Slashdot
Stories
Slash Boxes
Comments

[Search]

SlashTV   Jobs   Newsletter   Submit   khayman80 ▾   Log out

- Stories
- Submissions
- Popular
- Blog

Slashdot

-
- Build new
- Ask Slashdot
- Book Reviews
- Games
- Idle
- YRO
-
- Cloud
- Hardware
- Linux
- Management
- Mobile
- Science
- Security
- Storage

This discussion has been archived. No new comments can be posted.

Lawrence Krauss: Congress Is Trying To Defund Scientists At Energy Department 272 More Prefs

Lawrence Krauss: Congress Is Trying To Defund Scientists At Energy Department

[Archived Discussion]   Load All Comments

70 Full 04 Abbreviated 0 Hidden
Comments Filter:
Score:
5   • All
4   • Insightful
3   • Informative
2   • Interesting
1   • Funny
0
–1
The Fine Print: The following comments are owned by whoever posted them. We are not responsible for them in any way.

272 More Prefs

-

Price of using scientists as political pawns (Score:4, Insightful)

by Karmashock (2415832) Alter Relationship

You get involved in politics... you take sides... and there are consequences.

NPR for example is under similar threat of being defunded for the same reason. They took sides and when they stopped acting in the interests of all sides they became the enemy of sides they did not support... or the allies of sides they did support... and via the friend of my enemy is my enemy logic which is standard in politics... they became enemies.

Here someone is going to bitch at me like I had any part in any of these conseque

- ○

- ○

Re: (Score:5, Insightful)

by Anonymous Coward

Scientists taking sides? They took the side of **reality**. It's unfortunate for Conservatives that this reality doesn't line up with their views, but you can hardly blame that on the scientists.

-

-

Re: (Score:-1, Flamebait)

by Karmashock (2415832) Alter Relationship

Depends on what you mean. If you're talking about evolution versus creationism then of course you're correct. But that isn't why the department of energy is looking to get their budget cut.

For one thing you've got all the "green jobs" "green economy" crap that the democrats pushed and used to justify shutting down existing industry and business... putting big taxes on such businesses... etc... on the theory that it would create a new green economy.

Because the democrats think it is literally impossible to ki

-

-

Re: (Score:5, Insightful)

by Anonymous Coward

> Now you're going to sit there and attempt to be smug by claiming that the scientists are only doing their jobs and only pushing out the facts.

Well, that is IN FACT what they're doing. I'm sorry if you find this unpleasant, but that's the reality of the situation.

-

-

Re: (Score:2, Insightful)

by Karmashock (2415832) Alter Relationship

That's fine. You're playing politics and it is in your political interest to make that point. I'm being honest, unlike you... and am willing to tell you why things are the way they are... and I'm trying to show you how things could change.

But you don't care about that. You just want to keep playing your political games. And that's fine. You're not the only one that can play and in situations where its more serious the opposition isn't going to be honest with you either. Because you use honesty against peopl

-

-

Re: (Score:5, Insightful)

by Copid (137416) FanFriend of a Friend
I'm not clear on the claim here. It seems to be, "You guys are using facts to support a position the other guys disagree with, so don't be surprised when they start directly attacking facts and the gathering of facts." I agree that this is typically what happens. I'm not so sure that it's fair to say that both sides are doing equally bad things when it happens, though.
--
An interesting anagram of "BANACH TARSKI" is "BANACH TARSKI BANACH TARSKI"

-

-

Re: (Score:4, Insightful)

by Karmashock (2415832) Alter Relationship

No, I'm saying you used a scientific organization as a puppet for a political program that hurt a lot of people and is in the process of destroying industries, communities, and ways of life. And as a result, the political

allies of the people you hurt are reaching out to disrupt, break, and punish those that did that.

The science is irrelevant to the issue. You hurt people and they respond. You disrespect people and they respond.

Why would you think you could go after all these people and destroy them with no

-
-

Re: (Score:-1, Troll)

by Jane Q. Public (1010737) Friend of a Friend

I wouldn't even bother. No matter how valid a point you make the Kool-Aid Drinkers will never agree with you, and just continue quoting their gospel and insisting it's "fact", not politics. I know: I've been there many times.

-
-
›

Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:5, Insightful)

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-07-24 22:38 (#47528845) Homepage Journal

> @ClimateRealists That's the first I had read about O'Sullivan's rebuttal of the Greenhouse Effect. He makes a compelling argument. *[Lonny Eachus, 2012-02-23]*

> @GreatDismal See John O'Sullivan's "Slaying the Sky Dragon", for instance. If you think there is solid science behind AGW you are mistaken. *[Lonny Eachus, 2012-02-23]*

The 2010 fantasy novel *Slaying the Sky Dragon - Death of the Greenhouse Gas Theory* claims the second law of thermodynamics disproves the greenhouse effect. At first this seemed like a parody of creationists who claim the second law disproves evolution, but the Slayers seem **very** serious. They claim warm surfaces can't absorb back-radiation (*) from cold atmospheres because they mistakenly think heat can't be transferred from cold to warm objects **at all**. In fact, this is only true for **net** heat transfer. Cold objects **can** slow the rate at which warm objects lose heat **without** transferring more heat to warm objects than vice versa. That's how the greenhouse effect works.

(*) Also called downwelling longwave irradiance.

> "We can easily calculate what the measured CO2 increase by itself does to the global energy balance of a static system."

> This is where you are wrong. It has been shown that most of the models (at least) that are based on radiative forcings due to CO2 are based on flawed physics. See No, Virginia, Cooler Objects Cannot Make Warmer Objects Even Warmer. Their whole premise is based on a falsehood. ... *[Jane Q. Public, 2012-04-14]*

> And so I have read explanations of how the greenhouse effect is supposed to work. And almost all of the CO2 warming models ... rely on the concept of "back radiation", in which the gases radiate some of their absorbed energy back to earth. But that is in fact impossible. First Spencer's explanation of how back radiation is supposed to work: bit.ly/HZ04KR ... Spencer is a weird case, because he recently jumped the fence and said his research showed CO2 warming to be true. So anyway, here is physicist Pierre Latour, refuting Spencer's explanation: bit.ly/JV9XmI The important point here being that most, not just a few, CO2 warming models rely on this "back radiation" concept. I'm not trying to pick on Spencer, it's just that he probably wrote up the best explanation of the mythical back radiation. *[Lonny Eachus, 2012-05-21]*

Again, Dr. Latour's Slayer fan fiction is fractally wrong:

> ... the absorption rate of real bodies depends on whether the absorber T (radiating or not), is less than the intercepted radiation T, or not. If the receiver T > intercepted T, no absorption occurs; if the receiver T < intercepted T the absorption rate may be as great as proportional to (T intercepted – T absorber), depending on the amounts reflected, transmitted or scattered. What actually happens is the chiller radiates to the hot plate, but the plate cannot absorb any of it because it is too cold. The hot plate reflects, transmits or scatters colder radiation, just like my roof does for cold

radio waves. ... Energy from colder cannot heat hotter further because the second law of thermodynamics says so, because nature says so; always and everywhere. ... Conclusion, the hot plate remains at 150. All physics I know supports it; no physics offered refutes it. Spencer mistakenly assumed the 150 plate absorbs incident 100 radiation ... The generalized claim that a cooler object placed near a warmer object cannot result in a rise in temperature of the warmer object stands. ... *[Dr. Latour, 2011-11-06]*

If Dr. Latour understood the second law refers to net heat, he'd agree that adding a cold plate makes the heated plate lose heat slower. That's okay because net heat still flows from hot to cold, i.e. more heat moves from hot to cold than vice versa. But Dr. Latour disagrees, wrongly claiming that hot objects can't absorb **any** radiation from colder objects. He's not alone:

Continued here due to Slashdot's filter.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin 8+

-
  -

    Re:Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

    by Jane Q. Public (1010737) Friend of a Friend on 2014-07-25 17:02 (#47535707)
    Public Service Announcement:

    I have nothing to do with this person, or he with me. His pretense of knowing who I am and what I think, and his practice of taking years-old comments out of context and conflating them together does not make for sound argument.

    Dr. Latour did heat-transfer work for NASA, and has made a career of building control systems for chemical processes involving heat. I daresay he is more of an expert on the subject than "Khayman80".

    To the best of my knowledge, no-one to date has **successfully** refuted Latour's **science**. Many have tried, many have failed. Khayman80 himself admitted this a couple of years ago, right here on Slashdot, which makes me wonder why he's digging up even older arguments that he has **since** failed to refute. Perhaps he just forgot. Though I doubt it.

    I have no reply to this person specifically. As far as I am concerned, he is a non-person.
    Parent Share
    twitter facebook linkedin 8+
    -

  -

    Re:Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

    by Jane Q. Public (1010737) Friend of a Friend on 2014-07-25 17:09 (#47535755)
    Public Service Announcement

    I will add:

    Since this person is not making any **scientific** argument anyway, but simply attempting ad-hominem, and saying "so-and-so is wrong" without ANY evidence (which is all he can do, because he doesn't have any), this was a completely pointless exercise on his part. He was simply making another attempt at dragging my *persona* through the mud. I can only conclude that was his only purpose, since he didn't make any actual, substantive arguments.
    Parent Share
    twitter facebook linkedin 8+
    -

  -

    Re:Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

    by Jane Q. Public (1010737) Friend of a Friend on 2014-07-25 17:33 (#47535897)
    Public Service Announcement

I guess I just can't let it slide. Khayman80's argument that Latour doesn't understand that the subject under discussion is **net** heat transfer is almost certainly disingenuous and intended to mislead, because we had that argument a couple of years ago. Which he lost, by the way.

Latour has written papers about EXACTLY that topic, and I know that Khayman80 has seen at least one of them, because of the mentioned argument (which he lost), in which he admitted to having seen it. So he is either lying in order to try to convince others I am wrong (which is dishonest), of he has completely forgotten about Latour's actual work, in which case he's just making up the argument (which is intellectually dishonest), OR he is trying to make a straw-man argument by suggesting that Latour himself was arguing something he actually wasn't. Which is intellectually dishonest.

I'll let other readers decide the existence (if any) and extent (if any) of Khayman80's intellectual dishonesty. The evidence is right there above, if any of you would care to go read ALL OF those old arguments (which he lost).
Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin 8+

 ■

 ■

Re:Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:3)

by Jane Q. Public (1010737) Friend of a Friend on 2014-07-25 17:39 (#47535927)
HINT: When faced with the **facts**, a couple of years ago, that his own arguments did not hold water, and that nobody had successfully refuted Latour, his reply to me was "they will". Which, if you understand English, is an admission of defeat.

It is 2 years or so later now, and they still haven't. Dr. Roy Spencer (himself a self-proclaimed climate skeptic) and Anthony Watts (also a climate skeptic) both tried to disprove him experimentally, and both failed. And nobody has pointed out any **genuine** errors in Latour's math or logic.
Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin 8+

 ■

 ■

Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-07-26 20:59 (#47541343) Homepage Journal

> ... Since this person is not making any **scientific** argument anyway, but simply attempting ad-hominem, and saying "so-and-so is wrong" without ANY evidence (which is all he can do, because he doesn't have any), this was a completely pointless exercise on his part. He was simply making another attempt at dragging my *persona* through the mud. I can only conclude that was his only purpose, since he didn't make any actual, substantive arguments. *[Jane Q. Public, 2014-07-25]*

A real skeptic would be checking my calculations but Jane can't even acknowledge them. If the Slayers are right, why is Venus hotter than Mercury?

Mercury's daytime surface temperature is 350C while Venus has a *nighttime* surface temperature of **~470C**.

... despite the fact that Venus is 87% farther away from the Sun than Mercury, implying sunlight 3.5x weaker.

... **and** despite the fact that Mercury's albedo is ~0.1 and Venus's albedo is ~0.65.

... **and** despite the fact that a "night" on Venus lasts ~58 Earth days, during which the temperature barely changes from that at "high noon".

> ... Since all atmospheres must get colder with altitude as kinetic energy is transformed into potential energy in a planet's gravitational field, the lower atmosphere must be warmer than upper atmosphere, even if there is no radiation involved. This follows from the perfect gas law, $PV = nRT$. ... *[Dr. Latour, 2011-11-06]*

Riiiight. That's why the stratosphere doesn't exist. I've explained that long-term equilibrium surface temperature is determined by conservation of energy, not the ideal gas law. (If scientists were wrong, basketball players would have to dribble with gloves because the pressurized ball would have to be very hot.)

Many Slayers blame equilibrium surface temperature on pressure, which I call the basketball player glove fantasy. None of the Slayers at WUWT would answer this question: would Venus have the same surface temperature if its atmosphere were pure nitrogen, which isn't a greenhouse gas?

I've even seen a Slayer convince himself that all objects have the same albedo, which I call the gray Oreo fantasy.

Will Jane explain the fact that Venus is hotter than Mercury using basketball player gloves, gray Oreos, or truly original groundbreaking science?

