This discussion has been archived.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

Wanxiang May Give 2012's Fisker Karma a Relaunch 37 More Prefs

Wanxiang May Give 2012's Fisker Karma a Relaunch

Archived Discussion Load All Comments
33 Full 0 Abbreviated 0 Hidden
Comments Filter:
Score:
5
4
3
2
1
0
-1

- All
- Insightful
- Informative
- Interesting
- Funny

37 More Prefs
-

Misleading Article Summary (Score:5, Informative)

by lag10 (667114) Alter Relationship

New submitter sumit sinha notes recent reports that Tesla may soon be joined again by Fisker in the world of high-end, **all-electric car makers.**

The Fisker Karma is not an "all-electric car." It has an electric drivetrain with a gasoline range extender. The article itself makes this quite clear:

The Karma, **a hybrid-electric vehicle equipped with a small gasoline engine** that kicks in when its on-board battery is depleted, previously had a starting price of around $100,000.

If you could try to make more accurate article summaries in the future, that'd be great. Thanks.

-
-

Re: (Score:2)

by BarbaraHudson (3785311) Alter Relationship

The Fisker Karma is not an "all-electric car." It has an electric drivetrain with a gasoline range extender. The article itself makes this quite clear:

Bad Karma! Bad, bad Karma!!!

Sounds more like some sort of tax credit scam than an actual relaunch, given the current competition.

--
this post brought to you by the letter ' **t** ' in LGBTt (Lesbian, Gay, Bi, Transgender, transsexual)

-
-

›

Re:Misleading Article Summary (Score:2)

by Jane Q. Public (1010737) Friend of a Friend on 2014-09-21 12:12 (#47960085)
Hybrid or not, I'm not buying a Chinese car.

I'll pay twice as much for a Tesla first.
Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

-
-

Re:Misleading Article Summary (Score:0)

by Anonymous Coward on 2014-09-21 18:51 (#47961819)

I'm not buying a Chinese car. I'll pay twice as much for a Tesla first.

All the major components in the Tesla are made in China.

Panasonic batteries, built in Suzhou, Wuxi and Beijing, Brembo brakes, built in Nanjing. The motor is built from parts made by Fukoda in Shengang, etc etc.

It's as American as longan dumpling...

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

- **Re:Misleading Article Summary (Score:2)**

  by TWX (665546) Alter Relationship on 2014-09-21 22:05 (#47962373)
  Where's the body-shell made?

  From a safety point of view, that's where Chinese cars have been problematic, not in their brakes, or even their seatbelts or airbags.
  --

  IBM had PL/1 with syntax worse than JOSS,
  and everywhere the language went, it was a total loss...
  Parent Share
  twitter facebook linkedin

- **Re:Misleading Article Summary (Score:1)**

  by Jane Q. Public (1010737) Friend of a Friend on 2014-09-24 9:17 (#47984641)
  I am making one last reply to "khayman80" here, because he's so good at trolling and readers deserve to see the rebuttal.

  If radiation enters the boundary and goes right back out, we need to account for it entering and exiting. That's why there are separate terms for "power in" and "power out".

  Just no. If radiation goes in and comes right back out, we do not need to account for it, because then the NET amount of that particular radiation crossing your boundary is ZERO. A = A. You do know how to add and subtract, right? You know what a zero is, right?

  There is no net "radiative power in" from cooler to hotter. It's against the second law

of thermodynamics, and it violates the S-B radiation law: (e * s) * (Ta^4 - Tb^4).

That's exactly the equation Jane should be using to calculate electrical heating power! It has separate terms for "power in" and "power out" so it can describe power entering and exiting a boundary. If Jane would use that equation, he'd honestly be only saying there is no net "radiative power in" from cooler to hotter.

Just no. This is a ridiculous assertion. **The equation above is for heat transfer, not radiative power.**

I used the proper equation for radiative power, **which at steady-state doesn't depend on other bodies.** So there is no "difference" term. Just temperature. That's simple physics. You are trying to use a heat **transfer** equation to calculate power out of a single body at known temperature. That's just plain WRONG.

So Jane refuses to retract his absurd claim [slashdot.org] that view factors vary as the radius ratio, which violates conservation of energy. A cynic might have expected as much, given how Jane flagrantly violates conservation of energy by incoherently ignoring radiative power passing in through a boundary around the heat source.

I made no such claim, you liar. As you well know, the view factor from the surface of the inner sphere to the inner surface of the outer sphere is 1. The **calculated** view factor from the outer sphere to the inner was 0.9998. BUT, since all the radiation going IN which strikes the hotter body is effectively reflected or scattered, it goes right back out, AND the small amount of radiation from the cooler body that misses the inner sphere ALSO goes right back out, then the EFFECTIVE view factors in this case are both 1.

All the radiation going IN from the cooler body just goes right back OUT again, making the NET radiation crossing your boundary from the cooler body zero. If that were not so, then you'd have net energy being transferred from a cooler body to a hotter one, which is a violation of the second law of thermodynamics. As I've explained to you many times now. You're just plain wrong.

Jane's campaign of educating ignorant, stupid physicists about physics has only just begun. Jane still needs to educate Prof. Brown [slashdot.org] and Lonny Eachus still needs to educate Dr. Joel Shore [rit.edu].

No, I don't need to educate either one. They can both pick up a textbook on heat transfer and see that I am correct. I'm not arguing with them. Our discussion was about THIS experiment of Spencer's. What I did was refute YOUR "solution" to Spencer's challenge. I found the correct answers and checked my work. Funny, but YOUR solutions didn't check out when plugged back in to standard heat transfer equations. I daresay that any eminent physicist can also do the math and see where you were wrong. And I'm going to give them plenty of opportunity to see it. So why not just wait and see?

I did NOT make broad claims in this recent exchange about "greenhouse gas" or any such thing. So I'm not arguing with those other people. I simply showed YOU to be wrong.

Parent Share

Re:Misleading Article Summary (Score:1)

by Jane Q. Public (1010737) Friend of a Friend on 2014-09-24 9:23 (#47984725)
I am also going to say to you, khayman80, that there will be no further discussion here. You have been doing nothing but repeating false claims which I proved wrong long ago. Any further discussion with you would be a waste of time. You have wasted far too much of my time already.

You've twisted and distorted arguments, played havoc with the math, and tried to deny known physical laws. But I've caught you at every turn.

Time to act like a man and admit that you were wrong. After all, other people are going to see it anyway. I promised to publish the results of our exchange no matter how it turned out. You don't get to complain now just because you lost.
Parent Share

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

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-09-24 12:57 (#47987163) Homepage Journal

> ... I used the proper equation for radiative power, **which at steady-state doesn't depend on other bodies.** So there is no "difference" term. Just temperature. That's simple physics. You are trying to use a heat **transfer** equation to calculate power out of a single body at known temperature. That's just plain WRONG. ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-24]***

No, Jane tried to use an equation that only calculates radiative "power out" when Jane needs to use an equation for heat transfer that calculates radiative "power out minus power in".

> > If radiation enters the boundary and goes right back out, we need to account for it entering and exiting. That's why there are separate terms for "power in" and "power out".
>
> Just no. If radiation goes in and comes right back out, we do not need to account for it, because then the NET amount of that particular radiation crossing your boundary is ZERO. A = A. You do know how to add and subtract, right? You know what a zero is, right? ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-24]***

Jane's accounting for "power out" without including a term for "power in". That's not A = A, it's A = 0 because one of the terms has been ignored. It's led Jane to the absurd conclusion that electrical heating power doesn't depend on the cooler chamber wall temperature. If that's the case, then how did we detect the 2.7K cosmic microwave background radiation with warmer detectors? How do uncooled IR detectors see cooler objects? Again, why is Venus hotter than Mercury?

