

[Slashdot](#)
[Stories](#)
[Slash Boxes](#)
[Comments](#)

Search

[Deals new](#) [SlashTV](#) [Jobs](#) [Newsletter](#) [Submit](#) [khayman80 ▾](#) [Log out](#)

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

[Slashdot](#)

-
- [Build](#)
- [Devices new](#)
- [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This discussion has been archived.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.

[Michael Mann: Swiftboating Comes To Science](#) [780 More Prefs](#)

[Michael Mann: Swiftboating Comes To Science](#)

Archived Discussion [Load 500 More Comments](#)

6 Full 0 Abbreviated 0 Hidden

Comments Filter:

Score:

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

0

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

[780 More Prefs](#)

•

[Not sure why we'd listen to Michael Mann](#) (Score:5, Funny)

by [93 Escort Wagon \(326346\)](#) [Alter Relationship](#)

Starsky and Hutch and *Crime Story* didn't really have much to do with climate change - but I did like the Del Shannon theme song he used on the latter.

--

THANK YOU, Edward Snowden, for courageously doing what was right!

○

○

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

by [hedleyroos \(817147\)](#) [Alter Relationship](#)

Heat is the one about climate change.

■

■

›

[Re:Not sure why we'd listen to Michael Mann \(Score:2\)](#)

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#) on 2015-01-11 11:35 ([#48788479](#))

No, I'm pretty sure it was *Much Ado About Nothing*.

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

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

■

■

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

by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2015-01-12 9:17 ([#48794131](#)) [Homepage](#) [Journal](#)

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!!!!!! .. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-12-16\]](#)

After Jane emphatically rejected the [standard physics definition](#) of the term "net", it became clear that Jane is hopelessly confused about the term "net". Sadly, this is typical for Jane/Lonny Eachus and other [climate contrarians](#).

After it [became clear](#) that Jane is hopelessly confused about the very term "net" which he keeps screaming in ALL CAPS, I [explained](#) conservation of energy in a way that didn't require using that troublesome word. At this point, a real skeptic would either try to address this disagreement about a fundamental definition, or [agree to disagree](#) about the definition and solve the problem like I did without using the disputed word. But not Jane/Lonny Eachus:

.. No NET incoming radiation from cooler bodies is absorbed, therefore no NET radiation is crossing your boundary FROM those cooler bodies. It comes in and goes right back out. .. no NET cooler radiation is absorbed in the first place.. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-01-01\]](#)

Instead, Jane kept repeatedly screaming "NET" in ALL CAPS, completely ignoring the fact that his emphatic rejection of its standard physics definition reduces his rant to gibberish. Jane/Lonny Eachus also ignored me after [I asked him](#) simple questions about the definition of the word "net", so there doesn't seem to be any way to correct Jane's fundamental misconception.

I try to be tolerant of those who appear to suffer from Dunning-Kruger Syndrome, but one can only be so patient. :o) [\[Lonny Eachus, 2015-01-09\]](#)

Jane/Lonny tries to be tolerant of those he thinks suffer from Dunning-Kruger syndrome, but only if "tolerant" includes endless [cussing and screaming](#) garnished with [ball washing](#) fantasies. If Jane/Lonny wonders what a Dunning-Kruger victim looks like, he need only look in a mirror:

.. I'm really not sorry to say this after your past behavior, but showing you're wrong is just plain dirt simple. And not JUST wrong, but so ridiculously wrong that I can (and will, believe me!) use it as entertainment for certain of my friends. .. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-02\]](#)

.. It feels as though I'm explaining to a high-school student who has never seen a physics problem before. .. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-04\]](#)

I keep finding myself in a position where I feel I should explain, but I am at a loss as to why I should have to, because I am discussing this with someone who is supposed to have been a physics major. .. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-04\]](#)

.. You could not NOT understand it, unless you are 100% clueless about what the term NET means. .. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-01\]](#)

.. you fucking moron. .. outright lies .. your dishonest bullshit. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-03\]](#)