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

■

■

Re:Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:1)

by Jane Q. Public (1010737) Friend of a Friend on 2014-07-27 2:28 (#47541893)

A real skeptic would be checking my calculations but Jane can't even acknowledge them. If the Slayers are right, why is Venus hotter than Mercury?

A real skeptic would see you arguing with the person who made the argument in the first place, publicly, and not just your habit of "arguing" with people quoting the, with no notice on your personal blog, which nobody knows or cares about, so they don't even know you're trying to "argue" with them anyway.

I've stated this many times: your arguing with yourself on your personal blog amounts to zilch, because nobody knows or cares.

Do you HONESTLY expect me to visit your blog every day to see your arguments with yourself, and effigies of your "opponents"? And expect that is necessary to "refute" your straw-man and ad-hominem arguments? And (still to be legally determined) libel?

Pathetic. You've tried to argue with people who really matter (I don't claim to be one of them, but I've seen it a number of times) and you've come out the loser in every case. Even if you had the courage (haha... that's a laugh) of your convictions, you can't win a fucking argument. You don't know how. You don't understand logic. You've proved this many times.

Get stuffed, and go away. The ONLY thing you are to me is an annoyance. I have NO respect for you either as a scientist or a person.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

■

■

Re:Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

by Jane Q. Public (1010737) Friend of a Friend on 2014-07-27 2:40 (#47541917)
s/quoting the/quoting them

This person has no courage to engage the actual authors of ideas, but would rather do his best to ad-hominem others who mention those ideas. He has proven many times that he doesn't have "courage of conviction", but would rather snipe at others from the sidelines, without demonstrating strength of his own. That's called cowardice.

In any case, after many years now of being too tolerant and putting up with his abuse, I don't mind saying it like it is. I am looking into legal remedies against this odious person. We'll see how that turns out. In the meantime, I encourage everyone to save copies of these snipes of his. It's easier than getting a subpoena. But in all honesty I'm probably going to have to do that too.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-07-27 9:28 (#47543603) Homepage Journal

Charming. Do you explain the fact that Venus is hotter than Mercury using basketball player gloves, gray Oreos, or truly original groundbreaking science?

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Re:Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

by Jane Q. Public (1010737) Friend of a Friend on 2014-07-27 13:46 (#47545257)

Charming. Do you explain the fact that Venus is hotter than Mercury using basketball player gloves, gray Oreos, or truly original groundbreaking science?

Since it has little to do with arguments I have actually made, I don't try to explain it at all, nor do I have any reasonable obligation to do so. But I will briefly mention refutations by other people anyway, simply because you asked. Isn't that nice of me?

How about this? (This is someone else's work, not my own, so if you don't like it, argue with **him**.)

Evidence from Mars and Venus suggest that global warming from doubled carbon dioxide in the [Earth] atmosphere is unlikely to exceed 0.5 K. The atmospheres of these planets consist almost exclusively of CO_2 (Table 1.2). Venus has an atmosphere containing CO_2 at a pressure of 88 bars, i.e. 88 times our atmosphere's total pressure at sea level. Such an amount of CO_2 causes greenhouse warming by 500 K there. On the other hand, the mere 0.006 bars of CO_2 on Mars cause warming by 5.5K. These figures can be plotted on a graph of the logarithm of the pressure against the logarithm of the warming. The straight line between these two points can be extrapolated to find the warming effect of 600 ppm of CO_2 in the Earth's atmosphere, i.e. 0.0006 bars. The answer is 0.47 K. This is only one of eight observed relationships between radiation and surface temperatures, each indicating only small effects from doubled CO_2.

(From Idso, S.B. 1998: *CO2-induced global warming* Climate Research, 10, 69-82. K is Kelvin, NOT thousands.)

It took me about 30 seconds to find that. Spending another 30 seconds or so found this. Are you suggesting that if I spent more time I would not find more and better?

Again: if you have problems with their figures, I strongly suggest you argue with THEM. Because arguing with me isn't going to take their pages down. Is this support of Latour's argument? Probably not. But on the other hand it rather invalidates yours.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-07-27 15:27 (#47546049) Homepage Journal

You cited a non-peer-reviewed crackpot website which claims:

"...the fact that the CO2 increase is linear, while at the same time the amount of CO2 released by humans has grown exponentially, is the primary proof that humans are NOT responsible for the change in CO2 concentration..." **[Robert Clemenzi]**

I tried to tell you that humans **are** responsible for the change in CO2 concentration. You

even seemed to agree, calling Clemenzi's claim "ridiculous".

Before I waste time debunking the rest of that nonsense you cited, I'm wondering if you're regressing again. Hopefully I don't have to prove we're responsible for the CO2 rise again. If you still consider it "ridiculous" to deny that basic fact, do you see how Clemenzi might not be the best source of science education?

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Re:Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

by Jane Q. Public (1010737) Friend of a Friend on 2014-07-27 19:19 (#47547149)

You cited a non-peer-reviewed crackpot website which claims:

As you very well know, the part I was referencing was the part about Venus. If you have any problems with anything else on the page -- for that matter, if you have any problems with ANYTHING on the page, I suggest you take it up with the author as I originally told you.

I already told you: that isn't **my** argument. It is someone else. I just did you a **favor** and looked up something you asked for on Google. His arguments are not my own and I did not even read them carefully. I merely looked them up for you because you seemed to wanted to argue about yet another straw-man that had next to nothing to do with anything I had said.

I have no desire (or any motivation, for that matter) to engage you in some ridiculous argument about whether Venus is proof of "greenhouse warming", as compared to Mercury or the Earth.

There are many reasons why even if it were true, it is hardly relevant: Mercury has an extremely long day, almost no atmosphere, and a very eccentric orbit. Venus has a surface atmospheric pressure 92 times (give or take) Earth's, it's atmosphere is MOSTLY CO2 (around 96% or so), versus Earth's 0.04% or less, again give or take a bit. Not to mention the vast clouds of sulfuric acid.

You seem to want to ignore all these other variables and argue about just CO2, when the degree to which CO2 in particular affects Venus' surface temperature is speculative, to say the least. I'm not going to get into an argument that pointless. There are papers on both sides of that argument, and I am happy to let their authors fight it out in the journals. It is none of my affair.

I tried to tell you that humans are responsible for the change in CO2 concentration.

Why did you "try to tell me" this? I haven't intentionally disputed this. Not for many years, anyway. I suppose I might have, 4-5 years ago, when I knew next to nothing about the subject. So who are you arguing with? I went to that page, and you have this to say:

Charming, as usual. Itâ(TM)s strange that you ask for real science to support the âoealarmistâ fact that humans caused the rise in CO2 because weâ(TM)re burning carbon to release CO2 faster than the warming oceans can outgas their dissolved CO2. Is anyone we know of disputing that? Is it even part of the âoedebateâ?

Once again, not only arguing with yourself (since I was not present), but also (again as usual) arguing about something I didn't even say. I wasn't arguing with you about those things. So why did you try to make it appear I did? Why were you trying to give the impression I said something I did not in fact say? I will ask anyone who reads this to ask themselves that question. You must have a motivation, so what is it?

You are simply continuing your ridiculous straw-man and out-of-context arguments with yourself. I've said it before: from where I sit, it just makes you look like a fool.

And as for "charming": you seem to forget that you have given me MANY reasons to not be polite to you at all. To say that some of your actions have been uncivil is an understatement. I owe you no charm, nor civility of my own.

Parent Share

twitter facebook linkedin 8+

- ■

■

Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-07-27 20:01 (#47547277) Homepage Journal

> ... the part I was referencing was the part about Venus. ... I knew next to nothing about the subject. ... *[Jane Q. Public]*

Do you see how crackpot websites which make "ridiculous" claims that you might have made when you "knew next to nothing about the subject" might not be the best source of science education?

> ... I just did you a **favor** and looked up something you asked for on Google. His arguments are not my own and I did not even read them carefully. I merely looked them up for you because you seemed to wanted to argue about yet another straw-man that had next to nothing to do with anything I had said. ... *[Jane Q. Public]*

Venus vs. Mercury has everything to do with the Slayer nonsense you're spreading. You're just regurgitating even more misinformation that I have to debunk. That's the exact opposite of a favor! It's the same absurd behavior I've repeatedly asked you to stop.

Again, thanks for finally being honest. You're not interested in valid science, just something you can use to argue, even if it doesn't hold up under scrutiny. You've used this "principle of superficiality" to spread civilization-paralyzing misinformation which *seems* plausible at first glance to non-scientists, but doesn't hold up under scrutiny. In fact, I said as much last year:

"... each contrarian is more effective at superficial "science communication" than the average scientist. ... Once you get a contrarian started, a stream of regurgitated-but-superficially-plausible nonsense spews forth. Just consider Jane Q. Public. ..."

> ...I was not present... *[Jane Q. Public]*

Actually, you did respond. Repeatedly. Sure you weren't present?

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin 8+

- ■

■

Re:Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:1)

by Jane Q. Public (1010737) Friend of a Friend on 2014-07-27 21:29 (#47547507)

Do you see how crackpot websites which make "ridiculous" claims that you might have made when you "knew next to nothing about the subject" might not be the best source of science education?

Since I've received exactly no education from there, how would I know? Do you really need me to repeat that again before you get it through your head?

Venus vs. Mercury has everything to do with the Slayer nonsense you're spreading. You're just regurgitating even more misinformation that I have to debunk. That's the exact opposite of a favor! It's the same absurd behavior I've repeatedly asked you to stop.

Let's be specific. Explain to us what Venus vs. Mercury have to do with Pierre Latour's thermodynamic argument in regard to greenhouse warming? Stop prevaricating, and say what you mean. Do you have an actual argument to make?

Again, thanks for finally being honest. Youâ(TM)re not interested in valid science, just something you can use to argue, even if it doesnâ(TM)t hold up under scrutiny. Youâ(TM)ve used this "principle of superficiality" to spread civilization-paralyzing misinformation which seems plausible at first glance to non-scientists, but doesnâ(TM)t hold up under scrutiny. In fact, I said as much last year:

And yet, you have failed for 2 years to refute Latour. Gee, that's interesting. What isn't

holding water again? Are you sure you have that straight?

Yet again, trying to inflate your ego at the expense of others. It won't wash. You know you can't refute Latour, so you are piling straw-man on top of straw-man to try to make yourself look good. Again, I say: if you have a specific argument to make, then make it. Other than, that is, just rehashing the failed arguments you made 2 years ago. Quoting yourself complimenting yourself doesn't prove anything.

I am going to ask you again: why have you made it a habit of taking certain peoples' comments out of context, and then arguing with those comments when those other people aren't present, about things they did NOT say?

Stop dancing and beating around the bush. You're being utterly and disgustingly transparent. You've made not a single valid argument, but only implications. You've also thrown quotes of yourself about, plus more of the same old ad-hominem, out-of-context, straw-man arguments you've been making all along. But there isn't any meat anywhere.

And I think it's doubly hilarious that you're trying to argue with me about something I told you in plain English I wasn't even arguing. Only you.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin 8+

___

Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-07-27 21:41 (#47547547) Homepage Journal

> ... Explain to us what Venus vs. Mercury have to do with Pierre Latour's thermodynamic argument in regard to greenhouse warming? ... *[Jane Q. Public]*

Again, if the Slayers are right, why is Venus hotter than Mercury? Instead of regurgitating bad arguments you find in 30 seconds and which you don't even read carefully, please read carefully before regurgitating even more misinformation for me to debunk.

> ... you have failed for 2 years to refute Latour. ... You know you can't refute Latour...

I refuted Dr. Latour's claim that mainstream physics predicts infinite warming, and explained how the greenhouse effect is based on the Stefan Boltzmann law and requires a cold upper troposphere. Again, a real skeptic would be checking my calculation that a completely enclosed heated plate would reach an equilibrium temperature of 235F (386K).

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin 8+

___

Re:Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

by Jane Q. Public (1010737) Friend of a Friend on 2014-07-27 23:52 (#47547891)
You did nothing of the sort. You made the (quite incorrect) claim that Latour wasn't accounting for the fact that the subject at hand is **net** heat transfer. But that claim is simply incorrect. I repeat that Latour has written about this extensively, which you would know if you bothered to actually read more of what he has written than one blog post.

You took a badly-worded sentence or two and jumped on them as though Latour made a mistake. But his only mistake was wording a couple of sentences badly. He does in fact NOT suggest that warmer objects absorb no radiation, and he has written as much many times. (Which apparently you did not know. Why?) So you were tilting at windmills again... or should I say straw-men?

You have refuted NOTHING but a couple of unfortunately-worded sentences, which Latour himself publicly corrected shortly after that post appeared.

You failed. If you could **actually** prove his **actual** argument wrong, as opposed to the argument you mistakenly thought he made, you'd do it to his face or publish your results or both. Because, after all, it would be important to this cause you so avidly defend. But you haven't. Is that because you **knew** you were making straw-man arguments, or because you simply didn't bother to research the subject you were attempting to refute? Either one represents failure.

You have not been able to **actually** refute Latour. The only place a genuine "refutation" occurred is in your own mind.

