This discussion has been archived.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

NASA Study: Ocean Abyss Has Not Warmed **234 More** **Prefs**

NASA Study: Ocean Abyss Has Not Warmed

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

- All
- Insightful
- Informative
- Interesting
- Funny

234 More Prefs

-

phase change (Score:3, **Interesting**)

by aquabat (724032) Alter Relationship
Lots of Ice melting. Could be that all the energy is going into phase change right now.
--
A republic cannot succeed till it contains a certain body of men imbued with the principles of justice and honour.

-
-

  Re: (Score:5, **Insightful**)

  by durrr (1316311) Alter Relationship

  It's hard to admit that you could've been wrong isn't it?
  Especially after you've been gloating over your high horse position and have insulted everyone that disagreed.

  -
  -

    ›

    Re:phase change (Score:3)

    by Jane Q. Public (1010737) Friend of a Friend on 2014-10-07 23:06 (#48089259)

    It's hard to admit that you could've been wrong isn't it?
    Especially after you've been gloating over your high horse position and have insulted everyone that disagreed.

    Hah! You think this one is bad? I have stories.

    But it does seem to be true: the term "denier" is increasingly pointing in the other direction now.

    Parent Share
    twitter facebook linkedin

    -
    -

      Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer (Score:3, **Insightful**)

      by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-10-07 23:08 (#48089271) Homepage Journal

      > ... don't try to tell me you're calculating the TOTAL electrical power needed to both heat the source and cool the walls, because that would be a different experiment. Spencer stipulated "electrical power" **to the heat source**. He left power to the walls unstated, except to say that they are maintained at 0 degrees F. He did not say the power to the heat

> source AND to the walls was constant. ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-07]***

Again, I've repeatedly explained that the power needed to cool the walls is irrelevant, and that it isn't required to be constant.

> The problem with your theory is that you have failed to show that electrical power in = anything BUT power out. **It isn't heat transfer, as you have several times asserted.** Heat transfer to a cooler body has NO relevance to the radiated power output of a warmer body at known temperature. And since it does not affect the power out, it does not affect the power in. QED. ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-07]***

Again, why does Jane think if something doesn't affect the power out, it can't affect the power in? For example, black body "power in" depends on the chamber walls even though "power out" through that boundary doesn't depend on the chamber walls.

Since we agree that "electrical heating power" goes to zero when the chamber walls are also at 150F, has Jane also noticed that "net heat transfer" also goes to zero when the chamber walls are also at 150F?

Isn't that a weird coincidence? So why does Jane keep using an equation that depends on "electrical heating power = radiative power out" without even writing down an energy conservation equation to try to justify that claim? Has Jane even considered the possibility that if he applied conservation of energy, he'd find that electrical heating power really is determined by net heat transfer, rather than "radiative power out" which stays constant even if the chamber walls are also at 150F?

> If you draw your boundary around just the heat source itself, since there is NO NET RADIATIVE POWER COMING IN (which doesn't then just go right back OUT, yielding a net of 0)... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-07]***

If there's no net radiative power coming in, that must mean all the "power in" from the chamber walls just goes back out. That would yield a net of zero. But as usual Jane didn't write down the power in = power out equation showing these terms before they supposedly cancel. Is this what you mean, Jane?

Draw a boundary around the 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 "NO NET RADIATIVE POWER COMING IN", 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:1)

by drainbramage (588291) Alter Relationship on 2014-10-08 5:41 (#48090415)

Do you also sell perpetual motion machines?
Without a car analogy that whole rant just falls apart.

--
No brain, no pain.
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 2014-10-08 21:32 (#48099943)

For example, black body [archive.today] "power in" depends on the chamber walls even though "power out" through that boundary doesn't depend on the chamber walls.

Not according to my thermodynamics textbooks. Simply stating this, and linking to yourself stating it again elsewhere, isn't any kind of argument.

In analyzing Spencer's challenge, we could have assumed black bodies. The only reason we didn't was because YOU insisted that you wanted to include an emissivity figure. But it still doesn't change the general principle.

In this particular case, the only substantive difference between black bodies and gray bodies is the presence of an emissivity term. Big deal. For black-body radiant power emittance per unit area, you simply omit the emissivity and get: sigma * T^4. The only change amounts to somewhat different figures for power out, and therefore electrical power in. There is still no absorption of any NET radiant power from the cooler chamber walls. That hasn't changed.

Again, why does Jane think if something doesn't affect the power out, it can't affect the power in?

Conservation of energy. Your own idea of power in through a boundary = power out through that boundary.

If your boundary is around JUST the heat source, the **only** NET power in is electricity, and the **only** NET power out is radiation. I see absolutely no reason (if we assume 100% efficiency) that these should not be equal.

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?)

This does not even remotely resemble my equation. The textbook thermodynamic answer is: radiant power out at steady-state, per unit area, equals (emissivity * Stefan-Boltzmann constant) * T^4.

That's all. The end. No chamber walls (they're **cooler** so they add no net energy to the heat source).

So total power out = (epsilon * sigma) * T^4 * area

That's my equation. That's all the textbooks say I need. That's all heat transfer experts say I need.

Your continued assertion that, at steady-state, the presence of a nearby **cooler** body somehow affects the power output of a warmer body at known temperature is a bizarre violation of the Second Law of Thermodynamics. The power output is what it is. It depends **only** on emissivity and temperature. Cooler bodies do not affect it. And if they don't affect the power out, they aren't affecting the power in. Again: your own power in = power out principle. QED

I don't get why you don't see that you're contradicting yourself. Or maybe you do, and you're just putting on some kind of show.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

-
-

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

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-10-08 22:15 (#48100129) Homepage Journal

> Again, why does Jane think if something doesn't affect the power out, it can't affect the power in? For example, black body "power in" depends on the chamber walls even though "power out" through that boundary doesn't depend on the chamber walls.

> Not according to my thermodynamics textbooks. Simply stating this, and linking to yourself stating it again elsewhere, isn't any kind of argument. In analyzing Spencer's challenge, we could have assumed black bodies. The only reason we didn't was because YOU insisted that you wanted to include an emissivity figure. But it still doesn't change the general principle. ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-08]***

Again, I originally assumed black bodies because they're simpler: black bodies don't reflect any radiation. That means "power in" depends on the chamber walls and "power out" through that boundary only depends on the heat source.

> > Again, why does Jane think if something doesn't affect the power out, it can't affect the power in?
>
> Conservation of energy. Your own idea of power in through a boundary = power out through that boundary. If your boundary is around JUST the heat source, the **only** NET power in is electricity, and the **only** NET power out is radiation. I see absolutely no reason (if we assume 100% efficiency) that these should not be equal. ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-08]***

The crucial assumption isn't 100% efficiency, it's that nothing inside the boundary is changing. If not, power in != power out. Either way, conservation of energy doesn't imply that "if something doesn't affect the power out, it can't affect the power in." Otherwise it would apply to black bodies, and that isn't true. Otherwise it would apply even if that source is warming, so power in > power out, but that isn't true either.

> Your continued assertion that, at steady-state, the presence of a nearby **cooler** body somehow affects the power output of a warmer body at known temperature is a bizarre violation of the Second Law of Thermodynamics. The power output is what it is. It depends **only** on emissivity and temperature. ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-08]***

Once again, Jane confuses "radiative power out" which depends **only** on emissivity and temperature, with "electrical heating power" which goes to zero if the chamber walls are also at 150F.

> This does not even remotely resemble my equation. The textbook thermodynamic answer is: radiant power out at steady-state, per unit area, equals (emissivity * Stefan-Boltzmann constant) * T^4. That's all. The end. ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-08]***

Jane coyly says that my attempt to understand Jane's energy conservation equation doesn't even remotely resemble Jane's super-

secret energy conservation equation. Which he **still** refuses to write down.

Then, once again, Jane writes down the Stefan-Boltzmann equation which only determines "radiative power out" without even trying to write down an energy conservation equation to show how it relates to "electrical heating power". This means Jane either doesn't understand that "radiative power out" is different than "electrical heating power", or Jane doesn't understand that conservation of energy is necessary to link the two together.

Jane **still** hasn't written down an energy conservation equation for a boundary around the heated source which links "electrical heating power" to "radiative power out". Why? Just fill in these blanks:

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

This would be much faster than writing another rant. It would only be two lines long. Just list Jane's "power in" and Jane's "power out" around the heat source. Just. Two. Lines.

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 2014-10-08 22:38 (#48100211)

Again, I originally assumed black bodies because they're simpler: black bodies don't reflect any radiation. That means "power in" depends on the chamber walls and "power out" through that boundary only depends on the heat source.

I have it on record where you **insisted** that we assume gray bodies so that we could include a term for emissivity. Seriously. You insisted. I'm not going to look it up this late at night, because you are getting completely ridiculous. But I am sure as hell going to include it in my publication.

The crucial assumption isn't 100% efficiency, it's that nothing inside the boundary is changing. If not, power in != power out. Either way, conservation of energy doesn't imply that "if something doesn't affect the power out, it can't affect the power in." Otherwise it would apply to black bodies, and that isn't true. Otherwise it would apply even if that source is warming, so power in > power out, but that isn't true either.

