

[Slashdot](#)[Stories](#)[Slash Boxes](#)[Comments](#)[Deals new](#) [SlashTV](#) [Jobs](#) [Newsletter](#) [Submit](#) [khayman80](#) ▾ [Log out](#)

- [Stories](#)
- [Submissions](#)
- [Popular](#)
- [Blog](#)

[Slashdot](#)

- 
- [Build](#)
- [Ask Slashdot](#)
- [Book Reviews](#)
- [Games](#)
- [Idle](#)
- [YRO](#)
- 
- [Cloud](#)
- [Hardware](#)
- [Linux](#)
- [Management](#)
- [Mobile](#)
- [Science](#)
- [Security](#)
- [Storage](#)

This discussion has been archived.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

[Harvard Scientists Say It's Time To Start Thinking About Engineering the Climate](#) [312 More Prefs](#)

## [Harvard Scientists Say It's Time To Start Thinking About Engineering the Climate](#)

Archived Discussion [Load All Comments](#)

55 Full 06 Abbreviated 0 Hidden

Comments Filter:

Score:

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

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

-1

[312](#) [More Prefs](#)

### [We've been doing it for a long time](#) (Score:4, Insightful)

by [GameboyRMH \(1153867\)](#) [Foe of a Friend](#)

We've been doing unintentional geoengineering for hundreds of years now, why would some intentional geoengineering be so bad?

--

"When information is power, privacy is freedom" - Jah-Wren Ryel

○

○

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

by [i kan reed \(749298\)](#) [Alter Relationship](#)

Because purposeful geoengineering is, by its nature, going to be of larger scale of effect. Making mistakes about degree of effect or feedbacks could be very bad for us. It's devil you know versus devil you don't, and you only get one planet to try with. Relatively small chances of error are still kind of a big deal.

■

■

>

### [Re:We've been doing it for a long time](#) (Score:3)

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#) on 2014-11-21 12:42 ([#48436625](#))

Because purposeful geoengineering is, by its nature, going to be of larger scale of effect. Making mistakes about degree of effect or feedbacks could be very bad for us. It's devil you know versus devil you don't, and you only get one planet to try with. Relatively small chances of error are still kind of a big deal.

Pretty much this. It's the same precautionary principle that *should have* been used with GMOs, which are already causing serious problems. And I don't mean health problems, I mean ecology. Such as roudup-ready corn spreading in the wild, and passing some of its modified genes to other plants, when it wasn't supposed to.

The whole global warming scare made it abundantly obvious that the current state of science (plus politics) is incapable of intelligently managing the climate, or perhaps even managing it at all, much less intelligently.

I'd like to add, though: contrary to what OP implies, we've been "seriously considering" engineering the climate for many decades.

[Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

■

■

### [Re:We've been doing it for a long time](#) (Score:3)

by [i kan reed \(749298\)](#) [Alter Relationship](#) on 2014-11-21 12:49 ([#48436681](#))

[Homepage](#) [Journal](#)

Okay, the way in which you have agreed with me, and the similar arguments you brought up have convinced me I was wrong.

[Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

■

■

### [Re:We've been doing it for a long time](#) (Score:2)

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#) on 2014-11-21 13:05 ([#48436795](#))

Just curious: are you saying you don't believe GMO corn spread beyond its boundaries and hybridized with other corn, after Monsanto had claimed that wasn't possible in its applications to USDA? (Hint: it has been proven in court.)

Are you claiming that the roundup-ready genes have NOT been found in other plants growing near cornfields?

As I say: I am just curious what your point is here.

[Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

■

■

### [Re:We've been doing it for a long time](#) (Score:2)

by [i kan reed \(749298\)](#) [Alter Relationship](#) on 2014-11-21 13:19 ([#48436907](#)) [Homepage](#) [Journal](#)

That I don't view genetic modification as an extraordinary source of

danger, life spreads, no matter where its genetic sequences come from, and the science about it isn't ambiguous: human added genes aren't magic.

It made me realize if the science about control measures weren't ambiguous, there'd still be people making extremely stupid arguments of chance against it, and I don't want to be one.

[Parent Share](#)

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

■

■

### [Re:We've been doing it for a long time](#) (Score:2)

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#) on 2014-11-21 13:41 ([#48437063](#))

That I don't view genetic modification as an extraordinary source of danger

Well, in my **opinion** -- I admit that's all it is -- that suggests that you may not understand it very well.

[Parent Share](#)

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

■

■

### [Re:We've been doing it for a long time](#) (Score:0)

by Anonymous Coward on 2014-11-21 20:07 ([#48438817](#))

Agree with Jane Q, you don't know enough about genetics. Hell in my first year of Biomolecular there was plenty of incorrect information taught, simply because of the pace of advancements in understanding ( mostly related to epigenetics ).

[Parent Share](#)

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

■

■

### [Re:We've been doing it for a long time](#) (Score:1)

by Anonymous Coward on 2014-11-21 13:29 ([#48436967](#))

Tell us exactly what the problem is with this corn. Is it killing anything?  
Is it affecting anything?

[Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

■

■

### [Re:We've been doing it for a long time](#) (Score:1)

by [Jane Q. Public](#) ([1010737](#)) [Friend of a Friend](#) on 2014-11-21 13:58 ([#48437205](#))

Tell us exactly what the problem is with this corn. Is it killing anything? Is it affecting anything?

[I would very definitely call this HARM.](#)

Introduced plants spreading where they are very definitely unwanted are called *invasive species*.

Companies suing farmers whose fields have been invaded without their consent is abusive monopolistic behavior. (Read: "corporatism".)

I could go on, but those are 2 harms that have been proved. One to crop diversity, the other to society and free markets.

[Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

■

■

### [Arguably not the GMO that caused harm here](#) (Score:2)

by [Chirs](#) ([87576](#)) [Alter Relationship](#) on 2014-11-21 14:35 ([#48437449](#))

I would suggest that the GMO itself isn't actually harming anything. Rather, it's the regulatory framework around it that let Monsanto patent gene sequences and then sue farmers over them.

In many cases direct genetic modification is \*less\*

intrusive than other techniques of creating more suitable species of plants...the non-GMO method generally involves forcing random mutations via chemicals/radiation and then selecting for the traits you want. Of course there may be a bunch of other mutations that you didn't select for/against that could cause problems in people.

[Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

■

■

[Re:Arguably not the GMO that caused harm here](#)  
([Score:2](#))

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#) on  
2014-11-21 15:02 ([#48437661](#))

I would suggest that the GMO itself isn't actually harming anything.

And I would disagree.

Societal / economic issue aside, when an altered genome that was controversial in the first place, and was promised not to be cross-fertile, proves otherwise and starts cross-pollinating other strains uncontrollably, we should take that as a strong warning.

Ever read Jurassic Park? The book, not the movie.

[Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

■

■

[Re:Arguably not the GMO that caused harm here](#)  
([Score:2](#))

by [dbIII \(701233\)](#) [Alter Relationship](#) on  
2014-11-22 17:37 ([#48442121](#))

I'd say it's the implementation that's the problem and not the idea. Regulation isn't helping because it has just raised the barrier to entry so that Monsanto can afford it for it's

short lived hybrids that die out in a couple of generations but projects for things like using bananas for vaccine production (real project with successful results) can't. Trivial modifications such as hybrid tomatoes that taste like the "heirloom" varieties but can be shipped like the almost rock hard tasteless commercial varieties cost more than they could return - so that one is being done the slow hard way with a lot of crossbreeding. The researcher knows the gene sequence he wants but it could take a decade or two to get there without GMO.

Thus GMO opposition has meant that only the solutions that can gouge the maximum amount of money Monsanto style are viable. It's been counterproductive and has resulted in only the stuff worth stopping making it through. That's my opinion anyway.

Maybe if we could get some of the anti-vaxxers behind the idea of a vaccination treatment with no injections with scary preservatives, just eat a bit of raw banana that can be shipped 1/4 the way around the planet on a container ship. That could defuse the GMO opposition and turn it into the dodgy business practice of Monsanto opposition that it should be.

--

\.!/

[Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

■

■

### [Re:Arguably not the GMO that caused harm here \(Score:2\)](#)

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#) on 2014-11-21 15:08 ([#48437711](#))

In many cases direct genetic modification is \*less\* intrusive than other techniques of creating more suitable species of plants...the non-GMO method generally involves forcing random mutations via chemicals/radiation and then selecting for the traits

you want. Of course there may be a bunch of other mutations that you didn't select for/against that could cause problems in people.

However, **we do not know** what long-term unintended consequences there may be to this type of gene modification, because there has **been** no long term. While selective breeding of natural mutations -- even of a relatively "forced" variety -- has been around for millennia.

The point being that one method is time-tested and the other one not. We don't have any long-term examples of jellyfish genes crossed with plant genes. We do have evidence that bacterial and viral genes have invaded other organisms, but again those we have evidence of were very long ago and have had eons to weed out any bad variants or effects.

I do agree, however, that the regulatory system is faulty.

[Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

■

■

### [Re:We've been doing it for a long time](#) (Score:2)

by [morgauxo](#) (974071) [Alter Relationship](#) on 2014-11-21 14:24 ([#48437375](#))

It gives people who don't bathe often enough the heebie-jeebies.

[Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

■

■

### [Re:We've been doing it for a long time](#) (Score:3)

by [RockDoctor](#) (15477) [Friend](#) on 2014-11-23 14:38 ([#48445899](#)) [Journal](#)

I almost wish I knew what the heebie-jeebies are in your world. In mine they're Mini cars stuffed with long-haired androgynes.

--

Birds are not dinosaur descendants; birds **are** dinosaurs, for all useful meanings of "birds", "are" and "dinosaurs"

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

■

■

### [Re: We've been doing it for a long time](#) (Score:2)

by [TapeCutter \(624760\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#) on 2014-11-21 14:20  
([#48437347](#)) [Journal](#)

Are you claiming that the roundup-ready genes have NOT been found in other plants growing near cornfields?

We all know Monsanto are pricks in their dealings with small farmers who refuse to buy their seed, but what "damage" has been done to human health or the environment by GMO plants of any kind? - Resistance to roundup and cabbages that glow in the dark is not "damage".

Aside from that, scientific claims cannot be "proven in court" and your well known *non-belief* in AGW has nothing to do with science.

--

And did you exchange a walk on part in the war for a lead role in a cage? - Pink Floyd.

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

■

■

### [Re: We've been doing it for a long time](#) (Score:3)

by [riverat1 \(1048260\)](#) [Friend](#) on 2014-11-21 18:55 ([#48438625](#))

How about incorporating proteins from bacillus thuringiensis in corn or other plants. Essentially that's a pesticide and while it's not toxic to humans it is to other arthropods and could attack beneficial species as well as the target species.

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

■

■

[Re:We've been doing it for a long time](#) (Score:2)

by [davydagger \(2566757\)](#) [Alter Relationship](#) on 2014-11-22 15:09 (#48441579)

and then sue the living shits out of anyone who gets caught with monsanto IP that didn't pay monsanto. Feudalism much?

[Parent Share](#)

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

■

■

[Re:We've been doing it for a long time](#) (Score:0)

by Anonymous Coward on 2014-11-21 12:50 (#48436687)

It's the same precautionary principle that should have been used with GMOs, which are already causing serious problems.

Isn't that the same precautionary principle that should have been used before we started spewing CO2 into the atmosphere at unprecedented rates? Especially given that several mass extinctions were preceded by rapid CO2 releases?

[Parent Share](#)

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

■

■

[Re:We've been doing it for a long time](#) (Score:1)

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#) on 2014-11-21 12:59 (#48436755)

Isn't that the same precautionary principle that should have been used before we started spewing CO2 into the atmosphere at unprecedented rates? Especially given that several mass extinctions were preceded by rapid CO2 releases?

Since the satellite AND balloon AND **un-"adjusted"** ground temperature measurements ALL say the globe isn't warming, even while CO2 has risen significantly, I wouldn't worry much about it.

But more to the point: even if that were not true, and CO2 warming were proved (it is not), we didn't really suspect any actual warming until the late 70s... more than a hundred years after we started "spewing" it into the air. So...

no.

[Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

■

■

### [Re:We've been doing it for a long time](#) (Score:0)

by Anonymous Coward on 2014-11-21 13:28 ([#48436963](#))

Since the satellite AND balloon AND un-"adjusted" ground temperature measurements ALL say the globe isn't warming, even while CO2 has risen significantly, I wouldn't worry much about it.

If the globe isn't warming, that must mean the oceans aren't warming because they're part of the globe. Is that the case, Jane?

[Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

■

■

### [Re:We've been doing it for a long time](#) (Score:2)

by [Jane Q. Public](#) ([1010737](#)) [Friend of a Friend](#) on 2014-11-21 13:35 ([#48437021](#))

If the globe isn't warming, that must mean the oceans aren't warming because they're part of the globe. Is that the case, Jane?

I stated what I stated. If you have a specific argument to make, then make it. Otherwise kindly go away. I won't argue over insinuations.

[Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

■

■

### [Re:We've been doing it for a long time](#) (Score:0)

by Anonymous Coward on 2014-11-21 13:41 ([#48437067](#))

Since the oceans are warming, it's wrong to say "the globe isn't warming."

[Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

■

■

### [Re:We've been doing it for a long time](#) (Score:2)

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#) on 2014-11-21 14:49 ([#48437551](#))

Since the oceans are warming, it's wrong to say "the globe isn't warming."