Now get lost. Your totally unjustified arrogance is irritating as hell.
Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin g+

   ■

      ■

Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-07-28 14:38 (#47553285) Homepage Journal

> ... You made the (quite incorrect) claim that Latour wasn't accounting for the fact that the subject at hand is **net** heat transfer. But that claim is simply incorrect. ... *[Jane Q. Public]*

Once again, if Dr. Latour understood the second law refers to net heat, he'd agree that adding a cold plate makes the heated plate lose heat slower. That's okay because net heat still flows from hot to cold, i.e. more heat moves from hot to cold than vice versa.

> ... You took a badly-worded sentence or two and jumped on them as though Latour made a mistake. But his only mistake was wording a couple of sentences badly. He does in fact NOT suggest that warmer objects absorb no radiation, and he has written as much many times. ... You have refuted NOTHING but a couple of unfortunately-worded sentences, which Latour himself publicly corrected shortly after that post appeared. ... *[Jane Q. Public]*

He must have forgotten this nebulous unlinked correction because his blog post is still live and still contains all these badly worded sentences:

"... the absorption rate of real bodies depends on whether the absorber T (radiating or not), is less than the intercepted radiation T, or not. If the receiver T > intercepted T, no absorption occurs; if the receiver T < intercepted T the absorption rate may be as great as proportional to (T intercepted – T absorber), depending on the amounts reflected, transmitted or scattered. What actually happens is the chiller radiates to the hot plate, but the plate cannot absorb any of it because it is too cold. The hot plate reflects, transmits or scatters colder radiation, just like my roof does for cold radio waves. ... Energy from colder cannot heat hotter further because the second law of thermodynamics says so, because nature says so; always and everywhere. ... Conclusion, the hot plate remains at 150. All physics I know supports it; no physics offered refutes it. Spencer mistakenly assumed the 150 plate absorbs incident 100 radiation ... The generalized claim that a cooler object placed near a warmer object cannot result in a rise in temperature of the warmer object stands. ..."

In fact, he did more than suggest that warmer objects absorb no radiation: *"k is the fraction of re-radiation from the second bar absorbed by the first hotter bar... k must be identically zero, so no cold back-radiation is absorbed and T remains 150. Quod Erat Demonstrandum, QED."*

That's why I refuted Dr. Latour by showing that a completely enclosed heated plate reaches an equilibrium temperature of 235F (386K), which is less than infinity.

> Explain to us what Venus vs. Mercury have to do with Pierre Latour's thermodynamic argument in regard to greenhouse warming? *[Jane Q. Public]*

Again, if Dr. Latour and the Slayers are right, why is Venus hotter than Mercury? Hint: the Slayers are wrong. Venus is hotter than Mercury because of the greenhouse effect.

> ... I have no desire (or any motivation, for that matter) to engage you in some ridiculous argument about whether Venus is proof of "greenhouse warming", as compared to Mercury or the Earth. There are many reasons why even if it

were true, it is hardly relevant: Mercury has an extremely long day, almost no atmosphere, and a very eccentric orbit. Venus has a surface atmospheric pressure 92 times (give or take) Earth's, it's atmosphere is MOSTLY CO_2 (around 96% or so), versus Earth's 0.04% or less, again give or take a bit. Not to mention the vast clouds of sulfuric acid. You seem to want to ignore all these other variables and argue about just CO_2, when the degree to which CO_2 in particular affects Venus' surface temperature is speculative, to say the least. ... *[Jane Q. Public]*

No, I didn't ignore those variables. In fact, I pointed out differences that should make Venus cooler than Mercury in the absence of Venus's greenhouse effect. For instance:

- I compared Mercury's **daytime** surface temperature to Venus's **nighttime** surface temperature because Venus's long night should be cooler than Mercury's long day.
- I mentioned Venus's high albedo which is due to its vast clouds of sulfuric acid, and mentioned that this should keep Venus cooler than dark Mercury by reflecting more sunlight.
- I mentioned that Venus is farther from the Sun than Mercury even when Mercury is at aphelion, which should make Venus cooler than Mercury.
- I pointed out that long-term equilibrium surface temperature is determined by conservation of energy, not the ideal gas law. So pressure only affects surface temperature by enhancing the greenhouse effect if and only if GHG's are present.

I've also explained that a planet with no atmosphere is a simple case where the effective radiating level is at the surface, so the equilibrium surface temperature can be determined using the planet's albedo and distance from the Sun. The greenhouse effect modifies this simple case, which is why Venus is hotter than Mercury.

After I explained that Venus is hot because of its greenhouse effect, you replied by quoting a paper saying *"Such an amount of CO_2 causes greenhouse warming by 500 K there. On the other hand, the mere 0.006 bars of CO_2 on Mars cause warming by 5.5K."*

How do Slayers explain 500K of greenhouse warming on Venus, other than basketball player gloves and gray Oreos?

You also linked a crackpot website claiming that on Venus *"the solar energy simply does not reach the surface."*

I've explained that Venera 9 landed on the surface of Venus and found "surface light levels comparable to those at Earth mid-latitudes on a cloudy summer day." Check out the panorama.

Again, if the Slayers are right, why is Venus hotter than Mercury? Instead of regurgitating bad arguments you find in 30 seconds and which you don't even read carefully, please read carefully before regurgitating even more misinformation for me to debunk.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

-
-

Re:Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (**Score:2**)

by Jane Q. Public (1010737) Friend of a Friend on 2014-07-29 12:30 (#47559971)
You are simply proving you don't know what you're talking about.

Almost Latour's **entire** thesis is that S-B law says **net** heat transfer is either 0 or in one direction, from the hotter area to the colder. If the roles are reversed, and the colder item becomes the hotter, then the sign changes and the **net** heat transfer is still only in one direction... from hotter to colder.

And you don't know this because you didn't actually do any actual research about it.You claim "his blog post is still live" but link to an web archive. You haven't researched the topic.

You ignored due diligence, and because of that your "refutation" is nothing but a straw-man, which you continue to deny, either because you know it's a straw-man, and are just doubling down, or because you still refuse to perform the due diligence necessary to make an intelligent argument. The rest of this nonsense falls down because it's all house-of-cards based on your initial **misunderstanding** of Latour's actual thesis.

Just to be clear: shortly after Latour published that blog post, it became clear that the language he used **implied** that no radiation *at all* was absorbed by the warmer body. So a reader could not reasonably be blamed for inferring that. But Latour quickly apologized for the **unfortunate wording** and corrected himself to make it very clear he was referring to **net**, not absolute, heat transfer.

As such, just what part of the S-B law do you find controversial?

I don't blame you for inferring -- from that one blog post, which you like to in archive -- that what he meant was any heat transfer, rather than net. But again: he corrected that right away and anybody who knows jack shit about the subject knows that. But you, on the other hand, apparently refused to be bothered with due diligence. Imagine that.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin 8+

■

■

Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-07-29 12:56 (#47560205) Homepage Journal

Once again, if Dr. Latour understood the second law refers to net heat, he'd agree that adding a cold plate makes the heated plate lose heat slower. That's okay because net heat still flows from hot to cold, i.e. more heat moves from hot to cold than vice versa.

Again, he must have forgotten this nebulous correction which you still haven't linked. I linked to an archive of his blog post that I made yesterday, but here's another archive I just made showing that his blog post is still live today and still contains nonsense like this: *"k is the fraction of re-radiation from the second bar absorbed by the first hotter bar... k must be identically zero, so no cold back-radiation is absorbed and T remains 150. Quod Erat Demonstrandum, QED."*

He's completely wrong. The hotter bar absorbs cold back-radiation, and T does **not** remain 150F. That's why I refuted Dr. Latour by showing that a completely enclosed heated plate reaches an equilibrium temperature of 235F (386K), which is less than the infinite temperature he claimed.

> Apparently unlike you, sir, I have a basic understanding of math and physics. Please explain to us all where the Stefan-Boltzmann radiation law is in error. I am sure we would all love to know. *[Jane Q. Public, 2012-11-20]*
>
> ... just what part of the S-B law do you find controversial? *[Jane Q. Public, 2014-07-29]*

Again, the greenhouse effect is **based** on the Stefan-Boltzmann law. As I've explained: greenhouse gases re-emit some of [the upwelling long-wave IR], and it bounces around the troposphere until it gets to a height known as the "effective radiating level". Above this height (roughly 7km), there aren't enough greenhouse gases to keep "most" of the IR from escaping to space altogether. This effective radiating level controls the outflow of heat from the Earth. **Stefan-Boltzmann** tells us that power radiated is proportional to temperature^4, and temperature decreases with height in the troposphere. Adding greenhouse gases raises the height of this effective radiating level, where it is cooler, which therefore decreases the outflow of heat from the Earth. This is the greenhouse effect, and it isn't saturated because the effective radiating level can just keep getting higher (e.g. Venus).

Andrew Dessler also explains how the greenhouse effect depends on the Stefan-Boltzmann law. He even explains that an isothermal atmosphere wouldn't have a greenhouse effect: the Slayers' holy grail! Ironically, the greenhouse effect disappears if the upper troposphere **isn't** colder than the surface. The cold upper troposphere **isn't a problem** for the greenhouse effect. It's a **fundamental requirement**, along with the Stefan-Boltzmann law.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin 8+

■

■

Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-07-29 13:48 (#47560661) Homepage Journal

Maybe it would help if we checked my calculations step by step. Start with conservation of energy just inside the chamber walls at equilibrium: power in = power out.

The plate is heated by constant electrical power flowing in. The cold walls at 0F (T_c = 255K) also radiate power in. The heated plate at 150F (T_h = 339K) radiates power out. Using irradiance (power/m^2) simplifies the equation:

electricity + sigma*T_c^4 = sigma*T_h^4 (Eq. 1)

(Eq. 1 looks better in LaTeX, but hopefully this version is legible.)

Yes/No: can we agree that Eq. 1 is based on the Stefan-Boltzmann law and correctly describes conservation of energy just inside the chamber walls at equilibrium?

If yes, the next step is to solve Eq. 1 for the constant electrical input using a calculator or the Sage worksheet I provided.

If no, could you please write down the equation you think correctly describes conservation of energy just inside the chamber walls at equilibrium?

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Re:Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

by Jane Q. Public (1010737) Friend of a Friend on 2014-07-31 7:47 (#47574327)

Once again, if Dr. Latour understood the second law refers to net heat, he'd agree that adding a cold plate makes the heated plate lose heat slower. That's okay because net heat still flows from hot to cold, i.e. more heat moves from hot to cold than vice versa.

Absolute nonsense. He didn't do that simply because **that was not the argument he was refuting**. The argument he **was** refuting was clearly described, discussed, and linked to in his essay.

Jesus, get a clue. This is just more bullshit. I repeat: either you **know** it's wrong and are just spewing bullshit to make yourself look good (or in an attempt to make me look bad), or you just haven't done your due diligence.

My opinion is that you're just grasping at straws because you were shown to be wrong yet again. But those straws don't really exist. You were just plain wrong.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Re:Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

by Jane Q. Public (1010737) Friend of a Friend on 2014-07-31 7:50 (#47574353)

Maybe it would help if we checked my calculations step by step. Start with conservation of energy just inside the chamber walls at equilibrium: power in = power out.

We don't need to check your calculations because you're making a straw-man argument again. You are not refuting what Latour was actually arguing. And either you know that, or you just haven't paying attention. And the latter would be rather bizarre, given the nature of what you have been saying.

Stop making straw-man arguments. You aren't impressing anybody. You're making yourself look like a fool.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

■

■

Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-07-31 8:20 (#47574551) Homepage Journal

His actual argument is that *"k is the fraction of re-radiation from the second bar absorbed by the first hotter bar... k must be identically zero, so no cold back-radiation is absorbed and T remains 150. Quod Erat Demonstrandum, QED."*

Again, he's completely wrong. The hotter bar absorbs cold back-radiation, and T does **not** remain 150F. That's why I refuted Dr. Latour by showing that a completely enclosed heated plate reaches an equilibrium temperature of 235F (386K), which is less than the infinite temperature he claimed.

Maybe it would help if we checked my calculations step by step. Start with conservation of energy just inside the chamber walls at equilibrium: power in = power out.

The plate is heated by constant electrical power flowing in. The cold walls at 0F (T_c = 255K) also radiate power in. The heated plate at 150F (T_h = 339K) radiates power out. Using irradiance (power/m^2) simplifies the equation:

electricity + sigma*T_c^4 = sigma*T_h^4 (Eq. 1)

(Eq. 1 looks better in LaTeX, but hopefully this version is legible.)

Yes/No: can we agree that Eq. 1 is based on the Stefan-Boltzmann law and correctly describes conservation of energy just inside the chamber walls at equilibrium?

If yes, the next step is to solve Eq. 1 for the constant electrical input using a calculator or the Sage worksheet I provided.

If no, could you please write down the equation you think correctly describes conservation of energy just inside the chamber walls at equilibrium?

