is a shame that we can only go back 150 years. How old is the earth? The only way to gain accurate information regarding climate change is to compile as many data points as possible. One hundred and fifty years doesn't cut it.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



Yail_Bloor vor 17 Stunden

A Canadian version of *Daily Caller* isn't a good source. Paleoclimatology is very helpful, right-wing blogs are not very helpful.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



1elf vor 17 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

Exactly, Canada Free Press is known for being a pretty far right publication. <https://mediabiasfactcheck.com/canada-free-press/>

And here's a Canadian version of an obvious conservative praising Susan Crockford, one of the primary researchers cited in the article:

"Many scientists have grown frustrated with the domination of the polar bear story by dogmatic propagandists and have begun to speak out. Susan Crockford is one of them: a zoologist who is independent of the alarm industry and therefore free to make up her own mind. In this valuable paper, she has done a fine job of documenting the actual facts of the case as far as they are known."

As one can see, Crockford seems to be in the same position as climate science deniers are, out of the mainstream scientific community.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



1elf vor 17 Stunden (Bearbeitet)

Thank you for at least giving us a link, spider.

But here's a national geographic story on why polar bears are expected to be in greater trouble as the climate warms up.

<https://news.nationalgeographic.com/2018/02/polar-bears-starve-melting-sea-ice-global-warming-study-beaufort-sea-environment/>

One of their adaptations appears to be trying to find food where they've not sought it often before--in areas where humans congregate. That could be one of the reasons more are being "seen" by humans than in the past.

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden

Weitere Antworten Anzeigen



grappapost vor 17 Stunden

The end of the last ice age which melted the ice caps which covered the Northern Hemisphere were much faster than the minor change we've seen in the last 250 years. It was hotter 8,000 years ago during the Holocene Optimum than the present. There is no emergency. Seas have risen 130 meters in the last 11,000 years. Turn off the alarm.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



1elf vor 17 Stunden

According to Wikipedia: "The Holocene climatic optimum (HCO) was a period of warming in which the global climate became warmer. However, the warming was probably not uniform across the world. This period of warmth ended about 5,500 years ago with the descent into the Neoglacial and concomitant Neopluvial. At that time, the climate was not unlike today's, but there was a slightly warmer period from the 10th–14th centuries known as the Medieval Warm Period. This was followed by the Little Ice Age, from the 13th or 14th century to the mid-19th century, which was a period of cooling."

There weren't millions of people living on the planet 8,000 years ago, there doesn't seem to be any indication that the temperatures were much hotter than they are today, or that it trend extended to the entire globe. Nor could I find any reference that indicated the warming trend up was rapid (a couple 100 years) rather than a gradually warming world over a few thousand years.

If you've got data to the contrary, please share it.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



kevin alves vor 17 Stunden

crickets. I hear crickets. Too bad the ones who deny there is an emergency can't come up with scientific evidence to prove their case. When pushed to prove their assertion, all we hear is crickets

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



1elf vor 17 Stunden

Yeah I know. It's sad....but I guess if trolling is the only kind of work they can get paid for, or they otherwise starve, maybe they have little choice but to be posting the mostly unsupported opinions they post.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



charles casaburi vor 17 Stunden

The temp has gone up about 1 degree in the last 100 years which could easily be explained by measurement errors the current global warming panic swung into high gear during the late eighties & early ninties when the Soviet Union collapsed and temperature readings from Siberia one of the coldest places on earth that is habited stopped reporting because the poor Russians had more important things to worry about like eating. Since the data from Siberia restarted temperature increases have leveled off.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



underside of power vor 17 Stunden

Is that all one sentence?

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



1elf vor 16 Stunden

I have a good friend who is a full professor at a well known university who has been studying climate change in Siberia for over a quarter of a century, and everything you just wrote is absolutely wrong.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



wpete vor 16 Stunden

Another thing not important enough for poor Russians to worry about: commas.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden

Weitere Antworten Anzeigen



thomas grant vor 18 Stunden

Melting Antarctic Glaciers, America?

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



underside of power vor 18 Stunden

This page does a nice job of presenting the underlying oceanography which is driving the melting.

<http://www.antarcticglaciers.org/glaciers-and-climate/ice-ocean-interactions/changes-circumpolar-deep-water/>

The ice, the ocean and the atmosphere are all intrinsically linked, and in Antarctica we now see how complex changes in atmospheric circulation, driven by climate change and the ozone hole, are changing ocean circulation. Increased upwelling of warm, salty Circumpolar Deep Water is melting away the base of the ice shelves and the grounding lines of some of the largest, most vulnerable glaciers and ice streams in Antarctica, resulting in rapid, far-reaching and irreversible changes.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



grappapost vor 17 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

So it has happened before?

None of those things are unique in the history of the Earth.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



underside of power vor 17 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

You should read the information on the web page. It could help you understand how climate change driven by CO₂ is causing the melt.

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



therealargeprofessor vor 18 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

...

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



spiderl vor 18 Stunden

If you want a good read, "Ice Ghosts" is a great story about the Franklin Expedition of 1845. They were a group of explorers who wanted to find the NorthWest passage and instead found themselves locked in ice in the Arctic. The two ships, the "Erebus" and "Terror" were just discovered a few years ago.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



underside of power vor 18 Stunden

The Franklin Expedition didn't get past 75N. I am involved in a project which will intentionally freeze a ship into the Arctic ice. We expect to have to reach about 82N before freeze-in is possible.

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



spiderl vor 18 Stunden

Awesome! That really sounds interesting. The story about the Franklin Expedition has many unsolved, answered riddles attached to it. Their ships were abandoned farther north than the place where they ended up. The Innuited claimed they saw people and a dog living on one of them farther south.

Anyway, good luck with your project. Are you trying to figure out how the ice will behave or what will happen to the ship?

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



1elf vor 18 Stunden

You missed a rather important point, spider. Less than 200 years after the Franklin Expedition, the researchers are having to locate a place SIGNIFICANTLY FURTHER NORTH to find temperatures cold enough to recreate what happened to the expedition. If the world isn't getting warmer fast, why would that be necessary?

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



aphilos vor 18 Stunden

Annual ice loss: 200 billion tons . Sounds like a lot. Annual rise in sea level: One half millimeter (1/50 of an inch). Sounds like virtually nothing. A bit of a mystery, but one which is quickly solved. Almost all of the ice loss comes from the ice shelves, which, lying as they do over water, add nothing to water volume when they melt.

Should we worry nonetheless about the trend - tripling in a decade, quintupling in two? Do we even know what the trend really is? The very limited data set for Antarctica does not suffice to show whether ice loss there is accelerating, much less accelerating indefinitely, or merely oscillating (as most weather and climate trends do). If you triple ice loss every decade for a century, you get a frightening future. If....

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



underside of power vor 18 Stunden

Annual rise in sea level: One half millimeter (1/50 of an inch).

That is not the current rate of sea level rise.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



aphilos vor 15 Stunden

It is the current rate of sea level rise attributable to Antarctic ice loss. See DeConto's comment in the article.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



underside of power vor 14 Stunden

So it's on top of the 3.3 mm/yr and accelerating.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



aphilos vor 14 Stunden

Not quite. It would be included within the global rise from all sources. Whether it qualifies as an acceleration or an oscillation is the question I would prefer not to beg.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



wpete vor 15 Stunden

To answer your question, aphilos, the floating sheets don't raise the level themselves when they break off. However, they are holding back the ice on the mainland, which raise the sea level as it drifts, slides, or forms to replace the sheets that break away.

And when the new sheets break away...

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



aphilos vor 14 Stunden

Isn't the mainland ice flow precisely what is supposed to account for that comparatively trivial half-millimeter rise in sea level?

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



ozzy3_97 vor 18 Stunden

If the United States Geological... "Geniuses" had told all citizens that they demand nobody built a home on the side of or within 20 miles of the volcano, they might have some faith. They did not.....:(

Volcano's have been around much longer than the beginning of the "Stone Age". They have been actively spewing AFAWK, ever since. I would suggest they have been the cause of more pollution than any other source.....:(

The Earth also had a much greater covering of foliage, historically than it does today. Trees and pollution feed off each other and we live.....:)

We are changing as a planet. There's nothing we can do about it.....IT'S NOT US!!.....:(

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



oldcurm vor 18 Stunden

Sigh, just sigh. It is so sad when people saddle themselves with willful ignorance. Worse yet, those who will sell the future of their children for 30 pieces of silver. Which are you, ozzy? There is an overwhelming amount of evidence showing that humans are responsible for the majority if not nerly all of the global climate change. Come back with a Ph.D. in climatology and 30 years of experience in the field if you want to be taken seriously.

Gefällt mir 5 Antworten Link Melden



ozzy3_97 vor 18 Stunden

So What. We cannot stop being human and we will not walk to work or school. Se sill not freeze in winter or melt in summer if we have a way out. So all we can do is send our money, through gift or tax" to CEO's et. who will accomplish only one thing and it's not "changing the climate". No, we cannot win unless we are first weaned off weakness, uselessness, self-entitled waste" ...:(

Let's remember.....the ones we blame for our destruction also live here and have family here. That should give some something to think about...JMO..:(

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



oldcurm vor 18 Stunden

Wind and solar, tidal, fuel cells, electric vehicles, public transport, heat pumps, reforestation, and on and on - all of these things can mitigate climate change and most make the environment cleaner in the process. There is no reason to be wedded to fossil fuels, particularly coal. None of these things require us to lose our humanity. You clearly need to look at the data and analysis of actual scientists.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



reussere vor 18 Stunden

So ahh... what your saying is that the reason for the Antarctic ice loss... is Volcano's?

Seriously?

Do you understand that scientists can rather easily determine if CO₂ has a biological or geological origin? And that CO₂ we measure in the air is mostly biological in origin?

It always amazes me that uneducated morons believe they are smarter than all of the scientists in the world. One of the main things education teaches is how much we do not know. The more people claim to understand more than anyone the more we know they lack even a fundamental education.

And that is exactly what you are claiming in your post.

Gefällt mir 7 Antworten Link Melden



ozzy3_97 vor 18 Stunden

Do you understand that everything you just sent is so much proof of the lack of quality education in our schools.....:(

When you can't, or won't think, you are left to the mercy of indoctrination. Now, that's sad...:(

When we believe we have such great insight or accumulated knowledge of the working of our planet and yet, we cannot trust our meteorologists to get the "Weekend Weather" correct, we definitely have a strong faith in....something...:(

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



wpete vor 15 Stunden

Predicting the "weekend weather" is based on probability. (Hence all the "percent chances".) Probability cannot be "wrong" unless the value is 0% or 100%.

The odds of rolling a 5 or less on a die is 83%, but that doesn't make the odds "wrong" every time you roll a 6. That's not how math works.

Also, there's the whole climate=/=weather thing, but I can only handle one myth from an "educated" moron per post.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



1elf vor 18 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

Really. Care to explain how all that volcanic activity that has been happening throughout human history didn't really start warming the earth bigly until the last 150 years or so? I haven't heard of any huge increase in volcano activity recently, have you?

And volcanos are primarily responsible for air pollution? That would mean the world's most polluted cities like Delhi, Cairo, and a lot of other cities you've never heard of should be linked to volcanoes somewhere, but they're not. Meanwhile, LA and many Chinese cities have begun to see significant decreases in pollution. Care to explain how that have happened?

Yup, those cities nicely illustrate how humans can change their environment if they want to, for good or for bad. But it also so like humans to say "It's not affecting me so it's not a real problem" or ""I'll be dead before the manure hits the fan. Why should I suffer?" Bit selfish of them in this case, don't you think?

Gefällt mir 6 Antworten Link Melden



ozzy3_97 vor 18 Stunden

There's the problem. You believe the volcano's are warming the Earth....LOL....:(

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



jiiski vor 14 Stunden

No, you misunderstood what 1elf was saying to you.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



rich hanlon vor 18 Stunden

Spider1.

‘Facts talk. Bs walks

The Koch brothers continue to finance campaigns to make Americans doubt the seriousness of global warming, increasingly hiding money through nonprofits like DonorsTrust and Donors Capital Fund. Why focus on Charles Koch and David Koch? Many large foundations associated with corporate fortunes are active in financing climate denial groups — Anschutz, Bradley, Coors, DeVos, Dunn, Howard, Pope, Scaife, Searle, and Seid, to name a few. Unlike Koch, most of those fortunes did not come from owning a corporation like Koch Industries, historically rooted in fossil fuel operations. And none come as close as the Kochs in terms of decades-long focus on actively building a political influence network and coordinating other wealthy executives, corporations and families to dump amounts money into politics that not even the Koch brothers could afford.

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



nnvann vor 18 Stunden

Sounds like typical greedy pigs looking for profits at any cost. Sad.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



dgstmr vor 18 Stunden

You know when the Republicons are treading water they'll still blame it on sun spots.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



geotype vor 18 Stunden

...or Obama and HRC

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



buster666 vor 18 Stunden

Father in law just got hit with an 18% increase in homeowner insurance. He lives down in FL near the coast. Insurance companies know what is coming...

Gefällt mir 5 Antworten Link Melden



superkludge vor 18 Stunden

Has your father-in-law turned off his air conditioning and started riding public transit to reverse this problem? I'll go out on a limb and say no.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



buster666 vor 18 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

humans are literally releasing trillions of tons of carbon dioxide into the environment. Scientists understand that the chemistry of of the environment changes as a result of this. Its called science.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



spiderl vor 18 Stunden

Actually, the trees have a field day when the carbon dioxide levels increase.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



seattlenerd vor 18 Stunden

... assuming that we don't cut them all down first, of course.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



spiderl vor 18 Stunden

Very good point. We need to plant more.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



Yail_Bloor vor 18 Stunden

The bark beetles love it...the trees don't care for bark beetles though.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



gigantor vor 18 Stunden

That's a lie. There's no evidence that the CO2 fertilization effect (positive) trumps the redistribution of water effect (negative).

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



underside of power vor 18 Stunden

And crops become less nutritious, the fertilization effect asymptotes, etc.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



independent1va vor 18 Stunden

I am sooooo happy we sold our beach house on the Outer Banks 4 years ago - to a Republican.

Gefällt mir 7 Antworten Link Melden



buster666 vor 18 Stunden

it really is Trump country down there

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



independent1va vor 18 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

This was a rabid right wing conservative. Bumper stickers trashing Obama and some nonsense about "liberals."

I laugh every time I think about it.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



buster666 vor 18 Stunden

hah nice

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



spiderl vor 19 Stunden

Here are a few "predictions" that never happened:

1. Harvard biologist George Wald estimated that “civilization will end within 15 or 30 years unless immediate action is taken against problems facing mankind.”
2. “We are in an environmental crisis which threatens the survival of this nation, and of the world as a suitable place of human habitation,” wrote Washington University biologist Barry Commoner in the Earth Day issue of the scholarly journal Environment.
3. The day after the first Earth Day, the New York Times editorial page warned, “Man must stop pollution and conserve his resources, not merely to enhance existence but to save the race from intolerable deterioration and possible extinction.”
4. “Population will inevitably and completely outstrip whatever small increases in food supplies we make,” Paul Ehrlich confidently declared in the April 1970 Mademoiselle. “The death rate will increase until at least 100-200 million people per year will be starving to death during the next ten years.”

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



independent1va vor 18 Stunden

Yes, the melting is a figment of their imaginations.

Everything is fine. Go back to sleep.

Gefällt mir 5 Antworten Link Melden



1elf vor 18 Stunden

Hey how about all the "predictions" that did come to pass? Like we'd see increased ice melt over time due to global warming. That was more than a prediction of course as it was based on scientific theory.

As for the predictions you listed above, they could still happen. Just at a slower pace than originally predicted.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



spiderl vor 18 Stunden

Increased ice melt has been happening since before we were born. It is a historical fact, not based on "scientific theory." It simply means the climate continue to change. No surprise there!

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



justanotherdog vor 18 Stunden

More weaponized Stupid ... your coarse-grain grasp of natural history is the product of ignorance -- the opposite of science.

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



1elf vor 18 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

Not sure when you were born. 2014 maybe? Because we have definitely seen increased ice melt during my time on earth unlike anything my parents or their parents or their parents before them ever saw.

