

[Slashdot](#)

[Stories](#)

[Slash Boxes](#)

[Comments](#)

Search

[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This discussion has been archived.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.

[The Shale Boom Won't Stop Climate Change; It Could Make It Worse](#) [392 More](#) [Prefs](#)

[The Shale Boom Won't Stop Climate Change; It Could Make It Worse](#)

Archived Discussion

[Load All Comments](#)

[Full](#) [Abbreviated](#) [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

[392](#) [More Prefs](#)

[More cooling, then?](#) (Score:0, Insightful)

by Anonymous Coward

So, will we have 36 years of no warming instead of only 18?

-
-
- ›

[Re:More cooling, then?](#) (Score:0, Flamebait)

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#) on 2014-12-14 3:03 ([#48592879](#))

I'm getting plain fed up with all these cockamamie "CO2-based disaster" predictions. It's nothing but speculation run amok, and all the more baneful because it's politically- and money-driven.

Fact: we have no real, objective evidence that CO2 is going to cause us any real problems.

The scientific evidence has been stacking up against the idea for at least 10 years. It isn't happening, it isn't going to happen. And even if it did, it would probably benefit us more than hurt us.

[Parent Share](#)

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

■

■

[Re:More cooling, then?](#) (Score:2, Insightful)

by [danbert8 \(1024253\)](#) [Alter Relationship](#) on 2014-12-14 6:38 ([#48593367](#))

This would get modded flamebait. Warmer periods in earth's history have been more life prolific. I have yet to see studies seriously listing benefits of a warmer climate and actually comparing that to any negatives. It's all catastrophe and death. Because if heaven forbid we might benefit from it, there's no reason to tax or subsidize things, which appears to be the end goal of climate research, to engage social change.

--

Yes it's an anecdote! Were you expecting original research in a Slashdot comment?

[Parent Share](#)

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

■

■

Re:More cooling, then? (Score:3)

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#) on 2014-12-14 21:30 ([#48598395](#))

I have yet to see studies seriously listing benefits of a warmer climate and actually comparing that to any negatives.

<http://web.stanford.edu/~moore...>

I found that in 30 seconds. Why couldn't you?

I have little doubt that if I spent more time, I could find many more.

The actual fact is that for all of history, more deaths attributable to climate have been due to cold rather than warm. This is a statistic that is also just about as easy to find.

[Parent Share](#)

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

■

■

Re:More cooling, then? (Score:4, Informative)

by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2014-12-14 13:41 ([#48595863](#)) [Homepage](#) [Journal](#)

I'm getting plain fed up with all these cockamamie "CO2-based disaster" predictions. It's nothing but speculation run amok, and all the more baneful because it's politically- and money-driven. Fact: we have no real, objective evidence that CO2 is going to cause us any real problems. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-12-14\]](#)

Really? Then why did over a dozen national science academies say with one voice that "the need for urgent action to address climate change is now [indisputable](#)"?

The scientific evidence has been stacking up against the idea for at least 10 years. It isn't happening, it isn't going to happen. And even if it did, it would probably benefit us more than hurt us. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-12-14\]](#)

Even if CO2 causes us real problems, it would probably benefit us more than hurt us? Really? In 2014, the U.S. National Academy of Sciences and The Royal Society (U.K.) wrote a [joint publication](#) ([PDF](#)).

Here's another [2014 publication](#) by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, which publishes the journal *Science*.

Those scientific reports don't agree with Jane, nor do statements made by [all these](#) large scientific societies.

[Parent Share](#)

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

■

■

[Re:More cooling, then?](#) (Score:0)

by [jbp1 \(1179795\)](#) [Alter Relationship](#) on 2014-12-14 17:56 ([#48597203](#))

hahahaha bunch of alarmist, tree-hugging, social justice warriors.

<http://clivebest.com/blog/?p=5...> so as per mr best, there's another explanation and it actually makes a lot more scientific sense than mr mann. Oh and the anthropomorphic constant (Ac) in that Best equation = 0 or, try this for an even better idea of what is going to happen: <http://clivebest.com/blog/?p=2...> plus he has several other explanations, Ac = 0 for those also.

[Parent Share](#)

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

■

■

[Re:More cooling, then?](#) (Score:0)

by Anonymous Coward on 2014-12-14 18:24 ([#48597333](#))

Is the anthropomorphic constant sad or happy?

[Parent Share](#)

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

■

■

[Re:More cooling, then?](#) (Score:3)

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#) on 2014-12-14 21:36 ([#48598413](#))

Really? Then why did over a dozen national science academies say with one voice that "the need for urgent action to address climate change is now indisputable [nationalacademies.org]"?

I wrote "evidence", doofus. You do know what "evidence" means, yes? A public statement by an organization is not evidence. It's an opinion.

I am well aware that organizations have been making such public statements. But that isn't evidence. If you have actual, direct evidence, why did you not link to THAT, rather than somebody else's claim? But then I know why you didn't: you have shown yourself to be the Prince of straw-man arguments.

I am not in a position to answer "why" they might have done so. But the fact that they did is not itself evidence of anything. Consensus is not science.

[Parent Share](#)

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

■

■

[Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer \(Score:3\)](#)

by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2014-12-14 22:04 ([#48598567](#)) [Homepage](#) [Journal](#)

If you have actual, direct evidence, why did you not link to THAT, rather than somebody else's claim? [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-12-14\]](#)

I linked to reviews of actual, direct evidence by the U.S. National Academy of Sciences and The Royal Society (U.K.) in their [joint publication \(PDF\)](#), and another [review](#) of evidence by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, which publishes the journal *Science*.

While Jane is reading those reviews, he should also consider addressing this issue with his basic thermodynamics:

Your own insistence that power in = power out (assuming perfect conversion and no entropic losses) belies this argument. You are arguing against yourself and you refuse to see that. If power in = power out (your own stipulation) ... [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-12-14\]](#)

I'm not the only one insisting that power in = power out through any boundary where nothing inside is changing. [Once again](#), that's a fundamental principle called "conservation of energy". Here are some introductions: [example \(backup\)](#), [example \(backup\)](#), [example \(backup\)](#).

As you can tell, conservation of energy is a fundamental physics principle. Assumptions of "perfect conversion and no entropic losses" aren't applicable, and anyone who mistakenly thinks they are should read through those examples to learn about conservation of energy.

If power in = power out (your own stipulation), and the only NET power INTO a defined spherical region is electrical, and the only NET power OUT of that region is radiative, then net radiative power out **at steady-state** must therefore be equal to the net electrical power consumed. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-12-14\]](#)

Jane seems to be saying that at steady-state:

net electrical power consumed = net radiative power out

But net radiative power out of a boundary around the source = "radiative power out" minus "radiative power in", so the equation Jane just described also says:

net electrical power consumed = "radiative power out" minus "radiative power in"

However, this new equation doesn't match Jane's earlier equation:

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

Notice that Jane's earlier equation doesn't describe net radiative power out, which is why it violates conservation of energy. Is Jane retracting his earlier incorrect equation, or does Jane dispute the definition of the word "net"?

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

■

•

[Slashdot](#)

Archived Discussion Moderate Moderator Help Delete

- [Get 392 More Comments](#)
- [Submit Story](#)

When in doubt, mumble; when in trouble, delegate; when in charge, ponder. -- James H. Boren

- [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](#)