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

■

■

Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-07-31 9:51 (#47575187) Homepage Journal

I'm refuting his whole point:

*"... in Spencer's thought experiment, the passive body that is inserted into the system cannot make the **source** warmer than it already is. That is Latour's whole point. ..."* **[Jane Q. Public, 2014-02-13]**

The first step to understanding this thought experiment is determining the constant electrical power needed to keep the heated plate at 150F before the cool plate is added. Since you've done your due diligence, what electrical power did your research reveal?

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

■

■

Re:Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

by Jane Q. Public (1010737) Friend of a Friend on 2014-08-01 9:31 (#47582291)
No, you aren't. You're arguing something completely different.

Once again, if Dr. Latour understood the second law refers to net heat, he'd agree that adding a cold plate makes the heated plate lose heat slower. That's okay because net heat still flows from hot to cold, i.e. more heat moves from hot to cold than vice versa.

What you're doing is known as "straw-man argument", or in this case (it's a bit gray) it might be called "moving the goalposts".

If you've actually looked into what he wrote about this, then why do you continue to deny that **his whole argument is about NET heat transfer**? He has explicitly stated otherwise.

Even if you did not take his word for it, his career building control systems precisely for the purpose of managing heat transfer would strongly suggest that this is hardly something he is likely to neglect.

If you want to make this **other** argument, then I suggest you read about his later challenge to Spencer and Watts to disprove his thesis, their attempts to do so, and his analysis of why they failed. (Hint: keeping the input power constant is one of the subjects discussed.)

You are only showing yet again that you haven't really looked into this. The original argument you made above was made moot over 2 years ago. This more recent argument, about a year ago. More or less.

And lastly, I will remind you: you should be making these arguments to HIM, not me. Why are you "arguing" with me about this? If you want to refute him, then refute him, in public where other people can see.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin 8+

■

■

Re:Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

by Jane Q. Public (1010737) Friend of a Friend on 2014-08-01 9:39 (#47582379)

Again, he's completely wrong. The hotter bar absorbs cold back-radiation, and T does not remain 150F. That's why I refuted Dr. Latour by showing that a completely enclosed heated plate reaches an equilibrium temperature of 235F (386K), which is less than the infinite temperature he claimed.

Hahahahahaha!!! Jesus, you're a fool. **THAT ISN'T WHAT HE CLAIMED.** Quite the contrary. He claimed that a completely enclosed plate **DOES NOT** reach infinite temperature, which of course agrees with observations. Are you seriously this dense? Or did you just word your sentence in an unfortunate way, the way Latour did in his original blog post?

Here's **one way** you are wrong. In any realistic system, the enclosing plate would be of larger dimensions than the internal source, however slightly. So while the total re-radiated **energy** might be the same, it is spread over a larger area, so the energy density (and therefore temperature) would be **lower**.

How did you allow a layman to catch you in such an elementary error?

Not that I had any obligation to do so. Your argument is with him, not me. Just consider it a free lesson in humility.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin 8+

■

■

Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-08-01 11:28 (#47583477) Homepage Journal

> Again, he's completely wrong. The hotter bar absorbs cold
> back-radiation, and T does not remain 150F. That's why I refuted
> Dr. Latour by showing that a completely enclosed heated plate
> reaches an equilibrium temperature of 235F (386K), which is less
> than the infinite temperature he claimed.

Hahahahahaha!!! Jesus, you're a fool. **THAT ISN'T WHAT HE CLAIMED.**
Quite the contrary. He claimed that a completely enclosed plate **DOES NOT**

reach infinite temperature, which of course agrees with observations. **[Jane Q. Public, 2014-08-01]**

Again, Dr. Latour claimed that mainstream physics, which includes absorption of cold back-radiation, "would constitute creation of energy, a violation of the first law of thermodynamics." You've even repeated his claim:

> ... the temperature would go up until it outshone the rest of the universe, or it would cool down to zero. ... *[Jane Q. Public, 2013-12-24]*
>
>> "I told you what I think happens to that 10 Joules. By the first law of thermodynamics it doesn't just disappear so what happens to it?"
>
>> Yes, I know you told me but that doesn't happen. It would be a violation of the First Law of Thermodynamics. ... The system would never reach equilibrium, but would continue warming to infinity (if such a thing as infinite temperature existed). It would soon destroy itself from all this extra energy that is coming from nowhere. ... *[Jane Q. Public, 2014-02-17]*

That's why I've repeatedly told you that:

"Dr. Latour was wrong to claim that mainstream physics predicts the heated plate warms infinitely."

"I refuted Dr. Latour's claim that mainstream physics predicts infinite warming..."

If you're retracting your claim that absorbing cold back-radiation (i.e. mainstream physics) would violate the first law and "continue warming to infinity" then that's great news!

> Here's **one way** you are wrong. In any realistic system, the enclosing plate would be of larger dimensions than the internal source, however slightly. So while the total re-radiated **energy** might be the same, it is spread over a larger area, so the energy density (and therefore temperature) would be **lower**. How did you allow a layman to catch you in such an elementary error? Not that I had any obligation to do so. Your argument is with him, not me. Just consider it a free lesson in humility. *[Jane Q. Public, 2014-08-01]*

The key phrase is "however slightly" because that difference can be made arbitrarily small. Since the only objection you've raised is arbitrarily small, does that mean you now see that Dr. Latour is wrong to claim that the heated plate will stay at 150F after the second plate is added, because he wrongly claims that absorbing cold back-radiation would violate the first law?

If not, maybe it would help if we kept checking my calculations step by step. For the simplest case of blackbody plates with arbitrarily similar areas, this equation represents conservation of energy at equilibrium:

electricity + sigma*T_c^4 = sigma*T_h^4 (Eq. 1)

Sage solves Eq. 1 for a constant electric input of 509 W/m^2.

As Dr. Spencer said, now imagine that the second plate completely surrounds the heated plate. This simpler problem is a closer analogy for the greenhouse effect which completely surrounds Earth.

Electric input of 509 W/m^2 is constant and the walls are held at 0F (255K). Therefore, the second plate has to radiate the same power out as the heated plate did before it was enclosed. So energy conservation at equilibrium requires that the second plate be at 150F (339K).

But the second plate also radiates the same power **in**, toward the enclosed heated plate. Just like the cold chamber walls do. Now consider conservation of energy just inside the second plate (but outside the first) at equilibrium. We can solve for the insulated heated plate's temperature using Eq. 1 by setting T_c = 150F (339K). That yields an insulated heated plate temperature of 235F (386K).

So Dr. Latour was wrong to claim that mainstream physics predicts the heated plate warms infinitely. In reality, insulating the heated plate only warms it by a finite amount. Energy is conserved, and the second law is satisfied because net heat flows from hot to cold.

Why do Slayers think this is a problem? If we kept the same electric input but took those walls (and everything else) away to reveal the cosmic microwave background radiation at

-454.8F (2.7K), the heated plate would cool to 95F (308K). Even before the heated plate was surrounded by a second plate, it was still (finitely!) heated by radiation from the cold walls. Again, this is okay because net heat flows from hot to cold.

This is an important point. Greenhouse gases can insulate Earth's surface **because they're warmer than the cosmic microwave background radiation.**

When we can agree on this simplest example, we can move on to a more general example.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin ８+

- ▪

- ▪

Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-08-01 11:38 (#47583575) Homepage Journal

Dr. Latour's argument is that *"k is the fraction of re-radiation from the second bar absorbed by the first hotter bar... k must be identically zero, so no cold back-radiation is absorbed and T remains 150. Quod Erat Demonstrandum, QED."*

And within the last year you've claimed that:

"... in Spencer's thought experiment, the passive body that is inserted into the system cannot make the **source** *warmer than it already is. That is Latour's whole point. ..."* **[Jane Q. Public, 2014-02-13]**

Yes/No: do you claim the heated plate will remain at 150F after the second plate is added?

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin ８+

- ▪

- ▪

Re:Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

by Jane Q. Public (1010737) Friend of a Friend on 2014-08-01 12:57 (#47584223)
I told you already: you're trying to argue with the wrong person. I'm going to answer this, and them I'm done. You've been hammering at this unsuccessfully for over 2 years now. To say that it has been an outrageous waste of my time even answering you is an understatement.

Again, Dr. Latour claimed that mainstream physics, which includes absorption of cold back-radiation, "would constitute creation of energy, a violation of the first law of thermodynamics.

No, he didn't. I swear, you are the King of mis-stating other peoples' arguments, so you cay try to shoot down straw-men instead.

What he actually argues is that **Spencer's argument**, not "mainstream physics", would result in creation of energy. His **actual** argument is that "mainstream physics" (which he has used almost daily in his career as an expert in heat transfer) shows that it can't be so, therefore Spencer's argument is false.

That's not the same, and your claim that it is just shows you either misunderstand, or you're lying. After 2 years of this shit, I strongly suspect it is the latter.

The key phrase is "however slightly" because that difference can be made arbitrarily small. Since the only objection you've raised is arbitrarily small, does that mean you now see...

Now I **KNOW** you're just spouting bullshit. Because you well know that even "arbitrarily small" is not zero. And any deviation from zero is enough to make the difference between *T* and *T0* (or however you want to designate them) non-zero. A non-zero difference is all we need, no matter how "arbitrarily small" you try to make it. Remember that this is physical substance, not **merely** a mathematical abstraction.

you now see that Dr. Latour is wrong to claim that the heated plate will stay at 150F after the second plate is added, because he wrongly claims that absorbing cold back-radiation

would violate the first law?

He doesn't wrongly claim that absorbing any "cold back radiation" would violate the first law. Again, you are merely mis-stating his actual argument. Now YOU are confusing absolute transfer with net transfer. That's your problem, not his. His argument has always been about NET transfer, and he does NOT claim that "any" re-absorption would violate the first law. You are again trying to claim that his argument is not about net transfer, when it fact it always has been. You are tilting at windmills again. Or still, take your pick. Why do you persist in this? Who are you trying to convince? You sure as hell aren't convincing me of anything. I mean, hell, YOU just tried to imply that an enclosing mass can be made of negligible mass, to the point that we don't even have to take it into account. Hahaha.

I mean that's so wrong on so many levels. For one thing (I already mentioned another), if the mass were negligible (as it would have to be, to make the difference in dimension negligible), then it would also absorb and re-emit negligble radiation, which makes the whole argument moot. And I have to wonder again why you don't see these glaringly obvious problems with your arguments. If you reduced the mass (and thereby dimensions) to almost zero, you reduce the absorption and re-radiation to almost zero. You can't have it both ways. Unless you want to hypothesize about some mystery substance that is not known to exist in reality.

So Dr. Latour was wrong to claim that mainstream physics predicts the heated plate warms infinitely.

He doesn't claim that. Repeat: you are mis-stating his argument. He actually claims the reverse: he USES "mainstream" physics to show that in reality it does not warm infinitely, and therefore Spencer's argument was wrong. I mean you're just absolutely trying to reverse the real argument here. But I really don't expect you to see that, because if we assume you're being honest (which I do not in fact assume), you don't even see the enormous gaping holes in your own argument which you made above. IN REALITY, the enclosing plate will be somewhat cooler. That's not even advanced physics, it's simple math. Repeat: why can a layman so easily poke holes in your "physics" arguments? I'm not a physicist, and haven't claimed to be one.

This is an important point. Greenhouse gases can insulate Earth's surface because they're warmer than the cosmic microwave background radiation.

You're wrong about that too. Thermal insulation does not work by blocking radiative cooling. It inhibits convection and conduction. There is no convection or conduction between Earth's system and "the cosmic background". Only radiation. You have conflated two wholly unrelated concepts, and called it an argument.

I am DONE with your nonsense. If you think you really can refute Latour, then go do it, and stop bothering me. I have nothing to do with it. But I don't mind saying I wouldn't mind a bit if the whole world saw your foolishness as clearly as I do. So go do it, if you think you can, and leave me be. I am done here. I will respond no more to this stream of BS.

But before I leave, I'm going to do you a favor here. You don't deserve it, but I'm going to anyway. Here's a hint, if you really want to examine the difference that convection and conduction make, then take a strong look at how LONG it takes the Moon's surface, with no atmosphere, to cool off once it rotates into shadow.

Argue about that all you like, but with yourself. I won't be waiting to hear it.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin 8+

Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-08-01 13:30 (#47584523) Homepage Journal

> A non-zero difference is all we need, no matter how "arbitrarily small" you
> try to make it. ... IN REALITY, the enclosing plate will be somewhat cooler.

All we need to show that the heated plate stays at 150F after it's enclosed? No. The only way the heated plate would stay at 150F after it's enclosed is if the enclosing plate is at the same temperature as the chamber walls (0F).

Again. Yes/No: do you claim the heated plate will remain at 150F after the second plate is added?

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-08-01 17:10 (#47586207) Homepage Journal

We've determined equilibrium temperatures in a simple example, so let's solve a more general example.

Jane's concerned that the enclosing plate is bigger than the heated plate. But Earth's mean radius is 6371 km, and the effective radiating level is ~7 km higher, so these surface areas are only ~0.2% different. Of course, in a thought experiment this difference can be made arbitrarily smaller. Despite Jane's protests, this doesn't change the fact that enclosing the heated plate makes it warmer.

