

[Stories](#) [Firehose >](#)[All](#)[Popular](#)[Video](#) [new](#)[Jobs](#)[Deals](#)[Submit](#)Topics: [Devices](#) [Build](#) [Entertainment](#) [Technology](#) [Open Source](#) [Science](#) [YRO](#)Search [khayman80](#)Follow us:     

This discussion has been archived.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

[Politics Is Poisoning NASA's Ability To Do Science](#) [373 More Prefs](#)

[Politics Is Poisoning NASA's Ability To Do Science](#)

Archived Discussion

[Load All Comments](#)[43 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.

[373 More Prefs](#)

[wait what?](#) (Score:3, Insightful)

by [ganjadude \(952775\)](#) [Alter Relationship](#)

the EPA can worry about the environment, leave NASA to what NASA is supposed to do. National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Not the climatechange administration. not the muslim outreach administration but the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Please give NASA more money, but make sure it is used for space exploration as intended. I dont see why this is getting so much heat

--

IANAL, not the same as the new product from apple, the iANAL

-
-

[Re:](#) (Score:1)

by Anonymous Coward

The NOAA can worry about climate change with the EPA too.

-
-
- >

[Re:wait what?](#) (Score:5, Insightful)

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#) on 2015-03-16 21:39 ([#49272825](#))

The NOAA can worry about climate change with the EPA too.

Phil doesn't seem to think it's worth mentioning that in recent years, NASA's climate study budget has gone up

41% while their space budget only went up 7%.

That's almost 6 times as much increase for climate as for space. Phil still isn't happy? I don't know what the flat dollar figures are, but clearly climate has been getting attention.

I am with GP on the main point here: let NASA concentrate on space. And let NOAA and others work on climate. EPA, however, is a vastly self-serving and corrupt organization, and I wouldn't put it in charge of scrubbing toilets.

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

■

■

[Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer](#) (Score:0, Flamebait)

by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2015-03-16 22:54 (#49273015) [Homepage](#) [Journal](#)

Did you see [my RT](#) re: NASA budget? NASA environment spending went up 41%, space only 7%. [goo.gl/ixcstK](#) [\[Lonny Eachus, 2015-03-12\]](#)

... NASA's climate study budget has gone up 41% while their space budget only went up 7%. ... [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-16\]](#)

Sure, let's ask Sky Dragon Slayers how many satellites should observe and protect our home planet. As soon as they finish [mocking](#) NASA's director because Slayers claim that "global warming" is [nonexistent](#). But even when Slayers insist that "NASA needs to pull its head out of [faulty climate science](#) and get back to space," they should remember that not even space is compatible with Sky Dragon Slayerism.

After all, what if NASA just sends more missions to Venus and Mercury? Again, if CO2 isn't the reason, then why is [Venus hotter than Mercury](#)? Is Venus hotter than Mercury because of CO2, [gray Oreos](#), or basketball player gloves?

Shouldn't Sky Dragon Slayers be able to answer such simple questions before determining NASA's [aims and goals](#)?

Furthermore, Jane should explain why he [emphatically rejected](#) the [standard physics definition](#) of the term "net". If Jane/Lonny Eachus ever accepts the standard physics definition of the term "net", he'd find that the Sky Dragon Slayer nonsense he's been regurgitating for years is based on a misunderstanding of a basic physics definition.

On that glorious day, Jane/Lonny Eachus would finally have a more credible case for influencing NASA's aims and goals.

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

■

■

[You're a nutcase. Go away.](#) (Score:1)

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#) on 2015-03-17 0:19 (#49273191)

Furthermore, Jane should explain why he emphatically rejected the standard physics definition of the term "net".

There really appears to be something wrong with you. There are records of ALL our conversations about that. I did no such thing, and I could prove it AGAIN, if I cared to, but I have no reason to re-hash here old arguments you LOST a long time ago. As I told you before, sooner or later I will get around to publishing it all. But you aren't going to hurry me up by pulling this kind of crap.

As you have repeatedly shown to be your standard practice, you have taken yet another of my comments out of context, and are attempting to make it seem I was stating something that in fact I was not.

That's called LYING. And harassment.

I'm tempted to think you're crazy, but my honest opinion is that you're just a pathological ass.

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

■

■

[Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer \(Score:1\)](#)

by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2015-03-17 0:42 (#49273237) [Homepage](#) [Journal](#)

Furthermore, Jane should explain why he emphatically rejected the standard physics definition of the term "net".

There really appears to be something wrong with you. There are records of ALL our conversations about that. I did no such thing, and I could prove it AGAIN, if I cared to, but I have no reason to re-hash here old arguments you LOST a long time ago. ... [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-16\]](#)

There are records of all our conversations about that [here](#): [Here are links](#) to this [never ending "conversation"](#) [7](#), [8](#), [9](#), [10](#), [11](#), [12](#), [13](#), [14](#), [15](#), [16](#), [17](#), [18](#). [BACKUP 1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#), [8](#), [9](#), [10](#), [11](#), [12](#), [13](#), [14](#), [15](#), [16](#), [17](#), [18](#).

As everyone can see, Jane ended his hundreds of pages of Sky Dragon Slayer claims by unilaterally and baselessly declaring victory, and [screaming](#):

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

No doubt Jane/Lonny Eachus will retreat to an absurd evasion where screaming "NO!!!!!!" somehow **isn't** emphatic rejection of the [standard physics definition](#) of the term "net". Perhaps a minimum of 6 exclamation points after screaming in ALL CAPS are required for "emphatic" rejection in Janeland?

[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 2015-03-17 14:42 ([#49279017](#))

Thanks for that. You just saved me a lot of work. Although I am pretty darned sure that wasn't your intent.

I'm not worried about what you say here. I also have records, and I remember the conversations.

Other people, who actually know some physics (or have the proper textbooks) can follow the conversations if they like, and see that indeed, your "solution" to the problem that I let YOU define was just plain wrong.

I haven't bothered to go through what you've posted here yet, but if it's anything like what you did before, I expect it's grossly incomplete and cherry-picked.

[Parent](#)

[Share](#)

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

■

■

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

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#) on 2015-03-17 14:50 ([#49279049](#))

I see also that about half those links, or more, are to your "dumb scientist" site, where you like to indulge in your one-sided arguments against cherry-picked, out-of-context comments by others.

I mentioned that to you years ago, but I see you're still doing it.