Read the article. I am thinking you must have skipped reading it to be posting comments like the one above.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



spiderl vor 18 Stunden

You went back four generations. That's a tiny speck in the vast expanse of time. Were you around when Greenland was actually green? I don't think so.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



1elf vor 18 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

Did Greenland stay green? Nope. That hardly illustrates that "Increased ice melt has been happening before we were born" which in your case seems to mean not when "we were born." If you meant since humans started walking the earth, you should have said that.

Not sure how many generations you want to go back or how many you'd have to go back to find any time in human history when ice was melting at the rate it has been in the past few decades. Got an answer for that?

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



zipbag vor 18 Stunden

Sorry to inform you that the point of no return because of the exponential increase in the human population and it's resultant pollution will happen in YOUR lifetime. As a lucky 89 yr old Scientist, I've been able to enjoy a life that you will never experience.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



reginalibrarian vor 18 Stunden

So when parts of Florida disappear, that would be a historical.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



justanotherdog vor 18 Stunden

Weaponized Stupid ... words yanked from context, stripped of their meaning and significance and used as a bludgeon in the service of ignorance and brute force.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden

Weitere Antworten Anzeigen



steve haigh vor 19 Stunden

so Antarctica has its own gravity, that's pretty amazing!

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



deep space vor 18 Stunden

A tennis ball has its own gravitational field.

A coin has its own gravitational field.

Anything that has mass has a gravitational field.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



rich hanlon vor 19 Stunden

When 97 scientists are saying something is happening and 3 say it is not. I go with the 97.

Gefällt mir 8 Antworten Link Melden



david37934 vor 19 Stunden

and how where the 3% bribed.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



rich hanlon vor 18 Stunden

My comment regarding the Koch brothers funding climate change deniers was deleted. I called them a bad name

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



spiderl vor 18 Stunden

Rich:

Be very careful who you believe. It is always dangerous to go with the majority simply because it is the majority.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



rich hanlon vor 18 Stunden

Thanks for the warning but I am not know as a team player

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



justanotherdog vor 18 Stunden

What if they're just right?

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



seattlenerd vor 18 Stunden

Here's something to consider. The only people who are making serious money because of climate change are the people who are causing climate change.

When Mar-A-Lago is inundated, expect the US taxpayer to pay for it. When the Gullah speakers get drowned, don't expect to hear a peep from them, because they forgot to be Rich and White.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden

Weitere Antworten Anzeigen



grappapost vor 18 Stunden

When 97 are wrong...that is how Vegas makes money. What is your confidence level on those 97? +/- 5? Or +/-10? What is the margin of error on that study? And what were the qualifications? Was it peer reviewed by impartial anonymous reviewers?

All reasonable questions whenever someone appeals to Authority or Quantities of stomachs.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden

Weitere Antworten Anzeigen



chief jgh vor 19 Stunden

A lot of people treat this as something that will happen in the distant future, as if on Dec 31 2099 sea level will be about where it is now and on Jan 1, 2100 it will suddenly jump 3 feet. However, at half a millimeter alone from Antarctica plus another millimeter from Greenland, other glaciers, and thermal expansion, in thirty years (when Donnie and I will be nearly 100) sea level would be a foot higher. in 60 years, when younger readers of this article will be around 80, it will be 2 feet higher.

That assumes a static rate of increase, and the article indicates acceleration. We could be a two feet in thirty years, and 5 feet in 60. Say goodbye to Miami. Also most of our beach communities. This could happen in our lifetimes and will if we do not make a near complete global conversion to non-fossil fuels in an extremely short time. It could be done, but likely won' Wonder who is going to rebuild half of Manhattan on higher ground.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



david37934 vor 19 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

You forgot to mention extreme weather and that winds from more powerful hurricane will drive the few feet of water many miles inland.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



grappapost vor 18 Stunden

What extreme weather? Cyclone energy has been declining since the 1950s.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



kevin alves vor 17 Stunden

citation?

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



chief jgh vor 12 Stunden

I did not want to go too long, but Hurrican Sandy flooded parts of lower Manhattan with its 10 foot storm surge. and did a lot of damage to Queens and other low lying areas. It was a category 1 hurricane just before it hit. Not even an extreme storm. Add two to four feet to its starting point and you get more area damaged, more water in the subways. Again, if we do not change soon, a couple of decades after 2100, sea level will be near where the storm surges are now, and Lower Manhattan may flood on an annual basis. That is a lot of costly real estate to abandon and relocate, or alternatively, a lot of land to enclose in dykes and pump out the rain water.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



nnvann vor 18 Stunden

Its not just the rise in the sea level, its also about salinity. The ocean currents will slow and we'll experience more extreme whether, crop failures, etc. It will become more obvious every year.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



jeffy2345 vor 19 Stunden

Articles like this would have more credibility if they included ALL of the information. One of the effects of warming temperatures is increased precipitation, especially in Antarctica. Read the following NASA report: (There are also several other reports on this phenomenon as well.)

<https://www.nasa.gov/feature/goddard/nasa-study-mass-gains-of-antarctic-ice-sheet-greater-than-losses>

For now, increased snowfall on the Antarctic continent is creating more ice than the increased melting of the sheets on the shores is losing ice. Since this does not fit the rising sea levels caused by climate change narrative of Wapo, the information is left out of the article. The dishonesty of articles like this is why the deniers have such as easy time pushing their even more outrageous lies.

BOTH sides are cherry picking facts. The climate change deniers are more guilty but we do the planet no favors when we publish pieces like this without covering all the bases.

Bottom line: For the immediate future (and this could change) Antarctica is creating more ice than it is shedding. If Antarctica was the only variable in the equation, sea levels would fall, not rise. Unfortunately for us, there is the problem of Greenland, which is shedding more ice than Antarctica is gaining. At least for now, anyway.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



spiderl vor 19 Stunden

For your edification: "Climate change deniers" is a misnomer. Almost all people everywhere will admit the climate is changing, so there are no "climate change deniers."

The issue involves the primary causes of climate change. Since it has been occurring since time began, with and without human assistance, it is both disingenuous and ill-informed to claim that people are the primary cause.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



surfreality1 vor 18 Stunden

Please stop spreading ignorance. It is neither disingenuous nor ignorant to accurately point out that human engineered carbon releases are the primary cause for the recent spike in global temperatures. Fossil fuel is killing our environment.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



nnvann vor 18 Stunden

You are missing the point of how rapid its occurring.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



gigantor vor 19 Stunden

"increased snowfall on the Antarctic continent is creating more ice than the increased melting of the sheets on the shores is losing ice."

That's a lie, and you are a liar. The graph in this article is based on gravity measurements, and Antarctica overall is losing mass at an accelerating rate.

I hope your thirty pieces of silver was worth it.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



jeffy2345 vor 19 Stunden

Read the WHOLE article from NASA to which I provided a link. The conclusion was that, for the immediate future, Antarctica is gaining more ice than it is losing. It is you who have a reading problem. Maybe it's because you attended public schools in a place like DC.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



deep space vor 18 Stunden

jeffy: Here is an excerpt from the article

""Doing altimetry accurately for very large areas is extraordinarily difficult, and there are measurements of snow accumulation that need to be done independently to understand what's happening in these places," Smith said."

If my understanding is correct, the NASA scientists used one method to estimate the ice thickness in Antarctica. It is one datapoint. The current study is more comprehensive as the writer notes.

It's kind of how science works.. people publish observations, others review them, incorporate additional data etc., in order to get to a consensus. You can always pick a single paper that supports whatever you wish to advance as your agenda.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



gigantor vor 18 Stunden

You idiot. Its SNOW falling in E Antarctica, not hardened and compressed ICE melting at the borders. The only direct comparison is via MASS, not VOLUME, as any public school student from DC would already know. I'm guessing you're an Evangelical and have your Masters Degree in Hosana's.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



geotype vor 19 Stunden

Technically, Antarctica is a desert...

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden

Weitere Antworten Anzeigen



deep space vor 19 Stunden

Here is the problem with climate change. The timescale on which is happens is all out of whack with typical timescales humans are used to. Changes occur over a period of decades or even centuries. However, our normal timescales are in days or a few years. More importantly, our election cycles are 2-4 years. A politician anywhere is in a tough position -s/he may believe in the science but knows that it is a losing proposition to ask a basically scientifically illiterate populace whose views are shaped by talk radio for great sacrifices for a threat that is hard for them to comprehend. We may just have to wait for the impacts to become severe enough for people to pay attention.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



charlton heston vor 19 Stunden

and then it's too late. Sometimes being highly informed is a burden.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



geotype vor 19 Stunden

@ rubes - you are entitled to your own opinions...but not your own facts.

Stop watching Fox and get an edu.

Gefällt mir 5 Antworten Link Melden



thinks vor 19 Stunden

Scholars from Falwell's University, Trump University and the BBC (Bring Back Coal-mining) beg to differ.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



spiderl vor 19 Stunden

Bottom line? Human beings cannot predict the future. Get over yourselves, people.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



charlton heston vor 19 Stunden

But we can perform scientific measurement, of course.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



von mises vor 19 Stunden

Why bother? It is so much easier for spider not to. He's been lazy his whole life.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



spiderl vor 19 Stunden

You haven't read the new rules, have you, von? You are ignored.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



spiderl vor 19 Stunden

Absolutely. That doesn't give us the power to predict the future, though. We can offer theories, but that's about it.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



charlton heston vor 19 Stunden

Know what? We believe that you believe that.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



Yail_Bloor vor 19 Stunden

"That doesn't give us the power to predict the future, though."

They can't predict the time of a solar eclipse down to the second? Yes, they can. Science can predict the future.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



gigantor vor 19 Stunden

Hence the concept of insurance.

If you drive to the corner drugstore without your seatbelt on, you are in effect predicting your future (that you won't have a car accident over such a short and well-known distance). As a practical matter, people 'predict the future' all the time (there's not a single machine, ever, that was designed without such predictions).

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



zeddy bear vor 19 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

You should stop getting medical check-ups, spiderl. You wouldn't want any of that medical science predicting your health.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



co_independent vor 19 Stunden

Let's Build A Ceiling Over Antarctica! I can build it so cheaply and Mexico will pay for it.
DJT

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



mic mac 77 vor 19 Stunden

Don't worry Right-wingers. When you are continuously wrong you can just blame it on God punishing us for our 'moral decay'.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



martinguy vor 19 Stunden

The climate change deniers must thank the Lord that this problem won't affect them... icebergs, immunization, Darwinall fake news.

Gefällt mir 5 Antworten Link Melden



zebecxebec vor 19 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

From the time the earth began forming to the present and on into the future, the earth's climate has been, is, and will be changing. There is no doubt that mankind has had a destructive effect by its actions and overpopulation. How significant have mankind's actions been as compared to cosmological changes? Has mankind manufactured its own extinction earlier than cosmological effects? Extinction of species occurs constantly, and global extinction has happened frequently. Mankind far from being an intelligent species will probably affect its own extinction...

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



justanotherdog vor 19 Stunden

“There is a cult of ignorance in the United States, and there has always been. The strain of anti-intellectualism has been a constant thread winding its way through our political and cultural life, nurtured by the false notion that democracy means that 'my ignorance is just as good as your knowledge.’”

- Isaac Asimov

Gefällt mir 6 Antworten Link Melden



mic mac 77 vor 19 Stunden

He's right. Google 'the Paranoid Style of American politics'.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



justanotherdog vor 19 Stunden

That's Hofstadter, not Asimov. But yeah ...

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden

 **kunn sidder** vor 19 Stunden
When is George Will going to demonstrate integrity equal to his wit by admitting that we are facing a crisis from global warming?

Gefällt mir  3 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **von mises** vor 19 Stunden
When he admits that poor people are better off now than they were in the 1930's? So, rest assured, he will never do it.

Gefällt mir  2 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **mic mac 77** vor 19 Stunden
The Right has just released a study that shows that climate change is Gods punishment for homosexuality.

Gefällt mir  2 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **hushmypuppies** vor 19 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*
Falwell's Liberty University did an extensive review of Biblical facts and discovered this to be true. Just like when he claimed HIV was God's personal punishment for homosexuals.

Gefällt mir  1 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **rich hanlon** vor 19 Stunden
A Bible was written. That's a fact

Gefällt mir  1 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **hushmypuppies** vor 19 Stunden
Which version is the true one?

Gefällt mir  1 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **playingdown** vor 19 Stunden
Well at least we haven't handed the EPA to oil lobbyists, so we should be okay. Oh, that's right...Hillary's emails..dang.

Gefällt mir  3 Antworten  Link  Melden 



unlisted vor 19 Stunden

The WaPo fails to mention that most of the Eastern Antarctic is actually below sea level. like now, before any additional sea level rise. Once warm sea water begins to infiltrate under the ice sheets, it'll melt from the bottom up. The surface will appear to be stable and more or less the same altitude (about 5000 ft) but in actuality, it'll be melting from underneath. After some time... century? sooner? - there will be a catastrophic failure and the ice will pour out onto the sea. Scientists had though that the eastern antarctic was stable. Then they found it had melted before. I seem to recall a number of 90 meters (yes meters).

Bernie Sanders in his first presidential debate said climate change was this nation's number one threat. It wasn't a good answer only because it's the number one world-wide threat to humanity and stability.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



no oil on beaches ever vor 19 Stunden

I live across the street from the ocean on the East Coast in South Carolina and an article such as this I see as a direct attack on my decision to live here. One of the factors I included in my decision to live here was a local newspaper article about 20 years ago that said that the ocean rises about an inch every 100 years, so I felt confident in the ocean not rising during my lifetime here. Folks who want to challenge me just want me to sell out and the price of my house gets lowered because of these new unfounded articles. Well, my house is not for sale.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



kevin alves vor 17 Stunden

isn't there a biblical story about this? And doesn't your character lose?

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



LHS2 vor 19 Stunden

If you're a self-regarding progressive afflicted with the penchant for turning your own point of view into a quasi-religion, it's not enough to just be intolerant of other opinions and be willing to persecute heretics, you need an apocalypse mythology and what better than blaming every climate-related event on fossil fuels.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



justanotherdog vor 19 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

Or maybe you're just ignorant and wrong when it comes to science and math.

Gefällt mir 7 Antworten Link Melden



sean mccorkle vor 19 Stunden

Physics and evidence, LHS2. That's it boils down to. That's what we rely on.

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



geotype vor 19 Stunden

Where did you go to school?

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



zeddy bear vor 19 Stunden

Heartland Institute for college, Exxon University for graduate school?

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden

Weitere Antworten Anzeigen



geotype vor 19 Stunden

3 yrs ago the FL Gov. forbid any mention of climate change/AGW in any state govt communications. I'm guessing that includes schools also.

Bought and paid for by the FL real estate lobby...no joke

Gefällt mir 6 Antworten Link Melden



hushmypuppies vor 19 Stunden

I have a lovely soon-to-be-beachfront property to sell you. It's 2 blocks from the ocean now, but just imagine it as an investment for the future.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden

 **eclecticreader** vor 19 Stunden
Went to Ocean City on vacation and to Assateague Island. Sad to know that my childhood places will not be there for my great grandchildren. The view from the penthouse overlooking Ocean City was grand. However all the tall buildings have foundations built on sand.

Gefällt mir  5 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **mangymut** vor 19 Stunden
I get a kick out of all the science illiterate morons that an article on climate brings out. It never fails.

Gefällt mir  4 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **justanotherdog** vor 19 Stunden
Science magazine ended public comments ... because every discussion devolved into proving that evolution is a thing and that the earth is not the center of the universe.

Gefällt mir  6 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **sean mccorkle** vor 19 Stunden
Wow. Thats incredible. And sad.

Gefällt mir  2 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **1elf** vor 19 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*
The good news is that every year there are fewer climate change deniers commenting on WaPo. We're down to a few diehards, and those few will always be with us, like the people who still believe in 2018 that the earth is flat.

Gefällt mir  6 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **justanotherdog** vor 19 Stunden
... and that the New England Patriots have a shortstop.

Gefällt mir  4 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **bombayguy** vor 19 Stunden
Nice try...but no one knows this is happening due to humans and even if it did....i am not sure we can do much.

Gefällt mir  1 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **sean mccorkle** vor 19 Stunden
Yeah, we know.