.. I'm not even going to bother answering the rest of your blather. Because your whole argument was PUT to rest weeks ago and your failure to understand that (or at least admit it) is rather like a zombie which hasn't quite realized it is dead yet. I repeat: I have documented this all. I have the reputable and credible (and MAINSTREAM, "ACCEPTED") references which show you to be wrong. For a while I thought explaining this in different ways would show you that you were wrong. But over time, I have come to accept that you simply won't admit it, no matter what. That's too bad, because I had really hoped you would listen to the actual accepted SCIENCE behind this, and further accept that it was right and you were wrong. I no longer hold any such hope. I have myself come to accept that you are either a religious zealot, or a self-interested liar. And I very seriously doubt that you were ever actually a physicist. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-05\]](#)

.. That isn't even misunderstanding, it's just a lie. You HAVE TO understand this by now. You don't understand what NET means. **That is your failure, not mine.** .. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-12-16\]](#)

[Once again](#), 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. On the other hand, a Dunning-Kruger victim would only consider the possibility that professional physicists are lying, or 100% clueless about the definition of basic physics terms. In the most extreme cases, Dunning-Kruger victims with [associates degrees](#) in [web development](#) might spend hundreds of pages wrongly lecturing professional physicists about the definition of basic physics terms.

Apparently Jane/Lonny's purpose in life is to serve as a warning to others.

.. You are counting the radiation from the cooler body twice. Or, conversely, neglecting to account for its (NET) failure to be absorbed by the warmer body, and therefore exiting your sphere without being absorbed. .. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-01-01\]](#)

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](#).

In contrast, anyone can see that [my derivation](#) only counts radiation from the cooler body **once**.

I've [repeatedly failed](#) to explain that graybody equations have to reduce to blackbody equations where **all** incoming radiation is absorbed, not reflected.

.. Either way, you don't get to do that. It's bad math, and it's a violation of the First and Second Laws of Thermodynamics. .. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-01-01\]](#)

Good grief. For months, I've repeatedly explained that Jane's Sky Dragon Slayer equation violates conservation of energy. I've [repeatedly asked](#) Jane to write down an energy conservation equation for a boundary around the source without wrongly "cancelling" terms. Jane/Lonny Eachus adamantly refuses to take the very first step in applying the first law of thermodynamics to this problem, but as usual he's willing to endlessly insist that he's right.

Also for months, I've tried to [explain](#) to Jane/Lonny Eachus that his Sky Dragon Slayer "second law" argument is nonsense. Once again, the second law would only be violated if more power is radiated from cold to hot than vice-versa. Anyone can look at [my derivation](#) and verify that radiative power in from the chamber walls < radiative power out from the heat source, as long as $T_c < T_h$. Since this is always true, the second law is satisfied. And yet Jane/Lonny Eachus keeps wrongly insisting that my equation (which represents mainstream physics) somehow violates the second law of thermodynamics. It's hard to keep pretending that Jane/Lonny is just honestly confused about such basic physics. It seems like that level of confusion would make it difficult for Jane/Lonny to tie his own shoelaces or type English sentences.

.. I do not deny that there may be a greenhouse effect of some sort, but if there is, it doesn't work via the simple back-radiation mechanism that is usually given as the explanation. That explanation violates the Second Law of Thermodynamics. .. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-12-07\]](#)

That's the Sky Dragon Slayer chant. Slayers don't deny physics which haven't been discovered. How charitable of them! Slayers like Jane/Lonny Eachus just deny conservation of energy, both as applied to the greenhouse effect and to a simple vacuum chamber thought experiment. No matter how many times Slayers are told that the second law of thermodynamics isn't violated because more power is radiated from hot to cold than vice-versa, that fact never seems to penetrate their skulls. More disturbingly, Slayers might be perfectly aware of how ridiculous their mistake is, but they just want to confuse **other** people.

.. [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". .. [\[khayman80, 2014-12-29\]](#)

The equation for radiative power output of a gray body in vacuum is as I stated long ago. .. the equation for the radiative power output of a warmer body in the presence of cooler bodies does not depend on those cooler bodies. There is not even a variable for it in the equation. I repeat for the hundredth time: the radiative power output is related ONLY on the Stefan-Boltzmann equation $\sigma*\epsilon(T^4)$. Nothing else is required. The equation is the same in the presence of cooler bodies as it is in the presence of no other bodies at all. .. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-01-01\]](#)

That's exactly what I suspected. Jane/Lonny Eachus still doesn't understand the difference between "radiative power out" and "electrical heating power", and doesn't even try to justify equating them.