You can be sure that I am putting the full picture together, no cherry-picking on my part.

I did take exception to what YOU were calling "net" in the context of that argument. But I certainly do know what net is.

I repeat that my "NO!!!" comment was about your entire fallacious line of reasoning, in which you failed at basic math. **That comment was about your incorrect USE of "net", NOT about what the definition of "net" is.** To even think that's what I was saying, given the whole context of the argument, is pretty stupid.

[Parent](#)

[Share](#)

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

■

■

[Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer \(Score:1\)](#)

by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2015-03-17 15:38 ([#49279361](#)) [Homepage](#) [Journal](#)

... I repeat that my "NO!!!" comment was about your entire fallacious line of reasoning, in which you failed at basic math. **That comment was about your incorrect USE of "net", NOT about what the definition of "net" is.** To even think that's what I was saying, given the whole context of the argument, is pretty stupid.

[\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-17\]](#)

Charming. Once again:

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"

All I did there was substitute the standard physics definition of the term "net" into your equation. So if you're not disputing the definition of the word "net", you must agree with that simple substitution. Right?

Parent

Share

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

■

■

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

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#) on 2015-03-17 16:35 ([#49279705](#))

Jane seems to be saying that at steady-state:

I am NOT going to re-argue this with you. If you want to prove yourself right, you're going to have to prove those textbooks wrong. I will only repeat here what I've stated before. Given the conditions we discussed (i.e., gray bodies with same emissivity, vacuum, steady-state, etc.):

(A) NET radiative heat transfer is **always** from warmer object to cooler. Anything else is a violation of the fundamental laws of thermodynamics.

(B) The equation for radiative power output of a body at steady-state does not change in the presence of cooler bodies. It remains exactly the same. It is dependent ONLY on emissivity, thermodynamic temperature, and the Stefan-Boltzmann constant.

Parent

Share

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

■

■

[Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer \(Score:1\)](#)

by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2015-03-17 16:59 ([#49279839](#))

[Homepage Journal](#)

... NET radiative heat transfer is **always** from warmer object to cooler. Anything else is a violation of the fundamental laws of thermodynamics. ... [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-17\]](#)

... which just means that more power needs to be radiated from warmer to cooler than vice-versa. At least, that's the conclusion drawn using the standard physics definition of the term "net". (And once again, every equation I've derived satisfies that condition.)

... The equation for radiative power output of a body at steady-state does not change in the presence of cooler bodies. It remains exactly the same. It is dependent ONLY on emissivity, thermodynamic temperature, and the Stefan-Boltzmann constant. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-17\]](#)

Good grief.

[Once again, I've already agreed](#) that it's not necessary to account for cooler bodies in the **temperature versus power out** equation. Again, we're not disputing the equation for radiative power out. We're disputing the equation describing conservation of energy around a boundary drawn 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

There is no need to account for other, cooler bodies when calculating radiative power out. What, do you imagine that these cooler bodies are somehow "sucking" power away from the heat source? And that a warmer body (but still cooler than the source) "sucks" less power than colder ones do? That seems to be what you're saying here. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-10-05\]](#)

[Once again](#), Jane, I never said we need to account for other, cooler bodies when calculating radiative power out.

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

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

[Once again](#), no. I've [repeatedly agreed](#) that radiative power out only depends on emissivity and temperature.

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

... If you want to prove yourself right, you're going to

have to prove those textbooks wrong. ... [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-17\]](#)

[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 = $(\epsilon \cdot \sigma) \cdot T^4 \cdot \text{area}$ ". 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.

[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 2015-03-17 22:48 ([#49281079](#))

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.

Completely irrelevant. You found a temperature difference = power equation that applied to a completely different situation and you've been inappropriately applying it to this problem ever since. Much like when you tried to call a heat transfer equation the equation for radiative power out. (Hint: it isn't.)

But the reality is: the power **source** doesn't matter. Only power input matters. It doesn't matter whether that power is an electrical source, or a kerosene heater, or friction from a horse's ass... which I seem to be seeing a lot of lately for some strange reason.

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

■

■

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

by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2015-03-18 13:00 ([#49286465](#))

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

Answered [here](#).

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

■

■

Re:Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer (Score:1)by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#) on 2015-03-17 0:35 ([#49273217](#))

The only thing I am going to say further, despite what other BS you try to pull here, is that I was saying "NO!" to your line of argument. I was not disagreeing about what "net" is.

It's a classic case of "out of context". Which I am sure you well knew. Which makes you a demonstrably dishonest person.

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

■

■

Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer (Score:1)by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2015-03-17 0:48 ([#49273251](#)) [Homepage](#) [Journal](#)

The only thing I am going to say further, despite what other BS you try to pull here, is that I was saying "NO!" to your line of argument. I was not disagreeing about what "net" is. It's a classic case of "out of context". Which I am sure you well knew. Which makes you a demonstrably dishonest person. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-16\]](#)

Jane, my "line of argument" was very simple. If you weren't disagreeing about the definition of the word "net" then why did you scream "NO!!!!!" in response to my comment?

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) * T⁴ * 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](#) [g+](#)

■

■

Re:Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer (Score:2)by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#) on 2015-03-17 14:58 ([#49279099](#))

Jane, my "line of argument" was very simple. If you weren't disagreeing about the definition of the word "net" then why did you scream "NO!!!!!" in response to my comment?

I've explained this to you in public about 10 times now. I'm not going to do it again. I consider your incessant re-questioning about things I've already answered to be harassment.

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:

And this is where you're **misusing** "net". With all objects having the same emissivity, in a vacuum, no NET radiation is absorbed by the hotter body from the colder body. Therefore, that radiation cannot also be claimed to be part of the net radiated power of the hotter body.

I repeat once again: you're counting the radiation twice.

And I've explained that to you many times now. I've also explained that at least 3 textbooks on radiative heat transfer agree with me. And I've given you the titles of at least one of those textbooks, but if I remember, all three.

So you can look up YOURSELF that you are wrong. And you have NEVER, even once, tried to show me how the textbooks were wrong about this issue.

And I will repeat this again, too: your insistence on requiring me to defend my position about an argument **you LOST** months ago is harassment.

If you want to win, you will have to show that those textbooks were wrong. You haven't even tried to do so. So take it elsewhere, I am even less than not interested.