Gefällt mir  5 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **bombayguy** vor 19 Stunden
Nope. It is all lies based on weak data. A single undersea volcano outburst can do a lot of damage.

Gefällt mir  1 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **eric654** vor 19 Stunden
I assume this trolling servers some hidden purpose?

Gefällt mir  8 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **cbells** vor 19 Stunden
The only purpose it serves is to divert from people discussing what a civilization-altering situation this is.

Gefällt mir  3 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **hushmypuppies** vor 19 Stunden
Please scroll down and follow the links posted by so many people below that discuss the effect of volcanoes on global warming. Read the linked articles, then get back to us.

Gefällt mir  2 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **geotype** vor 19 Stunden
Clearly, you are incapable of making a simple correlation of cause and effect

Gefällt mir  4 Antworten  Link  Melden 



sscmits vor 19 Stunden

@bombaygug

What you mean is that you don't accept scientific evidence or logic. The scientists who study Antartica and climate change for a living are quite sure that humans are causing this because of increased carbon dioxide, and that decreasing greenhouse gases will reduce the planet's temperature.

Gefällt mir 5 Antworten Link Melden



grappapost vor 19 Stunden

By how much change in CO₂ in the atmosphere will change how much temperature? Recall that the Earth is not a black body, so SB doesn't quite apply....What is the ECS of CO₂? Prove it.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



justanotherdog vor 19 Stunden

Earth's albedo is 0.31 and Stefan-Boltzman absolutely applies.

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



von mises vor 19 Stunden

And allow me to let you in on a little secret, If a problem is affecting everyone and everyone has to work on the problem to solve it then that is what has to be done no matter how much you whine and blubber about "socialism".....

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



eric wang vor 19 Stunden

And Scott Pruitt only cares about finding his wife a cushy lucrative job using his power. What have we done to deserve this disaster?

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



sean mccorkle vor 19 Stunden

Good question. It keeps me up at night. Ultimately I think its because the haves haven't shared enough with the have nots, and by that I don't mean money but rather values, education, knowledge, etc

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



twittertrolltrump vor 19 Stunden

Humans are making themselves extinct with unbridled capitalism. Every dollar a guy like Trump or Putin owns has a carbon footprint and is linked directly to fossil fuels.

Capitalism in its current form and greed will be humanity's down fall. Humans will have to drastically change their lifestyles, culture, politics, financial systems....everything if we hope to survive as a species.

Trump and Pruitt pulling out of climate agreements and hacking down environmental protections is pure evil and callous irresponsibility. Trump and Pruitt are perfect examples of how corrupt rotten greedy human beings think and act.

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



grappapost vor 19 Stunden

Socialism is most definitely NOT the solution.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



texturepainting vor 19 Stunden

Are you sure? Have you ever been to Denmark?

Gefällt mir 8 Antworten Link Melden



sean mccorkle vor 19 Stunden

Or Sweden?

Gefällt mir 8 Antworten Link Melden



texturepainting vor 19 Stunden

Yeah, those Vikings turned out to be really good at protecting their environments.
....And they know how to party.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



justanotherdog vor 19 Stunden

What, exactly, do you think we will replace capitalism with when its historical moment has ended?

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



grappapost vor 19 Stunden

Barbarism. As is occurring in Venezuela now.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



justanotherdog vor 19 Stunden

Venezuela is an example of end-stage capitalism in a petrostate. "Barbarism" is an Orwellian epithet.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



1elf vor 19 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

Barbarism happens in nonsocialist countries too, like NK, Saudi Arabia, Russia....

I love how some conservatives love to use "socialist" Venezuela now as their model of a failed state because of socialism but neglect to remember how many democratic socialist countries are some of the better places for people to be living these days.

Like Norway, whose people Trump said would were the kind of immigrants he'd like to see come to the U.S. tho there is no indication that any Norwegians have any particular desire move to the US.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



grappapost vor 18 Stunden (Bearbeitet)

North Korea, Saudi Arabia, and Russia are all heavily socialist or fascist societies. Standard Marxism applied per the manual always leads to misery, lowered expectation, and dead bodies.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



texturepainting vor 7 Stunden (Bearbeitet)

Standard Marxism has never been applied to an entire country. You need to read his book. A few South/Central American countries tried, but they slid into totalitarianism quite quickly. NK, South Arabia and Russia are extremely different countries that are governed in completely different ways. Third, Socialism and fascism are not compatible at all. The fact that the Nazi party called themselves socialists only means that they were willing to highly tax the "inferior people", in order to advance their agenda. The truth of it is that they didn't tax them under law. They stole their stuff.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



texturepainting vor 18 Stunden (Bearbeitet)

Capitalism, Barbarism, Feudalism, the United States on some levels. They're all the same coin. Just as Socialism is the same coin as a convent, a family, a Tribe, the Boy Scouts, Religions and even the United States on many levels. There are no purely Socialistic countries and the only purely Capitalistic countries are condemned by most of the world for being "backward" or "third world" like Afghanistan (though, in the cities they do have some social systems. We brought many of them there, in fact).

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



dennis ray vor 19 Stunden

Bad science? No way, all Americans have to do is pray 5 times a day to their god, donald trump, and the problem will disappear in under 30 hours. Have you all no faith in our great savior?

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



grappapost vor 19 Stunden

And yet there is no link from atmospheric CO₂ from the combustion of fossil fuels and the latent heat of the oceans, which is the source of the melting.

Since the oceans contain 2,000 times the energy of the atmosphere, it would be good to know which natural process is responsible for the melt.

- 1) Calving due to increased ice buildup on the continent;
- 2) Pacific Decadal Oscillation;
- 3) Subsea volcanoes;
- 4) Something else or combination of things;

Feel free to speculate.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



sean mccorkle vor 19 Stunden

I think you misunderstand what latent heat is.

Gefällt mir 8 Antworten Link Melden



grappapost vor 19 Stunden

Latent heat converts ice to water, tres simple.....

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



sean mccorkle vor 19 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

The latent heat isn't *in* the oceans, its that fraction of energy that liquifies the ice *as* the ice melts.

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



1elf vor 19 Stunden

Just curious, grappapost, when in the past have we seen warming oceans CAUSED by calving due to increased ice buildup on the continent, or Pacific decadal oscillation, or subsea volcanoes? Surely you can post some earth periods where this was occurring, illustrating those natural times when these events PRECEDED ocean warming, thereby causing it.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



geotype vor 19 Stunden

Subsea volcanoes don't melt land ice. 4th grade Earth Science...

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



grappapost vor 19 Stunden

The ice loss is at the glacier boundary. Read the article.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



geotype vor 19 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

b/c the interior glaciers are melting at an accelerated rate, thus providing a conveyor to the sea.

p.s. all glaciers calve at the sea interface

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



scsmits vor 19 Stunden

@geotype

Why don't you publish a paper refuting their findings by pointing out this bit of "4th grade Earth Science"?

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



terrydactyl vor 19 Stunden

CO2 from the combustion of fossil fuels can be measured

The burning of long-buried fossil fuels releases CO2 containing carbon of different isotopic ratios to those of living plants, enabling distinction between natural and human-caused contributions to CO2 concentration.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Carbon_dioxide_in_Earth%27s_atmosphere#Anthropogenic_Contributions

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



grappapost vor 19 Stunden

The oceans are heated primarily by solar activity, ie, visible light.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



texturepainting vor 19 Stunden

Hey, straws are free, but you don't have to use them all. Of course the world is primarily heated by the sun. Global change is about the delicate balance between maintaining ice shelves or not. Just a sustained small increase can cause a long term melt.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



grappapost vor 19 Stunden

Prove that statement.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



texturepainting vor 19 Stunden

Ok. Go to Arizona or any other desert. Stand in the shade. Then stand in the sun. Do that a few times and notice the huge difference. There is almost no humidity there to trap warmth, hence the drastic difference in places right beside each other. That is an example of what trapped heat is. As for the sun primarily heating the world..... I guess you could try going to Mars or just accept that its simply colder there.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



justanotherdog vor 19 Stunden

Mars = Arizona without the heat or the cactus

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



texturepainting vor 19 Stunden (Bearbeitet)

No. Much much colder because the sun warms planets and not only is mars further away, it also lacks humidity in its atmosphere. Something to trap and contain the heat.

But yes... now that you mention it. Arizona blows.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden

Weitere Antworten Anzeigen

Weitere Antworten Anzeigen



justanotherdog vor 19 Stunden

Go ask the walrus ...

35,000 Walruses Are All Crowded Together In One Spot — And It Signals Something Ominous
Business Insider

Erin Brodwin Oct. 1, 2014, 11:14 AM

<http://www.businessinsider.com/35000-walruses-gathered-in-alaska-2014-10>

"The time has come," the Walrus said,
"To talk of many things:
Of shoes and ships and sealing-wax--
Of cabbages and anthropegenic climate change -- "

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



grappapost vor 19 Stunden

They found the fish? Walrus powwow?

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



geotype vor 19 Stunden

Pretending to do something while no effective action is taken is no different than doing nothing.

All **new** cars in England and France must be all electric by 2040 and 2030 respectively. Germany will do same.

That's doing something

Gefällt mir 5 Antworten Link Melden



spiderl vor 19 Stunden

Yes, that's definitely doing something. The key is to do something RIGHT. Otherwise, it's always best to do nothing.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



geotype vor 19 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

^ said no intelligent person ever

How many times did Edison and Alex Bell fail before they got it right?

Gefällt mir 6 Antworten Link Melden



gmb92 vor 19 Stunden

EVs, especially charged off a cleaner power grid, are far less carbon intensive than their counterparts. Moving towards such technology is certainly doing something right.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



danles vor 19 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

Here in Texas, I really think we ought to build a statue to Lamar Smith down on the beach. In a decade, his ankles will be wet, and in a few decades, he'll be under water entirely. Fitting tribute to a climate change denier who has put a bullet through federal efforts on CO2 management. Blub, blub, blub.

Gefällt mir 7 Antworten Link Melden



von mises vor 19 Stunden

And the Oklahoma City park dedicated to Jim Inhofe should just be allowed to bake. Not a drop of aquifer water will be allowed.

Gefällt mir 5 Antworten Link Melden



zeddy bear vor 19 Stunden

Humanity is the modern equivalent of the asteroid that wiped out the dinosaurs. Collectively, we are a mass extinction event. The tragedy is that the rest of creation will pay for our sins.

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



gmb92 vor 20 Stunden

Another study along these lines notes SLR contribution from the East Antarctic ice sheet is likely to be underestimated:

"Our results imply a dynamic EAIS response with continued anthropogenic warming and suggest that the EAIS contribution to future global sea-level projections may be under-estimated."

<https://www.nature.com/articles/nature25026>

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



hushmypuppies vor 20 Stunden

I finally figured out how the Deep State has gotten all these scientists to claim that global warming is real!

Scientists are in it for the big bucks, obviously. So, all the "clean energy" companies have put together a huge slush fund to pay them all off. When you divide this huge fund up among all the scientists who say global warming is happening, they each get about \$5.00. That's enough to get a cup of coffee at Starbucks, right? I think that makes it so worth it to compromise your professional reputation and personal integrity.

I need to share this news. Anybody know the number for Faux News?

/s/

Gefällt mir 6 Antworten Link Melden



i_believed_you vor 20 Stunden

* 2 cups of coffee.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



lance manly vor 19 Stunden

Coveffe

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



u-pb y the big lake vor 20 Stunden

It's a plot I tells ya'!

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



underside of power vor 19 Stunden

“The integrity and research of corporations saving millions of dollars by denying climate change is unimpeachable, but keep an eye on those tricky global warming scientist thousand-aires,” Stewart said. “I’ve never trusted them since I found out one of the elements on their periodic table — gold.”

<https://www.thewrap.com/jon-stewart-donald-trump-global-warming-expert-video/>

Gefällt mir 7 Antworten Link Melden



mbp1 vor 20 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

Stop misrepresenting the Paris agreement. It contains no standards and no means of enforcement. It's a vague non-agreement under which participating nations agree to follow their own policies regarding the control of GHGs. The reason almost every nation was willing to sign it is that it imposes no meaningful obligations on any of them.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



geotype vor 20 Stunden

Kinda like Trumps "great deal" w/ N. Korea...eh?

Gefällt mir 5 Antworten Link Melden



d edwards vor 20 Stunden

As nations set their own goals they are much more likely to meet them. They are putting their reputation on the line and not being coerced. It's a good thing.

Gefällt mir 6 Antworten Link Melden



mbp1 vor 20 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

Yes, let's just do something. Don't worry about whether it's effective, the important thing is to send representatives to meetings to talk about all of the ineffective things we're doing.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



d edwards vor 20 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

They are doing things. They have lists of projects underway. Many different projects of different types and different projects in different countries. Did you look for them?

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



mbp1 vor 20 Stunden

It's not working.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



von mises vor 20 Stunden

Then just sit on your thumb and spin around making comments. Clearly that will help.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



mbp1 vor 20 Stunden

Exactly what you're doing.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



von mises vor 19 Stunden

So, I suppose when the first US President stands up and demands changes across industry that will affect your lifestyle and wallet, offering you an "effective" action to stop this that asks you to give up your FREEDOM, you will be all in. Good one.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden

Weitere Antworten Anzeigen



geotype vor 20 Stunden

doing nothing is stupid and suicidal...

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



mbp1 vor 20 Stunden

Pretending to do something while no effective action is taken is no different than doing nothing.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



1elf vor 19 Stunden

Please give us an example of "pretending to do something" while no effective action is taken? Got any examples? A plan of action (Paris Agreement for one) by the way is not an example, unless you can prove that all the signees onto the plan have taken no action to meet any goals since the plan was signed.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



1elf vor 19 Stunden (Bearbeitet)

Update on the Paris agreement signed in November 2016. We are not even halfway through the 5 year mark for evaluation, but here are some real world examples of countries that have already taken action on the goals they've set for themselves.

<http://www.climatechangenews.com/2018/05/14/11-ways-paris-climate-deal-working-real-world/>

We're barely at the start of the plan's implementation. All of us concerned about climate change understand we had to start somewhere, and bringing the world to act together agree to "do something" was only the first step. But it is far better than sitting back and doing nothing at all.

Maybe the commenters who think the Paris Agreement is a poor solution can explain their rationale for believing that "doing nothing" is the better solution?

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



danles vor 19 Stunden

Oh, that must be why Donald Trump ran away from it.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



u-pb y the big lake vor 20 Stunden

Carbon dioxide and methane are heat trapping gases. Human activity has added both to the atmosphere. Something will change. Pretty simple stuff. The only arguments left are how much, what will change, how it will change and where it will change. Only a dope would ever claim that adding any substance to a system will result in no change. Even bigger dopes claim that man can have no effect on the Earth's environment.

Gefällt mir 11 Antworten Link Melden



dalyplanet vor 20 Stunden

No heat is trapped. Energy in equals energy out aside for some small calculated estimated adjusted in residual. If you increase the optical thickness of the atmosphere slightly you increase the size of the radiation field. Due to the lapse rate this means from space the Earth appears to be radiating at a slightly cooler temperature. In quite short order this causes the column of air below to increase and temperature slightly so that energy in equals energy out.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



radical middle vor 20 Stunden

That is pure nonsense. For Pete's sake stop making up physics and get a clue. Or are you paid to post nonsense?

Gefällt mir 6 Antworten Link Melden



dalyplanet vor 20 Stunden

That is the facts Jack

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



jtssigman vor 20 Stunden

There are no facts, only interpretations... and circles...

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



hushmypuppies vor 19 Stunden

Facts don't exist, in other words? The truth is whatever the biggest blowhard can shout loudest for the longest? That is utterly ridiculous, and a side effect of the turmoil spread today by the most ignorant president we have ever had.

Personally, I think I'll put my faith in the large number of experts who say global warming is real, not some person who thinks there are no such things as facts. And you can take that as a fact, not an interpretation.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



radical middle vor 19 Stunden

THESE are the facts:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Greenhouse_effect

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



u-pb y the big lake vor 20 Stunden

He is. He works for Heartland.

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



hushmypuppies vor 19 Stunden

Do you think it would help if I asked my friend who is a physicist to tutor him on the actual process taking place on the planet right now?