I've [repeatedly failed](#) to communicate that I agree radiative power out is a function of emissivity and temperature only. Once again, I'm just saying that "radiative power out" is different than "electrical heating power".

.. The equation for radiative power output of a gray body in vacuum is as I stated long ago. .. The proper equation for radiative power out DOES NOT INCLUDE that cooler incoming radiation.. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-01-01\]](#)

Once again, radiative power out is different than electrical heating power. For instance, electrical heating power goes to zero when the chamber walls are also at 150F, but radiative power out stays constant because it only requires the Stefan-Boltzmann equation.

But Jane and other Slayers seem to have confused two fundamental concepts, otherwise Jane wouldn't insist that this difference is a ["red herring"](#). Or maybe Jane/Lonny Eachus really **does** understand this simple difference, and just wants to confuse other people.

.. Any textbook on radiative energy transfer will tell you this. As I have said before, I have 3

of them here which all disagree with you, and I haven't even bothered to check the 4th. I already knew the answer before checking the first 3. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-01-01\]](#)

[Once again](#), Jane has 4 textbooks that say "radiative power out per square meter = $(\epsilon \cdot s) \cdot T^4$ ". Since I've repeatedly agreed with that statement, those textbooks don't disagree with me.

[Once again](#), Jane/Lonny Eachus just has 4 textbooks that say "radiative power out = $(\epsilon \cdot s \cdot \sigma) \cdot T^4 \cdot \text{area}$ ". I bet Jane \$100 that his textbooks **don't** claim that electrical heating power = radiative power out. That's Jane's incorrect Slayer assumption. Even Jane should be able to recognize that his 4 unnamed textbooks don't support him, because deep down even Jane should be able to tell that he's just endlessly blustering to cover up the fact that he can't produce any textbook quotes saying that electrical heating power = radiative power out.

.. You are wrong. You were proved wrong long ago. GO AWAY and stop bothering me with your nonsense. .. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-12-16\]](#)

.. you lost that argument a long time ago. I am not going to re-argue it with you. .. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-01-01\]](#)

Jane's already [proclaimed](#) that I'd "lost" years before I even debunked his Sky Dragon Slayer nonsense. Unilaterally proclaiming victory **years** before hearing someone's argument probably isn't a great way of convincing posterity that Jane/Lonny Eachus is a real skeptic who's merely confused about basic physics. But it might convince posterity that Jane/Lonny Eachus has betrayed humanity by deliberately spreading civilization-paralyzing misinformation.

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.

Utter nonsense. They are perfectly applicable in the kind of THOUGHT EXPERIMENT we were discussing, which is the ONLY context relevant to this discussion. Your own equations were proof of this.. nowhere did you factor in conversion inefficiencies. NOT ONCE. Stop being a goddamned hypocrite, and go away. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-12-16\]](#)

Again, I didn't factor in conversion inefficiencies because they're not applicable. Power in = power out through any boundary where nothing inside is changing. I've [already explained this to you](#) the last time you brought up efficiency. It just doesn't matter. Assume whatever inefficiency you want. It doesn't matter. Power in still equals power out through any boundary where nothing inside is changing, regardless of efficiencies. Do you see that caveat anywhere in these examples? [example \(backup\)](#), [example \(backup\)](#), [example \(backup\)](#).

It's especially ironic that Jane/Lonny Eachus accuses me of being a "goddamned hypocrite", but nowhere did Jane factor in conversion inefficiencies. NOT ONCE.

He also knows that the Venus argument is a prime example of circular reasoning: greenhouse gas theory says that is the reason Venus is hot, therefore Venus proves greenhouse gas theory on Earth. It's a ludicrous argument. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-12-07\]](#)

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

Sadly, neither Jane nor any of the [Slayers at WUWT](#) would answer this question: would Venus have the same surface temperature if its atmosphere were pure nitrogen, which isn't a greenhouse gas?

