

- [Slashdot](#)
- [Stories](#)
- [Slash Boxes](#)
- [Comments](#)

[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This discussion has been archived.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.

[Earth In the Midst of Sixth Mass Extinction: the 'Anthropocene Defaunaation'](#) [313 More Prefs](#)

[Earth In the Midst of Sixth Mass Extinction: the 'Anthropocene Defaunaation'](#)

Archived Discussion [Load All Comments](#)

29 Full 0 Abbreviated 0 Hidden

Comments Filter:

Score:

- 5 • [All](#)
- 4 • [Insightful](#)
- 3 • [Informative](#)
- 2 • [Interesting](#)
- 1 • [Funny](#)
- 0

The Fine Print: The following comments are owned by whoever posted them. We are not responsible for them in any way.

[313 More Prefs](#)**[no problem \(Score:5, Funny\)](#)**

by Anonymous Coward

I had no intention of reading past the summary anyway. If that....

-
-

[Re: \(Score:2\)](#)

by [Stuarticus \(1205322\) Alter Relationship](#)

Welcome, brother, grab a cowl and toss your razor in the bin on your right. Is it state the obvious Friday already, or is this just another opportunity for an argument about human impact on the climate?

--

If you think someone isn't free to have a different definition of "freedom" you may be a tyrant.

-
-

[Re: \(Score:3\)](#)

by [Concerned Onlooker \(473481\) Alter Relationship](#)

Nothing is obvious to the uninformed.

--

<http://www.rootstrikers.org/>

-
-

[Re: \(Score:3\)](#)

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\) Friend of a Friend](#)

Nonsense. LOTS of things are obvious to the uninformed:

Global warming, Young Earth, WMDs, chemtrails, anal probes... the list goes on and on. Granted, some of that is MISinformation, rather than lack of information, but I count misinformed as uninformed.

OP:

... we continue to drive animal extinctions today through the destruction of wild lands, consumption of animals as a resource or a luxury, and persecution of species we see as threats or competitors.

Well, I grant the "threats or competitors" part, to some degree. But the U.S. now has

MORE forests and other wildlife habitat than it had 100 years ago. In my general area, wolves and peregrine falcons have been reintroduced, quite successfully (th

-
-

Re: (Score:3)

by [Layzej \(1976930\) Fan](#)

You forgot to add your theory about Obama's birth certificate among your list of items you are misinformed about! (<http://slashdot.org/comments.pl?sid=5384291&cid=47418481>) That is my favourite of your many crazy theories.

-
-

Re: (Score:2)

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\) Friend of a Friend](#)

I don't have any "theory" about a birth certificate. I do have solid **evidence** (which has **not** been debunked) that the "copy" of the birth certificate on the White House web page has been deliberately manipulated.

You seem to be implying I am a "birther". This is not the case and you know it not to be the case. I have stated many times right here on Slashdot that I have no idea (and no opinion) about where Obama was actually born.

So why are you **deliberately** trying to make me look bad? What is your motiva

-
-

Re: (Score:3)

by [Layzej \(1976930\) Fan](#)

That's a very interesting theory. Who do you think manipulated it?

-
-

Re: (Score:2)

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\) Friend of a Friend](#)

That's a very interesting theory. Who do you think

manipulated it?

Where do you get the idea I would or should know this?
There are a great many possibilities.

I repeat: it is not a "theory". It is established fact. The document published on the White House website is not a simple "copy" of a birth certificate. Anyone can download it and see for themselves that it is not a simple scan into Photoshop or Illustrator, as the White House claims. Forensic evidence indicates it was edited using both Adobe products and Mac OS X Preview, and that it is not even remotely possible

-

-

Re: (Score:3)

by [Layzej \(1976930\)](#) [Fan](#)

How could we possibly know since - as you say - they faked the birth certificate? Why do you suppose they would do that?

-

-

Re: (Score:2)

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#)

I have already stated that it might have been done for legitimate reasons. Which makes your "conspiracy theory" accusation (which you have made many times, not just here) bogus.

But I am curious: why do you insist I demonstrate to you that it might NOT be a conspiracy theory? Are you unfamiliar with the subject?

I rather expect so. Here's my actual "theory": either you are ignorant of the actual facts surrounding the situation, and so **assume** it's "conspiracy theory", or you are ignorant of the actual fa

-

-

Re: (Score:3)by [Layzej \(1976930\)](#) [Fan](#)

Please, enlighten me. I would love to know who you think faked the birth certificate and why!

