This discussion has been archived.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

Denmark Makes Claim To North Pole, Based On Undersea Geography **163 More** **Prefs**

Denmark Makes Claim To North Pole, Based On Undersea Geography

Archived Discussion Load All Comments

28 Full 0 Abbreviated 0 Hidden

Comments Filter:

Score:

5
4
3
2
1

- All
- Insightful
- Informative
- Interesting
- Funny

The Fine Print: The following comments are owned by whoever posted them. We are not responsible for them in any way.
-1
163 More Prefs

No one gets the oil! (Score:1, Funny)

by Anonymous Coward

Problem solved. Now time for breakfast!

Re: (Score:4, Insightful)

by vawarayer (1035638) Alter Relationship
Very ironic that what makes oil available in the Arctic is global warming...

Re: (Score:0)

by Anonymous Coward

Actually it is plate tectonics.

Re: (Score:2)

by oh_my_080980980 (773867) Alter Relationship
Actually global warming. Easier access and higher oil prices make it financially profitable to drill in the Arctic.

›

Re:No one gets the oil! (Score:-1)

by Anonymous Coward on 2014-12-16 6:27 (#48608533)

No,no. Global cooling. Haven't you read the scientific papers from top agencies and researchers from the 70's. Sheesh

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Re:No one gets the oil! (Score:3)

by Rei (128717) FriendFriend of a Friend on 2014-12-16 6:29 (#48608547) Homepage

No, sorry, I've been too busy learning about archaeology from reading papers published in the 1800s and reading about how physics works by reading the works of the ancient Greeks.

--
It's not the 1990s, Slashdot; fix your unicode support. It's ridiculous that I can't type a thorn here.
Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Re:No one gets the oil! (Score:1)

by Anonymous Coward on 2014-12-16 6:50 (#48608679)

That's ridiculous. Archaeologists of the 1800s, ancient Greek physicists, and 1970s climate researchers were all ignorant, benighted, and backward. Today's scientists are correct.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Re:No one gets the oil! (Score:5, Insightful)

by itzly (3699663) Alter Relationship on 2014-12-16 7:26 (#48608915)
"When people thought the earth was flat, they were wrong. When people thought the earth was spherical, they were wrong. But if you think that thinking the earth is spherical is just as wrong as thinking the earth is flat, then your view is wronger than both of them put together." -- Asimov
Parent Share

twitter facebook linkedin

Re:No one gets the oil! (**Score:0**)

by Anonymous Coward on 2014-12-17 4:17 (#48615929)

"When people thought the earth was flat, they were wrong. When people thought the earth was spherical, they were wrong. But if you think that thinking the earth is spherical is just as wrong as thinking the earth is flat, then your view is wronger than both of them put together."

-- Asimov

Especially since it's really a hollow ball!

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Re:No one gets the oil! (**Score:2**)

by lgw (121541) Alter Relationship on 2014-12-16 7:56 (#48609143) Journal

Now now, Rei, don't exaggerate. US science education sucks, but most people are taught *Civil-War Era physics.* None of that relativity or quantum stuff that's over 100 years old now, of course, that's too scary, but we do an OK job of teaching 150-year-old science!

--
Slashdot Beta delenda est
Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Re:No one gets the oil! (**Score:3**)

by JDevers (83155) Alter Relationship on 2014-12-16 9:36 (#48610023)

Over 100 years old is a bit of a stretch, the foundation of modern quantum physics was laid mostly in the 1920s...so "nearly 100 years old" might be better.

Realistically though, the reason classical physics is the basic physical foundation laid for most students is simply that it is tremendously easier to understand and calculate and is basically "correct" for 99.999% of things people encounter in their real lives. Schools already teach far too many things which are somewhat useless later in life, why should most high school students be subjected to quantum mechanics when they don't even have the mathematical underpinnings to even come close to really understanding it.

In 100 years or so when we have the math and processing power to solve a five or six body gravity equation then maybe it can actually be taught to those who don't specialize in it, until then the classic approximation is pretty good for high school work.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

-
-

Re:No one gets the oil! (Score:2)

by lgw (121541) Alter Relationship on 2014-12-16 10:54 (#48610847) Journal

People don't encounter evolution in their daily lives either, excepting the Flu, but I find it rather important to teach (more stuff in that 100-150 window).