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

■

■

Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer (Score:1)by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2015-03-17 16:09 ([#49279545](#)) [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:

And this is where you're **misusing** "net". ... [\[Jane Q. Public,](#)

[2015-03-17](#)

Jane, all I did there was substitute the standard physics definition of the term "net" into your equation. So if you're not disputing the definition of the word "net", you must agree with that simple substitution. Right?

... With all objects having the same emissivity, in a vacuum, no NET radiation is absorbed by the hotter body from the colder body.

Therefore, that radiation cannot also be claimed to be part of the net radiated power of the hotter body. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-17\]](#)

Once again, it seems like we disagree about the physics definition of the term "NET". Once again, using the standard physics definition of the term "NET", the phrase "no NET radiation is absorbed by the hotter body from the colder body" actually means that more power is radiated from hot to cold than vice-versa. (Which is true in every equation I've derived.) Since net radiative power out of a boundary around the source = "radiative power out" minus "radiative power in", a physicist using that standard definition **has to** include terms for radiative power out **and** radiative power in.

... You are counting the radiation from the cooler body twice. ...

[\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-01-01\]](#)

... I repeat once again: you're counting the radiation twice. ... [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-17\]](#)

It's bewildering that you keep saying this. Anyone can see that I'm counting the radiation from the cooler body once:

An electrically heated plate is in a vacuum chamber with cooler chamber walls. 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've also explained that at least 3 textbooks on radiative heat transfer agree with me. And I've given you the titles of at least one of those textbooks, but if I remember, all three. ... So you can look up YOURSELF that you are wrong. And you have NEVER, even once, tried to show me how the textbooks were wrong about this issue. ... If you want to win, you will have to show that those textbooks were wrong. You haven't even tried to do so. ... [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-17\]](#)

[Riiight:](#)

[Once again](#), Jane has 4 textbooks that say "radiative power out per square meter = $(\epsilon \cdot \sigma) \cdot T^4$ ". 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 = $(\epsilon \cdot \sigma) \cdot T^4 \cdot \text{area}$ ". 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.

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

■

■

[Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer \(Score:1\)](#)

by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2015-03-17 16:16 ([#49279595](#)) [Homepage](#) [Journal](#)

Oops, "Riiight" should [link here](#) instead.

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

■

■

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

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#) on 2015-03-17 16:27 ([#49279665](#))

Jane, all I did there was substitute the standard physics definition of the term "net" into your equation. So if you're not disputing the definition of the word "net", you must agree with that simple substitution. Right?

I am NOT going over this with you again. It isn't going to happen.

Your "solution" broke the laws of thermodynamics 2 different ways. If you want to prove yourself right, you'll have to prove those textbooks wrong.

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

■

■

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

by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2015-03-17 16:38 ([#49279723](#)) [Homepage](#) [Journal](#)

So you dispute my simple substitution of the standard physics definition of the term "net" into your equation, while simultaneously insisting that you don't dispute the standard physics definition?

... There is no net radiative heat transfer from cold to hot. That's a violation of 1st & 2nd Thermo Laws.

[\[Lonny Eachus, 2015-03-01\]](#)

[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.

... Your "solution" broke the laws of thermodynamics 2 different ways. If you want to prove yourself right, you'll have to prove those textbooks wrong. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-17\]](#)

[Once again](#), 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.

[Once again](#), Jane has 4 textbooks that say "radiative power out per square meter = $(\epsilon \cdot \sigma) \cdot T^4$ ". 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 = $(\epsilon \cdot \sigma) \cdot T^4 \cdot \text{area}$ ". 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.

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

■

■

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

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#) on 2015-03-17 22:53 ([#49281091](#))

So you dispute my simple substitution of the standard physics definition of the term "net" into your equation, while simultaneously insisting that you don't dispute the standard physics definition?

I am disputing nothing at this time. I am NOT going to re-argue this with you. I have exactly zero reason or desire to do so.

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

■

■

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

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#) on 2015-03-17 22:59 ([#49281103](#))

Once again [slashdot.org], 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.

I will, however, correct this one straw-man, which you have made over and over and over again.

The textbooks say a great deal more than that. And you have been unwilling to admit that they're right about the rest of it, too.

Your answer was wrong. I showed you where it was wrong. I used standard textbook radiant heat transfer equations to prove it. I explained to you WHY it was wrong.

I have nothing further to say, unless you want me to just keep coming back here and showing people where you're trying to misleading everybody yet again.

You don't get to keep trying to make your problem my problem without consequences. I strongly suggest you knock it off.

[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 2015-03-17 23:15 ([#49281143](#))

Once again [slashdot.org], 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.

And once again, this is a mis-statement of the facts. Nobody I am aware of claims -- and I certainly did not claim -- that thermodynamics is violated because more power is radiated from hot to cold than vice-versa. Show me where somebody did say that.

In order for YOUR argument to work, a sphere of one substance suspended in a vacuum cavity surrounded by the same substance at the same temperature, would spontaneously **increase** in temperature. If it did that, it would be at a higher temperature (i.e., radiate more power to the wall of the cavity), which would then itself become warmer, and you would have a universe-destroying positive feedback.

That doesn't happen, man. Physics just doesn't work that way. It's a ludicrous self-destructive argument. It doesn't work. I've explained that to you in plain English, and with simple textbook physics equations, and it just doesn't work.

The only thing left, then, is that you're either a troll or a loon. I don't care to guess which. I just want you to go away and STOP HARASSING ME.

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

■

■

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

by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2015-03-18 12:57 ([#49286429](#))

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

So you dispute my simple substitution of the standard physics definition of the term "net" into your equation, while simultaneously insisting that you don't dispute the standard physics definition?

I am disputing nothing at this time. I am NOT going to re-argue this with you. I have exactly zero reason or desire to do so. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-17\]](#)

Don't you see how the fact that you previously disputed my simple substitution of the standard physics definition of the term "net" into your equation looked like disputing that standard physics definition?

If you're really not disputing my simple substitution any longer, then you're now agreeing with [my energy conservation equation](#). If so, that's great news!

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.

Completely irrelevant. You found a temperature difference = power equation that applied to a completely different situation and you've been inappropriately applying it to this problem ever since. ... [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-17\]](#)

Good grief, Jane. You've previously [hallucinated](#) conduction and convection terms in my equations describing conservation of energy through vacuum-filled spaces. If that's what you mean by

"inappropriately applying" then you should look at my equations very carefully. Notice the complete lack of conduction and convection terms. Notice that my equations are based on a fundamental principle called "conservation of energy" that applies to **all** situations.