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



sean mccorkle vor 19 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

I've tried. Many times. Doesn't work. Daly's so far out there you can't even see him from here.

If you want to have some real fun though, try to get him to read off the value of the "back radiation" flux from this energy balance diagram

<https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/b/bb/The-NASA-Earth%27s-Energy-Budget-Poster-Radiant-Energy-System-satellite-infrared-radiation-fluxes.jpg>

and compare it to the emitted radiation flux. Because that's the essence of the greenhouse effect, which he refuses to acknowledge.

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



jtssigman vor 20 Stunden

I'd try reversing the megatronic flow rate of the flux capacitor's primary anti-matter valve, but what do I know?

Gefällt mir 5 Antworten Link Melden



seattle nerd vor 19 Stunden

dalyplanet didn't exactly lie, but he/she didn't exactly tell the truth, either. What matters is the mean temperature of the atmosphere and oceans. You can do an energy balance and have a hotter troposphere; melt that ice and the oceans rise. Warm those subtropics and you get malaria farther north/south.

I'm gonna be dead in less than 40 years, and I can totally ride this out. My casket my float off to Taiwan, but I won't be in a caring mood.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden

Weitere Antworten Anzeigen



bombayguy vor 19 Stunden

Only dopes like you will lie. The amounts contributed by humans are miniscule compared to natural sources. So they have no effect

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



nunoverbeezwax vor 19 Stunden

And you are? A scientist? Do tell.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



dalyplanet vor 20 Stunden

The title of this piece should be "7500 years of unstoppable Antarctic ice melt"

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



d edwards vor 20 Stunden

... that has really sped up because of humans burning fossil fuels.

Gefällt mir 11 Antworten Link Melden



u-pb y the big lake vor 20 Stunden

Hey, DalyPlanet, Heartland having you work late tonight?

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



u-pb y the big lake vor 19 Stunden

Uhm, Daly, you have argued in the past that Antarctic ice amounts are growing. Now you're claiming it has always been melting for the last 7500 years and this somehow mitigates the finding that the melting has speeded up?

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden

Weitere Antworten Anzeigen



ellie59 vor 20 Stunden

There are three kinds of people. People who find this an interesting phenomenon, People who see that this is not good news for most of the world with most major cities situated on coastlines and the economic cost will be incalculable. And people who really don't care what happens because they'll be gone and it will be someone else's problem. These folks are not going to go out of their way to plan for the future.

You see it over and over - people who care about the future and people who don't. That's what it boils down to.

Gefällt mir 7 Antworten Link Melden



rireds vor 20 Stunden

What are you personally doing about it?

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



mangymut vor 20 Stunden

Voting for Democrats and against Trump Republicans.

Gefällt mir 7 Antworten Link Melden



rireds vor 20 Stunden

That sounds exhausting. Be sure to take frequent breaks.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



jtssigman vor 20 Stunden

Its not black and white! Some of us care about the future but also have other things to do... We get distracted, you know... We get stuck on Youtube videos of tasered rats.

But dont say we dont care!!!

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



hanging chad vor 20 Stunden

The universe doesn't care about our feelings.

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



ellie59 vor 20 Stunden

How true. And the planet earth is going to be here a very long time. It may look complete different than it does now. It may become hostile to life. But it will be here. Humans - as we exist today won't be here.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



d edwards vor 20 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

Based just on the established physics of the amount of heat CO₂ absorbs and emits, a doubling of atmospheric CO₂ concentration from pre-industrial levels (up to about 560 ppm) would by itself, without amplification by any other effects, cause a global average temperature increase of about 1 °C.

But, If emissions continue on their present trajectory, without either technological or regulatory abatement, then warming of 2.6 to 4.8 °C (4.7 to 8.6 °F) in addition to that which has already occurred would be expected by the end of the 21st century.

Even though an increase of a few degrees in global average temperature does not sound like much, consider that global average temperature during the last ice age was about 4 to 5 °C (7 to 9 °F) colder than now.

<http://dels.nas.edu/resources/static-assets/exec-office-other/climate-change-QA.pdf>

Guess which party is fighting against technological and regulatory abatement.

Gefällt mir 6 Antworten Link Melden



hushmypuppies vor 19 Stunden

Why are you trying to introduce facts into the debate? They're inconvenient. Don't you know that?

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



winghed106 vor 20 Stunden

Wow, but like, I have still have ice cubes for my Jameson's, so what's the problem? Just askin' for a friend.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



hubert giot vor 20 Stunden

I have to buy new shoes with higher soles

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



ozzy3_97 vor 20 Stunden

What if, we eliminated every human!! Would that stop the deterioration of the Ice-Cap?

I suggest that, the 2 very volcano's have generated enough poisonous gasses into the atmosphere to equal all and any pollutants humans have generated since recorded time....:(

We are not a constant existence. We do have limits and we have evolved to date. We will evolve more...JMO..:)

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



underside of power vor 20 Stunden

I suggest that, the 2 very volcano's have generated enough poisonous gasses into the atmosphere to equal all and any pollutants humans have generated since recorded time....:(

Where do people get this from?

Gefällt mir 13 Antworten Link Melden



terrydactyl vor 20 Stunden

They live in a magical alternate reality where they don't need facts.

Gefällt mir 9 Antworten Link Melden



radical middle vor 20 Stunden

All the disinformation websites out there? That just keep passing around debunked meme after debunked meme.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden

**matthew lang** vor 20 Stunden

you obviously haven't

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden

**geotype** vor 20 Stunden (Bearbeitet)*About 50 to 60 eruptions happen each month. Some volcanoes are in constant activity — Stromboli, Kilauea, or Sakurajima, for example.*

There is NO unusual or increased volcanic activity

<https://www.scholastic.com/teachers/articles/teaching-content/volcanic-eruptions/>

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden

Weitere Antworten Anzeigen

**charlton heston** vor 20 Stunden

So, did anyone ever figure out why Melania went dark for close to a month?

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden

**bryan he** vor 20 Stunden

GLOBAL WARMING.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden

**charlton heston** vor 20 Stunden

I dunno. Have you ever seen her around her husband. Ain' nuthin' too warm there. In fact, it's downright icy with those two. But, really, can ya blame her?

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden

**u-pb y the big lake** vor 20 Stunden

30 days is a pretty standard rehab stint. I'd be hitting the juice, too, if I had a public embarrassment of a husband like she has to deal with. She needs to get out ahead of her moron of a husband, go dig up land mines somewhere so orphans don't step on them.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden

 **kenneth hulse** vor 20 Stunden
I believe it is already too late. We are like termites eating the only house we have left. At the rate this is going we wont be around for the next century and no technology is not going to fix it.

Gefällt mir  4 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **bryan he** vor 20 Stunden
So, why do anything then?

Gefällt mir  Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **bobbywhite** vor 20 Stunden
Pascal's Wager.

Gefällt mir  1 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **pbjorling** vor 19 Stunden
Because we helped make this mess and it is only right to try to do some mitigation before we leave the problems for our children and grandchildren and their progeny to deal with.

Gefällt mir  1 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **bobbywhite** vor 20 Stunden
I have a hunch you are correct. I hope the animals can survive and start over without us.

Humans: evolution's only mistake.And what doozy it was.

Gefällt mir  2 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **ellie59** vor 20 Stunden
I agree - we destroy in a way that no other species does and we completely disrupt the delicate balance of nature.

Gefällt mir  2 Antworten  Link  Melden 



rireds vor 20 Stunden

If no technology is not going fix it, does that mean technology will fix it?

Sometimes it's a little hard to parse through appalling grammar.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden

Weitere Antworten Anzeigen



achem vor 20 Stunden

You have to hand it to the Chinese. They really do know how to do a good hoax. Seriously. Melting the Antarctic ice was a masterful touch.

Gefällt mir 9 Antworten Link Melden



sierrainsects vor 20 Stunden

How about the lady Trumper who told me that the reason some parts of Florida coastline are already flooding during high tides is that the buildings are too heavy and they are making the land sink.

Gefällt mir 6 Antworten Link Melden



matthew lang vor 20 Stunden

Finally a smart Floridian.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



u-pb y the big lake vor 20 Stunden

So she should sue Mar A Lago to keep our fat president from causing any more damage.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



rireds vor 20 Stunden

Cool story.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden

 **bryan he** vor 20 Stunden
In the late 2000s, Al Gore made a series of high-profile statements suggesting the possibility that Arctic sea ice could be completely gone during the summer by around 2013 or 2014.

Gefällt mir  1 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **i_believed_you** vor 20 Stunden
And?

Gefällt mir  2 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **bryan he** vor 20 Stunden
He was wrong.

Gefällt mir  1 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **i_believed_you** vor 20 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*
And what, you think these 80 scientists are too?

Gefällt mir  2 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **bryan he** vor 20 Stunden
Maybe.

Gefällt mir  1 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **i_believed_you** vor 20 Stunden
Do you doubt measurements?

Gefällt mir  2 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **bryan he** vor 20 Stunden
Yes,

Gefällt mir  1 Antworten  Link  Melden 



i_believed_you vor 20 Stunden (Bearbeitet)

You don't believe in the ability to measure?

Good luck to you.

Gefällt mir 5 Antworten Link Melden

Weitere Antworten Anzeigen



terrydactyl vor 20 Stunden

He said "could be". It's now half the average from the 1980s

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



geotype vor 20 Stunden

He was close. Summer melt has opened up sea lanes already

Gefällt mir 5 Antworten Link Melden



bryan he vor 20 Stunden

suggesting the possibility that Arctic sea ice could be completely gone during the summer by around 2013 or 2014.

Not even close..

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



geotype vor 20 Stunden

cite your source

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



bryan he vor 20 Stunden

<https://www.snopes.com/fact-check/ice-caps-melt-gore-2014/>

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



d edwards vor 20 Stunden (Bearbeitet)

Exactly. He quoted the most extreme forecasts. So what? There are many studies and many models all with different error bars.

Although Gore points to the most extreme to indicate the worst possibility a smart person knows the least extreme prediction has less melting.

Gefällt mir 5 Antworten Link Melden



i_believed_you vor 20 Stunden

Is snopes a source?

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



mr shark vor 20 Stunden (Bearbeitet)

That does NOT disprove this research, al gore is NOT a scientist and that was a while back, it's always the same isn't it ? the "well what about " response , which is the strategy of the Charletan and scam merchant.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden

Weitere Antworten Anzeigen



d edwards vor 20 Stunden

Sadly, the US has Lamar Smith as chairman of the House Committee on Science, Space and Technology.

He stands strongly with the fossil fuel industry

http://www.ontheissues.org/TX/Lamar_Smith_Energy_+_Oil.htm

Also, most people don't know that congress persons pay to get committee assignments and these funds can come from special interests. You can bet on who paid for Lamar Smith to be on that committee.

Gefällt mir 9 Antworten Link Melden



bobbywhite vor 20 Stunden

Yet another reason to work to flip the House.

<https://www.swingleft.org>

Gefällt mir 8 Antworten Link Melden



just stop already vor 20 Stunden

I believe I read a couple months ago that Smith is retiring? Not that there aren't 1,000 denialist a-holes just waiting to take his place.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



thistlepdx vor 20 Stunden

I could have shortened that headline for you considerably, WaPo. "We are in serious trouble."

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



kenneth hulse vor 20 Stunden

absolutely correct .

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



ron vor 20 Stunden

So what caused the ice ages that have and gone before the industrial age? What caused the Earth to have hundreds of years of a much hotter climate before the industrial age? Anyone? This stuff is getting pretty ridiculous. Nobody really knows for sure. Mankind has a long history of stupid.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



thistlepdx vor 20 Stunden

And you are part of that long and glorious history, ron. Read some science, fer chrissake.

Gefällt mir 13 Antworten Link Melden



u-pb y the big lake vor 20 Stunden

Forest fires happened before man was here so that must mean man is not responsible for forest fires.

Gefällt mir 7 Antworten Link Melden



bobbywhite vor 20 Stunden

The results of the investigation of causes of the Napa Wine Country Fire have just been released: multiple trees falling into power lines or power poles and knocking them over, causing sparks. High winds.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



u-pb y the big lake vor 20 Stunden

Impossible. Forest fires have been happening for millenia.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



geotype vor 20 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

Milankovitch Cycles. But they occur over 20,000 and 100,000 year periods

http://www.indiana.edu/~geol105/images/gaia_chapter_4/milankovitch.htm

Gefällt mir 8 Antworten Link Melden

Weitere Antworten Anzeigen



seemstome vor 20 Stunden

Trump's scientists have invented a machine to remove carbon dioxide from the atmosphere and send it to China.

It runs on clean coal.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



matthew lang vor 20 Stunden

Unfortunately the chinese invented clean coal and with the current tariffs we can't afford it.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



one citizen one vote vor 20 Stunden

Oh pshaw! I can't see Antarctica from my ostrich hole in Oklahoma, so you must be lying.

Gefällt mir 5 Antworten Link Melden



nfnik-washingtonpost vor 20 Stunden

But can you see Russia???

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



matthew lang vor 20 Stunden

I live in NE Iowa near the Miss. river and unfortunately I'm sure this will increase my property taxes. The real cause of course is the "heated debate" on the part of "liberals" and not the "cold shoulder" given the climate change concept by the right wing.

Anyone who refutes the concept of climate change caused by humans is ignorant. Anyone who claims that they know that it is "global warming" is perhaps too confident of their knowledge of long term cause and effect. Something has been thrown out of skew by humans when it comes to climate and it certainly seems related to greenhouse gasses.

Denying this just makes one moronic.

Denying federal funding to investigate the causes of whatever is going on is either tremendously stupid or biased towards the vestment of special interests into areas someone doesn't want questioned.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



u-pb y the big lake vor 20 Stunden

It is very simple--Carbon dioxide is a heat trapping gas. Humans have added more of it to the atmosphere than the atmosphere can discharge. Something's going to change and the only debates left are how fast, where and how much.

Gefällt mir 6 Antworten Link Melden



kenneth hulse vor 20 Stunden

trying to find any logic to whatever point you are making and it just doesnt seem possible.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



charlton heston vor 20 Stunden

I surely hope the reason for this is soon discovered. I was just on Fox News and it's pretty conclusive that global warming is a hoax, so I hope the intellectual power houses soon tell us why the ice is turning to water. This is weird, isn't it? If it's not global warming, what the heck is it?

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



i_believed_you vor 20 Stunden

Donald's ability to blow hot air?

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



matthew lang vor 20 Stunden

Perhaps it is the liberals inherent intellectual abilities that have changed the constant of the latent heat of fusion thereby allowing all of the "excess" ice on the world to melt.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



texsun13 vor 20 Stunden

It may be early for hiring Nero and his his fiddle but higher ground looks more appealing. Don't you think?

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



i_believed_you vor 20 Stunden

"The concept of global warming was created by and for the Chinese in order to make U.S. manufacturing non-competitive," - - DJ Trump

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



mbgrub vor 20 Stunden

Well what the heck! I think we should just burn coal till the cows come home!

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



nfnik-washingtonpost vor 20 Stunden

Burn enough coal and they won't. They'll fry in the fields.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



eggheadjoe vor 20 Stunden

...or burn cow manure.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



eggheadjoe vor 20 Stunden

Ice melting? Could this be a result of climate change? Since the deplorables do not believe in science and blindly follow their orange Hitler, this all must be "fake news." So keep burning fossil fuels, pollute the skies and watch states like Florida and Louisiana get permanently flooded and see them demand Federal government bailouts for damage caused by climate change. The tab will go to the Blue states.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



matthew lang vor 20 Stunden

Louisiana? Oh, that's the place they had a hurricane a few a few years back isn't it. Isn't it somewhere south of puerto rico?

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



kings lead hat vor 20 Stunden

TL: DR - DJT

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



i_believed_you vor 20 Stunden

“In the East, it could be the COLDEST New Year’s Eve on record. Perhaps we could use a little bit of that good old Global Warming that our Country, but not other countries, was going to pay TRILLIONS OF DOLLARS to protect against. Bundle up!”

- - DJ Trump

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



bobbywhite vor 20 Stunden

He's going to just love living in russia.