Warming, according to whom?

[This says long-term trends have not been detected, up to 2000.](#)

[This says no warming trend in upper ocean SINCE 2000.](#)

[This -- which is the longest and most comprehensive study to date -- says there is \*\*no\*\* detectable warming in the \*\*deep\*\* ocean.](#)

So I don't know who you've been listening to, but my sources say it isn't happening to any noticeable degree.

[Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

■

■

### [Re:We've been doing it for a long time](#) (Score:4, Insightful)

by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2014-11-21 15:03 ([#48437669](#)) [Homepage](#) [Journal](#)

[This -- which is the longest and most comprehensive study to date -- says there is \*\*no\*\* detectable](#)

[warming in the deep ocean.](#)

So I don't know who you've been listening to, but my sources say it isn't happening to any noticeable degree.

No, that source concludes: *"The net warming of the ocean implies an energy imbalance for the Earth of  $0.64 \pm 0.44 \text{ W/m}^2$  from 2005 to 2013."*

[Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

■

■

[Re:We've been doing it for a long time](#)  
([Score:2](#))

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#)  
on 2014-11-22 12:17 ([#48440921](#))

No, that source concludes: "The net warming of the ocean implies an energy imbalance for the Earth of  $0.64 \pm 0.44 \text{ W/m}^2$  from 2005 to 2013."

Are you able to read? Did you see that my comment was about DEEP ocean? Did you see that the very title of the paper is:

Deep-ocean contribution to sea level and energy budget not detectable over the past decade

??? The comment about temperatures at other depths is irrelevant to the point I made ABOUT THAT PAPER.

Do you know what the word "context" means?

As for other depths, this paper contradicts the other one I cited earlier. Are you telling us that you get to decide which one is correct?

[Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

■

■

[Re:We've been doing it for a long time](#)  
([Score:2](#))

by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2014-11-22 12:29  
([#48440967](#)) [Homepage](#) [Journal](#)

[Llovel et al. 2014](#) concludes "*The net warming of the ocean implies an energy imbalance for the Earth of  $0.64 \pm 0.44 \text{ W/m}^2$  from 2005 to 2013.*"

So it's wrong to say "the globe isn't warming."  
Hopefully you just hadn't read to the last sentence in their abstract before making that absurd claim. But now that you've read that sentence, you can't honestly keep claiming that "the globe isn't warming" unless you first debunk Llovel et al. 2014.

[Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

■

■

[Re:We've been doing it for a long time](#)  
([Score:2](#))

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#)  
on 2014-11-23 23:19 ([#48447351](#))

So it's wrong to say "the globe isn't warming."

I know what it says; I'm the one who linked to the paper.

I would simply repeat my questions above, but based on past experience you would continue to not get it.

The Llovel paper contradicts other papers in regard to stored heat in the upper ocean. I linked to [a summary of some of them](#) earlier.

According to THEM, there has been no observed upward trend, so my position that there is no significant warming is quite defensible.

[Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

■

■

**Re: We've been doing it for a long time**  
**(Score:2)**

by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2014-11-23 23:59  
([#48447443](#)) [Homepage](#) [Journal](#)

The “pause” (political doublespeak) is 18 now. And a recent study showed “missing” heat is NOT in the ocean. [\[Lonny Eachus, 2014-10-14\]](#)

... the Argo array has been measuring the upper-level sea temperatures since 2005. THOSE temperatures are no surprise and have already been accounted for. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-22\]](#)

Did you see my comment about Argo, or not? The ISSUE here was precisely the deep ocean (> 2000m depth). Upper temps were known. [\[Lonny Eachus, 2014-11-06\]](#)

Jane/Lonny Eachus used to agree that temperatures above 2000m depth were known and were no surprise while simultaneously claiming that the globe isn't warming. When he realizes the contradiction, which path will he take? Will Jane/Lonny realize this means that the globe is still warming? Or will Jane/Lonny just reflexively dismiss the temperatures above 2000m depth?

... As for other depths, this paper contradicts the other one I cited

earlier. Are you telling us that you get to decide which one is correct?

[\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-11-22\]](#)

... The Llovel paper contradicts other papers in regard to stored heat in the upper ocean. I linked to [a summary of some of them](#) earlier. According to THEM, there has been no observed upward trend, so my position that there is no significant warming is quite defensible. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-11-23\]](#)

No, that [blog summary](#) discusses sea **surface** temperatures. How could that possibly contradict the [Llovel et al. 2014](#) study of ocean temperature data down to 2000m?

But it's worse than that. For some reason, Jane seems to think that he can cite Llovel et al. 2014 regarding abyssal ocean temperatures, while also claiming their upper ocean temperatures aren't correct.

Perhaps Jane simply hasn't read Llovel et al. 2014. Their conclusion depends on the fact that:

total sea level rise = thermal expansion + land ice melting

Total sea level rise can be measured using satellite altimetry, and land ice melting can be measured by using the GRACE satellites. The remaining sea level rise is due to thermal expansion. Since ocean temperatures have been measured down to 2000m depth using ARGO, only the abyssal thermal expansion below 2000m is unknown.

Llovel et al. 2014 basically re-arranged that equation:

thermal expansion below 2000m depth = total sea level rise - thermal expansion above 2000m - land ice melting

That's why Jane can't cite Llovel et al. 2014 regarding abyssal ocean temperatures, while claiming that their upper ocean temperatures aren't correct. Their abyssal ocean temperatures are obtained by subtracting the ARGO upper ocean temperatures and GRACE non-steric sea level rise from the total sea level rise revealed by satellite altimetry.

So if Jane claims that ocean temperatures above 2000m depth aren't warming, that means the steric sealevel rise must be due to abyssal warming below 2000m depth. Physics says that Jane can't have his cake and eat it too.

Oh, and once again: ocean temperatures down to 2000m are different than sea surface temperatures. Seriously. There's like 2000m of difference between the two quantities, and one of them represents a whole heck of a lot more heat capacity. Can you guess which one?

[Parent Share](#)

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

■

■

**[Re:We've been doing it for a long time](#)**  
**[\(Score:2\)](#)**

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#)  
on 2014-11-24 18:13 ([#48454095](#))

Jane/Lonny Eachus used to agree that temperatures above 2000m depth were known and were no surprise while simultaneously claiming that the globe isn't warming. When he realizes the contradiction, which path will he take? Will Jane/Lonny realize this means that the globe is still warming? Or will Jane/Lonny just reflexively dismiss the temperatures above 2000m depth?

Engaging in your usual context-shifting, I see. But even more: how could I be "reflexively dismissing it" if my own statement, which you quoted, was "THOSE temperatures are no

surprise and have already been accounted for"??? , That makes absolutely no sense. No great surprise there, I suppose.