Now you're just speaking gibberish, AND contradicting yourself again. All along we have been discussing a system at steady-state, so your introduction of "if that source is warming" is 100% irrelevant to the conversation. You're straw-manning again.

Once again, Jane confuses "radiative power out" which depends only on emissivity and temperature, with "electrical heating power" which goes to zero if the chamber walls are also at 150F.

I'm not confusing anything. **Since the walls never ARE at 150F, this is another straw-man.** You're suggesting that it's a gradual process, but it's not. You're just repeating the same BS straw-man arguments you made before. That's at least 2 so far.

Jane coyly says that my attempt to understand Jane's energy conservation equation doesn't even remotely resemble Jane's super-secret energy conservation equation. Which he still refuses to write down.

There's nothing super-secret about it, and I've given it to you about 30 times now. My energy conservation equation is this:

electrical power in = (epsilon * sigma) * T^4 * area = radiant power out

There you have it. Conservation of **power**, which isn't strictly necessary, except that because this is steady-state, at any given instant energy is conserved.

You're trying to make it lots more complicated than it really is.

Then, once again, Jane writes down the Stefan-Boltzmann equation which only determines "radiative power out" without even trying to write down an energy conservation equation to show how it relates to "electrical heating power".

Utter nonsense. Not only did I just do it now, I have explained this to you **many times** before.

Jane still hasn't written down an energy conservation equation for a boundary around the heated source which links "electrical heating power" to "radiative power out".

Yes, I have. I have done it at least several times before, and I just did it again. Not only did I give you the equations, I showed you my exact calculations.

Why are you lying again, and trying to claim I did not do something that I very clearly and provably did do?

In fact, since you seem to be so obsessed with archiving other people's comments, I am sure you have several instances of where

I've showed this to you before.

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 2014-10-08 22:58 (#48100283)
I'm just sick and tired of your incessant lying about what went on before, and attempts to re-hash old arguments that you lost a long time ago.

I have nothing further to say to you at this time.
Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

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

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-10-08 23:14 (#48100339) Homepage Journal

> Again, I originally assumed black bodies because they're simpler: black bodies don't reflect any radiation. That means "power in" depends on the chamber walls and "power out" through that boundary only depends on the heat source.

I have it on record where you insisted that we assume gray bodies so that we could include a term for emissivity. Seriously. You insisted. I'm not going to look it up this late at night, because you are getting completely ridiculous. But I am sure as hell going to include it in my publication. ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-08]***

Remember to include that part where I originally

assumed black bodies because they're simpler. And the part where Jane insisted that "we should use real materials with real emissivities and absorptivies. Just to keep everybody honest."

But black bodies aren't "dishonest". Also, Jane should make sure to include the part where Jane said I was "lying again" for considering a black body source.

But if Jane wants to work on the simpler black body problem that I originally proposed months ago, that's fine with me. It's simpler, and easier to learn from.

> ... the equation for radiant power emittance **at steady state** does NOT say "X + ((epsilon * sigma) * T^4) - X". It simply says (epsilon * sigma) * T^4. **Because it's already known that X cancels out!!!** ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-08]***

No, that's because the equation for radiant power emittance doesn't have anything to do with conservation of energy, so those extra terms wouldn't be in the Stefan-Boltzmann equation in the first place.

That's what I've been trying to tell you, Jane. The Stefan-Boltzmann equation can give you "radiative power out" but only a completely different principle called "conservation of energy" can give you a totally different quantity known as "electrical heating power".

> My energy conservation equation is this: electrical power in = (epsilon * sigma) * T^4 * area = radiant power out ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-08]***

So you're saying electrical heating power is the same as radiative power out? What did that energy conservation equation look like before you cancelled terms? It's important.

> Jane still hasn't written down an energy conservation equation for a boundary around the heated source which links "electrical heating power" to "radiative power out".

> Yes, I have. I have done it at least several times before, and I just did it again. Not only did I give you the equations, I showed you my exact calculations. Why are you lying again, and trying to claim I did not do something that I very clearly and provably did do? In fact, since you seem to be so obsessed with archiving other people's comments, I am sure you have several instances of where I've showed this to you before. ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-08]***

Jane, just two days ago you claimed that you didn't say radiative power out was the same as electrical heating power, and that they don't need to be the same. Today you're saying they **are** the same.

> ... There is no NET absorption of radiative power from cooler bodies. WE KNOW THIS FROM THERMODYNAMICS. So any radiative power that comes in, goes right back out. That's YOUR power in = power out! ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-08]***

If any radiative power that comes in goes right back out, that means radiative power in = radiative power in that goes right back out. That means there should be a term for radiative power in, and a term for radiative power in that goes right back out. Maybe they cancel. But careful physicists would write them both down and think about them carefully before erasing them both because they "obviously" cancel.

> You are trying to count power incoming from a cooler body as part of the radiative power out of the hotter body. **That's counting it twice.** I told you that... what was it now? 3 weeks ago? A month? And I told you not just once but several times. ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-08]***

If that's what you think, could you take a few seconds to write down the energy conservation equation (before cancelling terms) that you think is correct?

> If there's no net radiative power coming in, that must

> > mean all the "power in" from the chamber walls just goes back out. That would yield a net of zero. But as usual Jane didn't write down the power in = power out equation showing these terms before they supposedly cancel.
>
> Why do that? Nobody does that. That's stupid. If you're publishing an equation for calculating P, and you have an additive term on one side of the equation, which is exactly cancleled out by an additive term on the other side of an equation, **you don't include them, you cancel them.** ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-08]***

Careful physicists write down all the possible terms in their equations first. Then the second step is to cancel out terms, if possible. Since we're disputing which terms cancel, the only equation we might be able to agree on is the equation **before** the terms are cancelled.

So let's see if we can agree on the energy conservation equation for a boundary around the heat source, before the contentious terms are cancelled:

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

This would be much faster than accusing me of lying again. It would only be two lines long. Just list Jane's "power in" and Jane's "power out" around the heat source. Just. Two. Lines.

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 2014-10-09 12:43 (#48105765)

And the part where Jane insisted that "we should use real materials with real emissivities and absorptivies. Just to keep everybody honest.

Suggesting that we "should" is not insisting. I wanted to use real materials. You refused and wanted to use gray bodies. We could have used black bodies as well. I didn't really care that much. But YOU insisted because you stated that we **had to** have emissivity.

Apparently that was because the equations you wanted to use (also apparently, from Wikipedia) had an emissivity term. Or maybe it was the MIT infinite-plane equations. Whatever. Regardless, you wouldn't use real materials with absorptivity but insisted on having an emissivity term. So gray-bodies it was. I do have it on record.

But black bodies aren't "dishonest". Also, Jane should make sure to include the part where Jane said I was "lying again" for considering a black body source.

Just no. "To keep everybody honest" is a figure of speech, not intended to be taken literally. And no, I didn't say you were lying again for "considering" black bodies. I would have been happy to use black bodies but real materials would have been -- wait for it -- more realistic. The reason I said you were "lying" was because of this exchange:

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.

I didn't write down an equation for a blackbody source **because we had agreed to use gray bodies**. Claiming that I "probably won't" write down a black body equation is a form of lying by implication, because we weren't discussing black bodies! By your own insistence. It was just another straw-man argument, AND blatant

dishonesty at the same time. I have a copy of our AGREEMENT to treat all the materials as gray bodies, in black and white. So your claim that I "probably won't" include a black-body equation, when I HAD shown you the gray-body equations I used, is just another dishonest way to distort the argument.

Jane, just two days ago you claimed that you didn't say radiative power out was the same as electrical heating power, and that they don't need to be the same. Today you're saying they are the same.

Another dishonest distortion of our actual exchange, which went like this:

Seriously, "radiative power out" is different than "electrical heating power". For instance, we agree that "radiative power out" stays constant even if the chamber walls are also at 150F, but "electrical heating power" goes to zero. So they can't be the same.

I didn't say they were the same. They don't need to be the same.

I hadn't said they were the same, **under those circumstances, but those circumstances never occur in Spencer's experiment**. As I have explained to you many times now, this is a straw-man argument. I Spencer's experiment, if A is the heat source and B is the chamber wall, then Ta^4 is **always** greater than Tb^4. There is **no** point at which Ta^4 - Tb^4 = 0 or Ta^4 - Tb^4 < 0.

So this is a 100% straw-man argument, and has no relevance to the discussion. Your continued insistence that it does is a lie.

If that's what you think, could you take a few seconds to write down the energy conservation equation (before cancelling terms) that you think is correct?

I could, but I will not. First, it's not "what I think", it's what the experts say (and some write, in textbooks). Second, I'm not going to take valuable time out of my day to try to "prove" textbook thermodynamics to you, any more than I am going to try to "prove" to you,

related to my previous example, how to the formula for the area of a circle is related to the formula for the volume of a sphere. I could, but we already know what it is, and why it is. So I'm not going to waste my time.

And third, your own "power in = power out" idea requires it. Your crackpot notion of some kind of "ambient" temperature (the chamber walls) affecting the power in is not physics, it's bullshit. There is no "ambient" temperature. It is a vacuum. There is no atmosphere. The only energy transfer we have here is radiation, and the radiation laws of physics disagree with you.