Relativity and QM are easy enough to teach qualitatively (and the math for SR for many examples is simple algebra). There's a host of people who don't believe either, who think modern physics is a hoax, because it contradicts the physics they were taught in school. We should really be teaching "an electron is not like a particle, nor like a wave, but behaves in it's own inimical way" in high school, along with the basics of relativity, so that people get

the sense that physics is *real,* that all this crazy stuff came from explaining experiments, that's it's not storytelling looking for proof!

--
Slashdot Beta delenda est
Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

-
-

Re:No one gets the oil! (Score:3)

by Rei (128717) FriendFriend of a Friend on 2014-12-16 14:33 (#48612739) Homepage

Macroscopic analogies help people envision what one's talking about, though. Saying "an electron does its own thing" doesn't really help people conceive just what that "thing" is.

I think the basic macroscopic analogy for particle/wave duality is to just go with the pilot wave theory and have them picture a boat bobbing along on a frictionless lake, where its wake is so powerful and so fast-responding that it steers the boat, and it never dies out - the boat creates the wake but is governed by it. There's even an experiment to visualize it involving bouncing a silicone droplet on a vibrating fluid bath, where you can even roughly reproduce a (non-quantized) version of the double slit experiment - the wake goes through both slits, then steers the droplet on the other side.

Of course, the analogy fails when you add quantum effects like virtual particles, uncertainty, etc....

--
It's not the 1990s, Slashdot; fix your unicode support. It's ridiculous that I can't type a thorn here.
Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

-

■

Re:No one gets the oil! (Score:2)

by turbidostato (878842) Alter Relationship on 2014-12-16 10:57 (#48610887)

"Over 100 years old is a bit of a stretch"

IParent is not specifically talking about quantum mechanics, just non-classic physics. Special Relativity paper comes from 1905 and the general one, 1915.

Classical physics can be pointed back to Newton: 1687.

"is basically "correct" for 99.999%"

It is not. It is utterly wrong. It just happens to throw the right numbers most of the time.

"until then the classic approximation is pretty good for high school work."

It is not. It would be much better to explain non-classical even without the maths (but two dimensional and statistical approach can be offered since the maths are in the curriculum) and throw the classic maths as what they are: a (very) useful approximation.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

■

■

Re:No one gets the oil! (Score:2)

by Jane Q. Public (1010737) Friend of a Friend on 2014-12-16 15:19 (#48613061)

It is not. It is utterly wrong. It just happens to throw the right numbers most of the time.

See the Asimov quote above from his Essay about "The Relativity of Wrong".

It isn't a matter of right or wrong. It is a matter of HOW right and HOW wrong.

Newtonian mechanics is **right enough** for most everyday living, as long as we don't have to explain how the LEDs in our TV or the lasers in our Blu-Ray players, or GPS work.

It's *right enough* to design and build a very nice modern car (*sans* certain electronic parts). Etc.

So no, it's not "utterly wrong". It's mostly right. It is only wrong at extreme ends of the scale... many decimal places, tiny increments of time, outrageous speeds, etc.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Re:No one gets the oil! (Score:2)

by turbidostato (878842) Alter Relationship on 2014-12-16 18:23 (#48614105)

"So no, it's not "utterly wrong"."

Yes, it is. Other ancient theories are crazily maddining wrong and certainly Newton's Principia is a shinning cathedral honoring the human intelligence but it still is utterly wrong.

Good you mention Asimov, since he was quite on the ontological path (against the pure mathematical path ala Dirac).

Now, forget about the numbers: it's about quality, not quantity. Newton thinks that there exists an absolute coordinate system and that things like mass, speed, length or time are therefore also absolute. Einstein demonstrates that he can't be any more wrong.

Ptolemy thought that the Earth is in the center of the universe and that objects in the sky

circle around it by means of a dance of composed circles (epycicles and deferents) and it offers a magnificent math that "it's mostly right with many decimal places" and his model is also a magnificent show of human ingenuity. The problem with ptolemaic astronomy are not the numbers -ptolemaic astronomy can offer very precise numbers; it is the axioms: the Earth is not even near to the center of the solar system and there's no specific reason for orbits to be exclusively based on circles, so it is not a matter of how good its numbes are, just like there's no absolute coordinate system as Newton thought, no matter how good his numbers are.

