This discussion has been archived.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

Phoenix Introduces Draft Ordinance To Criminalize Certain Drone Uses

187 More Prefs

well (Score:3)

by geekoid (135745) Friend of a FriendFoe of a Friend

A) It needs to only be applied to Drones with Cameras
B) Do people legally have privacy in an uncovered yard? I don't think they do. I'm talk about legal, not rudeness.

--
The Kruger Dunning explains most post on /. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dunning%E2%80%93Kruger_effect

-
-

Re: (Score:5, Interesting)

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

B) Do people legally have privacy in an uncovered yard? I don't think they do. I'm talk about legal, not rudeness.

In my state, the answer is Very Definitely Hell Yes.

It is strictly illegal for anybody (including law enforcement without a warrant) to use ANY means to view something on your property that isn't clearly visible to a common pedestrian or vehicle going past. That means, for example, that it's illegal for anybody (**including police**) to so much as use a stepladder to see over your back fence. It is termed "illegal surveillance" and the law was in place long before drones existed.

It's even illegal to stare

-
-

Has Jane/Lonny Eachus betrayed humanity? (Score:2)

by khayman80 (824400)

> Global-warming proponents betray science by shutting down debate
> ow.ly/Av6AX ***[CFACT, retweeted by Lonny Eachus, 2014-08-19]***
>
> "Climate science" isn't "settled", at all. On the contrary, it's very Unsettled.
> ow.ly/Av6AX ***[Lonny Eachus, 2014-08-19]***

Lonny's link claims that:

"... Most discussion on the science of AGW revolves around the climatic effects of

increased levels of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. How it got there in the first place- the assumption being that incr

-
-

Re: (Score:1)

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

But Jane/Lonny Eachus is still arguing about the fact that we're responsible for the CO2 rise by linking to that absurd rant and claiming it makes climate science "very Unsettled".

Why are you discussing someone's tweets here in a blatantly off-topic manner here on Slashdot? Oh, right... because you continue to claim it's me. Though that doesn't make it any less off-topic.

After visiting those links, I think to native speakers of English it's pretty clear: "unsettled" is wordplay on the phrase "settled science".

But since you bring MY name up, I will repeat this: I DO NOT dispute that humans have contributed to an increase in CO2 concentration. How much of an increase is due to hu

-
-

›

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

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-08-20 11:15 (#47713961) 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. ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-08-02]***

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. Jane replied:

> ... 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. ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-08-04]***

Jane claims he needs no such lesson because he said:

> 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. ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-08-02]***

No, the fundamental principle used to determine equilibrium temperatures **isn't** irrelevant. Anyone making that claim either needs a lesson about conservation of energy, or is deliberately spreading misinformation.

The basis of all my calculations is the **very** relevant principle that in equilibrium, power in = power out. I've never even mentioned the power used by the cooler of the chamber walls, so Jane either needs a lesson about conservation of energy or Jane's deliberately spreading misinformation. Which is it?

Remember that conservation of energy at equilibrium let us calculate the 233.8F equilibrium temperature of a heated plate enclosed by a superconducting shell. But we can also account for the finite thermal conductivity of an aluminum shell using this same relevant principle by drawing a boundary **within** the enclosing shell.

The same relevant principle applies: in equilibrium, power in = power out. Again, electrical power flows in. But all the other boundaries we drew were in vacuum, so heat transfer was by radiation. This time the boundary is inside aluminum, so heat transfer out is by thermal conduction.

electricity = k*(T_h - T_c) (Eq. 4)

For aluminum, thermal conductivity k = 215 W/(m*K). Sage solves this equation for an equilibrium inner shell temperature of 149.9F rather than 149.6F for a superconducting shell. This warms the enclosed plate to 234.0F rather than 233.8F for a superconducting shell.

Hopefully this exercise shows how useful it is to start with the widely applicable principle that in equilibrium, power in = power out. Hopefully it's also clear that **none** of these equations has anything to do with the power used by the cooler. Hopefully it's also clear that Jane's also wrong to claim that the power used by the cooler is required to be constant. The chamber wall **temperature** is held constant, so the power used by the cooler temporarily **decreases** after the enclosing plate is added, until it reaches equilibrium.

Why does Jane wrongly claim that the fundamental principle used to determine equilibrium temperatures is "irrelevant"? Does Jane need a lesson about conservation of energy, or is he deliberately spreading misinformation?

"If you don't think that's relevant, then you don't know what's relevant." **[Jane Q. Public, 2014-06-09]**

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

-
-

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

by Jane Q. Public (1010737) Friend of a Friend on 2014-08-20 13:27 (#47715239)
Jesus, you're a dumbshit. (That's just a statement of opinion. But an honest one.)

I told you before I'm not going to tell you why you're wrong. But here's another hint you don't deserve: I don't dispute your Equation 1, and never have (in a hypothetical ideal context, that is). You're just applying it in a way that doesn't actually apply.

I admit that it took me a while to figure that out when originally presented with this idea (which was a few years ago now). But I did, and I'm no physicist. However, there are physicists (like Joe Postma, for example) who might be happy to explain it to you if, that is, you don't piss him off (or haven't already pissed him off) with your adolescent, antisocial behavior.