Total sea level rise can be measured using satellite altimetry, and land ice melting can be measured by using the GRACE satellites

Assuming the rather huge problems with GRACE's accuracy have been fixed. It is claimed they were. Perhaps they have been.

But it's worse than that. For some reason, Jane seems to think that he can cite Llovel et al. 2014 regarding abyssal ocean temperatures, while also claiming their upper ocean temperatures aren't correct.

Except I did not do that. You have had a very nasty habit of twisting what other people say. That's dishonest. I've pointed that out to you many times, over a period of years. You really need to start reading what people actually say rather than interpreting so heavily.

Oh, and once again: ocean temperatures down to 2000m are different than sea surface temperatures.

Now, THAT is a fair point. I did in fact get surface temperatures mixed up with upper ocean temperatures. Mea culpa.

But I am just curious. Just a straightforward question: are you now claiming, as you seem to be, that the "missing heat" cause of the pause in surface warming is actually hiding in the UPPER ocean, rather than the lower?

[Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

■

■

[Re:We've been doing it for a long time](#)  
([Score:2](#))

by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2014-11-24 18:52

(#48454283) [Homepage Journal](#)

@ProfBrianCox Having said all that, this particular evidence has been based on data from the GRACE satellite, which in the past has turned out to be something of a [DISgrace](#)... but they say they have the problems worked out now. [\[Lonny Eachus, 2014-10-20\]](#)

Assuming the rather huge problems with GRACE's accuracy have been fixed. It is claimed they were. Perhaps they have been. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-11-24\]](#)

At the risk of provoking [this response](#), could you please link to evidence of these rather huge problems with GRACE's accuracy which in the past has turned out to be something of a DISgrace?

... how could I be "reflexively dismissing it" if my own statement, which you quoted, was "THOSE temperatures are no surprise and have already been accounted for"??? ... [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-11-24\]](#)

Only if you suggested that some blog summary of sea surface temperatures contradicted the Llovel et al. 2014 claim of significant warming down to 2000m.

... As for other depths, this paper contradicts the other one I cited earlier. Are you telling us that you get to decide which one is correct? [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-11-22\]](#)

... The Llovel paper contradicts other papers in regard to stored heat in the upper ocean. I linked to [a summary of some of them](#) earlier. According to THEM, there has been no observed upward

trend, so my position that there is no significant warming is quite defensible. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-11-23\]](#)

But it's worse than that. For some reason, Jane seems to think that he can cite Llovel et al. 2014 regarding abyssal ocean temperatures, while also claiming their upper ocean temperatures aren't correct.

Except I did not do that. You have had a very nasty habit of twisting what other people say. That's dishonest. I've pointed that out to you many times, over a period of years. You really need to start reading what people actually say rather than interpreting so heavily. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-11-24\]](#)

You seemed to suggest that some blog summary of sea surface temperatures contradicted the Llovel et al. 2014 claim of significant warming down to 2000m. Since we now seem to agree that there **is** significant warming down to 2000m, there's no reason to accuse anyone of dishonesty.

... are you now claiming, as you seem to be, that the "missing heat" cause of the pause in surface warming is actually hiding in the UPPER ocean, rather than the lower? [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-11-24\]](#)

I'm claiming that [Llovel et al. 2014](#) concludes: *"The net warming of the ocean implies an energy imbalance for the Earth of 0.64 +/- 0.44 W/m<sup>2</sup> from 2005 to 2013."*

I'm claiming that this conclusion is

inconsistent with your claims that the globe isn't warming. Can we agree that even the bottom edge of the confidence interval is positive, indicating net warming from 2005 to 2013?

[Parent Share](#)

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

■

■

**Re: We've been doing it for a long time**  
**(Score:2)**

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#)  
on 2014-11-24 19:30 ([#48454417](#))

I have no intention -- or reason, for that matter -- to reply to you about something someone may have written on Twitter.

However, regarding what you asked above, I have a question of my own: are you unaware of the issues that have been raised about GRACE? That seems unlikely.

You seemed to suggest that some blog summary of sea surface temperatures contradicted the Llovel et al. 2014 claim of significant warming down to 2000m. Since we now seem to agree that there is significant warming down to 2000m, there's no reason to accuse anyone of dishonesty.

I have already admitted I made an error.

But as for dishonesty, yes, you have given me ample and frequent reason to think you have been less than honest. So I won't apologize for suspecting you may be doing so at times when you may not actually be. "Fool me once..." as the saying goes. Here is an example:

Since we now seem to agree that there is significant warming down to 2000m,

Nowhere did I write such a thing. So when you continually -- rather routinely, in my

experience, as I have demonstrated on many occasions in the past -- suggest I have stated things that in fact I have not, I have to wonder what the reason is. Given the context and past experience, Occam's Razor would seem to indicate dishonesty. I know of no other reason that is anywhere even remotely as likely.

I'm claiming that this conclusion is inconsistent with your claims that the globe isn't warming. Can we agree that even the bottom edge of the confidence interval is positive, indicating net warming from 2005 to 2013?

No, without looking into it further, I do not agree. I'm not claiming that it is false, either... I would have to look some things up, which I am not free to do at the moment.

One thing I would have to check, just for example, is what those confidence intervals are **given** the multidecadal variability, which is not -- at least not uncontroversially -- known to any precise degree yet. What has been claimed to be a newly discovered variability in the Atlantic has turned up, for example. Not to mention that we know during La Niña periods of ENSO there tends to be storage, while during El Niño, more of a release. All these factors would need to be considered. Until I do, I neither agree or disagree.

[Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

■

■

[Re:We've been doing it for a long time](#)  
([Score:2](#))

by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2014-11-24 20:04  
([#48454547](#)) [Homepage](#) [Journal](#)

... are you unaware of the issues  
that have been raised about  
GRACE? That seems unlikely.

[\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-11-24\]](#)

What issues, raised by whom, in what scientific journal? Link?

I'm claiming that this conclusion is inconsistent with your claims that the globe isn't warming. Can we agree that even the bottom edge of the confidence interval is positive, indicating net warming from 2005 to 2013?

No, without looking into it further, I do not agree. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-11-24\]](#)

So you should either stop incorrectly claiming that the globe isn't warming, or stop citing Llovel et al. 2014 because their conclusion depends on net warming from 2005 to 2013.

[Parent Share](#)

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

■

■

[Re:We've been doing it for a long time](#)  
([Score:2](#))

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#)  
on 2014-11-25 12:05 ([#48461201](#))

What issues, raised by whom, in what scientific journal? Link?

I have frequently been astounded by your ability to find past information that suits your purposes, but when it comes to information that may serve to contradict your position, you suddenly appear to have never heard of Google. It is SO ridiculously easy to find references to issues with GRACE that I'm not going to bother to do it for you, and only an

idiot would call that confirmation of a contrary position.