■

■

Re: (Score:2)by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#)

Go enlighten yourself, and stop bothering people who are better educated about the subject. There's a thing called Google. Use it.

Here. [I'll provide a link](#) to get you started.

■

■

Re: (Score:3)by [Layzej \(1976930\)](#) [Fan](#)

Do you really think google knows who you think faked the birth certificate and why?

■

■

Re: (Score:2)by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#)

I already told you I don't have any theories -- or opinion, for that matter -- about who manipulated the White House website "copy" of Obama's birth certificate.

By the way, dear readers: does anyone else happen to notice just how **remarkably similar** this "Layzej" person's comments are to those of Khayman80? In fact both the nature of the comments and their timing **very strongly suggest** that "Layzej" is nothing but a sock-puppet account for Khayman80.

Reminder: folks here at Slashdot have a very low opin

■

■

[Re: \(Score:2\)](#)by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#)

Once again, you're wrong. Furthermore, the fact that you [can't even spell](#) "Layzej" correctly suggests your Scooby gang is drunk at the wheel.

■

■

[Re: \(Score:2\)](#)by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#)

Once again, you're wrong. Furthermore, the fact that you can't even spell "Layzej" correctly suggests your Scooby gang is drunk at the wheel.

Well, folks, how about a vote: is it just strange coincidence that he answered a reply to "Layzej", or is it worthy of note?

■

■

[Re: \(Score:2\)](#)by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#)

It's worthy of note in your [paranoia](#) diagnosis...

■

■

[Re: \(Score:2\)](#)by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#)

It's worthy of note in your paranoia diagnosis...

Are you claiming I am paranoid? Just trying to clarify.

It's amazing how you seem to have this entire collection of Slashdot comments I made years ago right at hand. I've mentioned this before.

What is the basis of your (apparently unhealthy, and definitely creepy) obsession with me?

Researching (and apparently indexing) years of other peoples' Slashdot comments is not something your average normal person does.

■

■

[Re: \(Score:2\)](#)

by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#)

No, you publicly claimed you were paranoid. One of the only true things you've ever said.

■

■

[Re: \(Score:2\)](#)

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#)

No, you publicly claimed you were paranoid. One of the only true things you've ever said.

NO, I did not. That is **NOT** what I wrote in the comment. That isn't even a distortion, it's just a plain old lie.

What I wrote was that I **thought** for a time I was being paranoid, but that the situation turned out to not be paranoia at all; it was real.

Stop lying about me. Period. Take your distortions and your lies and go crawl in a hole somewhere.

■

■

[Re: \(Score:2\)](#)

by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#)

If you think your paranoid delusions are real, maybe your tinfoil hat needs to be tighter.

■

■

Re: (Score:2)by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#)

Since I have neither, I wouldn't know.

I would also like to point out here the absolutely amazing fact that "Layzej" stopped replying the moment you popped up. What a "coincidence".

Well, this has been an interesting evening. Not only did I catch you in an outright lie, you accomplished exactly nothing but spreading more ad-hominem and attempted "character besmirching" based on that lie.

■

■

Re: (Score:3)by [Layzej \(1976930\)](#) [Fan](#)

I would also like to point out here the absolutely amazing fact that "Layzej" stopped replying the moment you popped up. What a "coincidence".

I hope you realize how crazy this makes you sound.

■

■

Re: (Score:2)by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#)

I hope you realize how crazy this makes you sound.

I hope you realize that you just gave us **more** evidence, consisting of yet another astounding "coincidence" on top of all the others.

I hope you realize just how remarkably similar your writing is to that of khayman80, and how the timings of your replies so neatly coincide

and cooperate.

■

■

[Re: \(Score:3\)](#)

by [Layzej \(1976930\)](#) [Fan](#)

Wow! The double-down. I didn't (but probably should have) see that coming. So did I summarize your position accurately: You are not a birther. You are certain that someone faked Obama's birth certificate (because you read it on the internet), but you are not willing to speculate who did this or why. You have no idea where the president of the USA was born (hint: Hawaii, USA).