... Much like when you tried to call a heat transfer equation the equation for radiative power out. (Hint: it isn't.) [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-17\]](#)

Good grief, Jane. This is your response to [my comment](#) explicitly and repeatedly telling you that radiative power out is different than electrical heating power? I've repeatedly told you that conservation of energy leads to heat transfer equations that describe electrical heating power, but the Stefan-Boltzmann equation can give you "radiative power out".

[Once again](#): the Stefan-Boltzmann equation can give you "radiative power out" but only a completely different principle called "conservation of energy" can give you a totally different quantity known as "electrical heating power".

[Once again](#): "radiative power out" **isn't** just a fancy way of saying "electrical heating power". They're completely different. To find electrical heating power, Jane needs to use conservation of energy, where power in = power out. That results in a heat transfer equation, not just an equation for "radiative power out".

Jane, I've been very clear that a heat transfer equation is used to find electrical heating power, not "radiative power out". And yet you keep claiming otherwise. Why, Jane?

... In order for YOUR argument to work, a sphere of one substance suspended in a vacuum cavity surrounded by the same substance at the same temperature, would spontaneously increase in temperature. If it did that, it would be at a higher temperature (i.e., radiate more power to the wall of the cavity), which would then itself become warmer, and you would have a universe-destroying positive feedback. ... [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-17\]](#)

Nonsense. Here's the first energy conservation equation [I derived](#):

$$\text{electricity} + \sigma T_c^4 = \sigma T_h^4 \text{ (Eq. 1)}$$

Notice that if the two temperatures T_c and T_h are equal, the required electrical heating power per square meter (electricity) = 0. So my equation actually says that a sphere of one substance suspended in a vacuum cavity surrounded by the same substance at the same temperature, would stay at that temperature forever without any electrical heating power.

The universe is safe.

That wasn't so hard, was it? So why does Jane keep insisting otherwise? Notice that every equation I've derived says that electrical heating power goes to zero when the heat source and chamber walls are at the same temperature, including [this more](#)

[complicated solution](#).

But ironically, Jane's mistaken "energy conservation" equation doesn't explain why electrical heating power goes to zero when the heat source and chamber walls are at the same temperature:

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

Before Jane keeps insisting that my equations say something they obviously don't, Jane should note that his mistaken "energy conservation" equation can't explain why the heat source doesn't need electrical heating power if the chamber walls are at the same temperature.

[Once again](#), note that conservation of energy through a boundary around the source leads directly to an [equation](#) describing the electrical power required to keep the source at temperature T_1 inside chamber walls at temperature T_4 . This equation is valid for $T_1 > T_4$, $T_1 = T_4$, and $T_1 < T_4$. Jane might wonder why he can't derive a single equation which works for all these cases.

... the power source doesn't matter. Only power input matters. It doesn't matter whether that power is an electrical source, or a kerosene heater... [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-17\]](#)

I'm not saying the power source matters. Whether you're using an electrical source or a kerosene heater, the important point is that required heating power (electrical or kerosene) is zero if the chamber walls are at the same temperature as the heat source.

That's not true for "radiative power out", as I've explained ad nauseum. That's because "radiative power out" doesn't depend on the chamber wall temperature. But that's **different** than "heating power" (electrical or kerosene) which **does** depend on the chamber wall temperature. "Heating power" tells you how much electricity or kerosene you'd need to keep the source at a certain temperature, given the temperature of the chamber walls.

One way to check your solution is to make sure that your equation for heating power (electrical or kerosene) agrees that no heating power is necessary if the chamber walls are at the same temperature as the heat source. My equations have all passed that check. Jane's mistaken equation doesn't.

... The textbooks say a great deal more than that. And you have been unwilling to admit that they're right about the rest of it, too. Your answer was wrong. I showed you where it was wrong. I used standard textbook radiant heat transfer equations to prove it. I explained to you WHY it was wrong. ... [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-17\]](#)

Jane, the only time I've been "unwilling to admit" that **your misinterpretation** of the rest of your textbooks was right was when you [claimed](#) that your textbook "implies that power-in = power-out

is not necessarily true, and in fact that is probably a very rare exception."

[Once again](#): No Jane, you've misinterpreted your textbook. Energy is **always** conserved, so power in = power out through any boundary where nothing inside is changing. This isn't a "very rare exception". It's a fundamental law called "conservation of energy". Does Jane seriously think his textbook says that using a fundamental law like "conservation of energy" is "doomed to fail"?

[Once again](#), 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.

And once again, this is a mis-statement of the facts. Nobody I am aware of claims -- and I certainly did not claim -- that thermodynamics is violated because more power is radiated from hot to cold than vice-versa. Show me where somebody did say that. ... [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-17\]](#)

As usual, that doesn't make any sense. Jane, **you've** been [accusing](#) me of violating the laws of thermodynamics. I've repeatedly explained that in every single equation I've derived, more power is radiated from hot to cold than vice versa. So my solution doesn't violate the second law of thermodynamics (or the first).

So your incessant accusations were baseless. If you're retracting those accusations, then that's great news!

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 2015-03-19 19:37 ([#49297925](#))

Energy is always conserved, so power in = power out through any boundary where nothing inside is changing.

For the hundredth time: nobody is disputing this. Your own attempt at a solution was what violated this rule. I am aware that you don't seem to understand why, after it was explained to you several times. But YOU do not seem to be aware that is not MY problem. And I am very far from happy with your attempts to publicly MAKE IT my problem. In case you missed it, that isn't working.

As usual, that doesn't make any sense.

It doesn't make any sense **to you**. My analysis made sense to

everybody else I showed it to.

I've repeatedly explained that in every single equation I've derived, more power is radiated from hot to cold than vice versa. So my solution doesn't violate the second law of thermodynamics (or the first).

And this is where YOU are mis-stating what is meant by "net". You say "more" goes from hot to cold, but you have also been claiming that SOME goes from cold to hot.

But what you're not getting is: given the nature of the experiment, that would be creating energy from nothing. You are increasing the thermodynamic energy of a hotter body by transferring heat to it from a colder body or bodies. And I'm not sorry to tell you: nature doesn't work that way.

I know what your argument is. I haven't misunderstood it. You're just wrong.