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



d edwards vor 20 Stunden

Not a great thinker. Trump also ridiculed the banning of CFC's saying that because he and others used hairspray inside, the CFC's couldn't get out to affect the atmosphere.

Gefällt mir 7 Antworten Link Melden



eggheadjoe vor 20 Stunden

Nonsense. The overall weather pattern is warmer weather. Glaciers are melting all over the world and average temperatures are rising. Need to look at the overall pattern over many decades. By the way, in the West it is warmer and drier and MILLIONS of trees are dying.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



i_believed_you vor 20 Stunden

Donald is full of it.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



charlton heston vor 20 Stunden

Yup. That's what climate change looks like.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



michaellwagner vor 20 Stunden

“Although there has been some progress in reducing nutrients, the overall levels remain high and continue to strain the region's coastal economies.” <http://www.wafb.com/story/38372116/scient-forecast-an-average-size-dead-zone-in-the-gulf-of-mexico-in-2018>

<https://www.ewg.org/agmag/2018/06/greenest-farm-bill-ever> - .WyGHR6dKiUk

<https://www.bbc.com/news/business-44159122>

<http://www.houmatoday.com/news/20180528/inexpensive-water-monitoring-device-may-help-gulf-dead-zone>

<https://www.nature.org/ourinitiatives/regions/northamerica/unitedstates/indiana/journeywithn-gulf-hypoxia.xml> <http://visionlaunch.com/4-solutions-dead-zones/>

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



bluewave vor 20 Stunden

This is great news for my beachfront property in Nevada and my Nebraska house boat manufacturing company.

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



i_believed_you vor 20 Stunden

I'm building a marina just outside of Death Valley.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



rich hanlon vor 20 Stunden

Republicans don't care

Gefällt mir 7 Antworten Link Melden



coofefe vor 20 Stunden

Prayer will due.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



seemstome vor 20 Stunden

Hey, that's what Makes America Great Again. Denial.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



seemstome vor 20 Stunden

Sure global warming is coming along with rising seas but with Trump in office the next two years will seem like an eternity for most people. Enjoy.

Gefällt mir 5 Antworten Link Melden



elmer72 vor 21 Stunden (Bearbeitet)

Yet another article about the damage being caused to our planet by overpopulation without ever once mentioning the dreaded word, "overpopulation". These scientists and the news media are all apparently terrified of the Vatican. Well here's a heads-up people - if humans don't use birth control Mother Nature will get rid of the excess in her own ways.

Gefällt mir 5 Antworten Link Melden



spiderl vor 21 Stunden

Overpopulation? On what basis do you claim the earth is over populated?

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



seemstome vor 20 Stunden

Oh, I don't know. It could be the lack of clean water or the seas being choked with plastic trash.

Gefällt mir 6 Antworten Link Melden



coofefe vor 20 Stunden

Starvation, deforestation, strip mining the worlds oceans while polluting the waters, shortage of drinking water in many countries etc..

Gefällt mir 6 Antworten Link Melden



cinnaplid vor 20 Stunden

It doesn't affect spidergirl, so therefore isn't a problem for the planet.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



soudesuka vor 20 Stunden

"Yet another article about the damage being caused to our planet by overpopulation"

What's with all the Malthuses commenting on things like this?

The primary driving force of AGW are BURNING FOSSIL FUELS and AGRICULTURAL PRACTICES. Fixing those to be GHG neutral would solve the problem, regardless of the world's population.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



elmer72 vor 20 Stunden (Bearbeitet)

Let us know when you've invented a Star Trek unlimited power source that can heat homes and provide transportation for seven and half billion people with zero impact on the planet. We are all eagerly waiting for that day. In the meantime we have to live in the real world.

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



bluewave vor 20 Stunden (Bearbeitet)

We invented it 70 years ago. Solar electric with nuclear base-load. Now we have the battery technology to make it cost effective.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



i_believed_you vor 20 Stunden

<http://world-nuclear.org/information-library/current-and-future-generation/nuclear-fusion-power.aspx>

<https://www.nbcnews.com/mach/science/long-wait-fusion-power-may-be-coming-end-ncna833251>

<https://www.lockheedmartin.com/en-us/products/compact-fusion.html?>

Dude.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



soudesuka vor 20 Stunden

"Let us know when you've invented a Star Trek unlimited power source that can heat homes and provide transportation for seven and half billion people with zero impact on the planet."

Solar panels, wind power, and biofuels all have zero GHG impact.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



nfnik-washingtonpost vor 20 Stunden

Not zero. But far lower.

Interestingly, those nasty rare earth elements are often mined by using the Sun to evaporate mineral brines. Not a lot of FFs used in that at all.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



spiderl vor 21 Stunden

“Anywhere you have thinner ice, it’s going to be weaker,” Dow said.

Wow. What an astounding observation!

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



soudesuka vor 20 Stunden

"Wow. What an astounding observation"

Given that you need things explained to you, that's a rather silly thing to be snarky about.

Gefällt mir 6 Antworten Link Melden



i_believed_you vor 20 Stunden

Sounds like the scientists are managing to get through to you.

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



coofefe vor 21 Stunden

Fake News, until ocean water will flood Mar o Lago and Trump tower in NYC.

Gefällt mir 6 Antworten Link Melden



i_believed_you vor 21 Stunden

Donald already wanted to build a sea wall in Scotland to protect his land. I think the government refused to let him.

Gefällt mir 5 Antworten Link Melden



jedediah smytheson vor 21 Stunden

But it's not ocean water; it's water from on top of Antarctica. Geez! Don't you know nothin'?

Gefällt mir 6 Antworten Link Melden



renaissance man vor 21 Stunden

In a few short years all that beach front property will be worthless underwater.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



jedediah smytheson vor 21 Stunden (Bearbeitet)

I don't mean to be too esoteric, but a rise in sea levels probably isn't the worst result. All this fresh water could disrupt thermohaline circulation, which would spell the end of the oceanic food chain. And that would seriously impact the terrestrial food chain, as well.

Gefällt mir 9 Antworten Link Melden



sumyounguy vor 18 Stunden

We will be dead

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



dalyplanet vor 21 Stunden

""

IT is widely understood that the collapse of the West Antarctic ice sheet (WAIS) would cause a global sea level rise of 6 m, yet there continues to be considerable debate about the detailed response of this ice sheet to climate change^{1–3}. Because its bed is grounded well below sea level, the stability of the WAIS may depend on geologically controlled conditions at the base which are independent of climate. In particular, heat supplied to the base of the ice sheet could increase basal melting and thereby trigger ice streaming, by providing the water for a lubricating basal layer of till on which ice streams are thought to slide^{4,5}. Ice streams act to protect the reservoir of slowly moving inland ice from exposure to oceanic degradation, thus enhancing ice-sheet stability. Here we present aerogeophysical evidence for active volcanism and associated elevated heat flow beneath the WAIS near the critical region where ice streaming begins. If this heat flow is indeed controlling ice-stream formation, then penetration of ocean waters inland of the thin hot crust of the active portion of the West Antarctic rift system could lead to the disappearance of ice streams, and possibly trigger a collapse of the inland ice reservoir.

25 years of being aware there's causes other than man-made global warming that caused the Antarctic ice sheet to melt.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



dalyplanet vor 21 Stunden

<https://www.nature.com/articles/361526a0>

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



soudesuka vor 21 Stunden (Bearbeitet)

Fantastic, a 25-year-old study that you're implying that the glaciologists forgot.

You've been doing this consistently for hours. Why?

Gefällt mir 15 Antworten Link Melden



jtssigman vor 20 Stunden

No offense intended, but persistence is only a virtue if you're not a F-up.

Gefällt mir 7 Antworten Link Melden



nfnik-washingtonpost vor 20 Stunden

Lying is fun???

Gefällt mir 6 Antworten Link Melden



1elf vor 20 Stunden

Not just hours. Dalyplanet has been posting this kind of bilge for years, whenever the issue of climate change comes up in a news story. His posts always sounds scientific but his proof tends to be cherry picked facts, unsourced charts, or old scientific theories. Note that the article he posts is from 1993, as if nothing has changed about science in 25 years. No matter how often he is proven wrong, he never backs down.

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



gmb92 vor 21 Stunden (Bearbeitet)

That would be a potential feedback to global warming, which would indicate the contribution to SLR is underestimated - one possibility for why models tend to be conservative compared to paleo observations.

"Scientists have noted volcanic eruptions tended to increase as glaciers melted."

<https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/get-ready-for-more-volcanic-eruptions-as-the-planet-warms/>

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden

Weitere Antworten Anzeigen



i_believed_you vor 21 Stunden

I look forward to seeing Manhattan flood regularly.

/s

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



ghcso vor 21 Stunden

Then you're going to love Miami.....Please have your row boat allow you to enter on the third floor of our building to access your condo....

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



mason fairfax vor 20 Stunden

Then check out the movie "The Day After Tomorrow". Great special effects.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



michael burns vor 21 Stunden

As you can see by the data cited in the article, the changes taking place in Antarctica are happening at an exponential rate, not a linear rate. The rate of ice loss will continue to accelerate since there is nothing occurring to prevent it. Carbon dioxide emissions are not decreasing. They are actually increasing. Carbon dioxide concentrations in the atmosphere are currently more than 411 ppm as measured at Mauna Loa, and they are increasing with every passing year. When the West Antarctic Ice Sheet collapses, the state that will suffer the most is Florida. Trump will lose Mar a Lago, but more importantly we will lose the nuclear power plants at St. Lucie and Turkey Point. It therefore will not simply be a coastal flooding catastrophe, but also a radioactive catastrophe.

Gefällt mir 6 Antworten Link Melden



jtssigman vor 21 Stunden

He could waltz through those meltdowns in a Hazmat Suit, but he's too awesome for that...

... Mortal minds can only manage so much KenM at a time...

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



soudesuka vor 21 Stunden

"Mortal minds can only manage so much KenM at a time"

But what about those meatballs in Congress?

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



maintaining my anonymity vor 21 Stunden

Nope nothing to see here. Pay no attention to the man behind the curtain
Sincerely Trump EPA

Gefällt mir 5 Antworten Link Melden



coofefe vor 21 Stunden

Pruitt is busy looking for a Chick Filet franchise.

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



vancouver bc ron vor 21 Stunden

Doesn't matter. We'll all be toast someday anyway.

<http://www.bbc.com/earth/story/20150323-how-long-will-life-on-earth-last>

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



bobbywhite vor 21 Stunden

Thanks for posting this. It was quite engaging, describing a myriad of possible scenarios leading to the end of all, or essentially all, life on earth and the likely time frames for each, should they happen.

The article ends with this cheery, toast -related thought

But that's not all. Beginning around 5 billion years from now, the Sun will expand, becoming a swollen star called a red giant. By 7.5 billion years in the future, its surface will be past where Earth's orbit is now. So the expanding Sun will engulf, and destroy, the Earth.

It's been suggested that Earth might escape. The Sun will lose mass as it grows, so Earth will spiral further out. But according to calculations performed in 2008, this won't be enough to save our planet. If that's true, the only hope lies with us. If any humans are still around, they might have the technology to move the Earth to safety. Otherwise, life on Earth has a maximum life expectancy of 7.5 billion years.

Good luck folks. I hope you find a way to save the animals.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



presto668 vor 20 Stunden

A lot less than that. We have about half a billion before the planet becomes uninhabitable.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



rubesfordon vor 21 Stunden

I am not a Republican. I believe in science. I am not a Republican. I know there is no special god that loves American Conservatives. I am not a Republican. I actually have some compassion for people. I am not a Republican. I do not love money more than my environment. I am not a Republican. I do not deny and then spread hate. etc. etc. etc.

Gefällt mir 9 Antworten Link Melden



bill-n-ted vor 21 Stunden

Just a little science:

The total amount of water is ALWAYS the same. It lives in a steady state: the volume of all the water is 333 million cubic miles--it has ALWAYS been that. What was changed is the some of it in trapped in ice.

When the water changes for ice (solid water) to "normal" water the surface water changes. This is because ice has less volume. (Notice that when you add ice to water and wait, the glass "fills". But the volume remains the same.)

Global warming is simply the water "apparently" filling the glass. It's the same volume of water; the ice is melting.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



phildecarp vor 21 Stunden (Bearbeitet)

True, but much of that ice that is melting is on land and above sea level. Once it melts and runs into the sea, the sea level rises.

Gefällt mir 12 Antworten Link Melden



nfnik-washingtonpost vor 21 Stunden

Plus water when heated expands. Thermal expansion is accounting for about 50% of the total rise at the moment.

Science.

Gefällt mir 8 Antworten Link Melden



i_believed_you vor 21 Stunden

Thank you for showing me that other people do realize what's happening.

Gefällt mir 7 Antworten Link Melden



geotype vor 21 Stunden

Where did you go to school?

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



nfnik-washingtonpost vor 21 Stunden

Trumpettes don't need no school. Just the pronouncements of Glorious Leader.

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



soudesuka vor 21 Stunden

"This is because ice has less volume."

Bzzt, wrong. Ice has more volume than water.

"(Notice that when you add ice to water and wait, the glass "fills". But the volume remains the same.) "

This is completely nonsensical.

"Global warming is simply the water "apparently" filling the glass. It's the same volume of water; the ice is melting."

Not even close, though I'm pretty sure that literally nobody has been claiming that large quantities of water have been created ex nihilo by AGW.

Gefällt mir 7 Antworten Link Melden

Weitere Antworten Anzeigen



peternz vor 21 Stunden

Our great grand children are going to blame us for this. Unlike our great grand parents, who were ignorant of the dangers, we knew the science and allowed his to happen anyway.

Gefällt mir 9 Antworten Link Melden



miow zeh-dung vor 21 Stunden

Models show that we must get rid of 70% of the human population to create a sustainable environment on the planet. So, which religion will go first to advocate birth control?

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



spontaneous order vor 21 Stunden

You go first to set an example.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



jedediah smytheson vor 21 Stunden (Bearbeitet)

Oops.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



jedediah smytheson vor 21 Stunden

Can't do that. Suicide is a sin. War is the answer.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



jedediah smytheson vor 21 Stunden

Well, that 70% figure assumes the other animals are still here. I say, let's kill all the other mammals on Earth, except cattle, sheep, goats, pigs, horses, dogs, and cats. Whales, dolphins, and porpoises first! If that's not enough, kill all the dinosaurs (birds) and reptilians. What could go wrong? BTW, the world's population at the time of Jesus was about 300+ million people, which is less than 5% of our current 7+ billion (about 300+ million).

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



gmb92 vor 21 Stunden

Outstanding group of scientists authoring this study. Good write-up.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



vancouver bc ron vor 21 Stunden

Mitch won't care. Turtles love water.

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden

 **dorsetbluevinney** vor 21 Stunden
We don't have to worry too much. Trump says climate change isn't real (and we are supposed to trust him). But, if he changes his mind on that, he'll just arrange a quick summit with a few penguins and come back declaring that the problem is solved, and we won't need to worry about ice melting ever again.

Gefällt mir  6 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **linn32** vor 21 Stunden
K, well, bye Florida! Go vote for Trump again.

Gefällt mir  5 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **a_cappella** vor 21 Stunden
Glub, glub, burrrle, burrrle.....

Gefällt mir  Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **bobbywhite** vor 21 Stunden
I call dibs on their Electoral College votes!!!

Bobby White
Californian

Gefällt mir  3 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **miow zeh-dung** vor 21 Stunden
It is time we pull out of all scientific knowledge about the world around us.
God will save the earth!
All we have to do is trust Donald Trump and his clan of ignorant, deplorable supporters!

Gefällt mir  8 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **rubesfordon** vor 21 Stunden (Bearbeitet)
On the bright side... I did meet a couple of ex-Trumpers that have finally woken up.

Gefällt mir  4 Antworten  Link  Melden 



jtssigman vor 21 Stunden

#alt-woke

#IntersectionalTrumpism

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



seemstome vor 21 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

Within the next fifty years there will be a nuclear catastrophe as well as rising seas. Of course there will also be the aftermath of germ warfare and the rise of artificial intelligence hostile to its human creators.