And no, your **ad-hominem** explanation of why you won't confront the actual engineer who made the argument won't wash. First, it *is* ad-hominem... not in the context of your scientific argument, but in the context of why you refuse to make your argument to the proper parties. So no, I did not "misuse" the phrase ad hominem. It was part of your argument, so it applies. Not to mention that it's just plain bullshit anyway.

Go ahead, keep making a fool of yourself. I'm happy to let you do it.
Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

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

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-08-20 13:58 (#47715517)
Homepage Journal

Why did you wrongly claim that the fundamental principle used to determine equilibrium temperatures is "irrelevant"? If you actually understand how conservation of energy at equilibrium works, then you must be able to recognize that enclosing a heated plate warms it. So why do you keep insisting otherwise? Do you need physics lessons, or have you betrayed humanity by deliberately spreading civilization-paralyzing misinformation?

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 2014-08-20 15:16 (#47716143)

Why did you wrongly claim that the fundamental principle used to determine equilibrium temperatures is "irrelevant"? If you actually understand how conservation of energy at equilibrium works, then you must be able to recognize that enclosing a heated plate warms it. So why do you keep insisting otherwise? Do you need physics lessons, or have you betrayed humanity by deliberately spreading civilization-paralyzing misinformation?

I have done nothing of the sort.

Are you saying that you have changed the nature of the experiment, such that it is no longer in vacuum?

The original experiment does not involve "enclosing a heated plate", except to the extent that it was already enclosed. In the experiment that has (always, as far as I am concerned) been under discussion, there is a heat **source** S, a passive **plate** P that is heated by that source, and an

enclosure (which I have called W for "wall") that is actively cooled. Everything inside the enclosure is in vacuum, so that ALL heat transfer is by radiation only. No convection, no conduction.

Are you referring to the same experiment? If so, then I will repeat what I have already stated several times. And I will also repeat that if you have an argument with it -- other than your straw-man argument above, that is -- you go argue it with the proper parties, not with me. But I am indulging you to this extent.

1) Even if the passive plate completely surrounds the **source**, then in any real-world situation it is impossible for it to ever **quite** reach the same temperature as that source, even if only because the surface area is (however slightly) greater than that of the source. We have discussed this before. Therefore at equilibrium temperature Ts will always be warmer -- even if only a little -- than the passive plate Tp.

2) By the Stefan-Boltzmann equation, NET heat transfer will always be from hotter to colder. And since Ts - Tp is a positive number, net heat transfer is from the source to the plate. The plate cannot cause the heat source to be hotter because that would require NET heat transfer in the other direction. But that is a violation of the Stefan-Boltzmann law. (There is no need to re-derive how we apply the S-B law here. Again, that would be re-hashing old news.)

By asserting that at equilibrium the passive plate can cause **the source** to be hotter, you are contradicting the S-B law. You can make all the other arguments you like to try to sidestep this, but eventually you're just going to step in it again. Pun very much intended.

I have stated this all before. I repeat that you are making a mistake. But in order to find out what it is, you are going to have to address your argument to the person you are attempting to refute. Your argument is not with me and trying to make it with me is childish. Given that, and the abusive nature of your past behavior, I refuse to help you further. No more hints.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

-
-

Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer.

(Score:2)

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-08-20 15:40 (#47716325) Homepage Journal

Why would you think the experiment has changed? Of course it's still in vacuum. It's the same experiment I described here, based on Dr. Spencer's description of the passive plate enclosing the heated plate. Maybe you should read it again, then explain why you think it just changed.

I've repeatedly explained that net heat flows from the electrical heater to the heated plate, to the enclosing shell. I've repeatedly explained that adding the enclosing shell reduces the net heat flow away from the heated plate, which warms it. I've explained that your bizarre focus on the exact **final** outer temperature of the enclosing shell relative to the **initial** temperature of the heated plate is completely irrelevant to the fact that enclosing the heated plate warms it.

The only way you'll be able to understand this is if you write down the equation governing equilibrium temperature. That's why I did that for you. If you still insist that the heated plate doesn't warm when it's enclosed, then write down the equation that you think describes the equilibrium temperature of the heated plate after the enclosing shell is added. If your equation is different than mine, explain why.

As long as you keep insisting that the heated plate doesn't warm when the passive enclosing plate is added, my argument **is** with you, so I'll keep asking you why you're spreading this civilization-paralyzing misinformation.

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 2014-08-20 18:28 (#47717271)

Why would you think the experiment has

changed?

Because your analysis of it is a total clusterfuck. Here's another hint: I have told you several times where you're wrong, but you're so damned arrogant you think I'm the one being stupid.

Go **where this has been debated before** if you want your answers. Because you keep demanding them from me even though you were too goddamned stupid to realize that I gave you the clue a long time ago.

No more replies. I am through. Again.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

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

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-08-20 19:28 (#47717573) Homepage Journal

> ... 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. ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-07-27]***
>
> ... 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? ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-08-04]***

You either need guidance, or you've betrayed humanity by deliberately spreading civilization-paralyzing misinformation.