Careful physicists write down all the possible terms in their equations first.

Sure. **When it's relevant.** But I don't have to write down extra terms when the equation is already a known physical law. See my comment above about volume of a sphere. The formula is already known and other "terms" are not relevant.

You appear to be trying to imply that I left something out. So if YOU think that, then why don't you write what you think it is here? Hint: we already know what it is, because you've already made that erroneous claim, several times. So you're just re-hashing fallacious old news again. But if you want to "explain" how you think it works again, go right ahead. If it's the same as last time, I reserve the right to laugh at you again.

So let's see if we can agree on the energy conservation equation for a boundary around the heat source, before the contentious terms are cancelled:

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

This would be much faster than accusing me of lying again. It would only be two lines long. Just list Jane's "power in" and Jane's "power out" around the heat source. Just. Two. Lines.

I have already done this, many times now. You already know what the answer is. So stop the bullshit and get on with it, if you have something to say. I'm NOT going to keep

repeating things I have already repeatedly told you.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

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

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-10-09 13:28 (#48106251) Homepage Journal

> ... Claiming that I "probably won't" write down a black body equation is a form of lying by implication, because we weren't discussing black bodies! By your own insistence. It was just another straw-man argument, AND blatant dishonesty at the same time. I have a copy of our AGREEMENT to treat all the materials as gray bodies, in black and white. So your claim that I "probably won't" include a black-body equation, when I HAD shown you the gray-body equations I used, is just another dishonest way to distort the argument. ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-09]***

Good grief, Jane. As I've repeatedly explained, the gray body equation has to reduce to the black body equation when emissivity = 1. I wasn't lying or being blatantly dishonest. I was trying to show you how to check your work.

> ... If you're publishing an equation for calculating P, and you have an additive term on one side of the equation, which is exactly cancleled out by an additive term on the other side of an equation, **you don't include them, you cancel them.** ... **it's already known that X cancels out!!!** There is no NET absorption of radiative power from cooler

> bodies. WE KNOW THIS FROM THERMODYNAMICS. So any radiative power that comes in, goes right back out. That's YOUR power in = power out! ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-08]***
>
> > Careful physicists write down all the possible terms in their equations first.
>
> Sure. **When it's relevant.** But I don't have to write down extra terms when the equation is already a known physical law. See my comment above about volume of a sphere. The formula is already known and other "terms" are not relevant.
>
> You appear to be trying to imply that I left something out. So if YOU think that, then why don't you write what you think it is here? Hint: we already know what it is, because you've already made that erroneous claim, several times. So you're just re-hashing fallacious old news again. But if you want to "explain" how you think it works again, go right ahead. If it's the same as last time, I reserve the right to laugh at you again. ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-09]***

Jane still refuses to write down his energy conservation equation before he "canceled" terms, so I still have to guess at his original equation. This still seems like the only energy conservation equation consistent with what Jane's saying above:

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?)

Again, Jane appears to be saying that "radiative power in from the chamber walls" = "radiative power from chamber walls, re-emitted back

out". If that's the case, then those terms would cancel as Jane claims. That's the only way to get from "power in = power out" to Jane's final equation:

> My energy conservation equation is this: electrical power in = (epsilon * sigma) * T^4 * area = radiant power out ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-08]***

Really? Let's use the Stefan-Boltzmann law to describe the radiative terms, one at a time. Let's start with a term we can probably agree on. Because "radiative power out from source" is emitted by a graybody source at temperature T1, the Stefan-Boltzmann law says:

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

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

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

Now for the final term. The only way the final term could cancel with the radiative power in term "(e*s)*T4^4" to obtain Jane's final equation would be if "radiative power from chamber walls, re-emitted back out" equals "(e*s)*T4^4". But it's being emitted by the source, which is at temperature T1. If reflections confuse you, just remember that the gray body equation has to reduce to the black body equation where there aren't any reflections at all. In that case, all that power is being absorbed and re-emitted, not reflected.

> The acknowledged formula for finding radiative power from temperature is just (sigma epsilon)T^4. There are no other factors involved... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-05]***

That's why radiation re-emitted by the source at temperature T1 is (e*s)*T1^4. There are no other factors involved. The source can't re-emit radiation at (e*s)*T4^4, so those terms in Jane's equation can't cancel. And the last term double-counts radiation emitted by the source, so it's zero.

So the correct equation (neglecting reflections) is:

electrical heating power per square meter + (e*s)*T4^4 = (e*s)*T1^4

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 2014-10-10 10:36 (#48113407)

Good grief, Jane. As I've repeatedly explained [slashdot.org], the gray body equation has to reduce to the black body equation when emissivity = 1. I wasn't lying or being blatantly dishonest. I was trying to show you how to check your work.

What does that have to do with ANYTHING? Of course it does. **But our discussion was not about an emissivity of 1, as you well know.** This is completely irrelevant to anything going on here.

Again, Jane appears to be saying that "radiative power in from the chamber walls" = "radiative power from chamber walls, re-emitted back out". If that's the case, then those terms would cancel as Jane claims. That's the only way to get from "power in = power out" to Jane's final equation:

My energy conservation equation is this: electrical power in = (epsilon * sigma) * T^4 * area = radiant power out

No. Why are you trying to lecture me about

what I told you? And getting it wrong, as well?

Here is a fundamental principle of thermodynamics, as related to radiant energy: net incoming radiation from cooler bodies is ALL either reflected, transmitted, or scattered. Any absorption and re-transmission is part of the "transmitted" term. And this is where (as evidenced below) you're getting it all wrong, for 2 reasons: first, because **at steady-state**, the relation given above already accounts for any radiative power being absorbed from other bodies. And second, **when this is the hottest body in the room**, that figure is ZERO. Zero net radiation absorbed from other, cooler bodies. This is a requirement of the Second Law of Thermodynamics.

Now, this is NOT the same as saying "no radiation absorbed at all". But when you put the two points above together, what it **does** mean is that ZERO of the radiative power output from the above equation is coming from other bodies. THE AMOUNT OF POWER OUTPUT IN THIS EQUATION DOES NOT NEED TO ACCOUNT FOR POWER FROM THE WALLS, BECAUSE THE NET IS ZERO.

The rest of your comment is just more blather along these same lines. You're trying to count the same power terms twice. I've already shown you how your figures do not add up.

You're either lying + trolling, or a sad excuse for a physicist.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

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

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-10-10 11:15 (#48113825) Homepage Journal

> My energy conservation equation is this: electrical power in =

> (epsilon * sigma) * T^4 * area = radiant power out ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-08]***
>
> ... **at steady-state**, the relation given above already accounts for any radiative power being absorbed from other bodies. ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-10]***

Only if "already accounts for" means "completely ignores" in Janeland.

> ... **when this is the hottest body in the room**, that figure is ZERO. Zero net radiation absorbed from other, cooler bodies. This is a requirement of the Second Law of Thermodynamics. Now, this is NOT the same as saying "no radiation absorbed at all". But when you put the two points above together, what it **does** mean is that ZERO of the radiative power output from the above equation is coming from other bodies. THE AMOUNT OF POWER OUTPUT IN THIS EQUATION DOES NOT NEED TO ACCOUNT FOR POWER FROM THE WALLS, BECAUSE THE NET IS ZERO. ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-10]***

Once again, it seems like we disagree about the meaning of the term "NET".

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

2. Can we agree that net power through a boundary is only zero if "radiative power out" equals "radiative power in"?

3. Can we agree that "radiative power out" only equals "radiative power in" if the source and the chamber walls are at the same temperature?

If we can agree on those three points... how can the net power be zero when the source is

warmer than the chamber walls?

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 2014-10-10 11:26 (#48113961)

Only if "already accounts for" means "completely ignores" in Janeland.

"Already accounts for", in Thermodynamics Land.

No, we don't have to "agree" on anything anymore. The only "agreement" I had with you was on the initial conditions of the experiment. Known physical principles do not require your "agreement". (Or mine, for that matter.)

I proved you wrong a long time ago. You keep hammering at this like some kind of zombie that doesn't realize it's dead yet. And you've added nothing new in all that time. Just brainless repetition of the same things.

In the context of Spencer's "experiment", colder objects do not make the heat source hotter still. It has been demonstrated, using straightforward application of thermodynamic and well-known heat transfer principles and equations.

None of the rest of your blathering matters. It is just constantly repeated hot air.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

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

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-10-10 11:38 (#48114101) Homepage Journal

So you're not going to retract your claim that net power is zero when the source is warmer than the chamber walls?

> ... **when this is the hottest body in the room**, that figure is ZERO. Zero net radiation absorbed from other, cooler bodies. This is a requirement of the Second Law of Thermodynamics. Now, this is NOT the same as saying "no radiation absorbed at all". But when you put the two points above together, what it **does** mean is that ZERO of the radiative power output from the above equation is coming from other bodies. THE AMOUNT OF POWER OUTPUT IN THIS EQUATION DOES NOT NEED TO ACCOUNT FOR POWER FROM THE WALLS, BECAUSE THE NET IS ZERO. ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-10]***

Is Jane using some kind of special Sky Dragon Slayer definition of the word "net"? In physics, net power through a boundary around the source = "radiative power out" minus "radiative power in".