People will long for the great days of Obama when there was still an America, even those who voted for Trump.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



paul tse vor 21 Stunden

this is an interesting observation on the impacts of the high speed antarctic ice melting.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



un mal hombre vor 21 Stunden

Good, perhaps like Noah's Great Flood, we need to truly drain the swamp, especially that sewer in DC, I say purge and cleanse it all.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



gerry patey vor 21 Stunden

Can't help but think of an American Stand Up comedian once describing American I.Q.

A hurricane is coming. Fine, I will strap myself to a tree and survive.

Sir, it is not the wind that is going to get you.

It is the flying Volkswagon car or cow which will crush your ribs.

Gefällt mir 6 Antworten Link Melden



big ben from la mesa vor 21 Stunden

One of the funniest lines I've ever heard; actually, it goes like this:
"It's not **that** the wind is blowing, it's **what** the wind is blowing."
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RQD7Fzid1xI>

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



gerry patey vor 21 Stunden

Touche, you are correct.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



rubesfordon vor 21 Stunden

@gerrypatey LOL

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



vancouver bc ron vor 21 Stunden

But how can this be? It's kinda chilly today in Vancouver BC.

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



chloemilo vor 21 Stunden

Really ... and that is your scientific assumption

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



a_cappella vor 21 Stunden

A local weather event is proof of the state of the climate?

We've had quite the warm spell in Belleville, Ontario.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



vancouver bc ron vor 21 Stunden

I guess I should have stated that I'm being sarcastic

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



lewfournier1 vor 21 Stunden

Hard to tell these days

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



bobbywhite vor 21 Stunden

The lack of overt belligerence is often a sign.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



giantsmax vor 21 Stunden

The problem is that most of red state America would cheer if coastal California went under water.

Gefällt mir 5 Antworten Link Melden



venenumreligio vor 21 Stunden

Until they realized that those coastal Californians would be forced to move further inland, i.e. closer to "red state America".

Gefällt mir 6 Antworten Link Melden



bobbywhite vor 21 Stunden

Trust me..there are years that, here in California, *we* would cheer about being underwater.

Gefällt mir 5 Antworten Link Melden



dorsetbluevinney vor 21 Stunden

There's plenty of low-lying land in the deep red south (Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Florida).

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



lewfournier1 vor 21 Stunden

And yet they keep building or rebuilding in those spots.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden

Weitere Antworten Anzeigen



madmanmike vor 21 Stunden

Only one remedy. Reduce the number of humans.

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



jtssigman vor 21 Stunden

u 1st volunteer?

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



a_cappella vor 21 Stunden

How 'bout birth control?

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



madmanmike vor 21 Stunden

Bingo!

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



jtssigman vor 21 Stunden

The problem is men; women were God's 2nd mistake...

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



ottawamd vor 21 Stunden

<https://www.livescience.com/38956-most-vulnerable-cities-to-flooding.html>

5 US cities.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



geotype vor 21 Stunden

Miami floods often now at high tides

Gefällt mir 5 Antworten Link Melden



nfnik-washingtonpost vor 20 Stunden

That water is just your imagination.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



alternative facts vor 21 Stunden

There are going to be a lot of displaced Chinese and Indians.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



jamesdean vor 21 Stunden

Not Shenzen!!! That's where everything comes from...

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



giantsmax vor 21 Stunden

If Trump can put 50% tariffs on Antarctic water that should slow them down.

Gefällt mir 7 Antworten Link Melden



venenumreligio vor 21 Stunden

We'll just build a sea wall and make Antarctica pay for it.

Gefällt mir 16 Antworten Link Melden



seemstome vor 21 Stunden

Brilliant! Email Fox news so that Trump can tweet it.

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



seafred vor 21 Stunden

Maybe Trump can stage a photo-op with the Antarctic ice cap and develop a "very special relationship" with it!

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden

 **i_go_pogo** vor 21 Stunden
"...nations have a short window — perhaps no more than a decade — to cut greenhouse-gas emissions if they hope to avert some of the worst consequences of climate change."

Our nation decided not to bother with that when we elected Donald Trump. We had a choice between keeping the oceans down and keeping black people down, and look what we decided.

Gefällt mir  5 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **rubesfordon** vor 21 Stunden
3 trillion tons since 1992. 40% in the last 5 years...and Trump fiddles, with his dipstick.

Gefällt mir  6 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **sumyounguy** vor 18 Stunden
dipsticks

Gefällt mir  Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **giantsmax** vor 21 Stunden
There was a young genius back in the 70's from Texas, named Sheldon. I will see what he is up to these days, maybe he can help.

Gefällt mir  3 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **b scott** vor 21 Stunden
No worries. Trump said it's a Chinese hoax ., And he knows more about ice than anyone .

Gefällt mir  5 Antworten  Link  Melden 



clowns_middle_jokers vor 21 Stunden (Bearbeitet)

"The result also reinforces that nations have a short window — perhaps no more than a decade — to cut greenhouse-gas emissions if they hope to avert some of the worst consequences of climate change"

=====

Not good ... Obama's deal with China gives them 30 years to set baselines to START measuring reductions and it was praised as a huge success ... uh oh

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



i_go_pogo vor 21 Stunden

Obama? Really???

Gefällt mir 5 Antworten Link Melden



a_cappella vor 21 Stunden

I get it: global warming is Obama's fault.

Thanks for the whataboutism.

Gefällt mir 9 Antworten Link Melden



1elf vor 20 Stunden

Wrong. China has been forging ahead with cleaner/alternative energy projects, for example to reduce its reliance on coal, if only because of the major pollution in some of its cities is an economic disaster.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



posttoastie1 vor 21 Stunden

Why doesn't someone tell those pinhead glaciers that "global warming" is a hoax?

Gefällt mir 6 Antworten Link Melden



justanotherdog vor 21 Stunden

Here's an old story I found once.

<http://slowdrowning.blogspot.com/>

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



lanights vor 21 Stunden

The left likes to act all sanctimonious, like it's only republicans with the carbon footprints. Why don't you blokes lead by example and adopt these low carbon lifestyles you want the govt to enforce? We'll wait....

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



rubesfordon vor 21 Stunden

Many of us do.

Gefällt mir 9 Antworten Link Melden



lanights vor 21 Stunden

And I applaud that.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



jtssigman vor 21 Stunden (Bearbeitet)

I would 2 but I only have 1 arm

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



bobbywhite vor 21 Stunden

I don't want your applause..I want you to do something.

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



jtssigman vor 21 Stunden

I'm trying to look busy. I have a grimace of concern on my face. What more do you want from me?

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



bobbywhite vor 21 Stunden

I wasn't talking to you..did you think I was?

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



jtssigman vor 21 Stunden

Yes. My narcissism is tending toward solipsism, says my shrink... I assume everything's about me...

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



a_cappella vor 21 Stunden

"What more do you want from me?"

Try a knowledge base and an understanding of basic physics.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden

Weitere Antworten Anzeigen



geotype vor 21 Stunden

It's repubs who are in denial of climate change/AGW

Gefällt mir 6 Antworten Link Melden



lanights vor 21 Stunden

What's the carbon footprint of WaPo?

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



geotype vor 21 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

Far, far less than Koch Industries

Gefällt mir 8 Antworten Link Melden



jmiller10 vor 21 Stunden (Bearbeitet)

Are Chinese and Indians Republican? Those two countries are almost half the world's population

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



a_cappella vor 21 Stunden

The Republicans are their best friends.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



jmiller10 vor 21 Stunden (Bearbeitet)

That accounts for the supposed trade war with China that Trump has instigated? It's a human problem, the US makes up about 5% of the world population

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



thistlepdx vor 20 Stunden

"It is well known that Americans consume far more natural resources and live much less sustainably than people from any other large country of the world. "A child born in the United States will create thirteen times as much ecological damage over the course of his or her lifetime than a child born in Brazil," reports the Sierra Club's Dave Tilford, adding that the average American will drain as many resources as 35 natives of India and consume 53 times more goods and services than someone from China."

<https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/american-consumption-habits/>

https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/EG.USE.COMM.FO.ZS?end=2015&start=2015&view=bar&year_low_desc=false

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



terrydactyl vor 21 Stunden

The boat is sinking but only the left should bail? While the right enjoys the benefit?

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden

Weitere Antworten Anzeigen



giantsmax vor 21 Stunden

I am heading to Fresno now to buy some beach front property.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



bobbywhite vor 21 Stunden

Please register in time to vote against nunes.

<https://andrewjanzforcongress.com>

Gefällt mir 5 Antworten Link Melden



thoughts from australia vor 21 Stunden

When asked for a comment EPA Director Scott Pruitt said, "um what's Antarctica?"

Gefällt mir 8 Antworten Link Melden



giantsmax vor 21 Stunden

So he truly is an American!

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



richard88 vor 21 Stunden

What about ice formations in the Arctic? Are they increasing? For every action there's an equal and opposite reaction.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



terrydactyl vor 21 Stunden

One word, NO

<http://nsidc.org/arcticseaicenews/charctic-interactive-sea-ice-graph/>

Gefällt mir 6 Antworten Link Melden



deep space vor 21 Stunden

richard - I think you do not properly understand Newton's third law.

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



soudesuka vor 21 Stunden

"What about ice formations in the Arctic? Are they increasing? For every action there's an equal and opposite reaction."

LOL!

Gefällt mir 6 Antworten Link Melden



a_cappella vor 21 Stunden

richard displays quite the lack of understanding of basic physics.

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden

Weitere Antworten Anzeigen



zlwonder vor 21 Stunden

More hysterical conjecture. This, from the article, in order: "If the acceleration continues...", "could be realized...", "perhaps...", "could allow..", "If...", "perhaps...", "the uncertainty...", "controversial study...", "could rise...", "if...", "were it to continue...", "There is no proof...", "I don't know...", "not necessarily see...", "worst case projections...", "Whether...", "depends on...", "could deliver...", "could help...", "if...", "then maybe...", "could drive...". Ridiculous.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



justanotherdog vor 21 Stunden

This is not how actual knowledge and reading work.

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



zlwonder vor 21 Stunden

It's how hysteria and propaganda work.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



justanotherdog vor 21 Stunden

Your propaganda sounds pretty hysterical ... my sides still hurt from laughing.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



rubesfordon vor 21 Stunden

@ZLWONDER Like FOX????

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



regression2themean vor 21 Stunden

Those North Korean beaches will get even bigger now.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



a_cappella vor 21 Stunden

No, the rising sea levels will cover the beaches that exist.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



gerrynofishing vor 21 Stunden

If climate change melts the icecaps and the Earth floods, all that means is that Humans will be wiped clean off the planet and that is a good thing. New life will arise

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



mic mac 77 vor 21 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

Every red-blooded American knows that global warming was invented by the Jew Globalists in order to take over the USA with their black helicopters. I read it on the Interwebs. ;-)

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



deep space vor 21 Stunden

You are wrong. The Chinese are hacking into the satellites and faking these photographs to make it look like the ice is melting. If you would actually travel to Antarctica, you would see it is all still there.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



mic mac 77 vor 21 Stunden

Source?.. no blogs, Infowars, or youtube please.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



terrydactyl vor 21 Stunden

And here I thought it was Area 51.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



kefka p vor 21 Stunden

points and laughs at deep space

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



deep space vor 21 Stunden

I am just going by what Trump told me. I am looking for ways in which this Chinese hoax could be perpetrated in the face of all this data scientists are gathering.

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



deep space vor 21 Stunden

A great technology could be if we move the earth slightly further away from the sun to compensate.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



conantheagrarian vor 21 Stunden

What if it got away and kept going? Then what?

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



deep space vor 21 Stunden

Then we simply burn more fossil fuels to compensate. That's the beauty of the plan.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



conantheagrarian vor 21 Stunden

I like the way you think.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



deltoid69 vor 21 Stunden

Urth git hot milions yers ago. Nutin knew. Eye hurd that on talk raydio.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



jtssigman vor 21 Stunden

Did yu now about sun-spots?

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



mic mac 77 vor 21 Stunden

And the Ice Age? ;-)

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



giantsmax vor 21 Stunden

eye no thet lyuns hav spetz.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



deltoid69 vor 21 Stunden

Mi son have frkles.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



jtssigman vor 21 Stunden

Did yu now a Ginger earns a frkle for every soul he steals?

Gingers ar the Debbil's chillins

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



deltoid69 vor 21 Stunden

Eye lyke Marry An betet.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



jtssigman vor 21 Stunden

U would!

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



klarn mxyzptlk vor 21 Stunden

Truly hilarious it is when believers in "evolution" [which means "unfolding"] cry and whine when things are said to be changing. A more consistent reaction would be to cheer and applaud when they claim things ARE changing since that, allegedly, would be evidence for their belief system.

Instead, we get more fear porn. Hypocrites!

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



geotype vor 21 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

Sure...climate changes but never at the **rates** we're seeing today. [key word - rate]

Learn the difference

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



jtssigman vor 21 Stunden

How can the people ever believe in evolution when they've never seen Darwin's face appear on a piece of toast?

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



annabelleigh vor 21 Stunden

When I saw how much money someone got for the Jesus on toast, I really thought about painting melted butter on the bread and making one myself. I just couldn't bring myself to take advantage of woefully ignorant people. See, atheists do have morals! :-)

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



giantsmax vor 21 Stunden

survival of the fittest--bread can survive a toaster much better than a finger trying to get toast out of the toaster can.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



conantheagrarian vor 21 Stunden

They found the face of jesus on a gas station bathroom floor a few years back out in the central valley of California. The owners didn't really want the people to turn the place into a shrine, and it all blew over after a while. Maybe got scuffed off or they mopped the floor. Time marches on.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



sartran vor 21 Stunden

My god.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden

Weitere Antworten Anzeigen



giantsmax vor 21 Stunden

Atlantis is rising again! I have missed Atlantis, I can't wait to get back home.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



geotype vor 21 Stunden

" Trump acknowledges climate change — at his golf course. The billionaire, who called global warming a hoax, warns of its dire effects in his company's application to build a sea wall."

"A permit application for the wall, filed by Trump International Golf Links Ireland, explicitly cites global warming and its consequences — increased erosion due to rising sea levels and extreme weather this century — as a chief justification for building the structure."

<https://www.politico.com/story/2016/05/donald-trump-climate-change-golf-course-223436>

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



mic mac 77 vor 21 Stunden

The courtiers will say "that's just Trump being a shrewd business man".

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



giantsmax vor 21 Stunden

Mexico has offered to pay.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



slowtime vor 21 Stunden

One of our major parties the GOP has at its head Trump, who do not believe in global warming or its effects on the planet. It is very important to get the GOP out of power by voting in 18/20, so the USA can go back to switching to solar and wind not Trump's coal fantasy of the 19th Century. Vote for change not head in the sand politics --- Vote Democratic from mayor to president in 18/20.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



moronmoron vor 22 Stunden

It could be bad. Wait for it. Wait for it. Wait. Wait.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



soudesuka vor 22 Stunden

Waiting is actually a bad idea, since warming is accelerating.

Gefällt mir 5 Antworten Link Melden



sartran vor 21 Stunden

You mean like Miami, Houston, New Orleans and Puerto Rico are waiting for it.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



pogo4 vor 21 Stunden

Bangladesh goes first.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



conantheagrarian vor 21 Stunden

And the Bangladeshis are welcomed to resettle in let me think on that.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



gregor t vor 22 Stunden

The willful ignorance and stupidity and arrogance of so many who deny the results of over a hundred years of scientific study and show themselves to be willing to destroy the world as we have known it for the last several hundred years is so depressing. I'm an old man though and have no children so at least there is that. Ciao.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



keith sabin vor 21 Stunden

GT, I'm a middle-aged man and have no children, and so I too can half-divest of the insupportable grief at the planet's seemingly inexorable decline...that I won't see the end of...but will see more of the interstitial stages of. Good luck, kids!

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



annabelleigh vor 21 Stunden

I'm also child-free. Thank goodness! I feel bad for the animals, plants and people who are following us. It ain't gonna be pretty.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



pogo4 vor 21 Stunden

I'm hoping my kids will swim over to visit me in the old folks home.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



pogo4 vor 22 Stunden

Head for the hills! West of Niagra Falls and east of the Rockies should be OK.