> ... **All** the radiation going IN from the cooler body just goes right back OUT again, making the NET radiation crossing your boundary from the cooler body zero. If that were not so, then you'd have net energy being transferred from a cooler body to a hotter one, which is a violation of the second law of thermodynamics. As I've explained to you many times now. You're just plain wrong. ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-24]***

This is complete gibberish, Jane. Power radiated in from the chamber walls needs to be accounted for using one term. Power radiated out from the source needs to be accounted using another. Once again, accounting for power flowing in doesn't violate the second law of thermodynamics or somehow imply net energy transfer from cool to hot, no matter how many times Jane wants to assert that nonsense. However, failing to account for power flowing in **does** violate conservation of energy, because power in = power out through any boundary where nothing inside is changing.

> > So Jane refuses to retract his absurd claim that view factors vary as the radius ratio, which violates conservation of energy. A cynic might have expected as much, given how Jane flagrantly violates conservation of energy by incoherently ignoring radiative power passing in through a boundary around the heat source.
>
> I made no such claim, you liar. As you well know, the view factor from the surface of the inner sphere to the inner surface of the outer sphere is 1. The **calculated** view factor from the outer sphere to the inner was 0.9998... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-24]***

Jane made no such claim? Jane **keeps** making that absurd claim! Again, the link I've repeatedly given Jane shows that for smaller radius R1, **F21 = (R1/R2)^2 = 0.9978**.

If the view factor varied as the **radius ratio** like Jane claims, energy really **wouldn't** be conserved. The view factor has to vary as the **area ratio**, which is the square of the radius ratio.

> > Jane's campaign of educating ignorant, stupid physicists about physics has only just begun. Jane still needs to educate Prof. Brown and Lonny Eachus still needs to educate Dr. Joel Shore.
>
> No, I don't need to educate either one. They can both pick up a

> textbook on heat transfer and see that I am correct. I'm not arguing with them. ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-24]***

Of course Jane argued with Prof. Brown and wasn't able to "educate" him. **Of course** Lonny Eachus argued with Dr. Joel Shore and wasn't able to "educate" him. Why not, Jane? Do those physicists not have heat transfer textbooks, or are they just ignorant and stupid?

> ... I did NOT make broad claims in this recent exchange about "greenhouse gas" or any such thing. So I'm not arguing with those other people. I simply showed YOU to be wrong. ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-24]***

But Jane **does** make broad claims:

> .. 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]

Jane/Lonny Eachus insists that an enclosed source doesn't warm, which means CO2 emissions couldn't cause warming. That's why Jane/Lonny Eachus needs to educate the American Institute of Physics, the American Physical Society, the Australian Institute of Physics, and the European Physical Society.

> .. Be a man for a change and admit it. .. [Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-15]

> .. Be a man and admit the truth.. You've been owned, man. BE enough of a man to admit it. .. [Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-19]

> ... Time to act like a man and admit that you were wrong. ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-24]***

Jane/Lonny Eachus wins a silver medal in psychological projection for telling me to "be a man for a change" but Slayer CEO John O'Sullivan still takes the gold.

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 2014-09-24 17:39 (#47989597)

No, Jane tried to use an equation that only calculates radiative "power

out" when Jane needs to use an equation for heat transfer that calculates radiative "power out minus power in".

I almost started to argue with you again, but I have learned that it won't do any good. You'll still keep insisting that this violation of the 2nd Law of Thermodynamics is really how it's done. Sigh.

I don't think you really believe that for a second, if you're really the physicist you claim to be. The **very simple** textbook math has proved it wrong. I mean, didn't it send up a red flag when you took your answer and fed it back into standard heat transfer equations and it didn't balance? Oh, that's right... you didn't. But I did.

But that's just a statement of fact. I'm not arguing with you now and I'm not going to again. You're either a fool or a liar, and I do not care which. I have already proved it and I intend to publish that for the world to see. Along with textbook explanations and diagrams showing exactly where and how you went wrong.

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 2014-09-24 17:48 (#47989657)

Jane made no such claim? Jane keeps making that absurd claim! Again, the link [thermalradiation.net] I've repeatedly [slashdot.org] given Jane [slashdot.org] shows that for smaller radius R1, F21 = (R1/R2)^2 = 0.9978.

I will make this one correction here. Yes, the view factor I mentioned was the wrong one, from the inside of the enclosing sphere to the heat source. (Or from the chamber wall to the outside of the enclosing sphere, which just happens to be the same due to specified dimensions.) Of course it is not the same from the chamber wall to the heat source. But that is the only mistake I made here.

But (this is not for you, but for other readers): because ALL of the incoming cooler radiation is reflected or scattered, and no NET amount is absorbed, it goes right back out your boundary. The rest that misses the heat source also goes right back out your boundary (pretty much by definition). Which all adds up to the TOTAL radiation coming in through your boundary going right back out again. There is no need to account for the view factor in this direction because there is no net radiation absorbed. It all goes right back out. Net **inwelling** energy through your boundary is zero.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

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

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-09-24 18:17 (#47989827)
Homepage Journal

> ... I mean, didn't it send up a red flag when you took your answer and fed it back into standard heat transfer equations and it didn't balance? Oh, that's right... you didn't. But I did. ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-24]***

Completely backwards, as usual. I've already shown that my solution keeps electrical heating power constant. Once again, Jane's solution halved the electrical heating power. Jane didn't notice this because he calculated net transfer incorrectly, which led him to the absurd conclusion that Jane was only off by about 0.1% when Jane was actually off by ~100%.

> ... because ALL of the incoming cooler radiation is reflected or scattered, and no NET amount is absorbed... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-24]***

Good grief, Jane. How did the Sky Dragon Slayers brainwash you into endlessly regurgitating this nonsense? Once again, radiation is absorbed by any surface with absorptivity > 0. Jane's either hopelessly confused about the very term "NET" which he keeps capitalizing, or Jane/Lonny Eachus has betrayed humanity by deliberately spreading civilization-paralyzing misinformation.

Again, how do Slayers think we detected the 2.7K cosmic microwave background radiation with warmer detectors? How do Slayers think uncooled IR detectors see cooler objects? Again, why do Slayers think Venus is hotter than Mercury?

> ... I'm not arguing with you now and I'm not going to again. You're either a fool or a liar, and I do not care which. I have already proved it and I intend to publish that for the world to see. Along with textbook explanations and diagrams showing exactly where and how you went wrong. ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-24]***

Again, Jane/Lonny Eachus actually means that he intends to show where mainstream physics "went wrong" according to the Sky Dragon Slayers. There are many ignorant, stupid physicists that

Jane/Lonny Eachus needs to educate: Prof. Brown, Dr. Joel Shore, the American Institute of Physics, the American Physical Society, the Australian Institute of Physics, and the European Physical Society, etc.

> .. Be a man for a change and admit it. .. [Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-15]
>
> .. Be a man and admit the truth.. You've been owned, man. BE enough of a man to admit it. .. [Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-19]
>
> ... Time to act like a man and admit that you were wrong. ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-24]***

Jane/Lonny Eachus wins a silver medal in psychological projection for telling me to "be a man for a change" but Slayer CEO John O'Sullivan still takes the gold.

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 2014-09-25 8:27 (#47993745)

Again, Jane/Lonny Eachus actually means that he intends to show where mainstream physics "went wrong" according to the Sky Dragon Slayers. There are many ignorant, stupid physicists that Jane/Lonny Eachus needs to educate: Prof. Brown, Dr. Joel Shore, the American Institute of Physics, the American Physical Society, the Australian Institute of Physics, and the European Physical Society, etc.