By the way -- and admittedly this is slightly, but only slightly, off-topic -- in regard to your Spencer's thought experiment, last year [Astrophysicist Joe Postma wrote](#) that your argument in regard to the physics was ... well, let's just say he used rather derogatory phrases. I was not aware of this article until today, but I thought you might find it of some interest.

So you should either stop incorrectly claiming that the globe isn't warming, or stop citing Llovel et al. 2014 because their conclusion depends on net warming from 2005 to 2013.

I cited Llovel et al. because of their conclusion regarding the deep ocean. I have already stated what research I would have to do before I could responsibly make a claim that the globe was warming.

[Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

■

■

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

by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2014-11-25 13:51  
([#48462373](#)) [Homepage](#) [Journal](#)

I cited Llovel et al. because of their conclusion regarding the deep ocean. I have already stated what research I would have to do before I could responsibly make a claim that the globe was warming.  
[\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-11-25\]](#)

No, you stated this:

... One thing I would have to check, just for example, is what those confidence intervals are

**given** the multidecadal variability, which is not -- at least not uncontroversially -- known to any precise degree yet. What has been claimed to be a newly discovered variability in the Atlantic has turned up, for example. Not to mention that we know during La Niña periods of ENSO there tends to be storage, while during El Niño, more of a release. All these factors would need to be considered. Until I do, I neither agree or disagree. [\*\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-11-24\]\*](#)

Jane, that's not research you'd have to do before claiming that the globe is warming. You'd only have to do that research before **attributing** the warming to a particular cause. The only research you have to do before claiming that the globe is warming is to read the last sentence in the [Llovel et al. 2014](#) abstract, and ask yourself if the bottom edge of their confidence interval is positive. Is it?

I cited Llovel et al. because of their conclusion regarding the deep ocean. I have already stated what research I would have to do before I could responsibly make a claim that the globe was warming. [\*\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-11-25\]\*](#)

Once again, the Llovel et al. 2014 conclusion regarding abyssal ocean temperatures depends on the globe warming. I've [already explained](#) why. If you didn't understand the equations I wrote down, just ask for help. Once you understand those equations, you'll finally see why you can't cite Llovel et al. 2014 regarding abyssal ocean temperatures while also claiming that the globe isn't warming.

I have frequently been astounded by your ability to find past information that suits your purposes, but when it comes to

information that may serve to contradict your position, you suddenly appear to have never heard of Google. It is SO ridiculously easy to find references to issues with GRACE that I'm not going to bother to do it for you, and only an idiot would call that confirmation of a contrary position. [\[Jane O. Public, 2014-11-25\]](#)

Sadly, that's exactly the [response](#) I [expected](#).

I've [written about](#) many issues with GRACE, and released my [source code](#). Here's a quick link to browse the "[control panel](#)" of my code, followed by the top level of the program itself. All the functions used in that file are declared [here](#) and defined in full [here](#).

So Jane will have to be more specific. I've written about many issues with GRACE, but none that qualify as "rather huge problems".

Past experience suggests that asking Jane to provide a link to support his accusation is pointless, because Jane will just [do this](#) again. But if I were to guess which WUWT link Jane had in mind to support his accusation, Jane would just accuse me of [putting words in his mouth](#).

So rather than put words in Jane's mouth, I've politely asked Jane to please link to evidence of these rather huge problems with GRACE's accuracy. Sadly, this [won't avoid unpleasantness](#) either. Doesn't Jane see that he's created a catch-22 where he gets to cuss and scream at people regardless of whether they ask Jane for a link to support his accusations, or whether they put words in his mouth by assuming what link Jane means?

That seems like a great way to justify cussing and screaming at people, but not such a great way to learn physics. So I'll politely ask again. Jane, please link to evidence of these rather huge problems with GRACE's accuracy.

... in regard to your Spencer's thought experiment, last year [Astrophysicist Joe Postma](#) wrote that your argument in regard to the physics was ... well, let's just say he used rather derogatory phrases. I was not aware of this article until today, but I thought you might find it of some interest. ... [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-11-25\]](#)

Mr. Postma's derogatory phrases are why I've often been puzzled that Jane [cites](#) Sky Dragon Slayer Mr. Postma [approvingly](#) and repeatedly. Here are some more [derogatory phrases](#) from Mr. Postma:

*"... climate alarmists are instead trying to negate the human mind ... They don't want to believe in anything good because their true goal is that they want to murder humans, as we will see below; that is what drives them. ... They negate the mind, they negate evolution, they hate what evolution produces, they hate all living things in fact because all living things radically modify the environment, even the lowliest bacterium. They must hate their own existence. They are a pestilence unto themselves, and they hate themselves for it, along with everyone else. ... Greenie environmentalists are negators of the mind. In other words, they're idiots, complete and utter idiots. They know nothing of the way the actual real world works and has worked and what it has done in the past, and what it currently takes to keep them alive. I know lots of them and I live around them and they're brain dead. All you have to do is talk to them to see that they're brain dead. They don't have high quality thoughts, and they don't engage in high quality mentation. ... Have you ever encountered **such evil** at the basis of such a large fad? This goes **far beyond** Nazism. ..."*

It's not surprising that Mr. Postma refuses to listen to mainstream physicists, because he believes they're "complete and utter idiots" who are brain dead and hate themselves and

everything else and they go *far beyond* Nazism and want to murder people. Mr. Postma recently [showed](#) how pointless it is to try to educate Sky Dragon Slayers.

Is Jane more reasonable than Mr. Postma, who's Godwined himself many times over? Let's find out:

The fact that you insist that I provide you with something I already gave you, a long time ago and repeatedly, represents either a fundamental **failure** to understand on your part to understand the concept, or simple dishonesty.

[\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-11-21\]](#)

As I've repeatedly pointed out, you've never written down the very first energy conservation equation without wrongly "cancelling" terms. You've only provided this incorrect Sky Dragon Slayer equation:

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

No. Once again, that's absurd, Jane.

The fact that you insist that I provide you with something I already gave you, a long time ago and repeatedly, represents either a fundamental **failure** to understand on your part to understand the concept, or simple dishonesty.

[\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-11-21\]](#)

A Dunning-Kruger victim would only consider the possibility that professional physicists are incompetent or dishonest. A real skeptic would **at least consider** the possibility that professional physicists understand physics better than they do, and that the physicists are trying to point out a genuine fundamental flaw in the skeptic's argument.

Here's how to use the principle of conservation of energy. Draw 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

Since power in = power out through any boundary where nothing inside is changing:

electrical heating power + radiative power in from the chamber walls = radiative power out from the heat source

Jane got the very first equation wrong, because Jane refuses to write down an energy conservation equation for a boundary around the source without wrongly "cancelling" terms. If he tried to do this **just once**, he'd realize that electrical heating power depends on the cooler chamber wall temperature.