The statement that "no net energy is transferred to the warmer body from the colder" is exactly WHY the equation for radiant heat output does NOT change in the presence of colder bodies. BUT... you neglect the fact that it would have to, if it were absorbing and re-radiating radiation from those colder bodies.

Your statement is a contradiction. Whether you claim it is a "raising" of energy of the warmer body, or "less loss" from the warmer body, the only other input power is the same. So you end up with a "hotter" hot body. But if your hot body is hotter, then its radiative output CHANGES, and so then does the temperature of the colder body, and you have created a feedback loop, not a new equilibrium. As I have already mentioned, you don't get to do that. You're adding energy from nowhere.

Further, even if you tried to maintain that it wasn't a feedback loop but just a new equilibrium, with the hotter temperature you would still have to increase the power to maintain the exterior walls at a constant temperature. Which means you would be **extracting** more thermal energy from the system... but not adding any more. Contradiction.

A given input energy is only going to raise a body of given properties to a certain maximum temperature. It doesn't matter whether that energy is electricity or cow farts. Any other assertion is... well... hot air.

I am completely done here. I have nothing further to say to you about this, regardless of whether you try to distort the issue even further.

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

[Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer \(Score:2\)](#)by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2015-03-19 21:11 ([#49298433](#))[Homepage](#) [Journal](#)

... I will do you a favor here, and say: don't bother to go calculating the energy, either. The problem is that an analysis of this kind, **based on** the assumption that power-in = power-out, is doomed to fail except in coincidental cases. Even conservation of energy can give very misleading results. The black body example I gave shows why your "energy conservation just inside the surface" won't work. ... power-in = power-out is not necessarily true, and in fact that is probably a very rare exception. ... [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-09-07\]](#)

Energy is always conserved, so power in = power out through any boundary where nothing inside is changing.

For the hundredth time: nobody is disputing this. ...

[\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-19\]](#)

"Nobody" is disputing this, apparently in the same way that "nobody" is disputing my simple substitution of the standard physics definition of the term "net" into Jane's equation.

... The equation for radiative power output of a body at steady-state does not change in the presence of cooler bodies. It remains exactly the same. It is dependent ONLY on emissivity, thermodynamic temperature, and the Stefan-Boltzmann constant. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-17\]](#)

... The statement that "no net energy is transferred to the warmer body from the colder" is exactly WHY the equation for radiant heat output does NOT change in the presence of colder bodies. BUT... you neglect the fact that it would have to, if it were absorbing and re-radiating radiation from those colder bodies. ... [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-19\]](#)

No, Jane. The equation for radiant heat output is still the Stefan-Boltzmann equation. As I've repeatedly told you, we agree that it is dependent ONLY on emissivity, thermodynamic temperature, and the Stefan-Boltzmann constant.

However, temperature is determined by internal energy. That's determined by a fundamental law called "conservation of energy" which is **necessarily true** and certainly **isn't** a "very rare exception" or "doomed to fail".

The fact that conservation of energy determines temperature doesn't change the equation for radiant heat output, even in the presence of colder bodies. The Stefan-Boltzmann equation remains exactly the same, as I've repeatedly explained.

... even if you tried to maintain that it wasn't a feedback

loop but just a new equilibrium, with the hotter temperature you would still have to increase the power to maintain the exterior walls at a constant temperature. Which means you would be **extracting** more thermal energy from the system... but not adding any more. Contradiction. ... [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-19\]](#)

Jane, I've [repeatedly failed to explain](#) how "conservation of energy" works. Once again: any power used by the exterior wall cooler (or heater) is simply being moved from some point outside the boundary to another point which is **also** outside the boundary. Because that power never crosses the boundary, it's irrelevant.

The word you're looking for isn't "contradiction". It's "irrelevant." As in, "Jane's objection is irrelevant because that power never crosses the boundary."

I've repeatedly explained that in every single equation I've derived, more power is radiated from hot to cold than vice versa. So my solution doesn't violate the second law of thermodynamics (or the first).

And this is where YOU are mis-stating what is meant by "net". You say "more" goes from hot to cold, but you have also been claiming that SOME goes from cold to hot. ... [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-19\]](#)

Exactly! Because that doesn't violate the second law of thermodynamics. But ignoring the power passing through a boundary around the source violates the **first** law of thermodynamics.

... But what you're not getting is: given the nature of the experiment, that would be creating energy from nothing. You are increasing the thermodynamic energy of a hotter body by transferring heat to it from a colder body or bodies. And I'm not sorry to tell you: nature doesn't work that way. ... [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-19\]](#)

Jane, do you agree that the way to tell if an equation is "creating energy from nothing" is to see if it satisfies the first law of thermodynamics, which is "conservation of energy"?

If your answer is no... how do you tell if an equation is creating energy from nothing?

If your answer is yes... that's why I've [repeatedly asked](#) you 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.

Jane, if you'd just take a few seconds to apply conservation of energy to this problem, you'd see that your solution violates conservation of energy. That's the law which tells us energy isn't created from nothing, so it's extremely ironic that you keep refusing

to take that very first step and yet continue to accuse me of creating energy from nothing, after I've repeatedly asked you to please write down an energy conservation equation for a boundary around the source without wrongly "cancelling" terms.

... Your statement is a contradiction. Whether you claim it is a "raising" of energy of the warmer body, or "less loss" from the warmer body, the only other input power is the same. So you end up with a "hotter" hot body. But if your hot body is hotter, then its radiative output CHANGES, and so then does the temperature of the colder body, and you have created a feedback loop, not a new equilibrium. As I have already mentioned, you don't get to do that. You're adding energy from nowhere. ... [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-19\]](#)

See above. If you want to prove that someone is "adding energy from nowhere" then you need to write down an energy conservation equation for a boundary around the source without wrongly "cancelling" terms.

If you ever find it in your heart to take those few seconds, you'll find that a new equilibrium (i.e. steady-state constant temperatures) **is** reached, exactly as I've repeatedly told you. Once again, the enclosed source temperature doesn't warm above 235F. Once it reaches that point, power in = power out, so the energy inside the boundary doesn't change. Thus the source reaches a new steady-state condition, where temperatures are constant.

Again, the universe is safe.

... A given input energy is only going to raise a body of given properties to a certain maximum temperature. ...
[\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-19\]](#)

No, because "conservation of energy" says that power in = power out through any boundary where nothing inside is changing. Thus, both power flowing in the boundary over some time period (which Jane calls "input energy") and power flowing **out** of that boundary are required to determine the steady-state temperature of a body of given properties.