This may be a plot by those evil Canadians, the ones who wanted to sell steel to America. We should ask Putin what to do.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



angryobserver vor 22 Stunden

Nothing will be done until major coastal cities get perma flooded.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



stephen butler vor 22 Stunden (Bearbeitet)

Right idea, but not quite that long. When the damage from climate change exceeds our ability to pay for it, insurance companies won't insure anything on the coast, businesses and wealthy people abandon these cities, that will be enough to force our glorious leaders to act.

In the spirit of your own comment, it will be too late.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



jmiller10 vor 22 Stunden (Bearbeitet)

pay for it? how do you propose it stop so it doesn't have to be paid for? Shut down driving, trucking, trains, ships, airplanes, no AC, no factories, etc forever worldwide?

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



stephen butler vor 21 Stunden

I'm a scientist, but a practical one. I understand that the global cooperation needed to prevent this damage simply isn't possible to achieve in the time we have. It's probably too late already.

What we *could* be doing is try to be competitive in the decades to come. The nation which will come out ahead a hundred years from now is the nation that is best prepared. We could be pouring money into R&D to give us better estimates of what will happen and when, developing and deploying new infrastructure to prepare for it, and preemptively moving critical infrastructure, like Wall St, which we don't want to be forced to deal with reactively.

Waiting for storms and floods to destroy property, and paying to rebuild it without even changing the flood-zoning, is the failure we are choosing today.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



annabelleigh vor 21 Stunden

I'm also a scientist and I believe it is also too late--simply because the nations of the world will not work together. Plus, there's too much CO2 in the atmosphere now. I have no problem with the belief that the human race has just about run it's course--geologically speaking. We weren't good stewards of our home. It's time to let the creatures that are able to survive us take over. I'm totally fine with that.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



stephen butler vor 21 Stunden

We are completely on the same page.

We only differ in that I am a hopeless idealist with a daughter, and I can't quite make myself let go of the chance that we will wake up, change the way we live, and learn to be good stewards.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



sartran vor 21 Stunden

There's this nifty thing called "electricity" they discovered a while back. It can do all kinds of amazing things!

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



stephen butler vor 21 Stunden

Electricity cannot pump out the ocean. Mother nature cannot be defeated on this. Human nature cannot be changed. Global Kumbaya is a unicorn dream whose time has already passed.

Moving to higher ground. More resilient structures. Better roads. Better medicines. Better insect control. More efficient armies for the inevitable wars. Drought resistant food. Better weather prediction. Better drainage. New fresh water supplies. Mold resistance. Better insulation. More efficient air conditioning.

These are amazing things that could matter, and there are thousands more if we would grow a collective brain. The right needs to stop pretending it isn't happening. The left needs to stop pretending it can be prevented. We all work together to predict, and manage climate change better than China and Russia, and we will see another golden age in the century to come.

Or we can sit in our beach property like deer in the headlights and watch while our species rips itself apart and functionally ends civilization.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



nwguy99 vor 22 Stunden

Climate Change?

Wasn't that caused by those Weak Canadians?

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



mic mac 77 vor 22 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

Regardless of what the Right thinks, big money seems to believe in climate science. The insurance companies are accounting for it, the Pentagon is counting on it and hedge funds everywhere are buying up northern farmland.

<https://www.quora.com/Why-are-so-many-hedge-fund-managers-buying-farmland>

Gefällt mir 8 Antworten Link Melden



sentinel2016 vor 22 Stunden

And Betsy works on vouchers to keep the educational level low.

Gefällt mir 5 Antworten Link Melden



angryobserver vor 22 Stunden

Low IQ will work against the one percent when the revolution starts. :)

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



sentinel2016 vor 22 Stunden

Not if cake is for free

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



pogo4 vor 22 Stunden

Will we get vouchers for funnel cake and corn dogs?

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



mic mac 77 vor 22 Stunden

I love funnel cake.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



nwguy99 vor 21 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

With lead additives, in small form mixed in to increase stupidity and also in bullet sized deployments.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



annabelleigh vor 22 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

When I was in my 20s, I really wanted to have two children. It didn't work out, and now I'm so thankful. Now I'm 57 and I'm so glad I won't be around for the worst of it. I think a lot of people believe technology will save our civilization. I think it will save the wealthy for a while, but in the end (who knows when that will be?) Mother Nature is going to win. I'm fine with that. The human race has turned the earth in to a trash dump. Future generations and the Plant and Animal Kingdoms are paying for it. Life will continue, just not as we know it now.

Gefällt mir 7 Antworten Link Melden



magnus maximus vor 22 Stunden

Climate change in the past has caused mass extinctions. Climate change now will also cause mass extinctions, but humans are not the ones who will go extinct because we have big brains and can react to changes in our environment. In the winter I turn on the furnace and in the summer I turn on the AC.

But all other species can only react to changes in the environment by genetically adapting to the changed environment. This takes a long time and most species simply go extinct.

Remember that the Bible tells us to be fruitful and multiply (overpopulation) and to subdue the earth and dominate it.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



pogo4 vor 21 Stunden

What does the bible say about subduing the Ocean? I think King Canute had the answer - executive orders!!!!

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



annabelleigh vor 21 Stunden

The Bible is BS. Total BS. It's attitudes like this that make me shake my head. When the earth's surface temperatures reach 136 degrees F in the shade your AC won't do squat. I can't believe you posted what you did. We are any other species. We also will go extinct one day.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



shaman vor 22 Stunden

So the adolescents just off from school are here oozing their political hormones all over with ignorant trump comments, when, in fact, this has been building up over decades and looms nearer and nearer. But no, a pathetic trump comment is the best they have.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



pogo4 vor 21 Stunden

I hate comments about ignorant Trump. I'm getting tired of hearing about him.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



pogo4 vor 22 Stunden

Trump should forget about his wall and build a dike around NYC. Think of the contracts!!!

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



shaman vor 22 Stunden

Who wants to save New York?

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



facts_do_matter vor 22 Stunden

People that rely on NY City tax payer dollars (Most of the Country)

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



cinnaplid vor 22 Stunden

Red states especially.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



allen braun - anti-pino vor 22 Stunden

But it's natural. So don't worry about it. Right?

It *can't* be the indiscriminate and continuous burning of fossil fuels and other emissions. That's just *silly*. Right?

Gefällt mir 6 Antworten Link Melden



bostondon vor 22 Stunden (Bearbeitet)

"Human-induced climate change is a HOAX I tell ya!!!" Said no one who believes in facts, science, and all that other good stuff.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



macionio vor 22 Stunden

All these Trump jokes just show that people aren't taking climate change seriously. When NYC falls into the ocean and the entire state of Florida gets wiped out by flooding, your hilarious crack about executive orders won't mean squat.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



achem vor 22 Stunden

The only silver lining is that Mara-lago is only a few feet above sea level.

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



al dubya vor 22 Stunden

Trumps our poorly educated president aaand America's Chump

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



cyiam vor 22 Stunden

Rick Scott's campaign slogan, "Miami's not underwater,.... yet!"

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



cinnaplid vor 22 Stunden

It was sort of amusing (in a sick way) to watch him sweating and struggling to read his statements on TV during Irma.

Vote these bums out.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



ellehcem vor 22 Stunden

Pretty simple in my book. Its all about the money.

Climate change its not a hoax; its is real and the sea levels are rising. Anyone would be dumb to build a sea level structure. New Orleans is a city that is below sea level. What were they thinking? What is a hoax is the brainwashing scare tactic that the media is doing to the citizens so federal & state governments can use to raise taxes.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



gregor t vor 22 Stunden

Um, if climate change is real and not a hoax then how is the media reporting it a "scare tactic"?

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



al dubya vor 22 Stunden

YOUR media

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



cinnaplid vor 22 Stunden

Tell us about YOUR media, dubya.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



gregor t vor 22 Stunden

So again, if it is not a hoax then how is reporting it a "scare tactic"?

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



middleground vor 22 Stunden

Citation for that?

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



gregor t vor 22 Stunden

Citation for what?

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



macionio vor 22 Stunden

Pretty sure they were thinking that it was on the coast where the biggest river in the country met the ocean, making it a natural hub for shipping and commerce. That goes for a lot of other cities, too. Major ports tend to be at sea level, because that's where the sea is. Major cities tend to spring up around major ports, because of the massive economic importance of ports.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



mic mac 77 vor 22 Stunden

Trump is probably happy about this, because of those beautiful ocean views, you could build some high-priced condos down there when all the ice melts.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



2018voter vor 22 Stunden

Thank god we have leaders like Scott Pruitt and the rest of the non-scientists in charge. It will be a bitter irony when their beachfront properties become worthless.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



sentinel2016 vor 22 Stunden

What are you talking about? Scotty can't even afford a condo in Washington and his wife needs a job.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



sarah menefee vor 21 Stunden

Unfortunately this will probably not happen in their lifetimes. Pruitt's grandchildren will suffer as well as those who follow. Adaptation, if it even occurs, takes a while.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



jannibal vor 22 Stunden

Not melting fast enough to drown Trump in the White House.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



d edwards vor 22 Stunden

This is sad. Trump's own staff gave Trump fake Climate Change "news"!

"The president rarely surfs the web on his own, but his staff have made a habit of slipping news stories on to his desk—including the occasional internet hoax about climate change. "

<http://www.politico.com/story/2017/05/15/donald-trump-fake-news-238379>

Wow. That's sad. A puppet-president that gets fed fake news AND admires Alex Jones.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



historywatcher vor 22 Stunden

No worries. If the Trumpster-Dumpster ever actually notices the floodwaters lapping the second floor of the White House, he'll just sign an Executive Order demanding that the Climate reverse itself. Then when nothing happens, he'll do a Tsunami of whaddabout Obama and whaddabout Hillary Tweets. Truly effective "leadership," Oh Mighty Energy Vampire!

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



gregor t vor 22 Stunden

I think he will actually be looking for the pizzing hookers

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



slightlycrazy vor 22 Stunden

oh, no, this can't be so. trump says climate change is a hoax! damn those chinese!

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden

 **conantheagrarian** vor 22 Stunden
How about we build some massive battery-powered compressors and make dry ice out of that CO2 and ship it to where those melting glaciers are and drill bore holes all over the place and pack them with dry ice. That should slow down the rising sea levels.

Gefällt mir  1 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **jmiller10** vor 22 Stunden
Darn it! If only Americans would quit driving their SUVs. It's completely their fault!

Gefällt mir  1 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **mic mac 77** vor 22 Stunden
When did the Right become anti-technological progress too?

Gefällt mir  3 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **jmiller10** vor 22 Stunden
I don't think the Chevy dealer asks your political affiliation when you buy a Suburban.

Gefällt mir  1 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **ep unum** vor 22 Stunden
 my Suburban.

Giggle

Gefällt mir  2 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **sentinel2016** vor 22 Stunden
Giggle much?

Gefällt mir  1 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **cinnaplid** vor 22 Stunden
Don't make eye contact with it. It clearly has a neurological problem.

Gefällt mir  2 Antworten  Link  Melden 



mic mac 77 vor 22 Stunden

No, but there seems to be a hostility towards electric cars, wind turbines and solar etc. Which, regardless of climate change, are an incredible technological achievement.

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



jmiller10 vor 22 Stunden

Telsa gave 9% pink slips....seems expensive electric cars aren't the answer

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



mic mac 77 vor 22 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

The entire American auto sector collapsed in 2008. And would still be dead without massive public investment.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



jmiller10 vor 22 Stunden

so it's not hostility to electric cars then.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



shaman vor 22 Stunden

No - GM collapsed.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden

Weitere Antworten Anzeigen



grac ian vor 22 Stunden

That's true - but I don't think most conservatives deep down dislike those things. What they don't like is the fact that they've become symbols for progressives to wave around like tribal totems - that, and the corporate welfare and subsidies that have gone along with them. Then again, there are all kinds of corporate welfare, everywhere. It would be unfair to say "green" tech is getting a free ride that is uniquely unfair...

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



jmiller10 vor 22 Stunden

I have three friends that drive a Tesla, all three are conservative. I have many friends that drive Suburban SUVs, Jeeps, Land Cruisers, Range Rovers - they're all mixed evenly between conservative and liberal.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



historywatcher vor 22 Stunden

I may be dumb, and a jingoist (look it up), but I am fake "Patriotic." Great response to a HUGE CHANGE in the only biosphere that we have. Send in your Darwin Award nomination today (before it's too late).

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



thrasonical trump vor 22 Stunden

So what can be done to stop it?

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



cinnaplid vor 22 Stunden

Do what you can to reduce your carbon footprint.

It's easy to do one's part.

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



thrasonical trump vor 22 Stunden

Yep it's easy but if you believe there would ever be a concerted effort by the world's population to do that you're dreaming.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



cinnaplid vor 22 Stunden

Look at mic mac 77's comment below.

Other countries have been doing it for years - why can't we get with the program?

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



thrasonical trump vor 22 Stunden

Beats me.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



christopher_s vor 22 Stunden

We can - and should. But it's probably not enough. We are very much in "the die is cast" territory, and barring some kind of magical technology, we are looking at a long period of warming while we claw our way to climate normalcy.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



gregor t vor 22 Stunden

There was until Trump blew it up by withdrawing from the Paris Climate Accord.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



ep unum vor 22 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

Wealth redistribution...what else?...it fixes everything.

Giggle

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



conantheagrarian vor 22 Stunden

Tax cuts for the wealthy. It fixes everything. And keep on giggling like this blithering fool.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



al dubya vor 22 Stunden

epu's 12

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



christopher_s vor 22 Stunden

Nothing, in the short term. (At least, not without epic, sci-fi movie global unity to end global warming). We're pretty much facing an era of trying to slow, rather than stop, the change, and figure out ways to mitigate effects that we can't stop.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden

Weitere Antworten Anzeigen



achem vor 22 Stunden

The White House is reporting that Trump has schedule a summit with Antarctica to address this.

A 4 minute video and commemorative coin marking this historic summit will be available for purchase.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



conantheagrarian vor 22 Stunden

They have called in the tailors for the Michelin Man and the Pillsbury Dough Boy to make him up a very fine snow suit.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



gregor t vor 22 Stunden

Pretty sure he will be creaming over the soon to be uncovered beaches.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



bostondon vor 22 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

"(This) result also reinforces that nations have a short window — perhaps no more than a decade — to cut greenhouse-gas emissions if they hope to avert some of the worst consequences of climate change."

"But...But...But all of this climate change as a result of human activity is a hoax!!!" All cued up on the turntable for the climate-change (or global-warming if one prefers) deniers' dancing and dining pleasure: Thomas Dolby's "She Blinded Me With Science".

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



natspete vor 22 Stunden

I've read too much here. I'm going to either CNN or GSN.

I'm actually a boss. No one enters without donuts or a pizza.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



mic mac 77 vor 22 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

I've looked around, WaPo is the best comment section going.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



slightlycrazy vor 22 Stunden

wsj is okay. pretty righty but mostly orderly and grammatical.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



d edwards vor 22 Stunden

Remember, each gallon of gasoline you burn sends about 20 pounds of CO₂ (a greenhouse gas) into the atmosphere,... EACH gallon. That is carbon that was previously sequestered in the ground for millions of years.

Gefällt mir 6 Antworten Link Melden



watersportsgate 2018 vor 22 Stunden

Mathematical literacy is not a right wing characteristic.

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



magnus maximus vor 22 Stunden (Bearbeitet)

Right! People should only burn hydrogen (it produces water that we can use) or biofuels (ethanol, bio-diesel and wood).

A carbon atom in a corn plant comes from the atmosphere. If you convert the corn to ethanol and burn the ethanol, the carbon ends up back in the atmosphere as carbon dioxide.

Most people argue that we have to burn fossil fuels to have a strong economy. But the pro-slave states made the same argument: we have to have slaves to have a strong economy.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



ep unum vor 22 Stunden

Oh noooo, climate change again?

Giggle

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



glaucomatose vor 22 Stunden

Oh noooo, another handle for giggles that I have to ignore?

Gefällt mir 9 Antworten Link Melden



ep unum vor 22 Stunden

A WAPO subscription glitch...I'll be back to my old self before you know it.