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

■

■

Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer (Score:2)by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2015-01-12 9:30 ([#48794321](#)) [Homepage](#) [Journal](#)

.. The experiment we were discussing was Spencer's radiation experiment. Not "global warming". You keep trying to apply my arguments about Spencer's challenge to the broader issue of global warming, aka "climate change", and it's not valid to do so. .. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-25\]](#)

CEASE misrepresenting my position and my words. We had an agreement: when we discussed Spencer's "back radiation" experiment, I made it abundantly clear that we were discussing ONLY Spencer's experiment, not "greenhouse warming". .. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-12-07\]](#)

How adorable. Once again, the whole reason Slayers dispute Spencer's experiment is because that implies greenhouse gases can't warm the surface:

.. the CO2-warming model rely on the concept of "back radiation", which physicists (not climate scientists) have proved to be impossible. I'm happy to leave actual climate science to climate scientists. But when THEIR models rely on a fundamental misunderstanding of physics, I'll take the physicists' word for it, thank you very much. .. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2012-07-05\]](#)

Actually, the rules aren't even well-known. The majority of CO2 warming models rely on a concept of "back radiation" that ([according to physicists](#)) does not even exist.. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2012-07-15\]](#)

.. I can show clearly, to someone with high school level math skills, that he was utterly, abjectly, and rather pathetically wrong, and the "Slayers", as he calls them, were right all along. Because, you see, as I know from experience, it isn't enough to show people the right way. At the same time it is necessary and desirable to show beyond doubt that "global warming alarmist" bullshit is just that: bullshit. .. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-10\]](#)

.. I stipulated before we got into that discussion that we were discussing ONLY Spencer's experiment, nothing else. You agreed to that condition. And now, you're violating it by extrapolating my comments to a completely different context. .. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-26\]](#)

I never agreed to pretend that Jane's Sky Dragon Slayer nonsense doesn't conflict with mainstream physicists' understanding of the greenhouse effect. Mainly because I couldn't imagine a Slayer resorting to such an [absurd evasion](#), but also because I can't imagine agreeing to look the other way while he paralyzed his brain by simultaneously insisting that mainstream physicists agree with the Sky Dragon Slayers, while also somehow completely ignoring the [National Academies of Science](#), the [American Institute of Physics](#), the [American Physical Society](#), the [Australian Institute of Physics](#), the [European Physical Society](#), [many other](#) scientific societies, [Prof. Grant Petty](#), [Prof. Brown](#), [Dr. Joel Shore](#), [Prof. Steve Carson](#), etc.

Heck, I've also [told](#) Jane/Lonny that his Sky Dragon Slayer nonsense is so ridiculous that even prominent climate contrarians are rational enough to back away from the Slayers. Even the [convicted scam artist](#) who [conned Jane](#) and [Lonny Eachus](#) knows better than to ask Sky Dragon Slayers to prop up his latest scam.

Riverat [said](#) Jane would need to actually witness the experiment to change his mind. [Once again](#), after hundreds of pages of listening to Jane/Lonny cuss and scream and endlessly insist that he's

correct, I agree with riverat. But I also 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?

.. If I were a "real skeptic", I would have **researched** the real answer to this problem. But wait.. I actually did! Unlike you, who found some equation for "electrical heating power" which applies to a space that is air-filled and subject to conduction and convection, I looked up the **actual** power equations for a vacuum-filled space with only radiant heat transfer. .. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-26\]](#)

Good grief. Anyone can see that [my derivation](#) only includes radiant heat transfer terms, not conduction and convection terms. Jane has either hallucinated conduction and convection terms in my equations describing conservation of energy through vacuum-filled spaces, or Jane/Lonny Eachus is simply lying.

.. Spencer's experiment is not "atmospheric radiation". It involves a vacuum. .. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-26\]](#)

Which makes it simpler, but the same radiative principles apply to the atmosphere. Again, that's why Slayers dispute Spencer's experiment.