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

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

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-10-10 13:44 (#48115207) Homepage Journal

> ... **when this is the hottest body in the room**, that figure is ZERO. Zero net radiation absorbed from other, cooler bodies. ... that ZERO of the radiative power output ...

> THE NET IS ZERO. ... *[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-10]*

By the way, just in case it wasn't obvious from the fact that I was responding to Jane's claims of zero net radiation absorbed and zero net radiative power output, I was talking about net radiative power because that's what Jane seemed to be talking about. That's why my equation only has radiative terms. Here's a less ambiguous version:

So you're not going to retract your claim that net radiative power is zero when the source is warmer than the chamber walls?

Is Jane using some kind of special Sky Dragon Slayer definition of the word "net"? In physics, net radiative power through a boundary around the source = "radiative power out" minus "radiative power in".

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 2014-10-10 13:48 (#48115233)

So you're not going to retract your claim that net power is zero when the source is warmer than the chamber walls?

That's a grossly inaccurate -- one might even say distorted -- way to sum up what I stated. Which is exactly what I have come to expect from you. I have no reason to retract anything.

Is Jane using some kind of special Sky Dragon Slayer definition of the word "net"? In physics, net power through a boundary around the source = "radiative power out" minus "radiative power in".

I made 2 statements, related to the situation under discussion (gray bodies in vacuum at radiative steady state):

First, there is no NET radiative power absorbed by a body at one thermodynamic temperature from another body at a lower temperature. Doing so would violate the Second Law of Thermodynamics. I'm using the standard definition of "net", which is to say "all inputs minus all outputs". No NET radiative input from chamber walls means anything crossing your precious boundary inward goes right back out. As I have explained to you many times now.

Second, the radiative power output, per unit area, of a gray body at a given temperature is (e * s) * T^4, where e = emissivity, s = Stefan-Botlzmann constant, and T is thermodynamic temperature.

Those are the statements I made. Anything else is a logical extension of those two principles.

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 2014-10-10 13:54 (#48115289)

By the way, just in case it wasn't obvious from the fact that I was responding to Jane's claims of zero net radiation absorbed and zero net radiative power output, I was talking about net radiative power because that's what Jane seemed to be talking about. That's why my equation only has radiative terms. Here's a less ambiguous version:

NOWHERE did I state "zero net radiative output". I don't believe I used that phrase at all, but if I did, you present it here out of context.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

■

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

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-10-10 14:05 (#48115401) Homepage Journal

> ... there is no NET radiative power absorbed by a body at one thermodynamic temperature from another body at a lower temperature. Doing so would violate the Second Law of Thermodynamics. I'm using the standard definition of "net", which is to say "all inputs minus all outputs". ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-10]***

If net radiative power is "all inputs minus all outputs" then net radiative power is only zero if all the inputs equal all the outputs. That only happens if the source is at the same temperature as the chamber walls.

But Jane claims that net radiative power is zero when the source is hotter than the chamber walls.

> NOWHERE did I state "zero net radiative output". I don't believe I used that phrase at all, but if I did, you present it here out of context. ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-10]***

Hmm...

> ... **when this is the hottest body in the room**, that figure is ZERO. Zero net radiation absorbed from other, cooler bodies. ... that ZERO of the radiative power output ... THE NET IS ZERO. ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-10]***
>
> ... no NET radiative power ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-10]***

Again, net radiative power is only zero if the source is at the same temperature as the chamber walls.

> NOWHERE did I state "zero net radiative output". I don't believe I used that phrase at all, but if I did, you present it here out of context. ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-10]***

Oh, so you're saying net radiative power isn't zero? For some odd reason I thought you were saying it was zero.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

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

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-10-11 5:13 (#48118843) Homepage Journal

> ... 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. ... Energy can be absorbed and re-emitted... [Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-28]
>
> ... I do not deny that some radiation is absorbed; but then it's just re-emitted. ... [Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-03]
>
> ... Here is a fundamental principle of thermodynamics, as related to radiant energy: net incoming radiation from cooler bodies is ALL either reflected, transmitted, or scattered. Any absorption and re-transmission is part of the "transmitted" term. ... [Jane Q.

> Public, 2014-10-10]

Jane can't quote a textbook stating this "fundamental principle" because it's nonsense. For instance, the "transmitted" term describes a body's transparency, not its absorption and re-emission. Here's an introduction:

"A body's behavior with regard to thermal radiation is characterized by its transmission t, absorption a, and reflection p. ...

An opaque body is one that transmits none of the radiation that reaches it, although some may be reflected. That is, t = 0 and a + p = 1

A transparent body is one that transmits all the radiation that reaches it. That is, t = 1 and a = p = 0."

Jane, absorption and re-emission isn't part of the "transmitted" term. They're totally different. The "transmitted" term is zero for opaque bodies like aluminum or blackbodies. If absorption and re-emission were part of the "transmitted" term, blackbodies would be transparent because they absorb all radiation that hits them. If absorption and re-emission were part of the "transmitted" term then both terms would equal 1. But once again, blackbodies **can't** be transparent.

Also, it's bizarre that Jane insists he's accounting for absorbed and re-emitted radiation in a "transmitted" term that isn't even in his energy conservation equation.

> ... **when this is the hottest body in the room**, that figure is ZERO. Zero net radiation absorbed from other, cooler bodies. ... that ZERO of the radiative power output ... THE NET IS ZERO. ... [Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-10]
>
> ... First, there is no NET radiative power absorbed by a body at one thermodynamic temperature from another body at a lower temperature. ... Those are the statements I made. Anything else is a logical extension of those two

> principles. ... [Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-10]

That's a serious problem, because Jane's first principle is wrong. Net radiative power would only be zero if the source and the chamber walls were at the same temperature.

Jane might consider replacing his incorrect first principle with "conservation of energy" which means power in = power out through a boundary where nothing inside is changing.

> ... No NET radiative input from chamber walls means anything crossing your precious boundary inward goes right back out. As I have explained to you many times now. ... [Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-10]

Jane, it's not my "precious" boundary. It's a general principle called "conservation of energy". Drawing a boundary is needed to apply conservation of energy. Here are some introductions: example (backup), example (backup), example (backup).

Note that drawing a boundary is needed to apply conservation of energy in all those introductions, just like I've repeatedly explained.

> If that's what you think, could you take a few seconds to write down the energy conservation equation (before cancelling terms) that you think is correct?

> I could, but I will not. ... I'm not going to take valuable time out of my day ... I'm not going to waste my time. ... [Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-09]

If Jane really could write down an energy conservation equation before wrongly "cancelling" terms, that would only take a few seconds. Endlessly screaming in ALL CAPS

and accusing me of lying wastes more of Jane's valuable time than writing down an energy conservation equation for a boundary around the source:

Jane's power in = ?
Jane's power 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 2014-10-11 11:44 (#48120283)

Jane can't quote a textbook stating this "fundamental principle" because it's nonsense. For instance, the "transmitted" term describes a body's transparency, not its absorption and re-emission. Here's an introduction [wikipedia.org]:

Okay, I admit I screwed up on that one sentence. Big deal. Elsewhere, I have on record where I told you transmittance was not an issue here at all because we are discussion diffuse gray bodies of significant mass, so there is no transmittance.

What I meant to say is exactly what I stated before: there is no net absorption of radiation from colder bodies. It is all reflected, transmitted, or scattered. And since these are diffuse gray bodies, none is transmitted.

Also, it's bizarre that Jane insists he's accounting for absorbed and re-emitted radiation in a "transmitted" term that isn't even in his energy conservation equation.

That was a mistake in one sentence, which you should have realized was a MISTAKE, because I clearly stated in our earlier conversation that there was no transmittance in this situation, and exactly why. You're trying to make it sound like I was "asserting" that when it was

clearly a brief moment of forgetfulness, no more.

... when this is the hottest body in the room, that figure is ZERO. Zero net radiation absorbed from other, cooler bodies. ... that ZERO of the radiative power output ... THE NET IS ZERO. ... [Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-10]

Again, you chop up my quotes to try to make it sound like I was saying something I was not. That is just plain dishonest. Why do you feel you need to be dishonest about it? Is it because you can't win an honest argument? THIS is what I wrote:

at steady-state, the relation given above already accounts for any radiative power being absorbed from other bodies. And second, when this is the hottest body in the room, that figure is ZERO. Zero net radiation absorbed from other, cooler bodies. This is a requirement of the Second Law of Thermodynamics.

Now, this is NOT the same as saying "no radiation absorbed at all". But when you put the two points above together, what it does mean is that ZERO of the radiative power output from the above equation is coming from other bodies. THE AMOUNT OF POWER OUTPUT IN THIS EQUATION DOES NOT NEED TO ACCOUNT FOR POWER FROM THE WALLS, BECAUSE THE NET IS ZERO.

Then you say:

That's a serious problem, because Jane's first principle is wrong. Net radiative power would only be zero if the source and the chamber walls were at the same temperature.

This is a COMPLETE distortion of what I was saying. You're just plain trolling again. In fact I don't think you've ever stopped. That's all you're doing here. You're deliberately distorting my comments to the point that I hardly recognize them.