You have demonstrated yourself to be utterly inept at knowing "what I actually mean".

These are just straw-man arguments, as usual. I have no argument with these other physicists. It was about Spencer's challenge and how YOU got it wrong, nothing more. Have you asked them, personally, about Spencer's experiment? (No, you haven't, or you would know you were wrong.)

Bringing up OTHER arguments like greenhouse gases won't win THAT argument for you. You have already lost it.

And that last sentence is not an argument, it's just a statement of fact.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

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

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-09-25 12:29 (#47996613) Homepage Journal

> ... These are just straw-man arguments, as usual. I have no argument with these other physicists. It was about Spencer's challenge and how YOU got it wrong, nothing more. Have you asked them, personally, about Spencer's experiment? (No, you haven't, or you would know you were wrong.) ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-25]***

Does Jane have the memory of a goldfish? **Of course** Jane has argued with these other physicists. Jane personally asked Prof. Brown about Sky Dragon Slayerism, but wasn't able to "educate" him. Lonny Eachus personally asked Dr. Joel Shore about Sky Dragon Slayerism, but wasn't able to "educate" him. And now Jane/Lonny Eachus fantasizes that these physicists agree with his Sky Dragon Slayerism? Maybe Jane/Lonny Eachus should read those exchanges again, and notice that Prof. Brown and Dr. Shore told Jane/Lonny Eachus the same things I am. That's because Prof. Brown, Dr. Shore and I are simply reiterating elementary mainstream physics.

> ... Bringing up OTHER arguments like greenhouse gases won't win THAT argument for you. You have already lost it. ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-25]***

How bizarre. The whole reason Slayers deny that an enclosed source warms is because that implies greenhouse gases can't warm the surface:

> .. 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]

That's why Jane, Dr. Latour and the rest of the Slayers disagree with the American Institute of Physics, the American Physical Society, the Australian Institute of Physics, and the European Physical Society.

Again, how did we detect the 2.7K cosmic microwave background radiation with warmer detectors? How do uncooled IR detectors see cooler objects? Again, why is Venus hotter than Mercury?

If Sky Dragon Slayers could answer these questions without resorting to gray Oreos or basketball player gloves, physicists might take the Slayers more seriously.

> .. Be a man for a change and admit it. .. [Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-15]
>
> .. Be a man and admit the truth.. You've been owned, man. BE enough of a man to admit it. .. [Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-19]
>
> ... Time to act like a man and admit that you were wrong. ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-24]***

Jane/Lonny Eachus wins a silver medal in psychological projection for telling me to "be a man for a change" but Slayer CEO John O'Sullivan still takes the gold.

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 2014-09-26 0:16 (#48000669)

Does Jane have the memory of a goldfish? Of course Jane has argued with these other physicists. Jane personally asked [slashdot.org] Prof. Brown about Sky Dragon Slayerism, but wasn't able to "educate" him.

As usual, you distort reality. Prof. Brown had **nothing** in the way of refutation or rebuttal or even retort to my second comment? Don't you find that interesting? I do.

As for Joel Shore, again he was mis-applying an equation for heat transfer when he should have been using the equation for radiant power out. Both you and Shore insist on mis-applying this equation in a way that violates the Second Law of Thermodynamics. It's rather amusing that you brought him up, because you both FUCKED UP YOUR PHYSICS in a similar way.

But again, this is all straw-man bullshit. NONE of them were ever able to actually refute Latour's math with real-world examples. Spencer failed, YOU failed in your analysis of Spencer, etc.

Engineers the world over do the math the way I did. So far that hasn't resulted in you either freezing or burning to death in your home. If they're all crazy, you might want to ask yourself why.

The reason the Earth is not catastrophically warming due to CO2, and the reason you aren't literally burning alive due to your home's heating system, are the same: "warmist" back-radiation physics is bullshit.

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 2014-09-26 0:25 (#48000695)
Just so we're clear: I respect Dr. Roy Spencer.

But he's not immune from Getting Things Wrong. Even so, all things considered, he has been less wrong than you.

Venus proves nothing about CO2-based warming on Earth. If you ASSUME it's causing warming here, then you can ASSUME it causes warming there, in proportion. Such assumptions prove nothing.

For some reason, you seem to think these continuing comments of yours prove something. The only reason I'm reading them at all is for a daily laugh, and to record them so others later can laugh with me.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

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

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-09-26 1:02 (#48000785) Homepage Journal

> ... As usual, you distort reality. Prof. Brown had **nothing** in the way of refutation or rebuttal or even retort to my second comment? Don't you find that interesting? I do. ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-26]***

It's not that interesting that Prof. Brown decided to ignore Jane/Lonny Eachus, given that he later said:

"Wow, Joel, I gotta say (after reading some of the replies on this thread) that this really is pointless. These folks have no conception of the FIRST law of thermodynamics, let alone the second. The argument for warming doesn't even require mentioning the SBE, it only requires the first law, the second law, and a monotonic relation between temperature difference in ANY channel and the rate of energy transfer in that channel, subject to very broad constraints.

But seriously, just a waste of time. When people just make stuff up and reject the contents of ELEMENTARY textbooks on the subject because they just don't like the conclusion those contents lead to, how can you argue with them? If somebody tries to solve the light bulb problem while pretending that it doesn't primarily cool via radiation and completely ignoring radiation, what can you do?

Get them to say "oops"?

Never happen. It's a religious issue, not a scientific one."

In other words, Prof. Brown gave up trying to educate Slayers like Jane/Lonny Eachus because it's a "waste of time."

> ... As for Joel Shore, again he was mis-applying an equation for heat transfer when he should have been using the equation for radiant power out. Both you and Shore insist on mis-applying this equation in a way that violates the Second Law of Thermodynamics. It's rather amusing that you brought him up, because you both FUCKED UP YOUR PHYSICS in a similar way. ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-26]***

That's odd. Just yesterday Jane had no argument with Dr. Shore. Now Jane claims that Dr. Shore "FUCKED UP" his physics.

> ... As for Joel Shore, again he was mis-applying an equation for heat transfer when he should have been using the equation for radiant power out. Both you and Shore insist on mis-applying this equation in a way that violates the Second Law of Thermodynamics. It's rather amusing that you brought him up, because you both FUCKED UP YOUR PHYSICS in a similar way. ... Engineers the world over do the math the way I

> did. So far that hasn't resulted in you either freezing or burning to death in your home. If they're all crazy, you might want to ask yourself why. ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-26]***

Physicists have "FUCKED UP" their physics, and only the Slayers can save the day! Or maybe the Slayers are crackpots. How could anyone tell, unless maybe Dr. Shore explained that:

*"Actually, the idea that radiation goes only from the warmer to colder objects is an invention of the Slayers. It appears nowhere in the physics literature. I don't know about the exact history of our understanding, but my physics textbook from 1983 (Serway, "Physics for Scientists and Engineers", after introducing the law P = sigma*A*e*T^4 says*

"A body radiates and also absorbs electromagnetic radiation at rates given by Eq. 17.11. If this were not the case, a body would eventually radiate all of its internal energy and its temperature would reach absolute zero. The energy that the body absorbs comes from the surroundings, which also emit radiant energy. If the body is at a temperature T and its surroundings are at a temperature T_0, the net power gained (or lost) as a result of radiation is given by

*P_net = sigma*A_*e*(T^4 - T_0^4) (17.12)*

When a body is in equilibrium with its surroundings, it radiates and absorbs energy at the same rate and so its temperature remains constant. When a body is hotter than its surroundings, it radiates more energy than it absorbs, and so it cools..."