.. even though I told him in no uncertain terms that we were debating **only** Spencer's experiment (his agreement can still be seen here on Slashdot), he insists that I am a "Sky Dragon Slayer", simply because I stated that Pierre Latour's radiation physics were correct. (For the record, I have never read the "Sky Dragon" books.) I do assert that there is no solidly demonstrated cause for concern over CO2. This person conflates that position of mine, with my use of **textbook** physics to refute Spencer, as somehow proving I am a Sky Dragon Slayer. .. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-12-07\]](#)

My [debunking](#) of Jane/Lonny's Sky Dragon Slayer nonsense begins with these two quotes:

@ClimateRealists That's the first I had read about O'Sullivan's rebuttal of the Greenhouse Effect. He makes a compelling argument. [\[Lonny Eachus, 2012-02-23\]](#)

@GreatDismal See John O'Sullivan's "Slaying the Sky Dragon", for instance. If you think there is solid science behind AGW you are mistaken. [\[Lonny Eachus, 2012-02-23\]](#)

Anyone who clicked on those links can see that Jane/Lonny Eachus only took a few hours to go from first reading about O'Sullivan's "rebuttal" of the greenhouse effect to advertising John O'Sullivan's "Slaying the Sky Dragon" fantasy novel. [Just a few days later, Jane also started cheerleading for the Sky Dragon Slayers.](#)

So **of course** Jane/Lonny Eachus hasn't read the Sky Dragon book. Jane/Lonny is so **unbelievably gullible** that he regurgitated Slayer misinformation without having read the book.

As usual, Jane retreats to an absurd evasion where spreading Sky Dragon Slayer misinformation for years isn't sufficient evidence to note that Jane has been spreading Sky Dragon Slayer misinformation for years. Apparently in Janeland, if something looks like a duck and quacks like a duck, it's **not** a duck.

Since then, you have consistently, improperly, and dishonestly misrepresented argument as including "global warming" even after repeated statements that I did not make that argument, and in fact you agreed that you understood this before we had our

long discussion of Spencer's experiment.. If you cannot represent my position correctly and honestly (and you have repeatedly demonstrated your unwillingness to do so), then don't try to tell other people what my arguments are. Quotes taken out of context from 5 years ago also count against you, not for you. CEASE misrepresenting my words. You have been warned repeatedly. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-12-07\]](#)

As I [suspected](#), Jane thinks his comments expire after 5 years, saving Jane/Lonny Eachus the trouble of retracting his endless flood of misinformation. Naturally, this statute of limitations [doesn't apply](#) to actual scientists. It's Jane/Lonny's superpower. Unfortunately for Jane/Lonny, he only went Sky Dragon Slayer in 2012, which was only 3 years ago. So Jane/Lonny's bizarre superpower hasn't kicked in yet.

Less than 5 years ago, Jane/Lonny Eachus even [regurgitated](#) John O'Sullivan's absurd [Sky Dragon Slayer denial](#) of the fact that we caused the modern rise in atmospheric CO2. Why did Jane even bother [asking](#) for evidence that Slayer CEO John O'Sullivan fooled Jane by only showing summer fluxes and hiding winter fluxes? Again, what happened to Jane's [surprising statement](#) that I made a "good point" about the Humlum et al. 2013 calculus mistake which mistook summer and winter for a long term CO2 rise?

Jane/Lonny Eachus [quickly regressed](#), once again cheerleading John O'Sullivan's Sky Dragon Slayer [misinformation](#) even after Jane/Lonny seemed to briefly start to understand that O'Sullivan and Humlum had fooled Jane/Lonny regarding summer and winter.

Then Jane/Lonny Eachus hit the irony jackpot by [saying this](#) regarding scientists: "*.. They've never heard of summer and winter?*"

Jane/Lonny Eachus even went above and beyond the call of duty by joining Slayer CEO John O'Sullivan in [blaming his teenage victim](#), and [wrongly insisted](#) that none of the members of "Principia Scientific" (John O'Sullivan's Sky Dragon Slayer club) have ever been convicted of any sexual wrongdoing. If Jane/Lonny Eachus really isn't a Sky Dragon Slayer, **at the very least** he'd retract his mistaken claim that no Slayers have been convicted of sexual wrongdoing, and admit that Slayer CEO John O'Sullivan is an admitted pedophile.