Nowhere did I actually claim that net radiative power from the walls would be zero. What I

actually stated, many times now, was that net radiative power from the wall **THROUGH A BOUNDARY between the heat source and the wall** would be zero, because it is just reflected or scattered by the heat source and goes back out. That small fraction that doesn't strike the heat source goes right back out anyway. So the net POWER IN from the wall across that boundary is zero, because it goes right back out again. The radiated power figure for the heat source remains unchanged.

Anything else is a violation of the Second Law of Thermodynamics, which says you can't have a NET energy transfer from cooler to warmer.

I did NOT claim the net radiative power through the boundary was zero. What I wrote was that the radiative power from the walls through that boundary cancels itself out, leaving a net across that boundary **from the wall** = 0.

By taking my comment out of context (yet again), you dishonestly distorted the meaning of my words.

The actual radiant power through that boundary isn't zero, because the radiant power output of the heat source still goes through it of course. Leaving a NET positive transfer of energy OUTWARD through the boundary.

Do you have any other ways you want to try to out-of-context or distort my comments, and claim that I said yet more things that I actually did not? After I had already clearly explained them to you IN context?

You do realize the potential consequences of that, do you not?

Remember, I'm recording all of this.

If Jane really could write down an energy conservation equation before wrongly "cancelling" terms, that would only take a few seconds. Endlessly screaming in ALL CAPS and accusing me of lying wastes more of Jane's valuable time than writing down an energy conservation equation for a boundary around

the source:

I have written down all I need to write down to answer Spencer's challenge. I solved for the correct temperature, and showed your own answer to be utterly wrong.

That was all I had to do. The rest of this is just trolling on your part. I have many times over answered these questions you are asking **again**.

And I have **demonstrated** you to be lying, I wasn't just saying so. This time yet again. Distorting other people's words by taking them out of context in a deliberately misleading way is a form of lying. I've publicly caught you at other forms of it too.

I know I've said this before, but no more replies. You're a very good troll, but when all is said and done, all you're really doing here is trolling. You already have answers to the questions you're asking, and you haven't once shown a legitimate error in my calculations. Everything else here is trolling in a hot-air balloon.

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 2014-10-11 11:51 (#48120309)

If net radiative power is "all inputs minus all outputs" then net radiative power is only zero if all the inputs equal all the outputs. That only happens if the source is at the same temperature as the chamber walls.

This is just more dishonest out-of-context nonsense again. I clearly told you that the **context** of my statement was radiation **from the walls through a boundary**. I did not claim the net radiation across that boundary was zero. I claimed the net radiation across the

boundary **from the wall** is zero, because it just goes right back out.

This is a wonderful example of how you distort context, in order to make it appear someone else is saying something they actually did not. That is a form of lying.

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 2014-10-11 11:56 (#48120323)
And by the way: your habit of distorted out-of-context quoting is the sort of thing that gets **journalists** sued and fired. For someone who claims to be a scientist, it's worse than pathetic.

I have told you this repeatedly over a period of years. You don't seem to learn.
Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

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

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-10-11 13:26 (#48120703) Homepage Journal

> ... net radiative power from the wall **THROUGH A BOUNDARY between the heat source and the wall** would be zero... the net POWER IN from the wall across that boundary is zero... I did NOT claim the net radiative power through the boundary was zero. What I wrote was that the radiative power from the walls through that boundary cancels itself out, leaving a net across that

> boundary **from the wall** = 0. ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-11]***

Again, Jane must using some kind of Sky Dragon Slayer definition of the word "net". In physics, "net radiative power out" means "radiative power out" minus "radiative power in". This is only zero when the source and chamber walls are at the same temperature.

Similarly, "net radiative power in" means "radiative power in" minus "radiative power out". Again, this is only zero when the source and chamber walls are at the same temperature.

> The actual radiant power through that boundary isn't zero, because the radiant power output of the heat source still goes through it of course. Leaving a NET positive transfer of energy OUTWARD through the boundary. ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-11]***

That's ridiculous, Jane. Notice that "net radiative power out" equals negative "net radiative power in". Since Jane seems to agree that "net radiative power out" is positive, "net radiative power in" **can't** be zero. It has to be negative, which just means more radiative power is flowing out than flowing in.

So Jane must not be using the physics definition of "net". What's the Sky Dragon Slayer definition of "net"? And how is it possible for the "net power in" to be zero when the source is hotter than the chamber walls?

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

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

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-10-11 16:29 (#48121569) Homepage Journal

> ... net radiative power from the wall **THROUGH A BOUNDARY between the heat source and the wall** would be zero... the net POWER IN from the wall across that boundary is zero... I did NOT claim the net radiative power through the boundary was zero. What I wrote was that the radiative power from the walls through that boundary cancels itself out, leaving a net across that boundary **from the wall** = 0. ... The actual radiant power through that boundary isn't zero, because the radiant power output of the heat source still goes through it of course. Leaving a NET positive transfer of energy OUTWARD through the boundary. ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-11]***
>
> This is just more dishonest out-of-context nonsense again. I clearly told you that the **context** of my statement was radiation **from the walls through a boundary**. I did not claim the net radiation across that boundary was zero. I claimed the net radiation across the boundary **from the wall** is zero, because it just goes right back out. This is a wonderful example of how you distort context, in order to make it appear someone else is saying something they actually did not. That is a form of lying. ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-11]***

Since Jane keeps bolding **"from the wall"** and claiming that "radiative power from the walls through that boundary cancels itself out," Jane seems to be saying:

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

> My energy conservation equation

> is this: electrical power in = (epsilon * sigma) * T^4 * area = radiant power out ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-08]***

It certainly seems like that's what Jane's saying. If "radiative power from the walls through that boundary cancels itself out" then those terms cancel to produce Jane's final energy conservation equation:

Jane's power in = electrical heating power
Jane's power out = radiative power out from source

Jane, is that what you're saying by "net radiation across the boundary **from the wall** is zero"?

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 2014-10-12 23:16 (#48127989)

That's ridiculous, Jane. Notice that "net radiative power out" equals negative "net radiative power in". Since Jane seems to agree that "net radiative power out" is positive, "net radiative power in" can't be zero. It has to be negative, which just means more radiative power is flowing out than flowing in.

Now you've just gone off the deep end. And by "deep end" I mean the deep end of the pit full of BS you've dug yourself.

Just no. Any spherical boundary you draw within this system has **additional** input: your vaunted electrical power.

I'm amazed that you finally got so caught up in your own bullshit that you made a mistake quite THAT fundamental.

Get stuffed, troll.

For that and actually quite a pile of other reasons that have built up over time, I still don't believe you're a real physicist.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

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

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-10-12 23:25 (#48128029) Homepage Journal

> That's ridiculous, Jane. Notice that "net radiative power out" equals negative "net radiative power in". Since Jane seems to agree that "net radiative power out" is positive, "net radiative power in" can't be zero. It has to be negative, which just means more radiative power is flowing out than flowing in.
>
> Now you've just gone off the deep end. And by "deep end" I mean the deep end of the pit full of BS you've dug yourself. Just no. Any spherical boundary you draw within this system has additional input: your vaunted electrical power. I'm amazed that you finally got so caught up in your own bullshit that you made a mistake quite THAT fundamental. Get stuffed, troll. For that and actually quite a pile of other reasons that have built up over time, I still don't believe you're a real physicist. ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-12]***

Electrical power isn't radiative power, so it wouldn't be included in net radiative power.

> ... I have written down all I need to write down to answer Spencer's challenge. I solved for the correct temperature, and showed your own answer to be utterly wrong. ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-11]***

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%.

So Jane hasn't written down all he needs to give the **correct** answer to Spencer's challenge. To give the correct answer, Jane has to draw a boundary around the heat source:
power in = electrical heating power + radiative power in from chamber walls
power out = radiative power out from source

This is the same answer that Prof. Brown and Dr. Joel Shore tried to explain to Jane. It's also the same answer that underlies the positions taken by the National Academies of Science, the American Institute of Physics, the American Physical Society, the Australian Institute of Physics, and the European Physical Society, etc.

> ... YOU are the one going against "established" physics here. ... If you could actually show how the **physics textbook** idea of heat transfer was wrong, you would be world famous by now. ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-06]***

No, I'd have to get in line behind all those other physicists who agree that adding CO2 warms Earth's surface, which is equivalent to saying that enclosing a heat source warms it. This is probably the most fascinating part of Jane's delusion. Not only does Jane completely misunderstand fundamental physics, Jane seems to earnestly believe that his crackpot Slayer conspiracy theory represents "established" physics. Fascinating.

Maybe that's why Jane won't even take a few seconds to write down an energy conservation equation before he wrongly "cancels" terms. Deep down, maybe Jane suspects that he's wrong and mainstream physicists are right.

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 2014-10-13 0:42 (#48128295)
Now you've gone so far off base, I can hardly do anything but laugh.

This is such a hilarious pile of misinformation that besides just recording it for may later writeup, I'm throwing a copy in my joke pile.