Giggle

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



gregor t vor 22 Stunden

Awesome response.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



screamingdizbusters vor 22 Stunden

There's other serious implications associated with polar ice caps melting - at what point does the fresh water begin to affect the salinity of the oceans and potentially threaten ocean life - the most plentiful food source on this planet? And....here's something I'm not sure is related, but it makes me wonder - what effect does the dispersion of weight by melting ice caps have on the earth's crust? Could the recent volcanic activity be influenced by melting ice caps? Maybe a volcano going off in Hawaii or Guatemala may seem like no big deal, but what if instead, Yellowstone or that other super volcano in Italy - Campi Flegrei which has shown serious recent activity were to go off? That sits under at least 500,000 people, and that's a small one...what if a really BIG one goes off? There are about 20 known supervolcanoes on Earth.....decreasing the weight dispersion on the earth's crust has got to cause an underlying shift in earth's magma core.....if one of the big ones actually does go off, I guess we won't have to worry about much anymore....we'll be the next dinosaurs

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



eric654 vor 22 Stunden

at what point does the fresh water begin to affect the salinity of the oceans and potentially threaten ocean life

It doesn't. The 159 Gt per year mentioned above is entering 71,800,000 Gt of southern ocean water.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



xwordplayer vor 22 Stunden

The real issue is whether the ocean currents that move cold water to warm and back again will be affected or change.

Gefällt mir 5 Antworten Link Melden



mah101 vor 22 Stunden

Exactly. Salinity is a major driver of ocean currents that move heat around the globe.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden

 **jake cutter** vor 22 Stunden

What is it with the number 10? Ted Danson gave us 10 years to fix the ocean in the late 80's and Al Gore gave us 10 years in the mid-2000's. Now we have another 10 years to fix Antarctic ice.

Gefällt mir  1 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **christopher_s** vor 22 Stunden

It gets a lot harder and more expensive as we go. I mean look at your house - your roof may not collapse right away if you don't fix that little leak. But give it time.

Gefällt mir  3 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **al dubya** vor 22 Stunden

What's Ted know? He's a bartender

Gefällt mir  1 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **cinnaplid** vor 22 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

I dunno. Bo Derek was 'hot' in the movie '10' - maybe you find that significant too.

Gefällt mir  1 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **gregor t** vor 22 Stunden

What is it with strawmen.

Gefällt mir  1 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **tkoho** vor 22 Stunden

What's the worst that could happen? Some real estate becomes worthless while other real estate becomes valuable. Maybe the storm cells become significantly more deadly, but that's what insurance is for. And possibly without the polar ice caps the ocean convection currents grind to a halt leaving the sea a barren wasteland, but I mean it's already full of plastic and oil spills anyway.

Gefällt mir  3 Antworten  Link  Melden 



radical middle vor 22 Stunden

The worst that could happen? You know these things have all been thought about at length. Google is your friend. Or are you merely being rhetorical? Insurance? We're talking flooding at a level that would bankrupt the country. Magnify Katrina and New Orleans across many areas of the country.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



slightlycrazy vor 22 Stunden

i think tk is being sarcastic

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



radical middle vor 22 Stunden

Wow. That went right over my head. I believe that climate change is by far the biggest threat facing us, and there have been so many trolls on this thread, I'm too busy whacking the moles. My ooops. Sorry about that TK

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



sentinel2016 vor 22 Stunden

Yep, no big deal, right?

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



middleground vor 22 Stunden

Tropical diseases heading north is not good. Farmland becoming unusable due to drought. Massive forest fires (got those). Farms having to move north (look up what's going on with the cranberry farmers in the northeast).

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



theansweris42 vor 22 Stunden

If the ice is melting how come my freezer still has ice? The bigger scientific question is when I close the freezer door, does the light go out? For far too long liberals have used science to poo poo our thoughtless bubbles. Its time we put an end to elite thinking.

Gefällt mir 5 Antworten Link Melden



al dubya vor 22 Stunden

Or just thinking in general ?

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



theansweris42 vor 22 Stunden

So assume global warming actually exists, couldn't we just make a huge and amazing icecube machine and turn it on either pole? Or maybe shrinking the sun a bit?

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



al dubya vor 22 Stunden

Trumpf loves you

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



docsider vor 22 Stunden

The melt rate has tripled in the past decade, the study concluded.

Man ... wasn't that on Obama's watch?

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



anacanapanasan vor 22 Stunden

Yup. Obama ordered it to melt. You are so right on with your science.

Gefällt mir 6 Antworten Link Melden



mic mac 77 vor 22 Stunden

Obama signed the Climate Accord, Trump scrapped it.

Gefällt mir 5 Antworten Link Melden



watersportsgate 2018 vor 22 Stunden

Mitch McConnell and Paul Ryan's watch.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden

Weitere Antworten Anzeigen



natspete vor 22 Stunden

None of us will be around when scientists are right or wrong. I studied science till I ultimately got a journo degree..

But this is clear as day. The Caps melt and it will be another 44 years till the Stanley Cup arrives in the DMV..

Sorry. Caps fan. The glass is always 10 percent above water. Go Caps Go!

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



christopher_s vor 22 Stunden

That doesn't sound correct. If gains in life expectancy continue at even a fraction of the pace that they have over the past 50 years, there will be many people -adults included - alive today that will still be here in 2100.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



natspete vor 22 Stunden

True that. And Redskins and Cubs fans will wonder where it all went wrong.

Chris, you clearly are a boss or a manager. Can I send you my resume? :D

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



rattus vor 22 Stunden

We already see the results. Should have stuck with the science degree. I did.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



hbinncfi vor 22 Stunden

Technology exists for economical conversion to electric autos and solar homes. The ignorant man in the White House is a fool.

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



natspete vor 22 Stunden

Go fire up some coal and make a decent barbecue ;)

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



hbinncfl vor 22 Stunden

What does that mean, Pete?

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



léa roy vor 22 Stunden

I DO NOT BELIEVE IT
DO
NOT
BELIEVE IT

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



anacanapanasan vor 22 Stunden

That must be DAVID DENNISON!!!

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



natspete vor 22 Stunden

I believe that we will win!
I believe that we... ah shoot. kitty cat wants to play.. Go Kitty!
F Trump.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



gregor t vor 22 Stunden

I hope you have your fingers in your ears while you chant this. It would be appropriate.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



old hilo boy vor 22 Stunden

Here's a link to an excellent graphic that lets a viewer get a good sense of time scale and changes.

[https://www.explainkcd.com/wiki/index.php/1732: Earth Temperature Timeline](https://www.explainkcd.com/wiki/index.php/1732: Earth_Temperature_Timeline)

This is for the "but the earth has warmed and cooled before" people, who are making a true but irrelevant statement.

Gefällt mir 5 Antworten Link Melden



dalyplanet vor 22 Stunden

You cannot combine high-resolution data with ultra low resolution data and call it science. What you call it is propaganda.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



glaucomatose vor 22 Stunden

Of course you can; what a profoundly silly statement. That's like arguing we can't have navigational charts because the Coast Guard measures the depths of harbor approaches to the foot with high-resolution sonar but NOAA uses lower-resolution hydrographic surveys to measure depths out at sea.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



radical middle vor 22 Stunden

The trolls are out in force on this article. I often wonder why they feel so compelled to join the Greek (denier) chorus. It's practically pathological. One wonders if there isn't a lot of energy being expended because there's a small, quiet voice in many that has to appreciate that climate science **is** science, and virtually no scientific organization in the world denies that we're warming, and that humans are causing it.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



sentinel2016 vor 22 Stunden

LOL. Please explain this in more detail.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



soudesuka vor 21 Stunden

"You cannot combine high-resolution data with ultra low resolution data and call it science. What you call it is propaganda."

That's incredibly silly.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



dalyplanet vor 21 Stunden

You guys have no idea what you're talking about. You don't understand science.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



old hilo boy vor 20 Stunden

On the contrary. Just what is your scientific background? What field? What training? As for me, I have a PhD in ecological anthropology and spent decades teaching prehistory. When you teach prehistory, you realize how important graphics can be and how very poorly the average college student (not to mention the average climate change denier) understand both short and long spans of time.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



nonalisa vor 20 Stunden

"This study has demonstrated that augmenting multispectral satellite data with panchromatic satellite data at a higher resolution can increase the precision and accuracy with which multispectral data can be classified by the ECHO algorithm."

<https://engineering.purdue.edu/ABE/people/Papers/bernard.a.engel.1/panchromati>

WHO doesn't understand science?

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden

Weitere Antworten Anzeigen



mic mac 77 vor 22 Stunden

Climate science isn't doubted anywhere in the civilized world but here.

Gefällt mir 16 Antworten Link Melden



millermatic vor 22 Stunden

To be fair... lots of us here don't doubt it.

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



rattus vor 22 Stunden

We aren't civilized anymore.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



vinoman1953 vor 22 Stunden

Amazing how many fools don't understand evolutionary processes. It's coming, u can't change it. The world is in a constant evolutionary process. How can you argue the evolution of man and deny the natural changes of climate? News flash libbies - the mountains, plains and deserts contain ocean fossils. The ocean grows and it recedes. Public school has really screwed u people up. And most of have been to ollege! Sad.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



christopher_s vor 22 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

I believe we are taking issue with "natural changes of climate." Yeah, if Yellowstone blows, we're toast. But cooking ourselves isn't "natural."

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



anacanapanasan vor 22 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

I went to ollege and I do not agree that humans have nothing to do with this. But it is ok if you want to say so. It is your constitutional right. Even if it is wrong.

It is. :)

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



radical middle vor 22 Stunden

Look in the mirror as you're using the word "fools". Better to keep your mouth shut and keep people wondering than open it and remove all doubt. Suggestion: Try reading the article again. This time for comprehension. Hint: The antarctic melting has nothing to do with "evolutionary processes". Since we are actually in slight solar dimming phase right now, the earth should be getting cooler. It's not.

Climate change denial is the strongest in this country. Now that's something we should actually be calling "sad".

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden

Weitere Antworten Anzeigen



léa roy vor 22 Stunden

if global warming is real why would one of the man with the highest IQ : our president, wouldn't believe it ? that doesnt make sense

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



anacanapanasan vor 22 Stunden

No. 1 in his class at Penn. Or so he said...er....lied.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



sentinel2016 vor 22 Stunden

It is "men" and he can't spell either!!

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



LiberalMillennialCanuck vor 22 Stunden

Do what you can: eat less meat, upgrade your A/C is it may be leaking or don't use A/C, take shorter hot showers, drive less if possible... educate yourself, your kids and friends without preaching on what the most effective ways are to reduce your carbon footprint... and vote.

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



bleinheim74 vor 22 Stunden

I'm going to eat more penguins, that will help keep that ice in Antarctica from being weighed down so easily and falling into the sea. As for stop using A/C....lol...good luck with that. You first lol.

Besides, the electricity you used to make your comment caused another chunk of Antarctica to break off. Way to go man....

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



léa roy vor 22 Stunden

99% of warming is coming from china & india

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



bleinheim74 vor 22 Stunden

I know it is. That's been known for many years. But the dingbats posting here just want another something to rant about Trump on.

Ack...I have to stop posting. Seas just rose another one tenth of a millimeter. I now have a dolphin in my swimming pool.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



LiberalMillennialCanuck vor 22 Stunden

No it isn't... the US is number 2 in total emissions and number 3 in per capita emissions. What source did you use to make your statement?

<https://www.ucsusa.org/global-warming/science-and-impacts/science/each-countrys-share-of-co2.html#.WyF7rqdKiUk>

Gefällt mir 5 Antworten Link Melden



LiberalMillennialCanuck vor 22 Stunden

bleinheim74, I understand you feel attacked because you enjoy the comfort of western living standards, but if we can make an effort to be more efficient, why not try? I'm only advocating for people to do what they can. Do you not see pollution and climate change as serious concerns? Are you willing to state that world is so vast a place that actions made by people cannot possibly impact it?

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



radical middle vor 22 Stunden

Wrong.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden

Weitere Antworten Anzeigen



christopher_s vor 22 Stunden

The truly tragic thing - and what future generations will most scorn us for - is that there is ample renewable energy, at our fingertips with existing technology. But heaven forfend that a few thousand coal miners have to get jobs installing solar panels instead of contracting black lung.

We have seen the enemy, and it is us.

Gefällt mir 5 Antworten Link Melden



natspete vor 22 Stunden

That Titanic movie which me and my wife have watched 10 times or so now,.. Love it .. in 2018, impossible with the Solo movie and all is actually ok. No worries.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



mic mac 77 vor 22 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

Are you saying that the new Star Wars flick is crap? I haven't seen it yet.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



natspete vor 22 Stunden

No. It's pretty good. We saw it last week :D

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



mic mac 77 vor 22 Stunden *(Bearbeitet)*

I heard Lawrence Kasdan (Empire Strikes Back) helped write it. So I'm hoping it's for grown-ups.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



glaucomatose vor 22 Stunden

It's not. It's Ron Howard-led crap.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



mic mac 77 vor 22 Stunden

Ron Howard?! Who in their right mind let him direct a Star Wars movie?

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



mic mac 77 vor 22 Stunden

The Right would prefer we spent money on proving the existence of angels.

Gefällt mir 3 Antworten Link Melden



smoke111 vor 22 Stunden

The level of stupidity in some of these responses is just amazing. We have a thin layer of atmosphere and mankind is injecting a gas at an accelerating rate which -- physics and chemistry clearly shows -- warms the atmosphere. But the same people who will rely on doctors to get healthy, engineering to fix their cars, and technology to keep them employed, become raving lunatics about this subject because they think it's a liberal conspiracy. God help us if these people ever get in control of our government. What was I thinking, they are in control of our government.

Gefällt mir 15 Antworten Link Melden



anacanapanasan vor 22 Stunden

CO2 does not exist and if it does Obama invented it and Hillary was going to spread it and Al Gore was going to say it is heating Earth and other fake stuff.

- The Base

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



deracsea vor 22 Stunden

All so the secret global cabal can turn us into zombie robot slaves.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



i_grok9000 vor 22 Stunden

Humans of a conservative mindset are clearly particularly awful at acting early in this kind of climate change-based disaster to prevent worse future disasters. My guess is that this is because conservatives are about as insightful as frogs when it comes to realizing they are slowing cooking themselves to death.

Gefällt mir 4 Antworten Link Melden



hmmmmmmn vor 22 Stunden

They think some god or another will save them. Literally a Stone Age mindset.

Gefällt mir 2 Antworten Link Melden



christopheratl vor 22 Stunden

When Dems take back control, I suggest a law that only allows those with at least a high school diploma to vote. This entire administration has proven how stupid the right really is.

Gefällt mir 1 Antworten Link Melden



i_grok9000 vor 22 Stunden

I don't think requiring a high school diploma will work. Many high school students I've taught (who of course lack that diploma) are far more aware of the threat posed by global warming than the current crop of Congressional Republicans and Trump will ever be.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



screamingdizbusters vor 22 Stunden

Aren't frogs one of the first species to experience genetic catastrophe when an ecosystem changes?

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden



natspete vor 22 Stunden

News flash. Salmon now swimming hard to Vancouver Canada where they prefer ducks and moose.

Gefällt mir Antworten Link Melden

 **d edwards** vor 22 Stunden
With just a quick look (and an excellent use of graphs) you can compare natural factors, CO2 effects, and current warming:

www.bloomberg.com/graphics/2015-whats-warming-the-world/

Even your crazy uncle would understand it.

Gefällt mir  6 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **natspete** vor 22 Stunden
great link, Edwards.. Smart. But we are WaPo readers. We actually have brains :)

Gefällt mir  Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **d edwards** vor 22 Stunden
Not everyone. Have you seen daly's posts?

Gefällt mir  3 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **léa roy** vor 22 Stunden
NOTHING WILL HAPPEN, trust me.

Gefällt mir  1 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **watersportsgate 2018** vor 22 Stunden
It's already happening.

Gefällt mir  4 Antworten  Link  Melden 

 **anacanapanasan** vor 22 Stunden
The ice is not melting....Obama did it....the ice is not melting....Obama did it.....etc.

Gefällt mir  3 Antworten  Link  Melden 



christopheratl vor 22 Stunden

LOL! "Trust me"! I'd rather trust those in Florida who are already dealing with climate change and sea level rise.

Gefällt mir  Antworten  Link  Melden 

Weitere Kommentare Anzeigen