■

■

[Re: \(Score:2\)](#)

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#)

Wow! The double-down. I didn't (but probably should have) see that coming. So did I summarize your position accurately: You are not a birther. You are certain that someone faked Obama's birth certificate (because you read it on the internet), but you are not willing to speculate who did this or why. You have no idea where the president of the USA was born (hint: Hawaii, USA).

No, I am not certain "because I read it on the Internet". I am certain because I downloaded a copy of it and examined it myself, layer by layer. I did read analyses on the Internet, but I confirmed the truth of some of them myself. Not all of them, of course. Some were just plain bullshit. Like your posts here. But some were true.

■

■

[Re: \(Score:2\)](#)

by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#)

... he's never sorted out that mess about his birth certificate, either. I know that lots of amateurs claimed "fake"... but lots of well-respected professionals have claimed "fake" since then, and no answers have been forthcoming. And probably never will. [[Jane Q. Public, 2012-11-08](#)]

Genuine, well-renowned graphics experts have examined Obama's supposed birth certificate, and [it's definitely a fake](#). It's not even a very good fake. [[Jane Q. Public, 2012-11-08](#)]

Obama isn't even eligible to be President. His b

■
■
>

[Re:no problem \(Score:2\)](#)

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#) on 2014-08-08 11:41 ([#47632167](#))

Now, finally, "khayman80" show his hypocrisy, loud and large, in [THIS COMMENT](#). (It's archived so I can't reply there, but I recommend others go read it. If you do, go back up the chain 8 or 10 comments and read about the context.)

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.

How many FAILS can we find in this short passage by "khayman80"?

First, guilt by association. The argument had nothing to do with any other "member" of a "group". As he already knows. It had to do with Pierre Latour's science only, not some "group".

Second, and at least as important: false accusation. To the best of my knowledge, none of the members of "Principia Scientific" (which seems from the context is pretty obviously who he is referring to) have ever been convicted of any sexual wrongdoing of any kind. O'Sullivan was once **accused** of improper sexual conduct by a known troubled (and repeatedly IN trouble) teenager his family was trying to help. **He was acquitted of all charges, as khayman80 already knows.** If he knew about the charges, it is only reasonable to believe he knew about the acquittal as well.

Third: misdirection. Khayman80 refuses to refute someone's science to his face -- or even properly read up on the topic -- because (he says) the people involved are reprehensible lowlifes. But not only is that **not science**, that charge is blatantly false. **To publicly call someone a pedophile and "child rapist" based on NO real evidence is a serious breach indeed.** He didn't mention any actual names, but that is no excuse because from the context it is very apparent that he meant John O'Sullivan, and if I were him (I am not) I would sue khayman80's ass without a second thought. And probably win.

But back to the main point. He used this to distract from the fact that he can't refute a scientific argument that he has been calling garbage and worse for more than 2 years now. He has attempted, and failed, and now he says he isn't going to bother because the PEOPLE with whom he disagrees are not up to his social standards (and even that, a false claim), rather than arguing the science as a scientist should.

Calling this mere "ad hominem" would be doing khayman80 a favor he doesn't deserve.

Khayman80: you seem to have zero understanding of what is proper (or even legal) in a scientific discussion. And to use these

FALSE charges against someone who isn't even involved in the scientific argument just shows the depths to which you will sink just to (as far as I can tell) misdirect from your failings and salve your own ego.

THIS is how desperate you've become to try to save yourself from being publicly proven wrong. But it won't work. You've been wrong for at least two years, you're still wrong, and you don't even have the courage to face the guy who proved you wrong.

I have zero respect for people who have repeatedly shown themselves willing to stoop to character assassination, deliberately fallacious arguments, and libel rather than behave like respectable scientists and just argue the facts.

How hypocritical. How abjectly pathetic. How disgusting.

[Parent Share](#)

[twitter](#) [facebook](#) [linkedin](#) 

■

■

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

by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2014-08-08 14:19
([#47633583](#)) [Homepage](#) [Journal](#)

The argument had nothing to do with any other "member" of a "group". As he already knows. It had to do with Pierre Latour's science only, not some "group".

[\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-08-08\]](#)

You [told me](#) to "make these same arguments to Latour and his friends" in his "little group" but I'd rather not, because his "friends" include pedophiles and a child rapist. That seems even more unpleasant and unproductive than talking with Jane/Lonny Eachus.

To the best of my knowledge, none of the members of "Principia

Scientific" (which seems from the context is pretty obviously who he is referring to) have ever been convicted of any sexual wrongdoing of any kind.