More importantly, I treated the plates as blackbodies where absorptivity alpha = 1 and emissivity epsilon = 1. This is a reasonable approximation for plates made of carbon nanotube arrays (PDF) which have alpha = ~0.99955. But more conventional plates have alpha and epsilon considerably less than 1.

The next step is to treat the plates as graybodies where absorptivity and emissivity are independent of wavelength, so they appear gray. Kirchoff's Law states that absorptivity = emissivity for graybodies.

MIT calculates heat transfer between graybody plates using an infinite sum of emission, reflection and absorption. Using my variable names, their final expression is:

net heat flow = sigma*(T_h^4 - T_c^4)/(1/epsilon_h + 1/epsilon_c - 1) (Eq. 2)

(Again, Eq. 2 looks better in LaTeX, but hopefully this version is legible.)

At equilibrium, net heat flow equals the electrical input. Note that MIT's Eq. 2 reduces to my Eq. 1 for blackbodies where epsilon_h = epsilon_c = 1.

Suppose the plates and chamber walls are made of oxidized aluminum with emissivity = 0.11. In this case, Sage solves Eq. 2 for a constant electric input of 29.6 W/m^2, which is lower than before because aluminum doesn't radiate as well as a blackbody.

Using Eq. 2 and the same reasoning as before, fully enclosing the heated plate warms it to the same equilibrium temperature of 235F (386K). Fully exposing the plate to the cosmic microwave background radiation cools it to 13F (263K), which is lower than before because the CMBR is a blackbody and aluminum chamber walls aren't.

So even for graybody plates, MIT's mainstream physics refutes Dr. Latour's nonsensical claim that the enclosed heated plate remains at 150F. They also use this equation to explain how thermos bottles insulate drinks, and describe the same radiation shields used since at least Daniels 1968 (PDF). Again, these shields work like Dr. Spencer's insulating plate.

If you won't listen to MIT physicists, note that their final expression is consistent with these equations and Eq. 1 in Goodman 1957.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Re:Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

by Jane Q. Public (1010737) Friend of a Friend on 2014-08-01 23:45 (#47587613)

Jane's concerned that the enclosing plate is bigger than the heated plate.

I know I said I wouldn't respond, but STOP TRYING TO TELL OTHERS WHAT *I* AM

CONCERNED ABOUT. YOU DO NOT KNOW, SO YOU HAVE NO PLACE
CLAIMING YOU DO.

I am not "concerned" about any of it. Though you seem to be. And I don't know why,
because your analysis above actually verifies what I stated earlier. I've been wasting my
time with (my opinion) an idiot.

But Earth's mean radius is 6371 km, and the effective radiating level is ~7 km higher, so
these surface areas are only ~0.2% different.

0.2% is not zero. Therefore T0 (if that is the outward extent of earth system) has a surface
area of T * 1.002, and its temperature will be measurably lower than that of heat source T.
Therefore we have a **net** heat transfer proportional to T - T0, which is a non-zero quantity.

You've proved nothing here except to verify my point. But let's finish it...

Of course, in a thought experiment this difference can be made arbitrarily smaller. Despite
Jane's protests, this doesn't change the fact that enclosing the heated plate makes it
warmer.

This argument is HILARIOUS. The only way you can make it "arbitrarily small" is by
making Spencer's (and your) whole argument "arbitrarily small" at the same time. I tried to
tell you this before, but you just don't get it. That's too bad, because in reality you can't
have it both ways.

If the dimensions (and therefore mass) of your "enclosing plate" approaches zero, then
any absorption and re-radiation will also approach zero, and any supposed effect it will
have on the temperature of the heat source will also approach zero. Even if your argument
were correct, you're arguing yourself out of an argument.

So no, this argument is NOT valid with an "arbitrarily small" enclosing mass. It has to have
enough to make a measurable difference on the temperature of the source (your argument,
not mine) or the whole argument is empty.

You are trying to say you can make the dimensions larger by an "arbitrarily small" amount,
without reducing **the effect you are arguing for** to an equally "arbitrarily small" amount.
But the whole argument was about tangible and measurable effects. So you can't have it
that way, man.

You sure know how to argue yourself into corners. Your assumptions are pure shit.

Now, I am done arguing. You can repeat the same BULLSHIT over and over all you want,
but that won't make it any more valid. If you had the courage of your convictions, you
would argue with the proper people about this, rather than trying to pick on (and losing to)
a layman who is actually just laughing at your antics. Not laughing at your insults and
attempts at ad-hominem and character assassination, no. But your antics, and your
arguments about "physics", yes.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-08-02 0:10 (#47587679) Homepage Journal

Again, the only way the heated plate would stay at 150F after it's enclosed is if the
enclosing plate is at the same temperature as the chamber walls (0F).

Again. Yes/No: do you claim the heated plate will remain at 150F after the second plate is
added?

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Re:Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

by Jane Q. Public (1010737) Friend of a Friend on 2014-08-02 10:51 (#47589563)
I want to clarify my comment above:

The relevant part should have read:

The outward surface S0 (if that is the outward extent of earth system) has a surface area of 1.002 * Earth's non-atmosphere surface), and therefore its temperature will be measurably lower than that of heat source T. And therefore we have a net heat transfer proportional to T - T0, which is a non-zero quantity.
Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-08-02 11:00 (#47589619) Homepage Journal

    ... therefore we have a net heat transfer proportional to T - T0

Don't you mean proportional to T^4-T0^4?

More importantly, can we agree that in equilibrium, power in = power out?

If so, the only way the heated plate would stay at 150F after it's enclosed is if the enclosing plate is at the same temperature as the chamber walls (0F).

Again. Yes/No: do you claim the heated plate will remain at 150F after the second plate is added?

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Re:Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

by Jane Q. Public (1010737) Friend of a Friend on 2014-08-02 11:35 (#47589779)
I meant what I said. If Q1**4 is proportional to Q2**4, then Q1 is proportional to Q2. I did NOT say "directly" proportional. I don't mind being corrected when I make a mistake but that was not a mistake.

More importantly, can we agree that in equilibrium, power in = power out?

No. I am not aware of any "conservation of power" law.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Re:Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

by Jane Q. Public (1010737) Friend of a Friend on 2014-08-02 11:46 (#47589825)
I admit to being an ass there. Mea culpa. But it's irrelevant. As long as the power used by the source and the power used by the cooler are constant as required, any relationship between them has no bearing on the experiment.
Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-08-02 11:47 (#47589829) Homepage Journal

More importantly, can we agree that in equilibrium, power in = power out?

No. I am not aware of any "conservation of power" law.

Energy is conserved, which means that if you draw a boundary around some system (like the heated plate), the power going in minus the power going out must equal the rate at which energy inside that boundary changes. At equilibrium, the system isn't changing so its energy is constant. Therefore, at equilibrium power in = power out.

That's the basis of all these calculations, which is why I repeatedly asked if we could agree on it.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin 8+
  ▪

  ▪

Re:Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (**Score:2**)

by Jane Q. Public (1010737) Friend of a Friend on 2014-08-02 12:01 (#47589899)

Again. Yes/No: do you claim the heated plate will remain at 150F after the second plate is added?

Repeat Latour's comment here:

However, the absorption rate of real bodies depends on whether the absorber T (radiating or not), is less than the intercepted radiation T, or not. If the receiver T [is less than] intercepted T, no **[net]** absorption occurs; if the receiver T [is less than] intercepted T the absorption rate may be as great as proportional to (T intercepted - T absorber), depending on the amounts reflected, transmitted or scattered.

(I have added [net] to indicate his argument is **net** heat transfer there, as Latour has explained many times elsewhere. I have also replaced "less than symbol" with [is less than] due to Slashdot's character restrictions.)

I repeat: you are completely (and wrongly) ignoring real-world conditions that apply to the experiment.

The experiment requires the passive plate to be some unspecified distance from the heat source. (This is a condition of the experiment; no contact is allowed since this is only about **radiative** transfer.) And no matter its configuration, it will radiate some of its absorbed energy outward to the chamber walls. This much we know.

The chamber walls C are actively cooled, although at a fixed power input. So it absorbs radiation from the internal space. We know at equilibrium T(c) will always be less than T at the source S: T(c) [is less than] T(s) because the wall is actively cooled. (We know for another reason too, but this is sufficient.)

We also know that the passive plate P will always be at a temperature less than that of the source, for the simple reason that no matter what its position, it does not absorb all the radiation from S. Or even if it did, as in the case of completely enclosing S, it would still re-radiate some of its absorbed energy out to the chamber walls C. Therefore as long as the conditions of the experiment are met, **no matter what else varies** such as relative mass, in this experiment T(p) will be lower than T(s). The amount is of no consequence, as long as it is non-zero (and it is).

Therefore, from S-B law, we can directly infer the following things:

T(c) [is less than] T(s) [net heat transfer is from source to walls, never the other way around]

T(p) [is less than] T(s) [net heat transfer is from source to plate, never the other way around]

We can also infer from the experimental conditions that T(c) [is less than] T(p), but that is irrelevant to the argument.

When equilibrium is achieved, these conditions still hold.

An elementary, obvious, and perfectly sound conclusion from this is that the source is not made hotter under any of these conditions. Even if plate P completely encloses source S, we know for at least two different reasons (greater radiative area, and the simple fact that it **does** radiate outward to the wall, which cools it) that T(p) will always be less than T(s), even at equilibrium.

Since the temperature of every other object is **less than** that of the heat source, there is no net heat flow TO the heat source, therefore the heat source does not become hotter. This is, and has been, the whole of Latour's argument, and it is valid. It is not crazy speculation by some nitwit, it is straightforward application of Stefan-Boltzmann law.

Q.E.D., indeed. If the above inequalities hold (and they do), Latour's conclusion is the only one that is mathematically valid.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-08-02 12:07 (#47589941) Homepage Journal
Again, can we agree that in equilibrium, power in = power out?
Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-08-02 12:10 (#47589959) Homepage Journal

Jane's still talking about plate areas, but he's definitely not concerned.

Let's see how a 0.2% larger enclosing plate affects equilibrium temperatures. The heated plate is a sphere with radius 6371 mm and surface area A_h. The enclosing plate is a 1 mm thick concentric shell with an inner radius of 6378 mm, surface area A_c1 on the inside, and A_c2 on the outside. The chamber is also a concentric sphere with inner radius 6386 mm, so there's a 7 mm gap on both sides of the enclosing shell. Again, the plates and walls are oxidized aluminum.

At equilibrium, the enclosing shell radiates the same power out as the heated plate did before it was enclosed. But its area is 1.0025 times larger, so its outer temperature is 149.6F (338.5K) instead of 150.0F (338.7K):

$$A\_h*T\_h\^4 = A\_c2*T\_c2\^4 \text{ (Eq. 3)}$$

For the moment, let's pretend the enclosing shell is a thermal superconductor, so its inner temperature is also 149.6F (338.5K). Energy conservation at equilibrium just inside the enclosing shell shows that the heated sphere will warm to an equilibrium temperature of 233.8F (385.3K)

Note that 233.8F is warmer than the heated sphere's original 150.0F equilibrium temperature.

We could keep making this thought experiment more realistic, but that wouldn't change the fact that enclosing the heated plate makes it warmer. For instance, instead of correcting the temperature manually as I did in Eq. 3, we could use Wikipedia's equation which includes areas. Or we could account for the enclosing shell's finite conductivity, but that would just make the heated plate even hotter.

Again, Dr. Latour and the Sky Dragon Slayers are wrong.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (**Score:2**)

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-08-02 13:51 (#47590347) Homepage Journal

> Now I **KNOW** you're just spouting bullshit. Because you well know that even "arbitrarily small" is not zero. And any deviation from zero is enough to make the difference between *T* and *T0* (or however you want to designate them) non-zero. A non-zero difference is all we need, no matter how "arbitrarily small" you try to make it. ... he USES "mainstream" physics to show that in reality it does not warm infinitely, and therefore Spencer's argument was wrong. I mean you're just absolutely trying to reverse the real argument here. But I really don't expect you to see that, because if we assume you're being honest (which I do not in fact assume), you don't even see the enormous gaping holes in your own argument which you made above. IN REALITY, the enclosing plate will be somewhat cooler. That's not even advanced physics, it's simple math. Repeat: why can a layman so easily poke holes in your "physics" arguments? I'm not a physicist, and haven't claimed to be one. *[Jane Q. Public, 2014-08-01]*

Jane's insistence that "a non-zero difference is all we need" between the heated plate's **initial** temperature of 150F and the enclosing plate's **final** temperature of ~150F was interesting. In this thought experiment, the enclosing plate was initially cooler than 100F.