Maybe that's why Jane won't even take a few seconds to write down an energy conservation equation before he wrongly "cancels" terms. Deep down, maybe Jane suspects that he's wrong and mainstream physicists are right.

The "mainstream physicists" are the ones who wrote the heat transfer textbooks I used to prove you wrong, dumbass.

Let's cut to the chase.

You insist that the radiant power output calculation of the heat source has to take into account the cooler temperature of the chamber walls. In fact the equation YOU gave for this several times is actually a heat transfer equation:

(epsilon * sigma) * (T1^4 - T2^4)

But that's NOT a power out equation, it's a heat transfer equation. Now, I'm only speculating, but I have a very strong suspicion that HOW you got this wrong, was that you read somewhere that this is how you have to calculate the radiant power output of a body.

THAT'S TRUE, **WHEN** YOU'RE EXTERNALLY **MEASURING** RADIANT POWER, BUT NOT WHEN YOU'RE CALCULATING IT FROM FIRST PRINCIPLES.

That's why I say: I suspect you saw this somewhere as a way to calculate radiant power from a *measured* result in an environment with "ambient" temperature. Because that is the only kind of place this legitimately shows up as a "power out" calculation.

When you **measure** the radiant output of a source, such as a human body in a colder room, for example, you have to correct for the ambient temperature (as pyrometers in fact do), *because your instrument is receiving not just the source, but also the "ambient" radiation*. So you have to subtract the ambient to get the radiant power of your body.

But that is not the case in Spencer's experiment. We are **calculating** the power from first principles, not measuring it externally. There is no "ambient" radiation hitting a measuring device which needs to be subtracted.

You've argued this every which way from Sunday, as the saying goes. You've even argued it rather dishonestly, as I have demonstrated. But as it turns out, you were wrong 2+ years ago, and you're still wrong.

And I still don't think you're a physicist. Or, for that matter, even willing to pick up an actual textbook on heat transfer and understand it.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

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

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-10-13 1:01 (#48128351) Homepage Journal

> You insist that the radiant power output calculation of the heat source has to take into account the cooler temperature of the chamber walls. ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-13]***

No, I've repeatedly agreed that radiative power out only depends on emissivity and temperature.

Once again, I'm just saying that "radiative power out" is different than "electrical heating power".

That's why Jane will never write down his "energy conservation" equation before wrongly "cancelling" terms. If Jane ever did, he'd have to face the fact that Jane's terms don't cancel.

How ironic. Jane's terms would only cancel if radiant power output of the heat source took into account the cooler temperature of the chamber walls. But that's impossible because it would violate the Stefan-Boltzmann law.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

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

by Jane Q. Public (1010737) Friend of a Friend
on 2014-10-13 1:08 (#48128389)

No, I've repeatedly agreed that radiative power out only depends on emissivity and temperature.

You've repeatedly stated other, contradictory things too.

You've tried to claim that POWER IN to the heat source is somehow magically dependent on the chamber walls. And the justification you gave for this was a heat transfer equation, as I described above.

I really don't care which figure you want to manipulate via magic: the power in or the power out. It's still magic, not physics.

I've already shown you the proper physics to apply. I have at least 4 online and 5 written references to back me up (though I think I've only linked to 3 of them so far).

There is genuinely no legitimate reason for me to be here listening to your BS anymore.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

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

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-10-13 1:19 (#48128423) Homepage Journal

> You've tried to claim that POWER IN to the heat source is somehow magically dependent on the chamber walls. And the justification you gave for this was a heat transfer equation, as I described above. ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-13]***

It's physics, not magic. Radiation from the chamber walls passes in through a boundary around the heat source:
power in = electrical heating power + radiative power in from the chamber walls
power out = radiative power out from the heat source

Jane, however, seems to say this:

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

> My energy conservation equation is this: electrical power in =

> (epsilon * sigma) * T^4 * area = radiant power out ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-08]***

Jane's saying that "radiative power from the walls through that boundary cancels itself out" so Jane claims those terms cancel to produce Jane's final energy conservation equation:

Jane's power in = electrical heating power
Jane's power out = radiative power out from source

The only way Jane's final term could cancel with the radiative power in term "(e*s)*T4^4" to obtain Jane's final equation would be if "radiative power from chamber walls, re-emitted back out" equals "(e*s)*T4^4". But it's being emitted by the source, which is at temperature T1. If reflections confuse you, just remember that the gray body equation has to reduce to the black body equation where there aren't any reflections at all. In that case, all that power is being absorbed and re-emitted, not reflected.

> The acknowledged formula for finding radiative power from temperature is just (sigma epsilon)T^4. There are no other factors involved... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-05]***

That's why radiation re-emitted by the source at temperature T1 is (e*s)*T1^4. There are no other factors involved. The source can't re-emit radiation at (e*s)*T4^4, so those terms in Jane's equation can't cancel. And the last term double-counts radiation emitted by the source, so it's zero.

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 2014-10-13 1:46 (#48128489)
I really have no further reason -- absolutely none -- to have to read this utter nonsense.

That's why radiation re-emitted by the source at temperature T1 is (e*s)*T1^4. There are no other factors involved.

Uh... I hate to tell you this, but this exactly what I have been saying all along. Except for the "re-emitted" part. I'd ask you what the hell you meant by that, if I really cared. (e*s)*T^4 is NOT "re-emitted" radiation. That is the **total** radiative output per unit area. So... Huh? What? Are you trying to say something here?

The source can't re-emit radiation at (e*s)*T4^4, so those terms in Jane's equation can't cancel. And the last term double-counts radiation emitted by the source, so it's zero.

The source doesn't have to "re-emit" radiation at (e*s)*T4^4, because none (NET) is absorbed in the first place. Again, this is what I have been saying all along. It is reflected or scattered. As I have stated before, this is a requirement of the Second Law of Thermodynamics.

I made one non-thinking slipup a while ago, which I pointed out. Don't try to present that as a genuine claim of mine: we have it here in black-and-white that I was not genuinely making that claim.

But yes, radiation inward from the chamber walls does cancel, because it is reflected or scattered and goes right back out. (A small part of it misses the inner sphere completely.) So no matter how you look at it, it is still a zero sum.

So what is your point here? Are you trying to claim that radiation from the chamber walls is absorbed, and NOT re-emitted? That's a violation of the Second Law, because it would require energy spontaneously flowing from cold to hot.

I don't care how you try to divide it up. Everything you've said ends up a violation of physics in one way or another. In fact you're pretty damned good at dreaming up ways to

violate basic physical laws, it seems.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

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

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-10-13 1:57 (#48128523) Homepage Journal

> ... none (NET) is absorbed in the first place. Again, this is what I have been saying all along. It is reflected or scattered. As I have stated before, this is a requirement of the Second Law of Thermodynamics. ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-13]***

No. Once again, gray body equations have to reduce to black body equations where there are no reflections.

> ... Are you trying to claim that radiation from the chamber walls is absorbed, and NOT re-emitted? ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-13]***

No, I'm claiming that any real physicist would write down an energy conservation before wrongly "cancelling" terms. Jane refuses to do that, so:

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

> ... radiation inward from the chamber walls does cancel, because it is reflected or scattered and goes right back out. (A small part of it misses the inner sphere completely.) So no matter how you look at it, it is still a zero sum. ...

[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-13]

No, Jane. Once again, gray body equations have to reduce to black body equations where there are no reflections.

Once again, if Jane would simply write down his energy conservation equation before wrongly "cancelling" terms, he would see that they **can't** cancel.

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 2014-10-13 2:11 (#48128557)

Since Jane keeps bolding "from the wall" and claiming that "radiative power from the walls through that boundary cancels itself out," Jane seems to be saying:

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

No, that is NOT what Jane is saying. Jane is saying what Jane already actually said, not this distorted nonsense of yours.

If I reply to you further at all on this subject, it will merely to be to publicly deny your false claims about what *I* stated. I have no other reason to reply. And I would only do so for the edification of other readers; it has nothing to do with you.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

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

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-10-13 2:25
(#48128619) Homepage Journal

> Jane is saying what Jane already actually said, not this distorted nonsense of yours. ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-13]***

Jane already actually said:

> ... net radiative power from the wall **THROUGH A BOUNDARY between the heat source and the wall** would be zero... the net POWER IN from the wall across that boundary is zero... radiative power from the walls through that boundary cancels itself out, leaving a net across that boundary **from the wall** = 0. ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-11]***
>
> ... net radiation across the boundary **from the wall** is zero, because it just goes right back out. ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-11]***

Jane's already actually described the following energy conservation equation:

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

If Jane didn't mean to describe that equation, Jane would've written down his actual equation. But Jane hasn't, because Jane can't.

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 2014-10-13 2:26 (#48128627)

No. Once again, gray body equations have to reduce to black body equations where there are no reflections.

No, they don't, because you still have an emissivity (which is the same as absorptivity, in a gray body).

You're trying to have it both ways again. There is also a "scattering" term which you're ignoring, which is not the same as reflection.

Jane's power in = electrical heating power + radiative power in from chamber walls

NO, it doesn't, and fucking well STOP claiming that it is. If YOU want to assert that, go ahead, but stop putting my name on it. I did not say that, and I do not say that, so stop putting my name on it. DO YOU UNDERSTAND???