As I see it, it's not that it would be mindblowing for the students to understand the basics of relativity or quantum mechanics but a matter of laziness from the teachers to find the proper way to teach them instead of "doing it as it has always been done".

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Re:No one gets the oil! (Score:2)

by turbidostato (878842) Alter Relationship on 2014-12-16 18:32 (#48614137)

"It isn't a matter of right or wrong. It is a matter of HOW right and HOW wrong.

Newtonian mechanics is right enough for most everyday living"

Well, ptolemaic astronomy is right enough for most everyday living too, just as much as newtonian mechanics.

In fact, now that you told about forgetting GPS, you probably know that ptolemaic astronomy not only is good enough to navigate your way all around the world, by land, boat or

plane, but the way navigation is tought to pilots and ship captains *is* ptolemaic, not copernican, right?

Why we don't stop teaching about Copernicus, then?

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Re:No one gets the oil! (Score:2)

by david_thornley (598059) Alter Relationship on 2014-12-16 12:54 (#48611831)

Feel free to cite the actual scientific papers predicting global cooling, as opposed to media hype about some speculation at the time.

--
"You can make a Slashdot signature quote seem authoritative by attributing it to a famous person" - Sun Tzu
Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Re:No one gets the oil! (Score:2)

by Jane Q. Public (1010737) Friend of a Friend on 2014-12-16 15:34 (#48613183)
HERE are just a few of them. Not that not all of them are scientific papers but some are.

It is of interest to note, as does the article in the National Academy of Sciences publication *Science News*, which is linked to on that page, that despite the misleading information spread by RealClimate and other sources, the National Academy of Sciences itself was convinced enough of the "Global Cooling" scare to actually publish a call for immediate action (Science News, Jan. 25 1975, p. 52).

It is further amusing to note (again as evidenced on the linked page above) that climate scientists at EAU -- the same University that has been partly responsible for the warming scare -- were at

that time proclaiming that we were headed for an ice age.

I could go on but I won't. The idea that global cooling was "not taken seriously" by scientists of the time is nonsense propaganda spread by alarmist apologist sources such as RealClimate. The actual record of papers published and the reaction of the scientific world clearly shows that it was taken very seriously indeed.
Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

-

-

Re:No one gets the oil! (Score:2)

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-12-16 15:38 (#48613207)
Homepage Journal

You're regurgitating complete nonsense. Once again, here's figure 1 from Peterson et al. 2008. Notice that papers predicting warming vastly outnumbered those predicting cooling, even in the 1970s. Ironically:

- The term "global warming" was first used in a 1975 *Science* article by Wally Broecker called *"Are we on the brink of a pronounced global warming?"*.
- Sawyer 1972 estimated climate sensitivity as 2.4C, and Schneider 1975 gave a preliminary range of 1.5C to 3.0C.
- Manabe and Wetherald, 1975: "The Effects of Doubling the CO2 Concentration on the climate of a General Circulation Model."
- In 1977, Freeman Dyson wrote that the "prevailing opinion is that the dangers [of the rise in CO2] greatly outweigh the benefits."
- In 1977, Robert M. White, the head of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, wrote a report for the National Academy of Sciences that said *"We now understand that industrial wastes, such as the carbon dioxide released in the burning of fossil fuels, can have consequences for climate that pose a considerable risk to future society."* [White, Robert, 1978, Oceans and Climate Introduction, Oceanus, 21:2-3]
- The 1979 JASON report "The long-term impact of atmospheric carbon dioxide on climate" estimated climate sensitivity as 2.4C to 2.8C.
- The National Academy of Science's 1979 Charney

> report estimated climate sensitivity as 1.5C to 4.5C and said *"If carbon dioxide continues to increase, [we] find no reason to doubt that climate changes will result, and no reason to believe that these changes will be negligible."*

While Jane is reading those papers, 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 * 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

-
-

Re:No one gets the oil! (Score:3)

by Jane Q. Public (1010737) Friend of a Friend on 2014-12-16 16:13 (#48613427)

You're regurgitating complete [time.com] nonsense [archive.is].