This is all clearly too difficult for Jane, despite the fact that this is the very first equation necessary to solve this problem. Because Jane is so far out of his depth, I suggested that Jane ask a physicist he respects this simple question:

@ProfBrianCox, an electrically heated plate is in a vacuum chamber with cooler walls. Does heating power depend on the wall temperature?

If Jane were a real skeptic, he'd at least ask a physicist he respects this simple question. But Jane refuses. Why?

It's pretty clear that Jane refuses to ask this simple question because he's just scared Prof. Cox (or any other mainstream physicist) will say "yes", which would mean that Jane's entire calculation is wrong, from the very first 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 2014-11-25 14:30 ([#48462769](#))

Mr. Postma's derogatory phrases are why I've often been puzzled that Jane cites... Mr. Postma

I cite Mr. Postma *because he understands the physics of the problem better than you do.*

End of story.

I found it very interesting that [his followup article](#), which I also discovered just today, mentioned the same problem with your version of the physics of Spencer's experiment that I mentioned to you in our prior discussion. To wit:

(a) Your math was fundamentally in error, in that you counted some radiated power twice, and

(b) If your idea of the physics were correct, a heat source within a cavity of the same material would form a positive feedback loop and heat to infinity. Which of course is ridiculous. You never did adequately explain how your positive feedback could occur only **once**, and then stop.

All in all, I found his arguments to be mathematically and physically sound, and yours not. That is why I have stopped arguing the point with you. Repeating unsound physics over and over is not going to make it more true, no matter how much you might wish it would.

[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 2014-11-25 14:37 ([#48462819](#))

In case my point wasn't clear, I'll spell it out explicitly:

I don't give a damn if Postma is rude... **as long as his physics is sound.**

Like me, he has had to deal with innumerable assaults by other rude people, who DON'T understand the physics. After a time, that does have an effect, and one gets to the point of having a short fuse. That's just human nature, when people are exposed to bullying and harassment for years on end.

If people are bothered by his rudeness, and wonder what caused it, many of them need only look in a mirror. I have little sympathy for them.

[Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

■

■

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

by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2014-11-25 15:30  
([#48463191](#)) [Homepage](#) [Journal](#)

So will Jane stop incorrectly claiming that the globe isn't warming, or will Jane stop citing Llovel et al. 2014, which depends on the globe warming? Or will he simply chug along without acknowledging this contradiction?

Will Jane ever support his accusation about GRACE with a link to whichever WUWT article he thinks supports his accusation? Or will he simply keep making that accusation with no evidence whatsoever?

Your math was fundamentally in error, in that you counted some radiated power twice... [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-11-25\]](#)

Completely backwards, as usual. In reality, Jane [didn't notice](#) that his electrical heating power halved when the enclosing shell was added, because Jane [counted](#) radiative power [twice](#).

... If your idea of the physics were correct, a heat source within a cavity of the same material would form a positive feedback loop and heat to infinity. Which of course is ridiculous. You never did adequately explain how your positive feedback could occur only **once**, and then stop. ... [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-11-25\]](#)

Good grief, not this nonsense again. I **never** described a positive feedback loop that occurred only **once**, then stopped. In fact, several months ago [I explained](#) that the equations I'm using account for an **infinite** series of reflections. But as [MIT explained](#), this infinite sum converges to a finite temperature.

Jane's never adequately explained why [Venus is hotter than Mercury](#). Is Venus hotter than Mercury because of CO<sub>2</sub>, [gray Oreos](#), or basketball player gloves?

... I don't give a damn if Postma is rude... **as long as his physics is sound**. Like me, he has had to deal with innumerable assaults by other rude people, who DON'T understand the physics. After a time, that does have an effect, and one gets to the point of having a short fuse. That's just human nature, when people are exposed to bullying and harassment for years on end. If people are bothered by his rudeness, and wonder what caused it, many of

them need only look in a mirror. I  
have little sympathy for them.

[\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-11-25\]](#)

I've had to deal with innumerable assaults by [rude people](#) who don't understand the physics, and then accuse me of being rude and insulting without evidence. Somehow, I've managed to avoid accusing them of being "complete and utter idiots" who are brain dead and hate themselves and everything else and go *far beyond* Nazism and want to murder people.

I cite Mr. Postma *because he understands the physics of the problem better than you do.* [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-11-25\]](#)

Actually, Jane's claiming that Mr. Postma understands the physics of the problem better than me, [Prof. Brown](#), [Dr. Joel Shore](#), 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.

That's quite an extraordinary claim, so it should be accompanied with extraordinary evidence. Or even just basic evidence like the very first simple equation necessary to solve the problem. Once again:

The fact that you insist that I provide you with something I already gave you, a long time ago and repeatedly, represents either a fundamental **failure** to understand on your part to understand the concept, or simple dishonesty.

[\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-11-21\]](#)

As I've repeatedly pointed out, you've never written down the very first energy conservation equation without wrongly "cancelling" terms. You've only provided this incorrect Sky Dragon Slayer equation:

My energy conservation equation  
is this: electrical power in =

$(\epsilon * \sigma) * T^4 * \text{area} =$   
 radiant power out [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-08\]](#)

No. Once again, that's absurd, Jane.

The fact that you insist that I  
 provide you with something I  
 already gave you, a long time ago  
 and repeatedly, represents either a  
 fundamental **failure** to understand  
 on your part to understand the  
 concept, or simple dishonesty.  
[\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-11-21\]](#)

A Dunning-Kruger victim would only consider  
 the possibility that professional physicists are  
 incompetent or dishonest. A real skeptic would  
**at least consider** the possibility that  
 professional physicists understand physics  
 better than they do, and that the physicists are  
 trying to point out a genuine fundamental flaw  
 in the skeptic's argument.

Here's how to use the principle of conservation  
 of energy. Draw 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

Since power in = power out through any  
 boundary where nothing inside is changing:

electrical heating power + radiative power in  
 from the chamber walls = radiative power out  
 from the heat source

Jane got the very first equation wrong, because  
 Jane refuses to write down an energy  
 conservation equation for a boundary around  
 the source without wrongly "cancelling" terms.  
 If he tried to do this **just once**, he'd realize that  
 electrical heating power depends on the cooler  
 chamber wall temperature.

This is all clearly too difficult for Jane, despite  
 the fact that this is the very first equation

necessary to solve this problem. Because Jane is so far out of his depth, I suggested that Jane ask a physicist he respects this simple question:

@ProfBrianCox, an electrically heated plate is in a vacuum chamber with cooler walls. Does heating power depend on the wall temperature?

If Jane were a real skeptic, he'd at least ask a physicist he respects this simple question. But Jane refuses. Why?