Holy fuck, you're a dimwit.

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 2014-10-13 2:32 (#48128647)

Holy fuck, you're a dimwit.

Which is just my personal OPINION, by the way. But an honest one.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

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

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-10-13 2:41 (#48128681) Homepage Journal

> No. Once again, gray body equations have to reduce to black body equations where there are no reflections.

> No, they don't, because you still have an emissivity (which is the same as absorptivity, in a gray body). You're trying to have it both ways again. There is also a "scattering" term which you're ignoring, which is not the same as reflection. ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-13]***

Gray bodies have emissivities between 0 and 1. So black bodies are one limit of gray bodies. Black bodies don't scatter or reflect radiation, they only absorb it.

> Jane's power in = electrical heating power + radiative power in from chamber walls

> NO, it doesn't, and fucking well STOP claiming that it is. If YOU want to assert that, go ahead, but stop putting my name on it. I did not say that, and I do not say that, so stop putting my name on it. DO YOU UNDERSTAND??? Holy fuck, you're a dimwit. ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-13]***

Oh, okay. So Jane completely denies that the chamber walls emit radiation in through a boundary around the source. That's what I suspected from the beginning, but Jane kept coyly saying things like this:

> ... net radiative power from the wall **THROUGH A BOUNDARY**

> **between the heat source and the wall** would be zero... the net POWER IN from the wall across that boundary is zero... radiative power from the walls through that boundary cancels itself out, leaving a net across that boundary **from the wall** = 0. ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-11]***
>
> ... net radiation across the boundary **from the wall** is zero, because it just goes right back out. ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-11]***

These statements made me think Jane was rational enough to see that "power in" through a boundary around the source would have to include radiative power from the chamber walls. Jane just seemed to wrongly think it cancelled, because Jane kept refusing to write down the energy conservation equation. But now Jane completely denies that radiation from the chamber walls passes in through a boundary around the heat source.

Fascinating.

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 2014-10-13 2:54 (#48128723)

Gray bodies have emissivities between 0 and 1. So black bodies are one limit of gray bodies. Black bodies don't scatter or reflect radiation, they only absorb it.

No shit, Sherlock. If you keep up this level of "talking down", I'm going to start treating you like a kindergartner.

Oh, okay. So Jane completely denies that the

chamber walls emit radiation in through a boundary around the source. That's what I suspected from the beginning, but Jane kept coyly saying things like this:

NO, I VERY CLEARLY AND REPEATEDLY EXPLAINED THAT I DENY NO SUCH THING.

I don't have any patience for your lying anymore. Goodbye. I will record any responses, at least for a while, but I won't reply.

Jesus, you're an ass. I mean the most incredible ass I've ever had the misfortune to meet online. I mean that very, very sincerely.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

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

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-10-13 3:06 (#48128761) Homepage Journal

> Jane's power in = electrical heating power + radiative power in from chamber walls
>
> NO, it doesn't, and fucking well STOP claiming that it is. If YOU want to assert that, go ahead, but stop putting my name on it. I did not say that, and I do not say that, so stop putting

> > my name on it. DO YOU UNDERSTAND??? Holy fuck, you're a dimwit. ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-13]***
>
> Oh, okay. So Jane completely denies that the chamber walls emit radiation in through a boundary around the source. ...

Jane objected:

> NO, I VERY CLEARLY AND REPEATEDLY EXPLAINED THAT I DENY NO SUCH THING. I don't have any patience for your lying anymore. Goodbye. I will record any responses, at least for a while, but I won't reply. Jesus, you're an ass. I mean the most incredible ass I've ever had the misfortune to meet online. I mean that very, very sincerely. ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-13]***

Only if "VERY CLEARLY AND REPEATEDLY EXPLAINED" means that Jane/Lonny Eachus clearly and repeatedly explained that he would never write down an energy conservation equation, and that only dimwits would claim that Jane thinks that "radiative power in from chamber walls" should be included in "Jane's power in".

It's fascinating how much effort Jane/Lonny Eachus has expended just to avoid writing down the power flowing into and out of a boundary around the heat source. If Jane/Lonny Eachus is so sure that he's right, why not just write down that obviously correct energy conservation equation?

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 2014-10-13 10:33 (#48132291)
You have repeatedly shown, quite clearly to anyone who bothers to read this, that you are willing to deliberately distort and misrepresent the words of others in order to have your way. That's LYING.

And it isn't just right here... you've been doing it for years. As I have documented.

It's fascinating how much effort Jane/Lonny Eachus has expended just to avoid writing down the power flowing into and out of a boundary around the heat source. If Jane/Lonny Eachus is so sure that he's right, why not just write down that obviously correct energy conservation equation?

No, that's just another lie. I don't need to write down a "conservation of energy equation" in regard to Spencer's experiment. I don't refuse to do it because I can't, as you have clearly implied. I refuse to do it because this is a dead issue. You were proved wrong weeks ago, and your demands for additional proof from me are just laughable.

Or they would be, if you weren't being such an enormous asshole.

I haven't expended ANY energy to avoid writing anything down. I've written down the proper and necessary equations not just once but many times now. Nothing else is necessary, and I have no reason to waste further effort chasing your red herrings.

All the effort I have been expending has been to correct your "mistaken" interpretations of the things I have stated. But they really could not be "mistaken", to the extent you have misrepresented them, if you had any understanding of the subject at all.

Get lost, liar. I will have nothing further to do with you.

Parent Share

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

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-10-13 15:12 (#48135193) Homepage Journal

> I haven't expended ANY energy to avoid writing anything down. I've written down the proper and necessary equations not just once but many times now. ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-13]***

Ironically, Jane's **still** trying hard to avoid writing down his energy conservation equation before wrongly "cancelling" terms. If he'd try to write down that equation **just once**, he might realize that the nonsensical equation he's written down many times isn't proper or necessary.

> I don't need to write down a "conservation of energy equation" in regard to Spencer's experiment. I don't refuse to do it because I can't, as you have clearly implied. I refuse to do it because this is a dead issue. You were proved wrong weeks ago, and your demands for additional proof from me are just laughable. ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-13]***

If Jane actually could write down an energy conservation equation before wrongly "cancelling" terms, Jane would see that "radiative power from the walls" **can't** cancel out.

Once again, the only way Jane's final term could cancel with the radiative power in term "(e*s)*T4^4" to obtain Jane's final equation would be if "radiative power from chamber walls, re-emitted back out" equals "(e*s)*T4^4". But it's being emitted by the source, which is at temperature T1. If

reflections confuse you, just remember that the gray body equation has to reduce to the black body equation where there aren't any reflections at all. In that case, all that power is being absorbed and re-emitted, not reflected.

If Jane would write down an energy conservation equation and think about it, he might realize that he's been endlessly crowing about "proving me wrong" using Sky Dragon Slayer nonsense that violates conservation of energy and/or the Stefan-Boltzmann law.

But since Jane's Slayer brainwashing is so thorough that he can't bring himself to write down that equation, Jane will probably keep endlessly crowing about "proving me wrong".

Ironically, if Jane's Slayer nonsense was right, Jane would also have "proven wrong" Prof. Brown, Dr. Joel Shore, the National Academies of Science, the American Institute of Physics, the American Physical Society, the Australian Institute of Physics, the European Physical Society, etc.

> ... YOU are the one going against "established" physics here. ... If you could actually show how the **physics textbook** idea of heat transfer was wrong, you would be world famous by now. ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-06]***

No, I'd have to get in line behind all those other physicists who agree that adding CO2 warms Earth's surface, which is equivalent to saying that enclosing a heat source warms it. This is probably the most fascinating part of Jane's delusion. Not only does Jane completely misunderstand fundamental physics, Jane seems to earnestly believe that his crackpot Slayer conspiracy theory represents "established" physics. Fascinating.

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 2014-10-13 15:23 (#48135285)
PUBLIC SERVICE ANNOUNCEMENT.

Dear readers:

I have repeatedly demonstrated that this person who calls himself "kayman80" has been blatantly dishonest about past conversations that have occurred here on Slashdot and elsewhere. **And** that he has **a habit** of deliberately distorting what other people say, for reasons of his own.

I have ceased feeding the troll. I recommend that you do so as well.
Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

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

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-10-13 15:56 (#48135547) Homepage Journal

> ... I have repeatedly demonstrated that this person who calls himself "kayman80" has been blatantly dishonest about past conversations that have occurred here on Slashdot and elsewhere. **And** that he has **a habit** of deliberately distorting what other people say, for reasons of his own. I have ceased feeding the troll. I recommend that you do so as well.
> ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-13]***

Instead of endlessly accusing me of blatantly dishonest deliberate distortions, a real skeptic would write down an energy conservation equation before wrongly "cancelling" terms. Actually, a real skeptic would've done that months ago, but better late than never.

Jane, I believe in you. I believe you **can** learn how conservation of energy works, but first you have to take a baby step of your own by writing down an energy conservation equation before wrongly "cancelling" terms. Just try it. You might learn something. On the other hand, endlessly accusing me of dishonesty probably isn't very educational.