No, I was not. Once again, you misrepresent my words.

Nowhere above did I write that "a majority of papers" supported global cooling. I merely pointed out the established **truth** that it was taken seriously. And again: the cited announcement by National Academy of Sciences is not "nonsense". It, too, is real.

Stop misrepresenting my words, then making straw-man arguments against me. That is dishonest. I have mentioned this to you many times before. Learn how to make an honest argument, or go the hell away.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

-
-

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

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-12-16 17:37 (#48613877) Homepage Journal

> ... the National Academy of Sciences itself was convinced enough of the "Global Cooling" scare to actually publish a call for immediate action (Science News, Jan. 25 1975, p. 52). ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-12-16]***
>
> I merely pointed out the established **truth** that it was taken seriously. And again: the cited announcement by National Academy of Sciences is not "nonsense". It, too, is real. ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-12-16]***

You linked to a blog and claimed it linked to an announcement in Science News, Jan. 25 1975, p. 52. But the blog you linked has two "Science News" links which lead here and here. Neither of those links lead to Science News, Jan. 25 1975, p. 52. Could you please post the link to Science News, Jan. 25 1975, p. 52?

While Jane looks for that link, he should also consider addressing this issue with his basic thermodynamics:

> > 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:
>
> NO!!!!! As I have explained to you innumerable times now, you can also consider your heat source, by itself, that "sphere". The only NET radiative power out comes from the electrical power in. Further, the cooler walls do not

> contribute any of that NET power out. That's what net means. ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-12-16]***

As I suspected, Jane disputes the definition of the word "net". Jane didn't get his nonsensical definition from any of his textbooks, because in physics, net power through a boundary around the source = "radiative power out" minus "radiative power in".

That's what net means. But after it became clear that Jane is hopelessly confused about the very term "NET" which he keeps capitalizing, I explained conservation of energy in a way that didn't require using that troublesome word. 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

Notice that this equation is equivalent to the equation Jane just described, but only if Jane uses the physics definition of the word "net". And in order to derive it, I didn't even have to use that word which has Jane hopelessly confused. All I had to use was conservation of energy.

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 2014-12-16 19:12 (#48614311)

You linked to a blog and claimed it linked to an announcement in Science News

I did not. Try reading again.

I wrote that the article linked to on that page **mentioned** the announcement, references in Jan. 25 Science News. And it does; you can read it right there.

As for the **mentioned** announcement it is in THIS issue of Science News, in the article *"NAS Warning On Climate Changes"*. Exactly as **mentioned** in the "Chilling Possibilities" article that is linked to in the page that I originally linked to, and EXACTLY as I stated it.

The *"NAS Warning On Climate Changes"* article itself is behind a paywall. If it weren't, I would have linked to it directly.

So I repeat: CEASE misrepresenting my words. I wrote exactly what I intended to write, and what I wrote has been demonstrated to be true.

Your distorted and inaccurate **interpretation** was not what I actually wrote, and I will thank you to stop doing that, once and for all. You have been warned many times.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

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

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-12-16 20:43 (#48614679) Homepage Journal

Feel free to cite the actual scientific

>> papers predicting global cooling, as opposed to media hype about some speculation at the time. ***[david_thornley]***
>
> ... the National Academy of Sciences itself was convinced enough of the "Global Cooling" scare to actually publish a call for immediate action (Science News, Jan. 25 1975, p. 52). ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-12-16]***
>
> As for the **mentioned** announcement it is in THIS issue of Science News, in the article *"NAS Warning On Climate Changes"*. Exactly as **mentioned** in the "Chilling Possibilities" article that is linked to in the page that I originally linked to, and EXACTLY as I stated it. The *"NAS Warning On Climate Changes"* article itself is behind a paywall. If it weren't, I would have linked to it directly. ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-12-16]***

Okay, so you read a blog which linked to an article which mentioned an announcement by the NAS. Then you responded to David Thornley's request for actual scientific papers predicting global cooling by saying "the NAS was convinced enough of the "Global Cooling" scare to actually publish a call for immediate action."