> ... your analysis above actually verifies what I stated earlier. I've been wasting my time with (my opinion) an idiot. 0.2% is not zero. Therefore T0 (if that is the outward extent of earth system) has a surface area of T * 1.002, and its temperature will be measurably lower than that of heat source T. Therefore we have a **net** heat transfer proportional to T - T0, which is a non-zero quantity. You've proved nothing here except to verify my point. ... *[Jane Q. Public, 2014-08-01]*

> The outward surface S0 (if that is the outward extent of earth system) has a surface area of 1.002 * Earth's non-atmosphere surface), and therefore its temperature will be measurably lower than that of heat source T. And therefore we have a net heat transfer proportional to T - T0, which is a non-zero quantity. *[Jane Q. Public, 2014-08-02]*

Jane continues to focus on the difference between the heated plate's **initial** temperature of 150F and the enclosing plate's **final** temperature of ~150F, while the enclosing plate's initial temperature was below 100F. For **all** the thought experiments we've discussed, the heated plate at time "t" has **always** been warmer than the enclosing plate at the same time.

As long as it's warmer than the chamber walls, the exact final equilibrium temperature of the enclosing plate is completely irrelevant to the fact that enclosing the heated plate warms it.

> The experiment requires the passive plate to be some unspecified distance from the heat source. (This is a condition of the experiment; no contact is allowed since this is only about **radiative** transfer.) ... We also know that the passive plate P will always be at a temperature less than that of the source... T(p) will be lower than T(s). The amount is of no consequence, as long as it is non-zero (and it is). ... An elementary, obvious, and perfectly sound conclusion from this is that the source is not made hotter under any of these conditions. Even if plate P completely encloses source S, we know for at least two different reasons (greater radiative area, and the simple fact that it **does** radiate outward to the wall, which cools it) that T(p) will always be less than T(s), even at equilibrium. Since the temperature of every other object is **less than** that of the heat source, there is no net heat flow TO the heat source, therefore the heat source does not become hotter. This is, and has been, the whole of Latour's argument, and it is valid. It is not crazy speculation by some nitwit, it is straightforward application of Stefan-Boltzmann law. Q.E.D., indeed. If the above inequalities hold (and they do), Latour's conclusion is the only one that is mathematically valid. *[Jane Q. Public, 2014-08-02]*

Nonsense. T(p) (which I call T_c) at time "t" has **always** been less than T(s) (which I call T_h) at the same time in **all** the thought experiments we've discussed. That's why I called them T_c and T_h! Constant electrical power flows in, and at equilibrium equal power radiates out. Enclosing the heated plate with a plate that's warmer than the chamber walls initially decreases that power out. Just as if the chamber walls were suddenly warmed. So the plates are no longer in equilibrium and build up heat until they radiate enough power via Stefan-Boltzmann to reach a warmer equilibrium.

That's why I solved for equilibrium temperatures using the principle that power in = power out. Once again, can we agree that in equilibrium, power in = power out?

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin 8+

-

-

Re:Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

by Jane Q. Public (1010737) Friend of a Friend on 2014-08-03 14:00 (#47595325)

Energy conservation at equilibrium just inside the enclosing shell shows that the heated sphere will warm to an equilibrium temperature of 233.8F (385.3K)

Nice link. Do you really expect me to read that .sws file? How about something human-readable?

So, first you postulate a thermal superconductor, and then assert that it has a far higher temperature on one side than on the other?

What a magical world you must live in.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin 8+

-

-

Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-08-03 15:04 (#47595629) Homepage Journal

> Nice link. Do you really expect me to read that .sws file? How about
> something human-readable? *[Jane Q. Public]*

These open source Sage worksheets show my work for these thought experiments. Clicking "Try Sage Online" would let you upload my third worksheet, and hitting shift-enter a few times would recalculate all its answers. But in case you don't want to do that, here's a formatted copy of that worksheet and its answers:

#Calculate constant electrical power/area heating 1st plate.
var('sigma T_c T_h electricity epsilon_h epsilon_c')
eq1 = electricity == sigma*(T_h^4 - T_c^4)/(1/epsilon_h + 1/epsilon_c - 1)
soln1 = solve(eq1.subs(T_c=255.372,T_h=338.706,sigma=5.670373E-8,epsilon_h=0.11,epsilon_c=0.11),electricity)
soln1[0].rhs().n()

ANSWER = 29.3986743761843

6379^2/6371^2.n()

ANSWER = 1.00251295644620

338.706*1.00251295644620^(-.25).n()

ANSWER = 338.493545219805

#Completely surrounded by 2nd plate
soln2 =
solve(eq1.subs(T_c=338.493545219805,electricity=29.3986743761843,sigma=5.670373e-8,epsilon_h=0.11,epsilon_c=0.11),T_h)
soln2[0].rhs().n()

ANSWER = 385.286813818721*I

This could also be done on a calculator, which is why I explained how to derive the equations using the principle that at equilibium, power in = power out.

> ... its outer temperature is 149.6F ... pretend the enclosing shell is

> > a thermal superconductor, so its inner temperature is also
> > 149.6F ... *[Dumb Scientist]*

> > So, first you postulate a thermal superconductor, and then assert that it has a
> > far higher temperature on one side than on the other? What a magical world
> > you must live in. *[Jane Q. Public]*

No, I said both sides of a thermal superconductor enclosing shell are at 149.6F.
Accounting for aluminum's finite conductivity would mean its inner temperature would be
higher than its outer temperature. If you'd like, we could see how an aluminum plate
warms the inner plate higher than the 233.8F it would be at with a superconducting plate.
Just let me know, and I'll do the calculations.

But I don't think that would be helpful yet, because I didn't realize we have a fundamental
disagreement:

> > More importantly, can we agree that in equilibrium, power in =
> > power out?

> > No. I am not aware of any "conservation of power" law. *[Jane Q. Public]*

Energy is conserved, which means that if you draw a boundary around some system (like
the heated plate), power going in minus power going out equals the rate at which energy
inside that boundary changes. At equilibrium, that rate is zero because the system doesn't
change. So at equilibrium, power in = power out.

That's the basis of all these calculations, which is why I've repeatedly asked if we could
agree on it.

Once again, can we agree that in equilibrium, power in = power out?

For the moment, I'll assume we can. If not, please explain why you don't agree that in
equilibrium, power in = power out.

I'm sorry that I didn't realize earlier that we have such a fundamental disagreement. I
should've been building a common understanding of equilibrium and conservation of
energy rather than solving increasingly complicated thought experiments. So let's take this
step by step and see if we can agree on anything.

Let's start with conservation of energy just inside the chamber walls at equilibrium: power
in = power out.

A blackbody plate is heated by constant electrical power flowing in. Blackbody cold walls
at 0F (T_c = 255K) also radiate power in. The heated plate at 150F (T_h = 339K) radiates
power out. Using irradiance (power/m^2) simplifies the equation:

electricity + sigma*T_c^4 = sigma*T_h^4 (Eq. 1)

(Eq. 1 looks better in LaTeX, but hopefully this version is legible.)

Yes/No: can we agree that Eq. 1 is based on the Stefan-Boltzmann law and correctly
describes conservation of energy just inside the chamber walls at equilibrium?

If yes, the next step is to solve Eq. 1 for the constant electrical input using a calculator or
the Sage worksheet I provided.

If no, could you please write down the equation you think correctly describes
conservation of energy just inside the chamber walls at equilibrium?

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-08-03 16:08 (#47595887) Homepage Journal
Instead of saying "an aluminum plate warms the inner plate" perhaps I should've said "an
aluminum plate warms the enclosed heated plate." Maybe this will help distinguish
between the inner surface of the enclosing plate and the enclosed heated plate. I'm sorry
for any confusion this caused, and corrected it at Dumb Scientist.
Parent Share

■

Re:Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

by Jane Q. Public (1010737) Friend of a Friend on 2014-08-04 10:31 (#47601045)

These open source Sage [sagemath.org] worksheets show my work for these thought experiments.

I know what a .sws file is. But I'm not going to download and install Sage on this computer to read it. And I didn't have any trouble understanding the above.

Regarding your calculations: you're making mistakes that others have already made -- and which have subsequently been shot down -- when trying to refute Latour. I could point a couple of them out now, but I'm not going to. This was amusing at first but I'm done babysitting you.

You really need to do your homework. I know you think you're right. But among other things, you're conflating... oops but I said I wouldn't do that. So good bye.

■

Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-08-04 11:23 (#47601433) Homepage Journal

Clicking "Try Sage Online" doesn't require downloading or installing Sage on your computer. But more importantly:

> More importantly, can we agree that in equilibrium, power in = power out?

> No. I am not aware of any "conservation of power" law. *[Jane Q. Public]*

Energy is conserved, which means that if you draw a boundary around some system (like the heated plate), power going in minus power going out equals the rate at which energy inside that boundary changes. At equilibrium, that rate is zero because the system doesn't change. So at equilibrium, power in = power out.

That's the basis of all these calculations, which is why I've repeatedly asked if we could agree on it.

Once again, can we agree that in equilibrium, power in = power out?

For the moment, I'll assume we can. If not, please explain why you don't agree that in equilibrium, power in = power out.

I'm sorry that I didn't realize earlier that we have such a fundamental disagreement. I should've been building a common understanding of equilibrium and conservation of energy rather than solving increasingly complicated thought experiments. So let's take this step by step and see if we can agree on anything.

Let's start with conservation of energy just inside the chamber walls at equilibrium: power in = power out.

A blackbody plate is heated by constant electrical power flowing in. Blackbody cold walls at 0F (T_c = 255K) also radiate power in. The heated plate at 150F (T_h = 339K) radiates power out. Using irradiance (power/m^2) simplifies the equation:

electricity + sigma*T_c^4 = sigma*T_h^4 (Eq. 1)

(Eq. 1 looks better in LaTeX, but hopefully this version is legible.)

Yes/No: can we agree that Eq. 1 is based on the Stefan-Boltzmann law and correctly describes conservation of energy just inside the chamber walls at equilibrium?

If yes, the next step is to solve Eq. 1 for the constant electrical input using a calculator or the Sage worksheet I provided.

If no, could you please write down the equation you think correctly describes conservation of energy just inside the chamber walls at equilibrium?

Earlier I made an offhand remark that enclosing the heated plate is like suddenly warming the chamber walls. This simpler scenario might be more helpful. Suppose the chamber walls are suddenly warmed from 0F to 149F. What will happen to the heated plate if the electrical power heating the plate remains constant? If you claim it would remain at 150F, think carefully about energy conservation at equilibrium. When the walls were at 0F, the plate was in equilibrium because power in = power out. But now the net power radiating out is **much** smaller, which means power in > power out. So what happens to the heated plate?

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

    ■

   ■

Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-08-04 18:23 (#47604079) Homepage Journal

> .. physicists are now saying "Climate scientists should start listening to physicists about physics." [Jane Q. Public, 2012-04-14]

Does Jane listen to physicists about physics?

> .. A cooler object cannot increase the temperature of a warmer object via thermal radiation. It just doesn't happen. Ask any physicist. .. [Jane Q. Public, 2012-04-17]

> .. An article by Spencer linked to elsewhere in this discussion (look for "Yes, Virginia") describes this concept of back-radiation, which is central to many of the AGW models. The article that I linked to above is by a Ph.D. physicist, refuting the first article. .. [Jane Q. Public, 2012-04-18]

Does Jane think PhD physicists are credible regarding physics?

> And yet the "climate scientists" themselves have not been asking the statisticians about the math or physicists about the physics. [Lonny Eachus, 2012-04-20]

Does Lonny Eachus ask physicists about the physics?

> .. climate scientists themselves have not been consulting .. physicists about the physics! [Jane Q. Public, 2012-05-02]

Does Jane consult physicists about the physics?

> .. How many of the CO2 models rely on the concept of "back radiation" to explain the radiative forcings? There's a bit of a problem with that: "back radiation" is physically impossible. Again see that link to the article by Latour (a physicist) who shows very clearly exactly why that is so. .. [Jane Q. Public, 2012-05-10]

> So anyway, here is physicist Pierre Latour, refuting Spencer's explanation: bit.ly/JV9XmI [Lonny Eachus, 2012-05-21]

> .. the CO2-warming model rely on the concept of "back radiation", which physicists (not climate scientists) have proved to be impossible. I'm happy to leave actual climate science to climate scientists. But when THEIR models rely on a fundamental misunderstanding of physics, I'll take the physicists' word for it, thank you very much. .. [Jane Q. Public, 2012-07-05]

Does Jane actually take the physicists' word for it?

> .. now it's physicists saying that they've got the physics wrong. .. [Jane Q. Public, 2012-07-05]

> .. They have been accused of getting the physics of their models wrong by

professional, well-respected physicists. [Jane Q. Public, 2012-07-05]

Actually, the rules aren't even well-known. The majority of CO2 warming models rely on a concept of "back radiation" that (according to physicists) does not even exist.. [Jane Q. Public, 2012-07-15]

After Namarrgon notes that Dr. Latour is actually a chemical process engineer, Jane admits his mistake:

By the way: Latour is a process engineer with **particular expertise** in thermodynamic control systems. If I were in a room in which you challenged him over thermodynamics, I'd probably want to go outside to avoid the bloodbath. Good luck with that whole argument. To say it's weak is just.. well.. weak. [Jane Q. Public, 2012-11-20]

A large body of scientists who are PHYSICISTS agree with me. A large body of scientists who are CLIMATE RESEARCHERS disagree. .. which group should I listen to? The ones whose SPECIALTY it is, or the tyros? Go learn a little humility yourself. Like for example learning to admit when you're wrong. [Jane Q. Public, 2013-05-30]

I showed Jane statements from the American Institute of Physics, the American Physical Society, the Australian Institute of Physics, and the European Physical Society. Spoiler alert: mainstream physicists **don't** agree with the Slayers.