Then Jane/Lonny Eachus should ask himself whether endlessly regurgitating all this Sky Dragon Slayer nonsense is **really** worth staining his legacy this badly.

Jane/Lonny Eachus even [lectured](#) mainstream physicists at the Sky Dragon Slayer website by regurgitating Slayer nonsense at them. Maybe Jane/Lonny Eachus is just performing a public comedy routine? For instance:

Yep, the guy's at least 800 milli-Timecubes! The interesting thing to me is that Spencer seems to be missing the point. Direct radiative heating of the Earth's surface by CO2 in the atmosphere is a [Lie-to-children](#) in the first place, and people who defend it based on religious faith really make themselves look silly. .. [\[lgw, 2014-12-07\]](#)

Like most physicists, I accept that energy is conserved. I'm defending this fundamental principle not because of "religious faith" but because of [Noether's first theorem](#) and the fact that our Universe exhibits time translation symmetry. If lgw seriously thinks defending one of the most fundamental principles in physics makes me look silly and at least 80% [Timecube](#), then that says more about lgw than about me. [\[khayman80\]](#)

.. I suggest you learn what "800 milli-timecubes" means. I doubt you will be pleased. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-12-14\]](#)

Only Jane/Lonny Eachus could respond to a comment where I translated 800 milli-Timecubes to percent and linked to an [explanation](#) of what it means, then suggest that I learn what it means.

Classic Jane. This would all be hilarious, except that Jane/Lonny Eachus seems **very** serious:

.. What's sad is that people are still saying crap like that AFTER science has proved them wrong. [CO2 is NOT heating the planet](#). End of story. People like McKibben trying to shove "Global Warming" down your throat when [IT DOESN'T EXIST](#) is the real sad thing about the human race. [\[Lonny Eachus, 2014-11-10\]](#)

.. "Global warming" is bullshit, not science. [\[Lonny Eachus, 2014-10-14\]](#)

Warming shrinking kids - or 'Can we just declare warmism a mental illness w/paranoid ideation & get it over with?' [goo.gl/GP8A0v](#)
[\[JunkScience, retweeted by Lonny Eachus, 2014-11-29\]](#)

I vote Yea on both: labeling it mental illness AND getting it over with. The sooner the better. I have grown really weary of arguing with [religious-fanatic](#) Kool-Aid Drinkers who know nothing about what they're ranting. But what's [even worse](#) are those who really should know better, but swallowed it hook, line, and sinker anyway. [\[Lonny Eachus, 2014-11-29\]](#)

Fascinating. Jane/Lonny Eachus votes for "warmism" to be labeled a mental illness. Could Jane/Lonny list a few examples of people he thinks should be labeled mentally ill, both those who know nothing and those even worse people who really should know better?

.. You keep hammering at this like some kind of zombie that doesn't realize it's dead yet. .. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-10\]](#)

Climate Alarmism is like a zombie that hasn't realized it's dead yet. Still looking for brains. [\[Lonny Eachus, 2014-10-22\]](#)

@JunkScience It's worse than that: they've already lost, and they just don't get it yet. They're like zombies. [\[Lonny Eachus, 2014-12-18\]](#)

IBD: Warming has stopped but eco-radicals' lunacy accelerates - 100% agreement among scientists planet isn't warming. [goo.gl/B1ORFR](#) [\[JunkScience, retweeted by Lonny Eachus, 2014-11-28\]](#)

"Mainstream" climate science in a nutshell. [\[Lonny Eachus, 2014-12-09\]](#)

[Global warming is] a dream of power & glory, for an unscrupulous few. Unscrupulous is an understatement. [\[Lonny Eachus, 2014-12-18\]](#)

..climate alarmism was political- and \$\$-driven fraud, not science.. [\[Lonny Eachus, 2014-12-26\]](#)

I had a "climate change" troll bugging me so I wasn't in a funny-perceiving mood. :o/
[\[Lonny Eachus, 2014-10-14\]](#)

.. I've been the victim of very, very serious trolls, joe. And it isn't funny. Character assassination, libel.. [\[Lonny Eachus, 2014-10-21\]](#)