Did you ever think it might be educational to actually **read** that NAS report first-hand rather than relying on third-hand interpretations of interpretations? If you did, you'd discover that the 1975 NAS report (PDF) "Understanding Climate Change: A Program for Action" **doesn't** predict global cooling. Quite the opposite! Read their words:

"Of the two forms of pollution, the carbon dioxide increase is probably the more influential at the present time in changing temperatures near the earth's surface (Mitchell, 1973a)."

"The corresponding changes of mean atmospheric temperature due to CO2 [as calculated by Manabe (1971) on the assumption of constant relative humidity and fixed cloudiness] are about 0.3C per 10 percent change of CO2 and appear capable of accounting for only a fraction of the observed warming of the earth between 1880 and 1940. They could, however, conceivably aggregate to a further warming of about 0.5C between now and the end of the century."

How ironic! Instead of predicting global cooling, the NAS actually predicted "about 0.5C" of CO2-based warming between 1975 and 2000. To see how their prediction fared, let's plot HadCRUT4 over that timespan. The raw data shows warming of 0.47C from 1975 to 2000, which rounds up to 0.5C.

So that 1975 NAS report wasn't predicting global cooling! Its **warming** prediction was actually fairly accurate, and was certainly within the statistical uncertainties.

Again, that's probably why the National Academy of Science's 1979 Charney report estimated climate sensitivity as 1.5C to 4.5C and said *"If carbon dioxide continues to increase, [we] find no reason to doubt that climate changes will result, and no reason to believe that these changes will be negligible."*

While Jane tries to explain why that NAS report predicting about 0.5C of CO2-based warming by 2000 was actually predicting global cooling, he should also consider addressing this issue with his basic thermodynamics:

> 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:
>
> NO!!!!! As I have explained to you innumerable times now, you can also consider your heat source, by itself, that "sphere". The only NET radiative power out comes from the electrical power in. Further, the cooler walls do not contribute any of that NET power out. That's what net means. ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-12-16]***

As I suspected, Jane disputes the definition of the word "net". Jane didn't get his nonsensical definition from any of his textbooks, because in physics, net radiative power through a boundary around the source = "radiative power out" minus "radiative power in".

That's what net means. But after it became clear that Jane is hopelessly confused about the very term "NET" which he keeps capitalizing, I explained conservation of energy in a way that didn't require using that troublesome word. 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

Notice that this equation is equivalent to the equation Jane just described, but only if Jane uses the physics definition of the word "net". And in order to derive it, I didn't even have to use that word which has Jane hopelessly

confused. All I had to use was conservation of energy.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

-

-

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

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-12-21 18:24 (#48649809) Homepage Journal

Jane's "interest" in that NAS report evaporated after I showed that Jane had been fooled by "Steven Goddard" once again. So let's return to Jane's confusion about basic thermodynamics.

> > 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:
>
> NO!!!!! As I have explained to you innumerable times now, you can also consider your heat source, by itself, that "sphere". The only NET radiative power out comes from the electrical power in. Further, the cooler walls do not contribute any of that NET power out. That's what net means. ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-12-16]***

I've already pointed out that Jane's hopelessly confused about the word "net", but that's just one of the mistakes Jane packed into these few sentences.

Jane's also wrong to imply that energy conservation across one choice of boundary

could somehow contradict energy conservation across another boundary choice. That's impossible. Many boundary choices are **inconvenient** but they all have to be **consistent**. Otherwise, how could we possibly tell which boundary choice was correct?

So Jane can't object to the simple energy conservation equation I derived by claiming that some other boundary choice would somehow contradict my equation. That's completely impossible, and if Jane doesn't understand that point then he should learn about conservation of energy: example (backup), example (backup), example (backup).

As you can tell after reading those introductions, here's how to apply 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

I put the boundary **around** the heat source so the boundary is in vacuum. That's because radiation can't travel through opaque solids like the heat source. So the only way to obtain an energy conservation equation with radiative terms is to place the boundary **around** the heat source.