> ... 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 Q. Public, 2014-08-04]***

You won't point out mistakes because you can't.

> Jesus, you're a dumbshit. (That's just a statement of opinion. But an honest one.) I told you before I'm not going to tell you why you're wrong. But here's another hint you don't deserve: I don't dispute your Equation 1, and never have (in a hypothetical ideal context, that is). You're just applying it in a way that doesn't actually apply. ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-08-20]***

You won't point out how this simple equation 1 doesn't apply because you can't.

> Oh, hell. I'll just give it away, since you're being such a dumbass (my opinion). **Among other mistakes**, you're making the same one that Watts did when he tried to refute Latour. I have noticed a couple of

> other mistakes, but that by itself shows you are wrong. ***[Jane Q. Public]***

You won't point out other mistakes because you can't.

> ... your analysis of it is a total clusterfuck. Here's another hint: I have told you several times where you're wrong, but you're so damned arrogant you think I'm the one being stupid. Go **where this has been debated before** if you want your answers. Because you keep demanding them from me even though you were too goddamned stupid to realize that I gave you the clue a long time ago. No more replies. I am through. Again. ***[Jane Q. Public]***

Again, I'd rather not go to that pedophile's website and debate with a child rapist. That seems even more unpleasant and unproductive than talking with Jane/Lonny Eachus.

> Why did you wrongly claim that the fundamental principle used to determine equilibrium temperatures is "irrelevant"? If you actually understand how conservation of energy at equilibrium works, then you must be able to recognize that enclosing a heated plate warms it. So why do you keep insisting otherwise? Do you need physics lessons, or have you betrayed humanity by deliberately spreading civilization-paralyzing misinformation?

I have done nothing of the sort.

[Jane Q. Public, 2014-08-20]

This is one reason why "conversations" with you are so stressful and unproductive. As usual, you're either lying or suffering from premature dementia. Of **course** you claimed the fundamental principle used to determine equilibrium temperatures (power in = power out) is irrelevant. Of **course** you've wrongly insisted that enclosing a heated plate doesn't warm it.

Which is it? Have you betrayed humanity by lying and deliberately spreading civilization-paralyzing misinformation, or are you suffering from premature dementia? Sadly, the result isn't too different either way.

*"... 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]**

"Jesus, you're a dumbshit. ... your adolescent, antisocial behavior ... keep making a fool of

yourself. ... you're being such a dumbass ... your analysis of it is a total clusterfuck. ... you're so damned arrogant you think I'm the one being stupid. ... you were too goddamned stupid ..." **[Jane Q. Public]**

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

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

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-08-21 13:12 (#47723489) Homepage Journal

> ... 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. ... I know they [the PSI Slayers] will (quite correctly) tear your arguments to shreds, and I even know how they'll do it. ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-08-04]***
>
> ... 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. ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-08-07]***

It's fascinating that you'd wrongly implied my previous calculations had units confused somewhere, but haven't pointed out the **actual** units confusion in the eq. 4 I posted yesterday.

I made a mistake by forgetting to divide by the 1mm thickness "x" of the enclosing shell:

electricity = k*(T_h - T_c)/x (Eq. 4)

Here's the corrected Sage worksheet; the old wrong worksheet is here. I'm sorry for any confusion this caused, and I've corrected the equation at Dumb Scientist.

The corrected temperatures with the aluminum enclosing shell are so close to those with the

superconducting shell that the differences don't show up with the four significant figures I'm using. So my original thermal superconductor approximation was even more accurate than I thought.

"... 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]**

Jane, instead of typing all those charming statements, have you considered that it might be quicker and easier to just write down the equation describing conservation of energy around the heated plate at equilibrium? You'd quickly see that adding a passive enclosing plate reduces the net heat flow out, which warms the heated plate.

"Jesus, you're a dumbshit. ... your adolescent, antisocial behavior ... keep making a fool of yourself. ... you're being such a dumbass ... your analysis of it is a total clusterfuck. ... you're so damned arrogant you think I'm the

one being stupid. ... you were too goddamned stupid ..." **[Jane Q. Public]**

Again, your telepathy isn't working correctly. I don't think you're being stupid. I just think you either haven't thought deeply enough about the equation describing conservation of energy at equilibrium, or that you've betrayed humanity by deliberately spreading civilization-paralyzing misinformation.

That's why I wanted to stress that admitting mistakes isn't the end of the world. I just admitted a mistake in my most recent calculation, and I'm okay. In fact, one way to convince posterity that you're honestly confused rather than deliberately spreading civilization-paralyzing misinformation would be to show that you have the courage to stop being wrong.

"If an honest man is wrong, after it is demonstrated that he is wrong, he either stops being wrong or he stops being honest." -- Anonymous **[Lonny Eachus, 2013-09-27]**

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 2014-08-20 15:24 (#47716205)
Oh, hell. I'll just give it away, since you're being such a dumbass (my opinion).

Among other mistakes, you're making the same one that Watts did when he tried to refute Latour. I have noticed a couple of other mistakes, but that by itself shows you are wrong.
Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Slashdot
Archived Discussion Moderate Moderator Help Delete

- Get 187 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