Maybe the Slayers could explain how uncooled IR detectors see cooler objects? Using the equations Dr. Shore and I are using, the source's required electrical heating power depends on the chamber wall temperature. That's how uncooled IR detectors can see cooler objects. But Jane's "Slayer physics" insists that the chamber wall temperature

doesn't affect the source's electrical heating power. So how do uncooled IR detectors see cooler objects? In particular, how did we detect the 2.7K cosmic microwave background radiation with warmer detectors?

> ... Venus proves nothing about CO2-based warming on Earth. If you ASSUME it's causing warming here, then you can ASSUME it causes warming there, in proportion. Such assumptions prove nothing. ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-26]***

If CO2 isn't the reason, then why is Venus hotter than Mercury? This isn't an assumption, it's a real-world example which any true skeptic should ponder before dismissing mainstream physics in favor of Sky Dragon Slayer brainwashing. Is Venus hotter than Mercury because of CO2, gray Oreos or basketball player gloves?

The Slayers have their own incoherent answer, while mainstream physics is presented by the American Institute of Physics, the American Physical Society, the Australian Institute of Physics, and the European Physical Society.

> .. Be a man for a change and admit it. .. [Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-15]
>
> .. Be a man and admit the truth.. You've been owned, man. BE enough of a man to admit it. .. [Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-19]
>
> ... Time to act like a man and admit that you were wrong. ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-24]***

Jane/Lonny Eachus wins a silver medal in psychological projection for telling me to "be a man for a change" but Slayer CEO John O'Sullivan still takes the gold.

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 2014-09-28 12:06 (#48014987)

Wow, Joel, I gotta say (after reading some of the replies on this thread) that this really is pointless. These folks have no conception of the FIRST law of thermodynamics, let alone the second. The argument for warming doesn't even require mentioning the SBE, it only requires the first law, the second law, and a monotonic relation between temperature difference in ANY channel and the rate of energy transfer in that channel, subject to very broad constraints.

Funny, because he's contradicting just about every argument behind the whole idea of AGW. I like how he makes these claims but isn't able to show how it actually works. He claims you can show warming via back-radiation WITHOUT the S-B equation? When it is absolutely fundamental to the very "energy transfer" he is asserting? What garbage.

Where's the math? In the comments you show in your link he also conflates backscatter with the "back radiation". But scattering and reflection are straw-men; they are completely unrelated to heat transfer via "back-radiation", and are 100% irrelevant to Spencer's experiment.

His mention of "empirical evidence" isn't science, it's an assertion of correlation without any causal link. It's a ridiculously weak argument... in fact it's not really an argument at all.

But seriously, just a waste of time. When people just make stuff up and reject the contents of ELEMENTARY textbooks on the subject because they just don't like the conclusion those contents lead to, how can you argue with them? If somebody tries to solve the light bulb problem while pretending that it doesn't primarily cool via radiation and completely ignoring radiation, what can you

do?

And this is downright hilarious in context. In incorrectly "solving" Spencer's challenge, YOU ignored basic textbook methods and math to get your answer. You used an imaginary "khayman80" method of arriving at your answer, which not only contradicts everything engineering textbooks say about heat transfer, your methodology directly contradicts the Stefan-Boltzmann radiation law, even though you used it yourself in calculations. Talk about hypocrisy. I repeat: I checked your final "answer" for temperature of the heat source and it violates both the Stefan-Boltzmann law and the second law of thermodynamics.

Further, what he was referring to in the latter paragraph were the comments in the forum... not Latour's analysis.

That's odd. Just yesterday Jane had no argument with Dr. Shore. Now Jane claims that Dr. Shore "FUCKED UP" his physics.

So? I'm still not arguing with him. I'm not even arguing with you. I've already showed you to be wrong. Let's get this straight: THIS "argument" **has been** with YOU, and ONLY you, and ONLY about Spencer's experiment. It's over, and you lost. All this other crap you bring up is just your way of trying to hide your own failure. It isn't working.

When a body is in equilibrium with its surroundings, it radiates and absorbs energy at the same rate and so its temperature remains constant. When a body is hotter than its surroundings, it radiates more energy than it absorbs, and so it cools..."

NONE of the bodies in Spencer's challenge are "in equlibrium" with their surroundings. None of them. Not one. Straw-man.

Maybe the Slayers could explain how uncooled IR detectors see cooler objects?

Straw-man. Our argument involved gray bodies, not detectors of specific wavelengths or electronics that take advantage of specific quantum effects. But I have an answer

anyway: they measure DIFFERENCES, not absolute radiation. You might be interested in THIS, which explains how IR pyrometers work. Hint: they don't work the way you seem to think they do.

And it's a straw-man in a different way: I repeat that I have NOT been claiming that no radiation from a cooler body is absorbed by a warmer body. What I claimed, I repeat, is that no NET radiative energy transfer occurs from cooler bodies to warmer. That concept does not conflict with the ability of infrared cameras or pyrometers to detect "cooler" radiation. Energy can be absorbed and re-emitted... and often (for non-gray-bodies) it is re-emitted in different wavelengths. But the fact remains that there is still no NET energy transfer from cooler to warmer. If there were, it would violate the second law of thermodynamics.

My argument has always been about NET heat transfer. I have explained to you many times that I do NOT claim no radiation from cooler bodies is ever absorbed. My argument is, and has been, about NET. And further, contrary to your own assertions, **since the NET energy transfer from cooler bodies is ZERO, it is not included in the "radiative power out" term of heat transfer equations**. Which is a concept that (apparently, if we *assume* you're being honest, which I doubt) you have had supreme difficulty getting through your head.

So just knock off the straw-man crap. You're very good at it, but I'm better at seeing it than you are at dishing it out.

Jane/Lonny Eachus wins a silver medal in psychological projection for telling me to "be a man for a change" but Slayer CEO John O'Sullivan still takes the gold.

And the ad-hominem too. You can claim all you want that your personal attacks have nothing to do with your arguments, but you have many times proved otherwise. Just knock off the bullshit. It isn't getting you anywhere.

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 2014-09-28 12:14 (#48015019)

Also, STOP sock-puppet modding down my comments. THAT'S AGAINST SLASHDOT'S RULES **and** it's just plain an asshole thing to do.

Parent Share

twitter facebook linkedin

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

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-09-28 15:48 (#48015949) Homepage Journal

> Maybe the Slayers could explain how uncooled IR detectors see cooler objects?
>
> Straw-man. Our argument involved gray bodies, not detectors of specific wavelengths or electronics that take advantage of specific quantum effects. But I have an answer anyway: they measure DIFFERENCES, not absolute radiation. ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-28]***

This isn't a quantum effect. The reason IR detectors measure DIFFERENCES, not absolute radiation, is because electrical heating power = (e * s) * (Ta^4 - Tb^4). If that weren't true, there would be no way to detect this difference, so uncooled IR detectors wouldn't be able to see cooler objects. And we couldn't have detected the 2.7K cosmic microwave background radiation with warmer detectors. **But we did!** How?