Maybe Jane doesn't actually take the physicists' word for it?

.. To the best of my knowledge -- and I have been following the issue -- not one physicist has even attempted to refute LaTour's analysis, while a number of physicists have backed him up. .. [Jane Q. Public, 2013-05-30]

rgbatduke is Prof. Brown, a physicist who'd refuted Dr. Latour's analysis directly to Jane, but as usual Jane just doubled down. On a Slayer blog post about Prof. Brown, Lonny Eachus even repeated Jane's arguments to physicist Joel Shore, who refuted Lonny.

Maybe Jane/Lonny Eachus doesn't actually take the physicists' word for it?

.. I consult "the experts". When it's a question of physics, for example, I look to references from physicists, not climatologists. After all, physicists are "the experts" when it comes to physics. [Jane Q. Public, 2013-11-15]

Does Jane really think physicists are "the experts" when it comes to physics?

.. First, they mention the theory of AGW "radiative" forcing, which as I stated earlier is probably myth, according to physicists and experts in radiative heat transfer. .. [Jane Q. Public, 2013-12-23]

Funny.. it's **physicists** and recognized experts in radiative heat transfer who are **disagreeing** with the concept. Since the concept involves physics and radiative heat transfer, I am rather inclined to believe them over "climate scientists". [Jane Q. Public, 2013-12-24]

.. Jesus, man. This guy designed heat transfer control systems for NASA. Do you really think he's going to make that kind of mistake? [Jane Q. Public, 2014-02-11]

Hopefully he just made elementary mistakes, rather than deliberately spreading civilization-paralyzing misinformation. Sadly, the result isn't too different either way.

.. Further, why do you imply that climate scientists are experts on thermodynamics? That's an area of physics, not climatology, and I know some physicists who very much disagree with today's mainstream "climate science". [Jane Q. Public, 2014-03-07]

.. I repeatedly linked you and others in the past to PHYSICISTS who say otherwise. .. [Jane Q. Public, 2014-03-21]

.. Latour is a control engineer for chemical processes and he has designed heat-transfer systems for NASA. [Jane Q. Public, 2014-03-22]

Latour designs heat-transfer control systems for a living. He did it for NASA, among other notables. [Jane Q. Public, 2014-03-24]

.. There are also physicists who worked for NASA, and other science

professionals, currently challenging the very foundations of AGW theory. ..
[Jane Q. Public, 2014-03-31]

Does Jane think physicists who work for NASA are credible regarding physics?

> .. Even if you did not take his word for it, his career building control systems
> precisely for the purpose of managing heat transfer would strongly suggest
> that this is hardly something he is likely to neglect. .. [Jane Q. Public,
> 2014-08-01]

> .. Dr. Latour did heat-transfer work for NASA, and has made a career of
> building control systems for chemical processes involving heat. I daresay he is
> more of an expert on the subject than "Khayman80". .. [Jane Q. Public,
> 2014-07-25]

Did heat-transfer work for NASA, or managed NASA's Apollo Docking Simulator
development? Doesn't seem to matter, as long as he did it for NASA. If having worked for
NASA gives Dr. Latour credibility, shouldn't Jane find climate.nasa.gov credible?

Jane's repeatedly implied that working for NASA gives one credibility, that physicists are
"the experts" when it comes to physics, and that Jane "takes the physicists' word for it."
I'm skeptical.

> .. why can a layman so easily poke holes in your "physics" arguments? I'm not
> a physicist, and haven't claimed to be one. [Jane Q. Public, 2014-08-01]

If Jane thinks he's poking holes, maybe he's the Black Knight. Jane has claimed to "take
the physicists' word for it," but I'm skeptical.

*".. non-person.. disingenuous and intended to mislead .. he is either lying .. dishonest ..
intellectually dishonest .. intellectually dishonest .. Khayman80's intellectual
dishonesty .. Pathetic. ... you've come out the loser in every case.. you can't win a fucking
argument. You don't know how. You don't understand logic. You've proved this many
times. Get stuffed, and go away. The ONLY thing you are to me is an annoyance. I have
NO respect for you either as a scientist or a person. .. cowardice .. odious person .. you
look like a fool .. utterly and disgustingly transparent .. Now get lost. Your totally
unjustified arrogance is irritating as hell. .. You are simply proving you don't know what
you're talking about. .. Jesus, get a clue. This is just more bullshit. .. spewing bullshit ..
You're making yourself look like a fool. .. Hahahahahaha!!! Jesus, you're a fool. .. a free
lesson in humility.. you either misunderstand, or you're lying. After 2 years of this shit, I
strongly suspect it is the latter. .. Now I **KNOW** you're just spouting bullshit. .. if we
assume you're being honest (which I do not in fact assume) .. I wouldn't mind a bit if the
whole world saw your foolishness as clearly as I do. .. stream of BS.. idiot .. Your
assumptions are pure shit. .. I'm done babysitting you.."* **[Jane Q. Public]**

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin 8+

   ▪

   ▪

Re:Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

by Jane Q. Public (1010737) Friend of a Friend on 2014-08-04 22:49 (#47604973)
Once again, you place years-old and unrelated comments in juxtaposition in order to try to
make it appear I was saying things I did not actually intend to say. That gets zero respect.
Do you really not understand that "out of context" is one of the classic fallacies?

I have known, and openly stated, for a long time that Latour is a chemical process
engineer. There is no contradiction there, no matter that you try to make it appear that
way. His is a profession which deals with this kind of problem all the time. And his little
group also does have physicists in it too. You should not forget that.

I showed Jane statements from the American Institute of Physics, the American Physical
Society, the Australian Institute of Physics, and the European Physical Society. Spoiler
alert: mainstream physicists don't agree with the Slayers.

None of your citations even mention Latour, much less try to refute him. You are just
making your usual straw-man arguments again.

And I already told you I was being an ass about your "power in equals power out" thing.
Trying to lecture me about conservation of energy is particularly pointless, since I need no

such lesson. But since you mention power... are you sure you don't have your units confused somewhere? But oops... I told you I wouldn't give you any more hints.

It is now triply hilarious to me that now I have stopped guiding you by the nose through this problem, you have turned hostile and ad-hominem again. Why do you need my guidance? Why don't you present your argument to Latour? He is the one making the argument you are trying (so far -- two years now -- very UNsuccessfully) to refute. I am aware that you think you are correct, but repeating that to me isn't going to get you anywhere.

Did heat-transfer work for NASA, or managed NASA's Apollo Docking Simulator development? Doesn't seem to matter, as long as he did it for NASA. If having worked for NASA gives Dr. Latour credibility, shouldn't Jane find climate.nasa.gov credible?

Very well. I hereby correct my comments to say his career has involved heat-transfer work AND he has worked for NASA. (Not that I expect you to honor that correction... as you have so conveniently left out other corrections I have made over the years.) But no, for reasons I have mentioned many times elsewhere, I do not find climate.nasa.gov credible. But that's off the subject... which is just par for the course for you, eh?

Do you feel that doing work for JPL has increased your credibility any? I am curious. If someone had asked me before I got to know you I might have said yes. But today is a different matter.

Despite your incessant attempts at ad-hominem, Latour and friends have had an open challenge out there for more than a year now -- I think closer to two -- asking for anyone who can formally refute his main thesis, which was briefly explained in his rebuttal of Spencer. So far nobody has. Why is that? If you can, why aren't you? Why are you here, trying to argue with me instead?

But we both know why, don't we? I'm only asking so that any other people who might read this will ask themselves.

Go make these same arguments to Latour and his friends, and leave me alone. Of course, I know they will (quite correctly) tear your arguments to shreds, and I even know how they'll do it. But I have no particular need to do that. So you should really stop asking me to do that. I'm not doing any of this in fact... I'm just watching you do it to yourself. And no, I'm not going to give you any more hints. If that one isn't sufficient, you'll probably never get it. Two years now. Wow.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin 8+

-

-

Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-08-04 23:07 (#47605027) Homepage Journal

I've explained that in equilibrium, power in = power out.

A blackbody plate is heated by constant electrical power flowing in. Blackbody cold walls at 0F ($T\_c = 255K$) also radiate power in. The heated plate at 150F ($T\_h = 339K$) radiates power out. Using irradiance (power/m^2) simplifies the equation:

electricity + sigma*T_c^4 = sigma*T_h^4 (Eq. 1)

(Eq. 1 looks better in LaTeX, but hopefully this version is legible.)

Suppose the chamber walls are suddenly warmed from $T\_c = 0F$ to 149F. What will happen to the heated plate if the electrical power heating the plate remains constant?

Note that this problem doesn't have multiple steps or confusing area changes. It's just one equation. T_c just increased and electricity is constant. Continuing to insist that T_h stays constant would just make it harder for posterity to believe Jane/Lonny Eachus is honestly confused, rather than deliberately spreading civilization-paralyzing misinformation.

If we increase the left hand side of Eq. 1, how could the right hand side **not** increase?

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin 8+

Re:Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (**Score:2**)

by Jane Q. Public (1010737) Friend of a Friend on 2014-08-04 23:17 (#47605063)
I understand what you're saying, very well. Too bad it's not correct. Repeating it isn't going to make it any more correct.

As for your heating the walls, the argument all along has been about something that is warmed from a cooler state to equilibrium. Whether your point about heating the walls is correct or not isn't part of it.

There was a reason for the particular argument Spencer was making. So he made that particular argument. Latour refuted that argument. If you want to argue about something else, that's your problem I guess.
Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Re:Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (**Score:2**)

by Jane Q. Public (1010737) Friend of a Friend on 2014-08-04 23:20 (#47605071)
The point I was getting at before is that other people have made these arguments before. They didn't hold up. Which you would have already known, if you had simply researched your subject.

I am puzzled why you think repeating arguments that have already been publicly shot down would suddenly become valid. Just because YOU made them?
Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (**Score:2**)

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-08-05 9:13 (#47607167) Homepage Journal

> A large body of scientists who are PHYSICISTS agree with me. A large body of scientists who are CLIMATE RESEARCHERS disagree. ... which group should I listen to? The ones whose SPECIALTY it is, or the tyros? Go learn a little humility yourself. Like for example learning to admit when you're wrong. *[Jane Q. Public, 2013-05-30]*

I showed Jane statements from the American Institute of Physics, the American Physical Society, the Australian Institute of Physics, and the European Physical Society. Spoiler alert: mainstream physicists **don't** agree with the Slayers.

Maybe Jane doesn't actually take the physicists' word for it?

> ... None of your citations even mention Latour, much less try to refute him. You are just making your usual straw-man arguments again. ... *[Jane Q. Public, 2014-08-04]*

All those professional physics societies agree that our CO2 emissions are causing warming, which Dr. Latour and the Slayers deny. Jane's claimed that physicists are "the experts" when it comes to physics, and that Jane "takes the physicists' word for it." I'm skeptical.

> ... To the best of my knowledge -- and I have been following the issue -- not one physicist has even attempted to refute LaTour's analysis, while a number of physicists have backed him up. ... *[Jane Q. Public, 2013-05-30]*

rgbatduke is Prof. Brown, a physicist who'd refuted Dr. Latour's analysis directly to Jane, but as usual Jane just doubled down. On a Slayer blog post about Prof. Brown, Lonny Eachus even repeated Jane's arguments to physicist Joel Shore, who refuted Lonny.

Maybe Jane/Lonny Eachus doesn't actually take the physicists' word for it?

> ... As for your heating the walls, the argument all along has been about something that is warmed from a cooler state to equilibrium. Whether your point about heating the walls is correct or not isn't part of it. ... *[Jane Q. Public, 2014-08-04]*

Of course it is. The heated plate reaches equilibrium at 150F with the chamber walls at 0F, then the chamber walls are warmed to 149F and the heated plate warms from a cooler state to a warmer equilibrium. This is a simple way to see that Slayer claims like these are wrong:

> ... Do you understand the second law of thermodynamics? Do you understand that it is not possible for a cooler body to increase the heat of a warmer body via infrared radiation? ... *[Jane Q. Public, 2013-05-27]*

> ... An object that is radiating at a certain black-body temperature WILL NOT absorb a less-energetic photon from an outside source. This is am extremely well-known corollary of the Second Law. ... *[Jane Q. Public, 2013-05-30]*

I've explained that in equilibrium, power in = power out.

A blackbody plate is heated by constant electrical power flowing in. Blackbody cold walls at 0F (T_c = 255K) also radiate power in. The heated plate at 150F (T_h = 339K) radiates power out. Using irradiance (power/m^2) simplifies the equation:

electricity + sigma*T_c^4 = sigma*T_h^4 (Eq. 1)

(Eq. 1 looks better in LaTeX, but hopefully this version is legible.)