It's pretty clear that Jane refuses to ask this simple question because he's just scared Prof. Cox (or any other mainstream physicist) will say "yes", which would mean that Jane's entire calculation is wrong, from the very first 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 2014-11-27 0:51 ([#48472869](#))

Good grief, not this nonsense again. I never described a positive feedback loop that occurred only once, then stopped. In fact, several months ago I explained that the equations I'm using account for an infinite series of reflections. But as MIT explained, this infinite sum converges to a finite temperature.

As usual, you have your context scrambled again.

I was referring to your original "solution" to Spencer's problem, which you posted publicly on your website as a "refutation" of a comment of my own. Your explanation of how you

found that solution led directly to a positive feedback loop, which I mentioned to you at the time. That has been a couple of years now.

But you have never acknowledged your original error. Ever moving the goalposts, ever finding new "explanations" for how your "solution" somehow didn't ACTUALLY violate conservation of energy.

This is why I don't engage you on this. My comments are only for the edification of other readers. You and I have been over this many, many times now, and your repetition of your BAD PHYSICS isn't going to make it any more true.

It's pretty clear that Jane refuses to ask this simple question because he's just scared Prof. Cox (or any other mainstream physicist) will say "yes", which would mean that Jane's entire calculation is wrong, from the very first equation.

It should be **pretty clear** to anybody who has actually been following these exchanges that I'm just not playing your game. My solution was already demonstrated to be true, and your solution was already demonstrated to be false. I have no obligation -- or reason -- to engage in your game of "No, but you HAVE TO do it this way...". Especially when "mainstream physicists" and textbooks on the subject say I don't.

No, I don't have to do it according to your own ill-conceived notions. I already did it, my way... that is to say, the "mainstream physics" way.

Have a nice day. Or not.

[Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

■

■

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

by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2014-11-27 10:43  
([#48475067](#)) [Homepage](#) [Journal](#)

... I was referring to your original "solution" to Spencer's problem, which you posted publicly on your website as a "refutation" of a comment of my own. Your explanation of how you found that solution led directly to a positive feedback loop, which I mentioned to you at the time. That has been a couple of years now. ... [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-11-27\]](#)

Once again, [I explained](#) that the equations I'm using account for an **infinite** series of reflections. But as [MIT explained](#), this infinite sum converges to a finite temperature. If Jane thinks he's found a mistake in MIT's derivation, please let everyone know exactly where.

And Jane, that wasn't a couple of years ago. I [refuted](#) your Sky Dragon Slayer nonsense 3 months ago, not a couple of years ago. It probably just feels like years because you've been cussing and screaming and insisting you're right and I'm wrong for hundreds of pages. Seriously, look at the index at the top of that comment, [which has links](#) to this [never ending "conversation"](#) [LINK](#), [LINK](#), [LINK](#). [BACKUP 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9.](#)

But you have never acknowledged your original error. Ever moving the goalposts, ever finding new "explanations" for how your "solution" somehow didn't ACTUALLY violate conservation of energy. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-11-27\]](#)

Jane, have you ever considered the possibility that I didn't make an error, and that you simply

don't understand physics as well as professional physicists do? For instance, you screwed up the very first equation because you don't know how to apply conservation of energy to a boundary around the heated source. I've tried to show you how to derive that equation, but you've repeatedly refused. Why?

Furthermore, you won't even ask a physicist you respect if electrical heating power depends on the cooler chamber wall temperature. This would be even easier than writing down a single equation. Just ask Prof. Cox (or any other mainstream physicist) and their answer might finally help you see why your Sky Dragon Slayer equation violates conservation of energy.

... My solution was already demonstrated to be true, and your solution was already demonstrated to be false. I have no obligation -- or reason -- to engage in your game of "No, but you HAVE TO do it this way...". Especially when "mainstream physicists" and textbooks on the subject say I don't. No, I don't have to do it according to your own ill-conceived notions. I already did it, my way... that is to say, the "mainstream physics" way. ...

[\*\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-11-27\]\*](#)

No, Jane's repeatedly demonstrated that he's incapable of judging whether a solution violates conservation of energy, which is apparently an "ill-conceived notion". Furthermore, Jane's somehow convinced himself that his Sky Dragon Slayer nonsense is "mainstream physics" at the same time that he completely ignores [Prof. Grant Petty](#), [Prof. Brown](#), [Dr. Joel Shore](#), the [National Academies of Science](#), the [American Institute of Physics](#), the [American Physical Society](#), the [Australian Institute of Physics](#), and the [European Physical Society](#), and [many other](#) scientific societies.

Since Jane doesn't seem to think those societies understand mainstream physics, maybe Jane will listen to [Prof. Steve Carson](#) who also [tried to educate](#) a Sky Dragon Slayer. Notice that [his eqn 9](#) with negligibly similar areas is equivalent to my equation, not Jane's Sky Dragon Slayer equation. Again, that's because Jane's Sky Dragon Slayer equation violates conservation of energy: power in = power out through any boundary where nothing inside is changing.

Jane, don't you see how absurd it is for you to simultaneously insist that your Sky Dragon Slayer nonsense is "mainstream physics" while completely ignoring the fact that mainstream physicists are telling you the Sky Dragon Slayers are wrong? Doesn't that self-contradiction bother you even a little bit?

Riverat [said](#) Jane would need to actually witness the experiment to change his mind. After hundreds of pages of listening to Jane cuss and scream and endlessly insist that he's correct, I'm starting to agree with riverat. But I'm starting to doubt that Jane would even be convinced by an experiment performed right in front of him.

Jane, what would you do if you saw first-hand evidence that electrical heating power depends on the cooler chamber wall temperature? Would you admit that your Sky Dragon Slayer nonsense is wrong, and try to understand how to apply conservation of energy to a boundary around the heated source? Or would you just retreat to some other absurd evasion, and keep endlessly arguing that electrical heating power **doesn't** depend on the cooler chamber wall temperature?

[Parent Share](#)

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

■

■

[Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer](#)

**(Score:2)**by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2014-11-28 11:14  
([#48480369](#)) [Homepage](#) [Journal](#)

Oops, 4 months ago. Still not a couple of years.

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

■

■

**[Re:We've been doing it for a long time](#) (Score:2)**by [CrimsonAvenger \(580665\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#) on 2014-11-21 14:11 ([#48437297](#))

If the globe isn't warming, that must mean the oceans aren't warming because they're part of the globe. Is that the case, Jane?

If the house is getting warmer, that must mean that the refrigerator is getting warmer, since the 'frig is part of they house, right?

That's an example of an elementary fallacy that we call the "Does Not Follow" (that's a (semi-)literary reference - anyone remember from what?).

Do note that PART of the Earth warming in no way implies that ALL of the Earth is warming.

Likewise, PART of the Earth NOT warming in no way implies that ALL of the Earth is NOT warming.