For example, I calculated the enclosing shell's inner temperature by drawing the boundary **within** the enclosing shell. This boundary was inside aluminum, so heat transfer through it was by thermal conduction, not radiation. Notice that even this boundary choice leads to a conduction equation where electrical heating

power depends on the cooler chamber wall temperature. That's because all boundary choices have to be consistent. They **can't** contradict each other unless one of them is wrong.

After I asked Jane to explain exactly where his boundary would be drawn, Jane replied:

> ... You can draw the boundary right around the heat source. Electric power comes in, radiative power goes out. There is no contradiction, and no inconsistency. ... ***[Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-15]***

Nonsense. I've repeatedly explained that my boundary is drawn **around** the heat source, so it's in vacuum and therefore contains radiative terms both for radiation going out **and** radiation going in.

Choosing to put the boundary somewhere else, like inside the heat source, leads to an energy conservation equation with conduction rather than radiative terms. But even those conduction equations agree that electrical heating power depends on the cooler chamber wall temperature. They can't contradict each other. Putting the boundary somewhere else might be inconvenient, but it couldn't possibly contradict the fact that electrical heating power depends on the cooler chamber wall temperature.

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

Once again, Jane's wrong. There is literally **no choice** of boundary which will lead to his absurd equation. Once again, it really sounds like Jane opened a textbook and found "radiative power out per square meter = (e*s)*T^4" and simply assumed that "radiative power out" is just a fancy way of saying

"electrical heating power".

At least, that's the most charitable explanation. Once again, I'm trying to rule out less charitable explanations like the disturbing possibility that Jane isn't honestly confused about basic thermodynamics. Maybe Jane/Lonny Eachus has simply betrayed humanity by deliberately spreading civilization-paralyzing misinformation.

Jane/Lonny Eachus could help convince posterity that he was just honestly confused by thinking carefully about conservation of energy, explaining exactly where his boundary lies, and **carefully** listing **all** the power going in **and out** of that boundary.

Or Jane/Lonny Eachus could help convince posterity that he's betrayed humanity by continuing to spread civilization-paralyzing misinformation.

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

-

-

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

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-12-26 10:25 (#48676301) Homepage Journal
Sadly, Jane/Lonny Eachus repeatedly chooses the second option. Once again.
Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

-

-

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

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-12-29 10:06 (#48690713) Homepage Journal
Jane/Lonny Eachus keeps lecturing about

physics.
Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Re:No one gets the oil! (Score:2)

by khayman80 (824400) on 2014-12-16 15:35 (#48613187) Homepage Journal

> No,no. Global cooling. Haven't you read the scientific papers from top agencies and researchers from the 70's. Sheesh

You're regurgitating complete nonsense. Once again, here's figure 1 from Peterson et al. 2008. Notice that papers predicting warming vastly outnumbered those predicting cooling, even in the 1970s. Ironically:

- The term "global warming" was first used in a 1975 *Science* article by Wally Broecker called *"Are we on the brink of a pronounced global warming?"*.
- Sawyer 1972 estimated climate sensitivity as 2.4C, and Schneider 1975 gave a preliminary range of 1.5C to 3.0C.
- Manabe and Wetherald, 1975: "The Effects of Doubling the CO2 Concentration on the climate of a General Circulation Model."
- In 1977, Freeman Dyson wrote that the "prevailing opinion is that the dangers [of the rise in CO2] greatly outweigh the benefits."
- In 1977, Robert M. White, the head of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, wrote a report for the National Academy of Sciences that said *"We now understand that industrial wastes, such as the carbon dioxide released in the burning of fossil fuels, can have consequences for climate that pose a considerable risk to future society."* [White, Robert, 1978, Oceans and Climate Introduction, Oceanus, 21:2-3]
- The 1979 JASON report "The long-term impact of atmospheric carbon dioxide on climate" estimated climate sensitivity as 2.4C to 2.8C.
- The National Academy of Science's 1979 Charney report estimated climate sensitivity as 1.5C to 4.5C and said *"If carbon dioxide continues to increase, [we] find no reason to doubt that climate changes will result, and no reason to believe that these changes will be negligible."*

Parent Share
twitter facebook linkedin

Slashdot

Archived Discussion Moderate Moderator Help Delete

- Get 163 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

Close

Slashdot