> ... 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 have NOT been claiming that no radiation from a cooler body is absorbed by a warmer body. What I claimed, I repeat, is that no NET radiative energy transfer occurs from cooler bodies to warmer. That concept does not conflict with the ability of infrared cameras or pyrometers to detect "cooler" radiation. Energy can be absorbed and re-emitted... and often (for non-gray-bodies) it is re-emitted in different wavelengths. But the fact remains that there is still no NET energy transfer from cooler to warmer. If there were, it would violate the second law of thermodynamics. My argument has always been about NET heat transfer. I have explained to you many times that I do NOT claim no radiation from cooler bodies is ever absorbed. My argument is, and has been, about NET. ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-28]***

Once again, Jane insists electrical heating power = (e * s) * (Ta^4). Once again, Jane's ridiculous equation doesn't just say there is no net "radiative power in" from cooler to hotter. Jane's wrongly saying the source absorbs no radiative power **at all**.

If Jane would reconsider conservation of energy and include a term for "radiative power in", **then** Jane could honestly say he was only claiming that no net radiative power is absorbed by the source. Until then, Jane's equation claims that no radiation is absorbed by the source **at all**. And since Jane seems to think he's only saying no "NET" radiative

power is absorbed, Jane will probably never be able to recognize his error, let alone correct it.

> ... And further, contrary to your own assertions, **since the NET energy transfer from cooler bodies is ZERO, it is not included in the "radiative power out" term of heat transfer equations**. Which is a concept that (apparently, if we *assume* you're being honest, which I doubt) you have had supreme difficulty getting through your head. ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-28]***

Once again, it's not included in the "radiative power out" term of heat transfer equations because it's included in the "radiative power **IN**" term.

I'm having supreme difficulty getting your concept through my head because it's Sky Dragon Slayer nonsense. The fact that more heat flows from warm to cold than vice-versa **doesn't** mean we can ignore the smaller amount of heat flowing from cold to warm. In fact, as I've repeatedly stressed, ignoring that heat violates conservation of energy.

Here's one way to see that: draw a boundary around a heated blackbody source. It's heated by constant electrical power flowing in. Blackbody cold walls at 0F (T4 = 255.4K) also radiate power in. The source at 150F (T1 = 338.7K) radiates power out. At steady-state, power in = power out:

electricity + (s)*T4^4 = (s)*T1^4 (Eq. 1J.2)

But Jane's equation is:

electricity = (s)*T1^4 (Jane's equation)

Because Jane's equation completely ignores radiative power flowing in, Jane's equation violates conservation of energy. How does Jane justify this violation?

> ... 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]***
>
> ... because T(p) < T(s), no matter now much of the radiation from P strikes S, no net amount is absorbed; it is all reflected, transmitted, or scattered according to S-B. ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-04]***

Once again, no. This Slayer talking point can't possibly apply to blackbodies. How does Jane rationalize ignoring "radiative power in" when the blackbody source can only absorb that radiation, not reflect or scatter it? Once again, remember that the gray body equation has to reduce to the blackbody equation when emissivity = 1.

> ... In incorrectly "solving" Spencer's challenge, YOU ignored basic textbook methods and math to get your answer. You used an imaginary "khayman80" method of arriving at your answer, which not only contradicts everything engineering textbooks say about heat transfer, your methodology directly contradicts the Stefan-Boltzmann radiation law, even though you used it yourself in calculations. Talk about hypocrisy. I repeat: I checked your final "answer" for temperature of the heat source and it violates both the Stefan-Boltzmann law and the second law of thermodynamics. ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-28]***

Good grief, Jane. Once again, my solution doesn't violate the Stefan-Boltzmann law or the second law of thermodynamics. But it's fascinating that Jane/Lonny Eachus keeps regurgitating this baseless Slayer talking point. It seems like Prof. Brown was right to say that arguing with Slayers is a pointless waste of

time.

> ... Venus proves nothing about CO2-based warming on Earth. If you ASSUME it's causing warming here, then you can ASSUME it causes warming there, in proportion. Such assumptions prove nothing. ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-26]***

Again, if CO2 isn't the reason, then why is Venus hotter than Mercury? This isn't an assumption, it's a real-world example which any true skeptic should ponder before dismissing mainstream physics in favor of Sky Dragon Slayer brainwashing. Is Venus hotter than Mercury because of CO2, gray Oreos, or basketball player gloves?

> ... Funny, because he's contradicting just about every argument behind the whole idea of AGW. I like how he makes these claims but isn't able to show how it actually works. He claims you can show warming via back-radiation WITHOUT the S-B equation? When it is absolutely fundamental to the very "energy transfer" he is asserting? What garbage. ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-28]***

That's odd. Just yesterday Jane had no argument with Prof. Brown. Now Jane claims that Prof. Brown is spreading "garbage" that contradicts just about every argument behind the whole idea of AGW. But Jane certainly isn't arguing with Prof. Brown or Dr. Shore or even me. Perish the thought.

Jane, don't you see how ironic it is to accuse three physicists (and the American Institute of Physics, the American Physical Society, the Australian Institute of Physics, and the European Physical Society, etc.) of "FUCKING UP" their physics, while also claiming that:

> .. I'll take the physicists' word for it, thank you very much. .. [Jane Q. Public, 2012-07-05]

> .. 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]

If Jane wanted to be consistent, he'd have to retract one of these claims. Jane is either a Sky Dragon Slayer accusing physicists of "FUCKING UP" their physics, or he believes physicists are "the experts" when it comes to physics and Jane takes the physicists' word for it. But not both!

> Also, STOP sock-puppet modding down my comments. THAT'S AGAINST SLASHDOT'S RULES **and** it's just plain an asshole thing to do. ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-28]***

I haven't used moderator points in over a year. But the fact that Jane is so convinced I am that he's cussing and screaming in ALL CAPS is emblematic of Jane's reasoning problems, just like when Jane was absolutely convinced that I'm a six-headed hydra.

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 2014-10-01 10:50 (#48039173)

This isn't a quantum effect. The reason IR detectors measure DIFFERENCES, not absolute radiation, is because electrical heating power = (e * s) * (Ta^4 - Tb^4). If that weren't true, there would be no way to detect this difference

You didn't bother to read my reference on pyrometers, did you? Because if you read it,

and understood it, and were honest, you'd know that is complete bullshit. That's not the "difference" they measure.

And that's the only reason I respond to you: to show others your bullshit. Funny how you don't seem to bother to read the TEXTBOOKS on how these things actually work, and instead just toss in your own theories. And... that's how you came up with the WRONG answer, which doesn't even check out using your own equations.

Once again, Jane insists electrical heating power = (e * s) * (Ta^4). Once again, Jane's ridiculous equation doesn't just say there is no net "radiative power in" from cooler to hotter. Jane's wrongly saying the source absorbs no radiative power at all.

NO. That is NOT what I claimed, and that is not what I am claiming. That isn't even misunderstanding, it's just a lie. You HAVE TO understand this by now. You could not NOT understand it, unless you are 100% clueless about what the term NET means.

I do not claim "no" radiation is absorbed. To repeat once again: no NET power from radiation is absorbed. Those are 2 completely different claims. You keep saying I claim the former, when I've actually only claimed the latter. And by now, there can be no remaining misunderstanding about that. You are simply lying. Again.

That's odd. Just yesterday Jane had no argument with Prof. Brown. Now Jane claims that Prof. Brown is spreading "garbage" that contradicts just about every argument behind the whole idea of AGW. But Jane certainly isn't arguing with Prof. Brown or Dr. Shore or even me. Perish the thought.

No, I am not arguing with them right now, as I made clear. I was arguing with YOU about Spencer's experiment. And you lost the argument.

When A is warmer than B, (Ta^4 - Tb^4) yields a positive number. Which means all NET radiative energy transfer goes from A to B.

That is clearly indicated by the minus sign, and is further dictated by the Second Law of Thermodynamics. There is no NET energy going from B to A. Only when B is hotter than A does any NET energy transfer in the other direction.