--

*"I do not agree with what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it"*

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

■

■

**[Re:We've been doing it for a long time](#) (Score:0)**by Anonymous Coward on 2014-11-21 14:44 ([#48437511](#))

Since the oceans absorb ~90% of the heat trapped by our CO2 emissions, they're a much better measure of the global radiative imbalance than surface temperatures which only absorb ~2% of that heat.

[Parent Share](#)

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

■

■

### [Re:We've been doing it for a long time \(Score:2\)](#)

by [rogoshen1 \(2922505\)](#) [Alter Relationship](#) on 2014-11-21 13:51  
([#48437157](#))

what i don't get, is that we're taking something as fantastically fucking complex as the global climate -- and using a single variable to explain / model it. That seems mind boggling naive to me.

[Parent Share](#)

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

■

■

### [Re:We've been doing it for a long time \(Score:2\)](#)

by [Todd Palin \(1402501\)](#) [Alter Relationship](#) on 2014-11-21 14:45  
([#48437519](#))

Say what? Who uses a single variable to model/explain climate change? Maybe Fox News does, but really, nobody else does. The models are enormously complex, and they get more complex all the time. They include a full array of climate/meteorological data, plus ocean temperatures, ocean circulation, ocean pH, solar radiation, earth's albedo, vegetation patterns, and much more. Maybe you are the one that is naive.

[Parent Share](#)

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

■

■

### [Re:We've been doing it for a long time \(Score:2\)](#)

by [david\\_thornley \(598059\)](#) [Alter Relationship](#) on 2014-11-21

15:03 ([#48437667](#))

It's possible to explain it in a variety of ways, including simple and complex. It's entirely possible to explain atmospheric warming by listing one variable. Modeling is another matter, and all the halfway decent models have tons of variables.

--

"You can make a Slashdot signature quote seem authoritative by attributing it to a famous person" - Sun Tzu

[Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

■

■

### [Re:We've been doing it for a long time](#) (Score:1)

by [rochrist](#) (844809) [Alter Relationship](#) on 2014-11-22 9:43 ([#48440417](#))

This is an assertion that is beyond idiotic.

[Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

■

■

### [Re:We've been doing it for a long time](#) (Score:2)

by [rogoshen1](#) (2922505) [Alter Relationship](#) on 2014-11-22 13:18 ([#48441109](#))

don't be retarded and pedantic. when people discuss global warming the popular thing seems to be focusing in on carbon emissions. Not methane, not any of the other more potent greenhouse gasses, just CO2.

Clearly climate scientists have models with thousands (or more?) variables -- that is not what i was referring to. It's the Al Gore types of the world, or smug prius owners.

[Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

■

■

### [Re:We've been doing it for a long time](#) (Score:2)

by [davydagger \(2566757\)](#) [Alter Relationship](#) on 2014-11-22 15:15 ([#48441601](#))

is unfortunately the basis of how we debate politics in the USA, and explains why there is a giant glaring gap between what constitutes "facts", "reality", and "rationale thinking" in politics, that wouldn't hold water in any other field.

The way you argue politics is make one point, and when the opponnent can't come back with a rebuttal in one sentence, start making noises, call them a loser, and accuse them of bullshitting. Thats what Americans expect out of politicians.

[Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

■

■

### [Re:We've been doing it for a long time](#) (Score:0)

by Anonymous Coward on 2014-11-21 13:00 ([#48436757](#))

That wasn't known before we started.

[Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

■

■

### [Re:We've been doing it for a long time](#) (Score:2)

by [bill\\_mcgonigle \(4333\)](#) \* [Friend of a Friend](#) on 2014-11-21 12:59 ([#48436753](#))  
[Homepage](#) [Journal](#)

*The whole global warming scare made it abundantly obvious that the current state of science (plus politics) is incapable of intelligently managing the climate, or perhaps even managing it at all, much less intelligently.*

But, hey, look what Harvard Economists have done with engineering the economy! Can't we have some ivory tower academics "fixing" the planet too?

But seriously, an upper-bound projected sea level rise of 4 inches is [completely unprecedented](#), so we should seek to thwart the productive capacity of humanity, and whatever happens, **don't** put one tenth of that money into ensuring clean water for every human on Earth, eliminating malaria, or building fusion reactors. Where the regulatory victory in that?!

--

My God, it's Full of Source!

OUTSIDE\_IP=\$(dig +short my.ip @outsideip.net)

[Parent Share](#)

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

■

■

### [Re:We've been doing it for a long time \(Score:3\)](#)

by [riverat1 \(1048260\)](#) [Friend](#) on 2014-11-21 19:09 ([#48438683](#))

I don't know where you get your "upper-bound projected sea level rise of 4 inches". 4 feet by 2100 is more realistic. The last time CO2 levels were as high as they are now sea level was around 80 feet higher than now. It may be that that much rise is already baked in and it's just a matter of how long it takes to get there (don't worry, it's still a matter of many centuries at least).

[Parent Share](#)

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

■

■

### [Re:We've been doing it for a long time \(Score:2\)](#)

by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2014-11-21 19:57 ([#48438789](#)) [Homepage Journal](#)

He might have gotten his absurd "4 inches" projection from Jane Q. Public's ridiculous sea level rise lectures:

*"The U.S. National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), reported that even if the worst predictions of the CO2-based warming model were correct, the oceans would rise an estimated [4 inches](#) over the next hundred years."*

*"And yet NOAA, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, probably the most capable agency of its kind in the world, has itself released a paper stating that even if the global-warming alarmist's worst-case scenario were to happen, the oceans would rise an average of [four inches](#) worldwide over the next hundred years. Who should I believe, do you think?"*

[Parent Share](#)

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

■

■

### [Re: We've been doing it for a long time](#) (Score:2)

by [jklovanc \(1603149\)](#) [Alter Relationship](#) on 2014-11-21 13:09 ([#48436833](#))

Such as roundup-ready corn spreading in the wild, and passing some of its modified genes to other plants, when it wasn't supposed to.

Care to cite anything that supports this statement? All I can find is a [specific experiment with rice](#) where the GMO rice passed the gene to non-GMO weed rice. The fact that both are species of rice may mean that their pollen is compatible. I believe that is called cross pollination. Can you cite any research where GMO genes have jumped species? I do not believe there are any weed corn varieties so cross pollination can not occur.

[Parent](#) [Share](#)

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

■

●

[Slashdot](#)

Archived Discussion Moderate Moderator Help Delete

- [Get 312 More Comments](#)
- [Submit Story](#)

"The voters have spoken, the bastards..." -- unknown

- [FAQ](#)
- [Story Archive](#)
- [Hall of Fame](#)
- [Advertising](#)
- [Jobs](#)
- [Terms](#)
- [Privacy](#)
- [Cookies/Opt Out](#)
- [About](#)
- [Feedback](#)

●

Switch View to: [Mobile](#) [Mobile View](#)

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

[Close](#)

[Slashdot](#)