[Again](#), warming the chamber walls is like partially closing the drain on a bathtub where water is flowing in at a constant rate. This raises the bathtub water level simply by reducing the water flow out. In exactly the same way, a source heated with constant electrical power warms when the chamber walls are warmed because that reduces the net power out.

Pretending that we only need to know the power flowing in and not the power flowing out is like pretending we only need to know a bathtub's faucet flow rate to determine the steady-state water level in the bathtub, and it doesn't matter if the drain is open or closed.

... It doesn't matter whether that energy is electricity or cow farts. Any other assertion is... well... hot air. ...
[\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-19\]](#)

Jane, I just finished explaining that it doesn't matter if the energy is electricity or kerosene. I didn't see the point of addressing your "friction from a horse's ass" observation because that didn't seem productive, but I hoped it would be clear from my response that "horse ass friction" heating power would be treated exactly the same as electrical or kerosene heating power.

Sadly, once again I seem to have overestimated you. So I'll be more explicit.

I'm not saying the power source matters. Whether you're using an electrical source or a kerosene heater or "horse ass friction" or cow farts, the important point is that required heating power (electrical or kerosene) is zero if the chamber walls are at the same temperature as the heat source.

That's not true for "radiative power out", as I've explained ad nauseum. That's because "radiative power out" doesn't depend on the chamber wall temperature. But that's **different** than "heating power" (electrical or kerosene or "horse ass friction" or cow farts) which **does** depend on the chamber wall temperature. "Heating power" tells you how much electricity or kerosene you'd need to keep the source at a certain temperature, given the temperature of the chamber walls.

One way to check your solution is to make sure that your equation for heating power (electrical or kerosene or "horse ass friction" or cow farts) agrees that no heating power is necessary if the chamber walls are at the same temperature as the heat source. My equations have all passed that check. Jane's mistaken equation doesn't.

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

■

■

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

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#) on 2015-03-20 18:06 ([#49306343](#))

I didn't see the point of addressing your "friction from a horse's ass" observation because that didn't seem productive,

It certainly wasn't, but it should have been. Most people would have gotten the point.

Pretending that we only need to know the power flowing in and not the power flowing out is like pretending we only need to know a bathtub's faucet flow rate to determine the steady-state water level in the bathtub, and it doesn't matter if the drain is open or closed.

I didn't pretend that, and in fact I explicitly stated as much in my last comment. Where did you learn to read?

Spencer's experiment stipulated that the outer wall be kept at a

constant temperature. Given that it is being given input from interior heat sources, it would take energy (over time, power of course) to maintain that low temperature. This was obviously Spencer's attempt to model the radiation "escaping to space".

However, YOU have repeatedly stated that your electrical power input was considered to be **maintaining a temperature difference** between the heat source and the outer wall. In fact that was the stated basis for many of your arguments about conservation of energy.

But you neglected to consider that when your heat source gets hotter, more thermal energy must be **extracted** from the walls to maintain that difference. Which consumes more electrical power.

But your input energy was supposed to be constant. So you're either violating the parameters of the experiment, or you are creating energy from nothing. You don't get to have it both ways, and again your "solution" contradicts itself.

The rest of this is similar mis-construction or mis-representation of my actual analysis of the problem. There is nothing new here, and nothing I have any reason to repeat yet again.

DONE. And I mean it. All you're doing is giving me fodder to make you look like a bigger fool later when I publish this. Your continued self-contradiction amounts to little more than clownish buffoonery and indirect insult.

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

■

■

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

by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2015-03-20 18:38 ([#49306479](#))

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

... Spencer's experiment stipulated that the outer wall be kept at a constant temperature. Given that it is being given input from interior heat sources, it would take energy (over time, power of course) to maintain that low temperature. This was obviously Spencer's attempt to model the radiation "escaping to space". ... [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-20\]](#)

Again, any power used to maintain that low temperature is simply being moved from some point outside the boundary to another point which is **also** outside the boundary. Because that power never crosses the boundary, it's irrelevant.

... However, YOU have repeatedly stated that your electrical power input was considered to be **maintaining a temperature difference** between the

heat source and the outer wall. In fact that was the stated basis for many of your arguments about conservation of energy. ... [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-20\]](#)

No, the electrical power input is however many watts are sent **in** through the boundary around the heat source. That's why it's included in the energy conservation equation through that boundary.

... But your input energy was supposed to be constant. So you're either violating the parameters of the experiment, or you are creating energy from nothing. You don't get to have it both ways, and again your "solution" contradicts itself. ... [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-20\]](#)

The electrical power input **which crosses the boundary around the heat source** is constant. Any power which doesn't cross that boundary is irrelevant, because it isn't included in that energy conservation equation.

And again, inserting the standard physics definition of the word "net" into [your equation](#) reproduces the energy conservation equation you're still adamantly rejecting. Would it really be so hard to take a few seconds to write down an energy conservation equation for a boundary around the source without wrongly "cancelling" terms? That's another way to see that you should consider using the standard physics definition of the word "net".

This is **really** basic physics, Jane. If you're actually this hopelessly confused, maybe you shouldn't be lecturing physicists about physics.

And for your sake I hope you actually **are** just confused. It's difficult to understand why anyone would deliberately spread misinformation about what the National Academy of Sciences [calls](#) "one of the defining issues of our time."

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

■

■

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

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#) on 2015-03-20 18:48 ([#49306535](#))

No, the electrical power input is however many watts are sent in through the boundary around the heat source. That's why it's included in the energy conservation equation through that boundary.

You have just contradicted yourself AGAIN, because I have records of you clearly arguing that the input power was to **maintain a temperature difference** between the heat source and the walls, while I was arguing that the input to the heat source was constant

but the power to the cooled walls was not stipulated and could be variable.

So now you're contradicting yourself, in trying to argue otherwise.

I am NOT going to re-argue this with you. I showed you the correct answer, double-checked according to standard textbook physics, in both directions.

Anything else you have to say is self-serving prevarication. And you've had an awful lot of it to say. That's a real problem you have, man. It isn't mine.

You were wrong. Own it, accept it, and move on. Until then, you're being WORSE than an obnoxious ass. You're harassing me and being a PAIN in the ass.