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 2014-10-08 22:20 (#48100141)

If there's no net radiative power coming in, that must mean all the "power in" from the chamber walls just goes back out. That would yield a net of zero. But as usual Jane didn't write down the power in = power out equation showing these terms before they supposedly cancel.

Why do that? Nobody does that. That's stupid.

If you're publishing an equation for calculating P, and you have an additive term on one side of the equation, which is exactly cancleled out by an additive term on the other side of an equation, **you don't include them, you cancel them.**

If I'm showing you the equation for calculating the volume of a sphere, I don't write it like this:

Volume = Z + (4/3 * pi * r^3) - Z

That would be STUPID. I publish the equation this way:

Volume = 4/3 * pi * r^3

Similarly, the equation for radiant power emittance **at steady state** does NOT say "X + ((epsilon * sigma) * T^4) - X". It simply says (epsilon * sigma) * T^4. **Because it's already known that X cancels out!!!** There is no NET absorption of radiative power from cooler bodies. WE KNOW THIS FROM THERMODYNAMICS. So any radiative power that comes in, goes right back out. That's YOUR power in = power out!

You are trying to count power incoming from a cooler body as part of the radiative power out of the hotter body. **That's counting it twice.** I told you that... what was it now? 3 weeks ago? A month? And I told you not just once

but several times.

That's just wrong. **The number is the same regardless of the presence or absence of any cooler bodies.**

And since nearby cooler bodes do NOT supply and net input to the hotter body, and do NOT affect the radiant power output of the hotter body, they do NOT affect any power input to the hotter body. QED

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

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

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-10-08 23:16 (#48100347) Homepage Journal
Answered here.
Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Re:phase change (Score:3)

by Layzej (1976930) Fan on 2014-10-08 9:58 (#48093489)
Who should we believe... The guy who thinks that the 9/11 attacks were an inside job and that Obama faked his birth certificate, or the scientists.... Tough choice...
Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Re:phase change (Score:2)

by Jane Q. Public (1010737) Friend of a Friend on 2014-10-08 21:45 (#48100023)

Who should we believe... The guy who thinks that the 9/11 attacks were an inside job and that Obama faked his birth certificate, or the scientists.... Tough choice...

Who should we believe? Someone who gives the textbook answers to physics questions, or somebody who publicly lies about what other people wrote?

[A] I did not state that the 9/11 attacks were an inside job. I merely stated that

evidence indicates that we weren't told the whole truth about it. And the evidence does in fact indicate that. I did NOT, however, despite your claim here to the contrary, pretend to know what that truth is. So that's lie #1.

[B] I did not claim Obama faked his birth certificate. I DID state that the document posted on the internet by the Whitehouse as Obama's birth certificate has been digitally manipulated, not just "scanned". Because... it has. I downloaded it and examined it myself. There is zero chance it was a mere scan into Adobe Illustrator, as the Whitehouse claimed.

HOWEVER, I also stated, several times, that there are some perfectly **legitimate reasons** why the document might have been manipulated. So... I DID NOT claim "Obama's birth certificate is fake". That's lie #2.

[C] It isn't about who we should "believe", anyway. It's about what the evidence says.

[D] For somebody who claims to not be the same person as "khayman80", you sure show up in a lot of his conversations, and link to a lot of his old comments. Just EXACTLY in the same way he does.

You also like to ad-hominem, just as you did here, and just like he does. (In fact you linked to one of his huge ad-hominem attacks. And before you say "that's not ad-hominem", yes it is. Because you're asking "Who should we believe?" That's the whole of your "argument". It's not just ad-hominem it's 100% pure textbook ad-hominem.

So who, indeed, should we believe? The person with the evidence, or the people with straw-man and ad-hominem arguments?

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

-
-

Re:phase change (Score:3)

by Layzej (1976930) Fan on 2014-10-08 22:20 (#48100147)
Jane1:

Kinda hard to argue with the owner of the building when he publicly says he did it on purpose!

vs Jane2:

I did not state that the 9/11 attacks were an inside job. I merely stated that evidence indicates ...

Who to believe?

I did not claim Obama faked his birth certificate. I DID state that the document posted on the internet by the Whitehouse as Obama's birth certificate has been digitally manipulated

Seems like a distinction without a difference. Not sure we should use you as a barometer on which way the term "denier" points.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

-
-

Re:phase change (Score:2)

by Jane Q. Public (1010737) Friend of a Friend on 2014-10-08 22:51 (#48100265)

Jane1:

Kinda hard to argue with the owner of the building when he publicly says he did it on purpose!

Hahaha! Building 7 wasn't a "9/11 attack"!!! It didn't even occur to me you were talking about that. I have the owner of the building on video saying they took it down. So who indeed should we believe? You, or that same owner of the building saying it himself??? Please explain to me why he should lie to the news.

Hahahahaha! Hell, I thought you were talking about the terrorist attack. That's what most people mean when they say "9/11". Not the bullshit that happened afterward.

Seems like a distinction without a difference.

Only to those who don't know what the hell they're talking about. If you did, you'd know why it makes all the difference in the world.

Not sure we should use you as a barometer on which way the term "denier" points.

I don't give the slightest damn who YOU use as a barometer. My only interest is making sure facts get out to people who care about the facts.

Let's see now: we have the owner of Building 7 saying publicly to the news that they took the building down.

We have incontrovertible evidence that the document presented as Obama's birth certificate **on the Whitehouse website** is a document that was intentionally, digitally manipulated. (No claims

here about WHY. There could be legitimate reasons.)

And we have you trying to make fun of someone who was just saying those were facts.

Yep. Sure enough. That says "denier" to me.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Re:phase change (Score:3)

by Layzej (1976930) Fan on 2014-10-08 23:15 (#48100345)

Wikipedia thinks: *"When the North Tower collapsed, debris fell on the nearby 7 World Trade Center building (7 WTC), damaging it and starting fires. These fires burned for hours, compromising the building's structural integrity, and 7 WTC collapsed at 5:21 p.m."*

But I'd love to hear the *real* truth about the 9/11 attacks and Obama's birth certificate. Please elucidate.

"What about building 7?" A social psychological study of online discussion of 9/11 conspiracy theories

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Re:phase change (Score:2)

by Jane Q. Public (1010737) Friend of a Friend on 2014-10-09 12:49 (#48105819)
Not only is Wikipedia not the authoritative answer to everything in the Universe, what it says doesn't even contradict what **I** said. At all.

I have nothing further to say here.
Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Re:phase change (**Score:3**)

by Layzej (1976930) Fan on 2014-10-09 17:49 (#48108055)
so who was behind the 911 attacks and who faked Obama's birth certificate? Obviously if you are right these are very important questions!
Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Re:phase change (**Score:3**)

by Layzej (1976930) Fan on 2014-10-09 21:01 (#48108819)

Wikipedia not the authoritative answer to everything in the Universe

Of course not. Only you know the *real* truth.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Re:phase change (**Score:2**)

by Jane Q. Public (1010737) Friend of a Friend on 2014-10-10 10:42 (#48113469)
No, because you are mischaracterizing my positions again.

I didn't say "somebody else" was behind 9/11. That was never my claim and implying that it was is a form of lying. I merely claimed that there were things about it we weren't told, which is a very different argument.

And there are several possible **legitimate** reasons why the document on the Whitehouse website might have been manipulated. (It's not his "birth certificate".) And if that's true, then it's not important at all who did it.
Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Re:phase change (**Score:3**)

by Layzej (1976930) Fan on 2014-10-10 12:48 (#48114753)
Please! We want to know the *real* truth behind these plots! Do you think Osama collude with the owner of the building? Do you think there was a plant in the white house who is manipulating documents? This is all very fascinating and I look forward to learning the real truth that Wikipedia won't tell us!
Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Organizational Change (**Score:0**)

by Anonymous Coward on 2014-10-08 12:05 (#48095415)
At my university, they are moving the climate coursework to the Department of Religious Studies. That's how progressive we are!
Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Re:Organizational Change (**Score:2**)

by Jane Q. Public (1010737) Friend of a Friend on 2014-10-08 21:52 (#48100053)

At my university, they are moving the climate coursework to the Department of Religious Studies. That's how progressive we are!

Haha! Yes, they are building a Church of Global Warming in a town in my state.

I understand they have their own version of the Bible. The first chapter is AnthropoGenesis.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Re:Organizational Change (Score:0)

by Anonymous Coward on 2014-10-13 8:56 (#48130957)

At my university, they are moving the climate coursework to the Department of Religious Studies. That's how progressive we are!

Haha! Yes, they are building a Church of Global Warming in a town in my state.

Who? The Koch Brothers together with Tony Wazzup?

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Re:phase change (Score:2)

by ultranova (717540) Friend of a Friend on 2014-10-09 7:20 (#48102369)

> I have stories.

The problem is you confuse them with reality. Climate is not a social construct, it won't stop reacting to changes in atmospheric composition just because you tell a good story, or even a crazy conspiracy theory one.

--

Forget magic. Any technology distinguishable from divine power is insufficiently advanced.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Slashdot
Archived Discussion Moderate Moderator Help Delete

- Get 234 More Comments
- Submit Story

I bet the human brain is a kludge. -- Marvin Minsky

- FAQ
- Story Archive
- Hall of Fame