A high-schooler can easily understand this. It's simple subtraction.

Further, by the same equation the temperature (T) of warmer A does not depend on the cooler B. And as the Stefan-Boltzmann temperature-power relation (e*s)*T^4 clearly implies, the **power** output of A also does not depend on B.

Power output of A at a given temperature Ta is independent of B. Changing the temperature of B (as long as it remains cooler) does not affect the power output of A. This is exactly where you have been getting it wrong, by trying to use a heat transfer equation rather than a power output equation.

This is textbook stuff, and you're getting it wrong. Period. I don't give the slightest damn whether your precious professors agree or disagree. My argument was with YOU.

I haven't used moderator points in over a year. But the fact that Jane is so convinced I am that he's cussing and screaming in ALL CAPS is emblematic of Jane's reasoning problems, just like when Jane was absolutely convinced that I'm a six-headed hydra.

It fit the pattern I saw in the past. It's possible that it was someone else. Just not very likely.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

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

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-10-01 13:23 (#48041111) Homepage Journal

> You didn't bother to read my reference on pyrometers, did you? ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-01]***

That reference shows the object (i.e. chamber wall) temperature has an effect on the temperature controlled cavity (i.e. source). Which Jane denies:

> ... Radiation from the cooler walls has no effect on the heat source whatsoever. This is a basic requirement of thermodynamics! ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-21]***

No, that's Sky Dragon Slayer nonsense. If radiation from the cooler walls really had no effect on the heat source whatsoever, the IR thermometer wouldn't work because the cooler object temperature would have no effect on the temperature controlled cavity whatsoever.

When the source temperature is held constant, its required electrical heating power **is** an IR thermometer.

Here's one way to see that: draw a boundary around a heated aluminum source. It's heated by constant electrical power flowing in. Aluminum cold walls at some unknown temperature T4 also radiate power in. The source at 150F (T1 = 338.7K) radiates power out. At steady-state, power in = power out. Using the equation which neglects reflections:

electricity = (e*s)*(T1^4 - T4^4)

If the required electrical heating power is 82.1 W/m^2, then the chamber wall is at absolute zero (-459.7F).

If the required electrical heating power is 55.6 W/m^2, then the chamber wall is at 0F.

If the required electrical heating power is 27.8 W/m^2, then the chamber wall is at 90F.

If the required electrical heating power is 0.0 W/m^2, then the chamber wall is also at 150F.

If the source needs to be refrigerated to stay at 150F, the required electrical power is negative. The same equation can be used to determine the chamber wall temperature, regardless of whether it's warmer or cooler than the source.

That's why when the source temperature is held constant, its required electrical heating power is an IR thermometer. At least, it's a thermometer when using mainstream physics. But Jane's equation is:

electricity = (e*s)*T1^4 (Jane's equation)

Since Jane's equation doesn't depend on the chamber wall temperature, uncooled IR detectors can't see cooler objects in Janeland. And we couldn't possibly have detected the 2.7K cosmic microwave background radiation with warmer detectors. **But we did!** How? This must be inexplicable to Slayers who are brainwashed into believing that:

> ... all the way up to the exact point thermal equilibrium is achieved, all radiant power is a result of electrical power, therefore the power input and power output are constant. It is not a "gradual" process. ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-20]***

No. Again, mainstream physics shows that electrical heating power gradually decreases to zero as the chamber wall temperature increases. That's how uncooled IR detectors can see cooler objects.

> Once again, Jane insists electrical heating power = (e * s) * (Ta^4). Once again, Jane's ridiculous equation doesn't just say there is no net "radiative power in" from cooler to hotter. Jane's wrongly saying the source absorbs no radiative power at all.

> NO. That is NOT what I claimed, and that is not what I am claiming. That isn't even misunderstanding, it's just a lie. You HAVE TO understand this by now. You could not NOT understand it, unless you are 100% clueless about what the term NET means. I do not claim "no" radiation is absorbed. To repeat once again: no NET power from radiation is absorbed. Those are 2 completely different claims. You keep saying I claim the former, when I've actually only claimed the latter. And by now, there can be no remaining misunderstanding about that. You are simply lying. Again. ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-01]***

That's not what you claimed? Jane, you've been insisting for months that electrical heating power per square meter = 82 W/m^2, regardless of the chamber wall temperature. That means Jane insists that electrical heating power per square meter = (e * s) * (Ta^4).

If Jane were only writing down the Stefan-Boltzmann equation to calculate radiative power out, **then** he'd be able to honestly say that he's only claiming that net radiative power flows from warm to cold. But calculating "electrical heating power" requires writing down a heat transfer equation with power in = power out. Since Jane refuses to include a term for "radiative power in" in his heat transfer equation, he's wrongly saying the source absorbs no radiative power **at all**.

> ... Power output of A at a given temperature Ta is independent of B. Changing the temperature of B (as long as it remains cooler) does not affect the power output of A. This is exactly where you have been getting it wrong, by trying to use a heat transfer equation rather than a power output equation. This is textbook stuff, and you're getting it wrong. Period. ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-01]***

Jane, I've repeatedly explained that there's a big difference between electrical heating power, and radiative power out. Calculating "radiative power out" just requires writing down the Stefan-Boltzmann law. Calculating "electrical heating power" requires drawing a boundary around the heat source at steady-state, and setting power in = power out.

Once again, Jane's completely backwards. He needs to use a heat transfer equation, not an equation for "power out" only. This is probably because Jane doesn't understand the difference between electrical heating power and radiative power out. And since Jane seems convinced that he's right and physicists are wrong, he'll probably never be able to recognize his error, let alone correct it.

> When A is warmer than B, (Ta^4 - Tb^4) yields a positive number. Which means all NET radiative energy transfer goes from A to B. That is clearly indicated by the minus sign, and is further dictated by the Second Law of Thermodynamics. There is no NET energy going from B to A. Only when B is hotter than A does any NET energy transfer in the other direction. A high-schooler can easily understand this. It's simple subtraction. ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-01]***

When A is warmer than B, more heat flows from A to B than vice-versa. Once again, this doesn't mean we can ignore the heat flowing from B to A. And that's exactly what Jane's doing, by insisting that:

> ... 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]***
>
> ... because T(p) < T(s), no matter now much of the radiation from P

> strikes S, no net amount is absorbed; it is all reflected, transmitted, or scattered according to S-B. ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-04]***

Once again, no. This Slayer talking point can't possibly apply to blackbodies. How does Jane rationalize ignoring "radiative power in" when the blackbody source can only absorb that radiation, not reflect or scatter it? Once again, remember that the gray body equation has to reduce to the blackbody equation when emissivity = 1.

Can Jane write down a simple equation describing the electrical heating power of a blackbody source, like I did? If Jane would at least try to do that, he might learn about the difference between "radiative power out" and "electrical heating power" and he might learn why it's impossible to ignore "radiative power in" when the blackbody source can only absorb that radiation, not reflect or scatter it.

> ... Venus proves nothing about CO2-based warming on Earth. If you ASSUME it's causing warming here, then you can ASSUME it causes warming there, in proportion. Such assumptions prove nothing. ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-26]***

Again, if CO2 isn't the reason, then why is Venus hotter than Mercury? This isn't an assumption, it's a real-world example which any true skeptic should ponder before dismissing mainstream physics in favor of Sky Dragon Slayer brainwashing. Is Venus hotter than Mercury because of CO2, gray Oreos, or basketball player gloves?