Suppose the chamber walls are suddenly warmed from T_c = 0F to 149F. What will happen to the heated plate if the electrical power heating the plate remains constant?

Note that this problem doesn't have multiple steps or confusing area changes. It's just one equation. T_c just increased and electricity is constant. Continuing to insist that T_h stays constant would just make it harder for posterity to believe Jane/Lonny Eachus is honestly confused, rather than deliberately spreading civilization-paralyzing misinformation.

If we increase the left hand side of Eq. 1, how could the right hand side **not** increase?

> ... you have turned hostile and ad-hominem again. ... *[Jane Q. Public, 2014-08-04]*

Note that the italicized words at the end of my comment are Jane's words, not mine:

*"... non-person... disingenuous and intended to mislead ... he is either lying ... dishonest ... intellectually dishonest ... intellectually dishonest ... Khayman80's intellectual dishonesty ... Pathetic. ... you've come out the loser in every case... you can't win a fucking argument. You don't know how. You don't understand logic. You've proved this many times. Get stuffed, and go away. The ONLY thing you are to me is an annoyance. I have NO respect for you either as a scientist or a person. ... cowardice ... odious person ... you look like a fool ... utterly and disgustingly transparent ... Now get lost. Your totally unjustified arrogance is irritating as hell. ... You are simply proving you don't know what you're talking about. ... Jesus, get a clue. This is just more bullshit. ... spewing bullshit ... You're making yourself look like a fool. ... Hahahahahaha!!! Jesus, you're a fool. ... a free lesson in humility... you either misunderstand, or you're lying. After 2 years of this shit, I strongly suspect it is the latter. ... Now I **KNOW** you're just spouting bullshit. ... if we assume you're being honest (which I do not in fact assume) ... I wouldn't mind a bit if the whole world saw your foolishness as clearly as I do. ... stream of BS... idiot ... Your assumptions are pure shit. ... I'm done babysitting you..."* **[Jane Q. Public]**

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-08-05 12:49 (#47608573) Homepage Journal

... I hereby correct my comments to say his career has involved heat-transfer work AND he has worked for NASA. (Not that I expect you to honor that correction... as you have so conveniently left out other corrections I have made over the years.) ... *[Jane Q. Public, 2014-08-04]*

... Jesus, man. This guy designed heat transfer control systems [and worked for NASA]. Do you really think he's going to make that kind of mistake? *[Jane Q. Public, 2014-02-11]*

Hopefully he just made elementary mistakes, rather than deliberately spreading civilization-paralyzing misinformation. Sadly, the result isn't too different either way.

... Latour is a control engineer for chemical processes and he has designed heat-transfer systems [and worked for NASA]. *[Jane Q. Public, 2014-03-22]*

Latour designs heat-transfer control systems for a living. He did it [and worked for NASA], among other notables. *[Jane Q. Public, 2014-03-24]*

... There are also physicists who worked for NASA, and other science professionals, currently challenging the very foundations of AGW theory. ... *[Jane Q. Public, 2014-03-31]*

Does Jane think physicists who work for NASA are credible regarding physics?

... [Dr. Latour's career has involved heat-transfer work AND he has worked for NASA.] I daresay he is more of an expert on the subject than "Khayman80". ... *[Jane Q. Public, 2014-07-25]*

... I do not find climate.nasa.gov credible. ... *[Jane Q. Public, 2014-08-04]*

So why did Jane repeatedly mention working for NASA? How could working for NASA give someone credibility if Jane doesn't find NASA credible?

A blackbody plate is heated by constant electrical power flowing in. Blackbody cold walls at 0F ($T_c = 255K$) also radiate power in. The heated plate at 150F ($T_h = 339K$) radiates power out. Using irradiance (power/m^2) simplifies the equation:

electricity + sigma*T_c^4 = sigma*T_h^4 (Eq. 1)

Suppose the chamber walls are suddenly warmed from T_c = 0F to 149F. What will happen to the heated plate if the electrical power heating the plate remains constant?

Note that this problem doesn't have multiple steps or confusing area changes. It's just one equation. T_c just increased and electricity is constant. Continuing to insist that T_h stays constant would just make it harder for posterity to believe Jane/Lonny Eachus is honestly confused, rather than deliberately spreading civilization-paralyzing misinformation.

If we increase the left hand side of Eq. 1, how could the right hand side **not** increase?

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

-

-

Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-08-05 22:15 (#47611845) Homepage Journal

This person has no courage to engage the actual authors of ideas ... do it to his face ... you should be making these arguments to HIM, not me. Why are you "arguing" with me about this? If you want to refute him, then refute him, in public where other people can see. ... If you think you really can refute Latour, then go do it ... If you had the courage of your convictions, you would argue with the proper people about this ... his little group also does have physicists in it ... Why don't you present your argument to Latour? ... Latour and friends have had an open challenge out there for more than a year now -- I think closer to two -- asking for anyone who can formally refute his main thesis, which was briefly explained in his rebuttal of Spencer. So far nobody has. Why is that? If you can, why aren't you? Why are you here, trying to argue with me instead? But we both know why, don't we? I'm only asking so that any other people who might read this will ask themselves. Go make these

same arguments to Latour and his friends ... *[Jane Q. Public]*

Slashdot is public, neutral ground. More importantly, I wouldn't talk with Dr. Latour's friends in his little PSI Slayer group for the same reason I wouldn't talk with Super Adventure Club members if they existed.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Re:Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

by Jane Q. Public (1010737) Friend of a Friend on 2014-08-06 10:13 (#47615169)

So why did Jane repeatedly mention working for NASA? How could working for NASA give someone credibility if Jane doesn't find NASA credible?

Why does "khayman80" repeatedly mention working for JPL online?

No reason at all? Just for giggles? Somehow I doubt that.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-08-06 10:18 (#47615203) Homepage Journal

A blackbody plate is heated by constant electrical power flowing in. Blackbody cold walls at 0F (T_c = 255K) also radiate power in. The heated plate at 150F (T_h = 339K) radiates power out. Using irradiance (power/m^2) simplifies the equation:

electricity + sigma*T_c^4 = sigma*T_h^4 (Eq. 1)

Suppose the chamber walls are suddenly warmed from T_c = 0F to 149F. What will happen to the heated plate if the electrical power heating the plate remains constant?

Note that this problem doesn't have multiple steps or confusing area changes. It's just one equation. T_c just increased and electricity is constant. Continuing to insist that T_h stays constant would just make it harder for posterity to believe Jane/Lonny Eachus is honestly confused, rather than deliberately spreading civilization-paralyzing misinformation.

If we increase the left hand side of Eq. 1, how could the right hand side **not** increase?

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Re:Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

by Jane Q. Public (1010737) Friend of a Friend on 2014-08-07 8:33 (#47622979)

A blackbody plate is heated by constant electrical power flowing in. Blackbody cold walls at 0F (T_c = 255K) also radiate power in. The heated plate at 150F (T_h = 339K) radiates power out. Using irradiance (power/m^2) simplifies the equation:

...

If we increase the left hand side of Eq. 1, how could the right hand side not increase?

Why are you asking me? I mean, I know where you're making at least one mistake, but I already told you that you're going to have to discover it on your own.

Parent Share

twitter facebook linkedin ８+

   ■

  ■

Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-08-07 9:10 (#47623295) Homepage Journal

I'm asking you because you're claiming I made at least one mistake, without having the courage to actually say what it is. I'm also asking because this simple thought experiment disproves your ridiculous Slayer claims:

> ... Do you understand the second law of thermodynamics? Do you understand that it is not possible for a cooler body to increase the heat of a warmer body via infrared radiation? ... *[Jane Q. Public, 2013-05-27]*

> ... An object that is radiating at a certain black-body temperature WILL NOT absorb a less-energetic photon from an outside source. This is am extremely well-known corollary of the Second Law. ... *[Jane Q. Public, 2013-05-30]*

Once again. A blackbody plate is heated by constant electrical power flowing in. Blackbody cold walls at 0F (T_c = 255K) also radiate power in. The heated plate at 150F (T_h = 339K) radiates power out. Using irradiance (power/m^2) simplifies the equation:

electricity + sigma*T_c^4 = sigma*T_h^4 (Eq. 1)

Suppose the chamber walls are suddenly warmed from T_c = 0F to 149F. What will happen to the heated plate if the electrical power heating the plate remains constant?

Note that this problem doesn't have multiple steps or confusing area changes. It's just one equation. T_c just increased and electricity is constant. Continuing to insist that T_h stays constant would just make it harder for posterity to believe Jane/Lonny Eachus is honestly confused, rather than deliberately spreading civilization-paralyzing misinformation.

If we increase the left hand side of Eq. 1, how could the right hand side **not** increase?

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin ８+

   ■

  ■

Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (Score:2)

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-08-07 11:25 (#47624725) Homepage Journal

If Jane could answer this simple question, he wouldn't have spent the time since my last comment regurgitating more nonsense from "Steve Goddard" and issuing "Public Service Announcements" like Jane did at the beginning of this thread.

Once again. A blackbody plate is heated by constant electrical power flowing in. Blackbody cold walls at 0F (T_c = 255K) also radiate power in. The heated plate at 150F (T_h = 339K) radiates power out. Using irradiance (power/m^2) simplifies the equation:

electricity + sigma*T_c^4 = sigma*T_h^4 (Eq. 1)

Suppose the chamber walls are suddenly warmed from T_c = 0F to 149F. What will happen to the heated plate if the electrical power heating the plate remains constant?

Note that this problem doesn't have multiple steps or confusing area changes. It's just one equation. T_c just increased and electricity is constant. Continuing to insist that T_h stays constant would just make it harder for posterity to believe Jane/Lonny Eachus is honestly confused, rather than deliberately spreading civilization-paralyzing misinformation.

If we increase the left hand side of Eq. 1, how could the right hand side **not** increase?

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin ８+

   ■

  ■

Re:Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (**Score:2**)

by Jane Q. Public (1010737) Friend of a Friend on 2014-08-07 20:05 (#47627795)

I'm asking you because you're claiming I made at least one mistake, without having the courage to actually say what it is. I'm also asking because this simple thought experiment disproves your ridiculous Slayer claims:

Courage, my ass. I've already explained at least 3 times that if you'd bothered to read Latour's work, including other attempted refutations and his replies, you'd know this already.

Your argument is not with me, so stop trying to make it with me. I have ZERO obligation to explain to you where you are making mistakes, and I've told you that several times.

After some of the sh*t you've pulled, I don't owe you a damned thing, including civility. I sure as hell don't owe you any answers. If you want to talk about "courage", then I repeat: why aren't you asking the author of the whole thing, rather than me?

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer. (**Score:2**)

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-08-07 20:18 (#47627833) Homepage Journal

> This person has no courage to engage the actual authors of ideas ... do it to his face ... you should be making these arguments to HIM, not me. Why are you "arguing" with me about this? If you want to refute him, then refute him, in public where other people can see. ... If you think you really can refute Latour, then go do it ... If you had the courage of your convictions, you would argue with the proper people about this ... his little group also does have physicists in it ... Why don't you present your argument to Latour? ... Latour and friends have had an open challenge out there for more than a year now -- I think closer to two -- asking for anyone who can formally refute his main thesis, which was briefly explained in his rebuttal of Spencer. So far nobody has. Why is that? If you can, why aren't you? Why are you here, trying to argue with me instead? But we both know why, don't we? I'm only asking so that any other people who might read this will ask themselves. Go make these same arguments to Latour and his friends ... why aren't you asking the author of the whole thing, rather than me? *[Jane Q. Public]*

Again, I wouldn't talk with Dr. Latour's friends in his little PSI Slayer group for the same reason I wouldn't talk with Super Adventure Club members if they existed.

But perhaps a blunter approach is necessary. I don't want to comment at a pedophile's website or talk with Dr. Latour's child rapist friend. That seems even more unpleasant and unproductive than talking with Jane/Lonny Eachus.

Once again. A blackbody plate is heated by constant electrical power flowing in. Blackbody cold walls at 0F (T_c = 255K) also radiate power in. The heated plate at 150F (T_h = 339K) radiates power out. Using irradiance (power/m^2) simplifies the equation:

electricity + sigma*T_c^4 = sigma*T_h^4 (Eq. 1)

Suppose the chamber walls are suddenly warmed from T_c = 0F to 149F. What will happen to the heated plate if the electrical power heating the plate remains constant?

Note that this problem doesn't have multiple steps or confusing area changes. It's just one equation. T_c just increased and electricity is constant. Continuing to insist that T_h stays constant would just make it harder for posterity to believe Jane/Lonny Eachus is honestly confused, rather than deliberately spreading civilization-paralyzing misinformation.

If we increase the left hand side of Eq. 1, how could the right hand side **not** increase?

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Archived Discussion   Moderate Moderator Help Delete

- Get 272 More Comments

- Submit Story

  FORTH IF HONK THEN

- FAQ
- Story Archive
- Hall of Fame
- Advertising
- Jobs
- Terms
- Privacy
- Cookies/Opt Out
- About
- Feedback
-
  Switch View to: Mobile Mobile View

Close

Slashdot