O'Sullivan was once **accused** of improper sexual conduct by a known troubled (and repeatedly IN trouble) teenager his family was trying to help. **He was acquitted of all charges, as khayman80 already knows.** If he knew about the charges, it is only reasonable to believe he knew about the acquittal as well. [[Jane Q. Public, 2014-08-08](#)]

Looks like Jane believes John O'Sullivan's disgusting [blame the victim](#) act. If Jane knew about the acquittal, it is only reasonable to believe he knew that John O'Sullivan later wrote "Vanilla Girl: A [fact-based](#) crime story of a teacher's struggle to control his [erotic obsession](#) with a schoolgirl."

John O'Sullivan even [illustrated](#) "Vanilla Girl" but think twice before clicking that link. Not just because it depicts child nudity, but also because you'll have to wash your eyes with bleach to banish the image of a nude John O'Sullivan leering at a topless girl. That leer doesn't seem too different from O'Sullivan's "serious" [expression](#).

"Vanilla Girl" is **much** more fact-based than "Slaying the Sky Dragon" so Jane might want to read John O'Sullivan's fact-based book before defending him any further. Keep a barf bag handy, though. It's a disturbing glimpse into the mind of a psychopathic pedophile.

John O'Sullivan is [CEO](#) of the PSI Slayers, and his behavior makes his [smears against Michael Mann](#) an unbelievably ironic example of psychological projection. Even for a climate contrarian.

Khayman80 refuses to refute someone's science to his face -- or even properly read up on the topic -- because (he says) the people involved are reprehensible

lowlifes. But not only is that not science, that charge is blatantly false. To publicly call someone a pedophile and "child rapist" based on NO real evidence is a serious breach indeed. He didn't mention any actual names, but that is no excuse because from the context it is very apparent that he meant John O'Sullivan, and if I were him (I am not) I would sue khayman80's ass without a second thought. And probably win. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-08-08\]](#)

Dr. Oliver K. Manuel is a [PSI member](#) who was arrested for "multiple counts of [rape](#) and [sodomy](#) of his own children."

But back to the main point. He used this to distract from the fact that he can't refute a scientific argument that he has been calling garbage and worse for more than 2 years now. He has attempted, and failed, and now he says he isn't going to bother because the PEOPLE with whom he disagrees are not up to his social standards (and even that, a false claim), rather than arguing the science as a scientist should. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-08-08\]](#)

I already argued the science [ad nauseum](#), but I'd rather not argue with pedophiles and child rapists because they aren't up to my social standards. Since [Dr. Manuel](#) regularly [comments](#) at [PSI Slayer websites](#) that are [run by](#) John O'Sullivan, I'd rather not comment at those websites.

Calling this mere "ad hominem" would be doing khayman80 a favor he doesn't deserve. Khayman80: you seem to have zero understanding of what is proper (or even legal) in a scientific discussion. And to use these FALSE charges against someone who isn't even involved

in the scientific argument just shows the depths to which you will sink just to (as far as I can tell) misdirect from your failings and salve your own ego. THIS is how desperate you've become to try to save yourself from being publicly proven wrong. But it won't work. You've been wrong for at least two years, you're still wrong, and you don't even have the courage to face the guy who proved you wrong. I have zero respect for people who have repeatedly shown themselves willing to stoop to character assassination, deliberately fallacious arguments, and libel rather than behave like respectable scientists and just argue the facts. How hypocritical. How abjectly pathetic. How disgusting. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-08-08\]](#)

Once again, you're using "ad hominem" incorrectly. I'm not saying that the PSI Slayers are wrong because some of them are pedophiles and child rapists. I already [explained](#) why the Slayers are wrong. I'm just saying that I don't want to talk with pedophiles and child rapists. Outside of Jane's PSI Slayer bizarro world, this probably isn't a controversial position.

It's **adorable** that you keep insisting someone proved me wrong, but it would be more believable if you could finally answer this simple question:

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/m²) 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](#) 

■

•

[Slashdot](#)

Archived Discussion Moderate Moderator Help Delete

- [Get 313 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](#)

Trademarks property of their respective owners. Comments owned by the poster. Copyright © 2014 Dice. All Rights Reserved. Slashdot is a [Dice Holdings, Inc.](#) service.

[Close](#)

[Slashdot](#)