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

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

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-10-02 3:35 (#48045231) Homepage Journal

> ... 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. ... [Jane Q. Public, 2014-07-29]
>
> ... At no time in this experiment are the temperatures equal, so net heat transfer is **always** in one direction and only one direction. ... [Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-04]
>
> ... HEAT TRANSFER is always in one direction. ... [Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-07]
>
> ... There is **heat transfer** which is energy, which represents NET flow in one direction. ... there IS a **net, non-zero flow of energy** (heat transfer) THROUGH that boundary in one direction from the hollow enclosing plate to the chamber wall. This is a net, non-zero quantity. [Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-08]
>
> ... According to the S-B equation itself, net heat transfer is either 0, or only in one direction. Yes, we are talking NET here. ... [Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-10]
>
> ... If the chamber walls were hotter than the central source, then heat transfer would be in the other direction (because the sign of the solution to the equation above changes), and only THEN are you getting net heat transfer TO the central sphere. ... [Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-15]

> ... Another requirement of the S-B law, and also of thermodynamics: since **EVERY other object in the system is at a lower temperature** than the heat source, NET heat transfer is in ONLY one direction: from hotter to colder. Therefore, no energy is flowing "backward" to boost the output of the heat source. ... [Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-19]
>
> ... When A is warmer than B, (Ta^4 - Tb^4) yields a positive number. Which means all NET radiative energy transfer goes from A to B. That is clearly indicated by the minus sign, and is further dictated by the Second Law of Thermodynamics. There is no NET energy going from B to A. Only when B is hotter than A does any NET energy transfer in the other direction. ... [Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-01]
>
> ... You could not NOT understand it, unless you are 100% clueless about what the term NET means. ... [Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-01]

It's beginning to seem like we disagree about the meaning of the term "NET".

1. Can we agree that net heat transfer through a boundary around the source = "radiative power out" minus "radiative power in"?

2. Can we agree that net heat transfer **always** contains terms in **both** directions?

3. Can we agree that just because "radiative power out" > "radiative power in", that **doesn't** mean "radiative power in" = 0?

If we can agree on all those points, that's great. Maybe this will help Jane write down a simple equation describing the electrical heating power required to keep a blackbody source at 150F inside 0F chamber walls. Remember that "electrical heating power" is different than

"radiative power out". Also remember that blackbodies can only absorb radiation, not reflect or scatter it. Finally, remember that the graybody equation has to reduce to the blackbody equation when emissivity = 1.

On the other hand, if Jane answers "no" to any of those three yes/no questions... why?

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 2014-10-03 14:16 (#48058897)

That reference [omega.com] shows the object (i.e. chamber wall) temperature has an effect on the temperature controlled cavity (i.e. source). Which Jane denies:

Via a QUANTUM EFFECT, you fucking moron. Further, I repeat for about the 100th time that I do not deny that some radiation is absorbed; but then it's just re-emitted. Sometimes, in a non-gray body, in a slightly different form.

And ALL of that is straw-man irrelevancy, since no NET radiation absorption occurs from colder bodies to warm, which was the subject under discussion.

It's a combination of your historical tendency to straw-man argue, and outright lies about what I wrote.

This is the only kind of reply you're going to get from me, as long as you keep up your dishonest bullshit.

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 2014-10-03 14:23 (#48058941)

If we can agree on all those points, that's great. Maybe this will help Jane write down a simple equation describing the electrical heating power required to keep a blackbody source at 150F inside 0F chamber walls. Remember that "electrical heating power" is different than "radiative power out". Also remember that blackbodies can only absorb radiation, not reflect or scatter it. Finally, remember that the graybody equation has to reduce to the blackbody equation when emissivity = 1.

I don't need to "agree" with you about anything. I've already demonstrated how TEXTBOOK PHYSICS proved you wrong. That doesn't require any kind of "agreement". I'm just wondering when you're going to stop the dishonesty and admit you were wrong.

The whole world is going to see it soon anyway, so you might as well "come clean", as they say.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

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

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-10-03 14:49 (#48059119) Homepage Journal

> That reference shows the object (i.e. chamber wall) temperature has an effect on the temperature controlled cavity (i.e. source). Which Jane denies:

> Via a QUANTUM EFFECT, you fucking moron. ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-03]***

Charming. As I just explained, IR detectors don't have to depend on quantum effects. Classical mainstream physics allows a temperature-controlled source to detect IR from the cooler chamber walls as follows:

electricity = (e*s)*(T1^4 - T4^4)

If the required electrical heating power is 82.1 W/m^2, then the chamber wall is at absolute zero (-459.7F).

If the required electrical heating power is 55.6 W/m^2, then the chamber wall is at 0F.

If the required electrical heating power is 27.8 W/m^2, then the chamber wall is at 90F.

If the required electrical heating power is 0.0 W/m^2, then the chamber wall is also at 150F.

If the source needs to be refrigerated to stay at 150F, the required electrical power is negative. The same equation can be used to determine the chamber wall temperature, regardless of whether it's warmer or cooler than the source.

> ... Further, I repeat for about the 100th time that I do not deny that some radiation is absorbed; but then it's just re-emitted. Sometimes, in a non-gray body, in a slightly different form. And ALL of that is straw-man irrelevancy, since no NET radiation absorption occurs from colder bodies to warm, which was the subject under discussion. ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-03]***

If you don't deny that some radiation is absorbed, then it should be very easy to write down a simple equation describing the required electrical heating power (**not** the radiative power out) of a blackbody source.

> I don't need to "agree" with you about anything. I've already

> demonstrated how TEXTBOOK PHYSICS proved you wrong. That doesn't require any kind of "agreement". I'm just wondering when you're going to stop the dishonesty and admit you were wrong. The whole world is going to see it soon anyway, so you might as well "come clean", as they say. ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-03]***

Jane, if we can't agree on the meaning of the term "NET", why are you still capitalizing the word "NET"? Screaming the word louder and louder is unlikely to be productive.

1. Can we agree that net heat transfer through a boundary around the source = "radiative power out" minus "radiative power in"?

2. Can we agree that net heat transfer **always** contains terms in **both** directions?

3. Can we agree that just because "radiative power out" > "radiative power in", that **doesn't** mean "radiative power in" = 0?

If Jane answers "no" to any of those three yes/no questions... why?

> I don't need to "agree" with you about anything. I've already demonstrated how TEXTBOOK PHYSICS proved you wrong. That doesn't require any kind of "agreement". I'm just wondering when you're going to stop the dishonesty and admit you were wrong. The whole world is going to see it soon anyway, so you might as well "come clean", as they say. ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-03]***

If you're so confident that you're right, why not prove it by taking a few seconds to write down a simple equation describing the electrical heating power required to keep a blackbody source at 150F inside 0F chamber walls. Remember that "electrical heating power" is different than "radiative power out". Also

remember that blackbodies can only absorb radiation, not reflect or scatter it. Finally, remember that the graybody equation has to reduce to the blackbody equation when emissivity = 1.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

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

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-10-03 15:37 (#48059453) Homepage Journal

Jane probably won't write down an equation describing electrical heating power for a blackbody source, so I'll try to guess at Jane's reasoning.

> If radiation enters the boundary and goes right back out, we need to account for it entering and exiting. That's why there are separate terms for "power in" and "power out".

> Just no. If radiation goes in and comes right back out, we do not need to account for it, because then the NET amount of that particular radiation crossing your boundary is ZERO. A = A. You do know how to add and subtract, right? You know what a zero is, right? ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-24]***

Draw a boundary around the blackbody heat source:
Jane's power in = electrical heating power + radiative power in from chamber walls
Jane's power out = radiative power out from source + radiative power from chamber walls, re-emitted back out

At steady state, Jane's power in = Jane's power out:

electrical heating power + radiative power in from chamber walls = radiative power out from source + radiative power from chamber walls, re-emitted back out (Jane's equation?)