Parent

Share

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

■

■

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

by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2015-03-20 19:15 ([#49306623](#))

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

No, the electrical power input is however many watts are sent in through the boundary around the heat source. That's why it's included in the energy conservation equation through that boundary.

You have just contradicted yourself AGAIN, because I have records of you clearly arguing that the input power was to **maintain a temperature difference** between the heat source and the walls, while I was arguing that the input to the heat source was constant but the power to the cooled walls was not stipulated and could be variable. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-20\]](#)

Again, the reason the electrical input power **heating the source** is included in the energy conservation equation through a boundary around the heat source is **because it passes through that boundary**. That's the important point.

You still don't seem to understand that power which doesn't pass through that boundary isn't included in that energy conservation equation. I've [repeatedly failed to explain](#) that the power to the cooled walls you keep talking about is **completely irrelevant** because it doesn't pass through that boundary.

Jane, this is on the level of "drawing within the lines." Does the power pass through the boundary or not? Just think about whether a crayon line crosses the lines in a coloring book. If it does, that

power gets included in the energy equation through that boundary.

Seriously, take a few seconds to write down an energy conservation equation for a boundary around the source without wrongly "cancelling" terms. You'd quickly find that:

- (1) The power to the cooled walls is irrelevant.
- (2) **Because** only the power passing through the boundary is included, the electrical power heating the source maintains a temperature difference between the heat source and the walls.

And again, inserting the standard physics definition of the word "net" into [your equation](#) reproduces the energy conservation equation you're still adamantly rejecting. That's another independent way to see that you should consider the possibility that only power passing **through** a boundary should be included in the energy conservation equation across that boundary.

[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 2015-03-20 20:51 ([#49306973](#))

You still don't seem to understand that power which doesn't pass through that boundary isn't included in that energy conservation equation. I've repeatedly failed to explain [slashdot.org] that the power to the cooled walls you keep talking about is completely irrelevant because it doesn't pass through that boundary.

I understand the situation quite well, and I solved it using standard physics textbook methods. I am very definitely not the person who is confused here.

I've repeatedly failed to explain [slashdot.org] that the power to the cooled walls you keep talking about is completely irrelevant because it doesn't pass through that boundary.

No, you haven't "failed to explain" this. What you did -- typically in your fashion, in my experience -- was **change your story** when you realized that it was not a viable avenue of attack.

I repeat: I have all this already on record.

GO AWAY. You are achieving NOTHING with this nonsense but making yourself look progressively more foolish.

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

■

■

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

by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2015-03-20 21:33 ([#49307101](#))
[Homepage](#) [Journal](#)

I've [repeatedly failed to explain](#) that the power to the cooled walls you keep talking about is **completely irrelevant** because it doesn't pass through that boundary.

No, you haven't "failed to explain" this. What you did -- typically in your fashion, in my experience -- was **change your story** when you realized that it was not a viable avenue of attack. ... [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-20\]](#)

Don't be ridiculous, Jane. Anyone who clicks [that link](#) will see that I've consistently told you that only power which passes through a boundary is included in its energy conservation equation. Again, the source heating power passes through that boundary, but the exterior wall cooler power doesn't pass through that boundary.

It's just like crayons in a coloring book, Jane.

I repeat: I have all this already on record. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-20\]](#)

[Gosh, really?](#) Before you [give a copy](#) of your [cussing and screaming](#) to your grandchildren, you might want to consider giving it to them before they've mastered coloring books. Otherwise "Grandma Jane" will have to answer a lot of awkward questions.

And again, inserting the standard physics definition of the word "net" into [your equation](#) reproduces the energy conservation equation you're still adamantly rejecting. That's another independent way to see that you should consider the possibility that only power passing **through** a boundary should be included in the energy conservation equation across that boundary.

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

■

■

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

by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2015-03-27 21:03 ([#49359479](#))
[Homepage](#) [Journal](#)

Continued [here](#) and [here](#) and [here](#).

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

■

■

Re:Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer (Score:1)

by [khallow \(566160\)](#) [Alter Relationship](#) on 2015-03-17 3:24 ([#49273785](#))

I have to agree, Jane Q. Public won this one. I backtracked through the threads, and I see no evidence that Jane Q. Public got "net" wrong. khayman80 OTOH ought to brag only about things he/she didn't get badly wrong. For those who are interested, it is instructive how many levels deep you have to go in quotes before you finally get to the "net" debate which khayman80 posts endlessly about. This is a clear case of harassment. Finally, we have [this gem](#) from Jane Q. Public:

In the interest of goodwill I would warn you about trying to argue with this person. I have documented proof that (a) he doesn't argue honestly, (b) he will personally hound and harass people, especially if they prove him wrong. He doesn't seem to be able to accept being wrong.

[...] If you insist on arguing with him, prepare to have your words repeated -- for years -- out of context and in distorted and misleading ways. I suppose it's possible that it's some kind of personal vendetta against just me, but I suspect an actual personality flaw.

Looks like Jane Q. Public got another one right.

Parent

Share

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

■

■

Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer (Score:1)

by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2015-03-17 3:43 ([#49273859](#)) [Homepage](#) [Journal](#)

I just [reposted](#) the comment Jane emphatically rejected. If there's some logical way to explain why Jane rejected my very simple comment that **doesn't** involve rejecting the standard physics definition of the term "net" then Jane and/or Khallow should consider providing it.

Parent

Share

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

■

■

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

by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2015-03-17 3:45 ([#49273869](#)) [Homepage](#) [Journal](#)
s/them/then

Parent

Share

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

■

■

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

by [khallow \(566160\)](#) [Alter Relationship](#) on 2015-03-17 4:51 ([#49274175](#))

For the edification of the rest of Slashdot, backtracking the link that Khayman80 provides, goes through several irrelevant threads until it finally, after around 20 or 30 digression/regressions/parent posts gets to [this post](#) made in September 2014. I side with Jane Q. Public fully (once I saw that he/she explicitly stated an assumption I had

concerns about). Fuck you, khayman80.

What I find particular mendacious about this whole idiocy is not the bone-headed, ridiculously long, linked list of zero information, "nuh uh" responses from khayman80, but the innocent-sounding "I just reposted" remark above which dumps you at the head of a very long linked list of bullshit rather than linking you to the meat of the disagreement - like I did above. It's quite clearly harassment from a fool.

khayman80, next time you want to dredge up an old argument, link to the argument directly. It shouldn't take me an hour to figure out what the argument is even about. I wondered for about ten minutes or so, if even the eventual source post would be from last year! It just kept going on and on. I still haven't found out where the quoted comments in Jane Q. Public's source post came from. I guess it was email or perhaps another endless argument elsewhere which didn't show up in my Google search.