Quick! Get the world's smallest violin and play a sad song for poor victimized Jane/Lonny Eachus. He needs all his strength to keep spreading civilization-paralyzing misinformation, [libelling scientists](#), trying to assassinate their characters, and successfully weaponizing irony:

I had no idea how disgusting human behavior could be, before I encountered climate alarmists. [\["Steve Goddard", 2014-10-19\]](#)

Isn't that the truth. I have a pretty good story to tell. [\[Lonny Eachus, 2014-10-19\]](#)

I won't say @MichaelEMann is "lying" here. I don't want to be sued. Let's just say he's

a very creative storyteller. @MichaelEMann [doesn't know](#) the emails were "hacked". Evidence suggests they were leaked from "inside". Second, much WASN'T out of context. [\[Lonny Eachus, 2015-01-09\]](#)

What an adorable euphemism. Surely nobody can tell that Jane/Lonny Eachus is obliquely accusing Michael Mann of lying. [Once again](#), Jane/Lonny Eachus [smears scientists](#) with illegally obtained **private** emails while [proclaiming](#) that revealing **public** records is illegal, unethical, despicable lowlife sociopathic behavior.

But never fear! Jane/Lonny Eachus knows the difference between opinion and libel:

Just this, before I block you again. Believe or not, it's friendly advice. Learn the difference between opinion and libel. I feel this bears repeating. [LEARN THE DAMNED RULES!](#) Opinion and libel are different things. Learn the difference. It could save your ass. [\[Lonny Eachus, 2014-05-04\]](#)

.. you should be careful what you say about people, even online, and *regardless of whether you are a journalist*. In most cases the libel laws are no different for Joe Shmoe than they are or a syndicated columnist. Generally, opinions are fine.. as long as they're clearly opinion and not stated as fact. Because even "You're an asshole" is commonly accepted as an opinion, that's probably okay.. *especially* if you make it clear that it's only opinion. But "fraud", and other such claims? Usually over the line, unless you can show that it's true. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-01-26\]](#)

I, for one, and goddamned sick of the LIES being told in the name of "climate change". Not just my opinion, PROVABLE lies. [\[Lonny Eachus, 2014-11-06\]](#)

[Ruh-roh](#). Maybe Jane/Lonny Eachus is a deep-cover Greenpeace operative on a mission to make climate contrarians seem irrational and scientifically illiterate. If so, well played.

I'm willing to let Hell freeze over if that's what it takes to prove that CO2-based "climate change" is BS. [\[Lonny Eachus, 2014-12-06\]](#)

Here's the real question: is Jane/Lonny Eachus willing to keep misinforming people about climate change even as we keep rapidly warming the Earth?

When are more people going to pick up on the fact that they have been LIED TO about "Global Warming" for 20 years?
That was a Christmas gift.
Don't worry, be happy. :o)
Especially about global warming. Worry about the people who [lie to you](#) about it.
[\[Lonny Eachus, 2014-12-23\]](#)

That's a very good question. Eventually, people are going to pick up on the fact that Jane/Lonny Eachus [ignored](#) direct evidence from 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*.

People might eventually pick up on Jane/Lonny's long record of baseless accusations and civilization-paralyzing misinformation, then compare that to the record of the NAS, AAAS, [etc.](#)

Then they'll ask who was lying and/or opposing the ["urgent need"](#) to address climate change.

Jane/Lonny Eachus.. do you **really** want to be the last person in your neighborhood regurgitating this civilization-paralyzing misinformation once people pick up on the fact that they've been lied to about global warming? Because that seems to be where you're headed. Do you expect a fruit basket?

[Parent Share](#)

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

■

■

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

by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2015-01-12 12:56 ([#48796761](#)) [Homepage](#) [Journal](#)

Oops, Jane started cheerleading a few **weeks** later. Also, "inefficiency" should be inefficiencies.

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

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

■

•

[Slashdot](#)

Archived Discussion Moderate Moderator Help Delete

- [Get 780 More Comments](#)
- [Submit Story](#)

Optimism is the content of small men in high places. -- F. Scott Fitzgerald, "The Crack Up"

- [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](#)