Jane, is that your equation for required electrical heating power? By "A = A", are you saying "radiative power in from the chamber walls" = "radiative power from chamber walls, re-emitted back out"?

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 2014-10-03 15:53 (#48059569)

Jane probably won't write down an equation describing electrical heating power for a blackbody source, so I'll try to guess at Jane's reasoning.

It's not a "black body" source, it's a "gray body" source, as per our agreement when this discussion first started. And I showed you my equations not just once but many times.

You're just lying again.

What is wrong with you? I ask this question very seriously. You were very clearly shown to be wrong, using textbook physics methodology, yet you continue this bullshit. Why? I'd really like to know. (And it was indeed textbook physics. I have 3 different textbooks here... wait, make that 4... which all disagree with you.)

You replied not by admitting you were wrong, but by lying about what I wrote and refusing to accept the clear demonstration that your own brand of "physics" as you applied it to this

problem is a blatant violation of the Second Law of Thermodynamics.

You leave me no choice but to conclude that either you are one of the "True Believers", and no facts will sway you, or that you're simply being dishonest. I quite literally have no other options.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

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

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-10-03 16:10 (#48059699) Homepage Journal

> It's not a "black body" source, it's a "gray body" source, as per our agreement when this discussion first started. And I showed you my equations not just once but many times. You're just lying again.
> ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-03]***

Again, Jane's gray body equation has to reduce to the black body equation when emissivity = 1, so this is a way to check Jane's work. But since Jane seems convinced that checking his work is "lying" let's write down both equations simultaneously.

Draw a boundary around the (gray or black body) heat source:
Jane's power in = electrical heating power + radiative power in from chamber walls
Jane's power out = radiative power out from source + radiative power from chamber walls, re-emitted back out

At steady state, Jane's power in = Jane's power out:

electrical heating power + radiative power in from chamber walls = radiative power out from source + radiative power from chamber walls, re-emitted back out (Jane's equation?)

Jane, is that your equation for required electrical heating power? By "A = A", are you saying "radiative power in from the chamber walls" = "radiative power from chamber walls, re-emitted back out"?

Now use the Stefan-Boltzmann law to describe the radiative terms, one at a time. First for Jane's gray body:

Because "radiative power in from chamber walls" is emitted by graybody walls at temperature T4, the Stefan-Boltzmann law says:

gray electrical heating power + (e*s)*T4^4 = radiative power out from source + radiative power from chamber walls, re-emitted back out (Jane's equation?)

Is that what you're saying, Jane?

Now for Jane's black body check:

Because "radiative power in from chamber walls" is emitted by blackbody walls at temperature T4, the Stefan-Boltzmann law says:

black electrical heating power + (s)*T4^4 = radiative power out from source + radiative power from chamber walls, re-emitted back out (Jane's equation?)

Is that what you're saying, Jane?

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

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

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-10-03 19:19 (#48060741) Homepage Journal

Since Jane probably won't even say yes or no, I'll keep trying to guess at Jane's reasoning. Now the next term for Jane's gray body:

Because "radiative power out from source" is emitted by the graybody source at temperature T1, the Stefan-Boltzmann law says:

gray electrical heating power + (e*s)*T4^4 = (e*s)*T1^4 + radiative power from chamber walls, re-emitted back out (Jane's equation?)

Is that what you're saying, Jane?

Now the next term for Jane's black body check:

Because "radiative power out from source" is emitted by the blackbody source at temperature T1, the Stefan-Boltzmann law says:

black electrical heating power + (s)*T4^4 = (s)*T1^4 + radiative power from chamber walls, re-emitted back out (Jane's equation?)

Is that what you're saying, Jane?

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 2014-10-03 22:02 (#48061183)

Since Jane probably won't even say yes or no, I'll keep trying to guess at Jane's reasoning. Now the next term for Jane's gray body:

There is no reason to "guess" at my reasoning. I spelled it out quite clearly when we had our "argument" (which you lost).

You do realize this is all going to be published, right? I warned you not just once or twice, but many times now. Every time you pull this kind of BS will be just another instance of widespread public knowledge of your dishonesty.

Parent Share

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

by Jane Q. Public (1010737) Friend of a Friend
on 2014-10-03 22:08 (#48061201)

Because "radiative power out from source" is emitted by the graybody source at temperature T1, the Stefan-Boltzmann law says:

gray electrical heating power + (e*s)*T4^4 = (e*s)*T1^4 + radiative power from chamber walls, re-emitted back out (Jane's equation?)

I am not going to get drawn into an argument that you have already lost. I repeat that the equation you show is for HEAT TRANSFER, not "radiative power out". You are just plain wrong about that and any heat transfer textbook will you so.

Every reply you have given the past couple of weeks has demonstrably been a lie, in one form or another: presenting principles which you know to be not representative of the real situation (e.g., heat transfer in place of the proper "radiated power" equation), or claims that I stated something that I provably did not.

One might be characterized as fraud, and the other as libel. And you expect anyone to take you seriously?

Just asking.

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

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-10-03 22:20

(#48061223) Homepage Journal

> There is no reason to "guess" at my reasoning. I spelled it out quite clearly when we had our "argument" (which you lost). You do realize this is all going to be published, right? I warned you not just once or twice, but many times now. Every time you pull this kind of BS will be just another instance of widespread public knowledge of your dishonesty. ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-03]***

I have to guess at your reasoning because what you've said doesn't make any sense.

> If radiation enters the boundary and goes right back out, we need to account for it entering and exiting. That's why there are separate terms for "power in" and "power out".

> Just no. If radiation goes in and comes right back out, we do not need to account for it, because then the NET amount of that particular radiation crossing your boundary is ZERO. A = A. You do know how to add and subtract, right? You know what a zero is, right? ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-24]***

I have to guess at what Jane meant by this, because it's not in equation form. In physics, statements in equation form are easier to analyze.

Draw a boundary around the (gray or black body) heat source:
Jane's power in = electrical heating power + radiative power in from chamber walls
Jane's power out = radiative power out from source + radiative power from chamber walls, re-emitted back out

At steady state, Jane's power in = Jane's power out:

electrical heating power + radiative power in from chamber walls = radiative power out from source + radiative power from chamber walls, re-emitted back out (Jane's equation?)

Jane, is that your equation for required electrical heating power? By "A = A", are you saying "radiative power in from the chamber walls" = "radiative power from chamber walls, re-emitted back out"?

> I am not going to get drawn into an argument that you have already lost. I repeat that the equation you show is for HEAT TRANSFER, not "radiative power out". You are just plain wrong about that and any heat transfer textbook will you so. ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-03]***

Once again, to calculate "electrical heating power" you need to use a heat transfer equation which accounts for power in and power out. That's because power in = power out through any boundary where nothing inside is changing. Once again, the equation Jane's using is only valid for "radiative power out" which is completely different than "electrical heating power". That's why I'm starting with the principle of "conservation of energy" and trying to understand what Jane's saying, in equation form.

Jane, if you don't agree with the "power in" and "power out" that I've tried to glean from your rants, just fill in the following blanks like I did. It'll be much faster than accusing me of dishonesty, fraud, and libel.

Jane's power in = ?
Jane's power out = ?

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

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-10-03 23:17
(#48061341) Homepage Journal
Jane responds.
Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

- Slashdot
  Archived Discussion Moderate Moderator Help Delete

- Get 37 More Comments
- Submit Story

  "Love may fail, but courtesy will previal." -- A Kurt Vonnegut fan

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

Close

Slashdot