[Parent](#)

[Share](#)

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

■

■

[Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer \(Score:1\)](#)

by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2015-03-17 5:04 ([#49274253](#)) [Homepage](#) [Journal](#)

I still haven't found out where the quoted comments in Jane Q. Public's source post came from. I guess it was email or perhaps another endless argument elsewhere which didn't show up in my Google search.

No, everything is public and [linked here](#). If you could be more specific about exactly which quoted comments you can't find, I could easily give you the link.

I side with Jane Q. Public fully (once I saw that he/she explicitly stated an assumption I had concerns about). Fuck you, khayman80.

Charming. You side with Jane Q. Public fully regarding this very simple problem? Let's recap. An electrically heated plate is in a vacuum chamber with cooler chamber walls. The problem is: what's the required electrical heating power?

To solve this problem, start by applying 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 (conservation of energy):

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

Jane, however, insists that:

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

So which energy conservation equation do you fully side with, Khallow?

[Parent](#)

[Share](#)

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

■

■

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

by [khalow \(566160\)](#) [Alter Relationship](#) on 2015-03-17 13:47
([#49278595](#))

Wait, you're "Dumb Scientist"? I guess after a documented year of this, you'll have to rename your blog, "Creepy Stalker". Well, at least you're not yet WOOFY GOOFY level of nuts.

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

In the link I provided, Jane Q. Public explained why he/she dropped the "radiative power in" term as being negligible. I found the argument sufficient.

Having read your blog a bit more, I think it's time you dial back on your obsessive stalking. Glancing over your Dumb Scientist [link](#), I see that you linked to my Slashdot posts dozens of times without ever discussing this with me or having a coherent argument for why you did so.

I don't really mind, since it increases the visibility of the posts. I think they're good material and will weather the years well. But you're missing an opportunity for enlightening and/or entertainment.

Just two weeks later, it becomes clear that Iâ(TM)ve failed to communicate once again. The futility of these conversations is depressing and frustrating. Itâ(TM)s just not worth trying to clear up this apparent confusion of ~200 year instrumental aggregates with ~650,000 year ice core proxies like EPICA.

Update: Iâ(TM)ve failed to communicate again and again and again and again and again and again and again and again and again and again and again and again and again and again and again and again.

Each "again" is a link to one of my posts over what appears to be a year period between 2013 and 2014. I can't tell if they're all climate related (I doubt a one of them has anything to do with 650k year ice cores), but I had fun reading through them. Since Slashdot works so poorly with Google search, I might have better luck searching for my global warming change-related posts via your blog than via Google. There's some good stuff in there. Maybe you ought to read through my stuff sometime.

As a final remark, I posted this on your website in 2011 and my opinion has not changed since except for the last paragraph (due to the current creepy stalker vibe).

Let me put it simply. I donâ(TM)t trust the current research. I donâ(TM)t

trust your or my characterizations of the current research. I donâ(TM)t have the time to figure this out though my belief is that there is insufficient uncertainty in the predictions of future climate change.

I figure though that this will all settled down in a couple of decades. Weâ(TM)ll almost double the duration of satellite-based evidence (plus have a greater span of data collected) and global warming will be more pronounced by then. Further, the economics side will be better known. Weâ(TM)ll have a better idea of the future direction of fossil fuels since peak oil will probably happen by then with peak natural gas coming. Alternative technologies like solar cells (which appear to be declining in price per watt by about 50% per eight years) may obsolete some or most fossil fuel needs. Perhaps the problem will solve itself by then.

I thank you for this marvelous website though. You have been sincere, helpful, and knowledgeable. I will consider your words even though Iâ(TM)m obviously not very receptive at the moment.

That remains my position. A couple of decades of climate should be enough, if there's a near future problem. So far, it doesn't appear to indicate such a problem with slow warming growth.

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

■

■

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

by [khayman80](#) (824400) on 2015-03-17 14:23 ([#49278887](#))

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

In the link I provided, Jane Q. Public explained why he/she dropped the "radiative power in" term as being negligible. I found the argument sufficient.

Wow. I [responded](#): Jane's accounting for "power out" without including a term for "power in". That's not $A = A$, it's $A = 0$ because one of the terms has been ignored. It's led Jane to the absurd conclusion that electrical heating power doesn't depend on the cooler chamber wall temperature. If that's the case, then how did we [detect](#) the 2.7K cosmic microwave background radiation with warmer detectors? How do [uncooled IR detectors](#) see cooler objects? Again, why is [Venus hotter than Mercury?](#)

Maybe khallow's referring to Jane's insistence that:

... all the radiation going IN which strikes the hotter body is effectively reflected or scattered ...

But I repeatedly failed to communicate that the grey body equation has to reduce to the black body equation when emissivity = 0, in which case there are **no** reflections or scattering.

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

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

■

■

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

by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2015-03-17 14:34 ([#49278967](#))

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

Ack, I meant when emissivity = 1, as I said [originally](#).

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

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

■

■

[Re:Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer](#) (Score:1)

by [uninformedLuddite \(1334899\)](#) [Alter Relationship](#) on 2015-03-18 15:11 ([#49287559](#))

So which energy conservation equation do you fully side with, Khallow?

I'm not Khallow but I support the energy conservation of you remaining quiet and still

--

The new right fascists are bilingual. They speak English and Bullshit.

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

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

■

■

[Re:wait what?](#) (Score:2)

by [shutdown -p now \(807394\)](#) [Alter Relationship](#) on 2015-03-17 7:02 ([#49275025](#)) [Journal](#)

Fine. So then EPA and NOAA get all the budget that's currently allocated to NASA for environment study purposes, right?

--

[Glory to heroes!](#)

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

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

■

●

[Slashdot](#)

Archived Discussion

- [Get 373 More Comments](#)
- [Submit Story](#)

interlard - vt., to intersperse; diversify -- Webster's New World Dictionary Of The American Language

- [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 © 2015 Dice. All Rights Reserved.
Slashdot is a [Dice Holdings, Inc.](#) service.

[Close](#)

[Slashdot](#)