

[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This discussion has been archived.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.

[The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists Introduces the Doomsday Dashboard](#) [78 More Prefs](#)

[The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists Introduces the Doomsday Dashboard](#)

Archived Discussion

[Load All Comments](#)[14 Full](#) [02 Abbreviated](#) [10 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.

[78 More Prefs](#)

[Not comprehensive](#) (Score:2, Funny)

by Anonymous Coward

Sure, they added climate change to try to stay relevant when nuclear stockpiles plunged, but there are so many possible doomsdays they ignore entirely.

I see nothing about zombies on the site, for example.

-
-

[Re:](#) (Score:2)

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#)

Sure, they added climate change to try to stay relevant when nuclear stockpiles plunged, but there are so many possible doomsdays they ignore entirely.

I see nothing about zombies on the site, for example.

Personally, I consider zombies to be vastly more likely a threat than any "climate change" from CO2.

Which is to say: not at all. Zombies in the movies kill people who are stupid and slow.

But maybe the whole CO2 warming schtick is aimed at stupid and slow people too. Even better.

-
-
- >

[Re:Not comprehensive](#) (Score:0, Offtopic)

by [RespekMyAthorati \(798091\)](#) [Alter Relationship](#) on 2015-03-23 18:38 ([#49324637](#))

Ah, Lonny.*

Same old head-in-the-sand stupidity as always.

"Jane Q. Public" is actually a man named Lonny Eachus.

[Parent](#)

[Share](#)

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

■

■

[Re:Not comprehensive](#) ([Score:1](#))

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#) on 2015-03-23 20:40 ([#49325101](#))

"Jane Q. Public" is actually a man named Lonny Eachus.

Even if that happened to be true, who (besides you, that is), gives a damn? Is this your amateur attempt at the despicable practice of "doxxing"?

Besides: I would estimate in good faith that there is about a 99.9% probability that "RespekMyAthorati" is a man named "Bryan Killett", who demonstrably can't stand to be tied down to one pseudonym like his "Khayman80" account, he thinks it's fun to harass other people using multiple sock-puppet accounts.

The other 0.01% would almost have to be one of Bryan's friends. If he has any. NOBODY ELSE, in all my years here, has bothered to try to harass me in this manner. Nobody.

[Parent](#)

[Share](#)

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

■

■

[Re:Not comprehensive](#) ([Score:1](#))

by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2015-03-23 22:15 ([#49325341](#)) [Homepage](#) [Journal](#)
Answered [here](#).

[Parent](#)

[Share](#)

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

■

■

[Re:Not comprehensive](#) ([Score:1](#))

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#) on 2015-03-24 17:10 ([#49332255](#))

Answered [here](#).

I see. So you admit "RespekMyAthorati" is one of your sockpuppet accounts? If not, why are you answering for "him"?

[Parent](#)

[Share](#)

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

■

■

[Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer \(Score:2\)](#)by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2015-03-25 11:46 ([#49337835](#)) [Homepage](#) [Journal](#)Answered [here](#).

By the way:

Bill Nye - a guy I respected a lot when I was younger - caught in inexcusable misinformation about global warming. [patriotpost.us/posts/31194 \[Lonny Eachus, 2014-11-14\]](#)

I *used to* respect Nye.

MT @SteveSGoddard: Dear @TheScienceGuy - you've set a high bar for stupidest climate post [stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2015/02/06/bil... \[Lonny Eachus, 2015-02-06\]](#)

... I used to respect Nye a lot. But ever since he started opening his mouth about AGW he has been sounding like his head has gotten so big it could be mistaken for he Goodyear Blimp. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-02-23\]](#)

Ad-hominem will get you nowhere. Billy Nye DEMONSTRATED that he knows squat about AGW by co-hosting [THIS](#) video with Al Gore... showing an experiment to "prove" CO2 warming that could never have actually worked. While Anthony Watts also gets part of it wrong -- actual greenhouses do not actually work by "trapping infrared radiation" -- he still demonstrates conclusively that the Nye-Gore "demonstration" was 100% a crock of made-up shit. To publicly DEMONSTRATE his ignorance and dishonesty in that manner, then call others half-stupid, is very strong evidence that Bill Nye is a chronic sufferer of Dunning-Kruger Syndrome. Or just plain a liar. Choose one. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-02-23\]](#)

Jane/Lonny Eachus accuses Bill Nye of being a liar or suffering from Dunning-Kruger syndrome, but Jane can't even write down a simple energy conservation equation without wrongly "cancelling" terms.

I've repeatedly [explained](#) that only the power passing through a boundary is included in the energy conservation equation across that boundary. I've even [linked](#) to textbooks so Jane can verify that this is how "conservation of energy" works.

If Jane ever reads and understands those textbooks, he'd know that the cooler power isn't relevant for the same reason that he could know that a crayon mark doesn't cross the lines in a coloring book. Again, this is **really** basic physics.

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

If Jane can't even master the most basic details about conservation of energy, Jane won't ever be able to analyze how greenhouses work because that depends on understanding conservation of energy.

Jane, you of all people really shouldn't be accusing scientists of being liars or suffering

from Dunning-Kruger syndrome.

[Parent](#)

[Share](#)

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

■

■

[Re:Not comprehensive](#) (Score:1)

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#) on 2015-03-23 20:57 ([#49325157](#))

And I just literally stumbled on [this little gem](#). I wasn't even looking for anything, it was just a mis-click. RespekMyAthorati says:

Holy shit.

The second law says exactly the opposite: namely that entropy in a closed system will always increase over time, so that complexity and information content will always decrease.

Hahahaha!

This guy's supposed to be a PhD physicist, and he doesn't know how information relates to the Second Law of Thermodynamics!

Apparently RespekMyAthorati has never heard of "[event horizons](#)" and [why those were a big theoretical problem for physics, because of the information loss](#).

Gotcha again, dude! And I'm no physicist. Never claimed to be. But I sure seem to know more about it than you do.

If you keep losing arguments this spectacularly, you're probably going to have to give back that degree.

[Parent](#)

[Share](#)

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

■

■

[Re:Not comprehensive](#) (Score:1)

by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2015-03-23 21:08 ([#49325181](#)) [Homepage](#) [Journal](#)

This guy's supposed to be a PhD physicist

Really? Where did "RespekMyAthorati" claim to be a PhD physicist?

[Parent](#)

[Share](#)

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

■

■

[Re:Not comprehensive](#) (Score:1)

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#) on 2015-03-23 21:45 ([#49325287](#))

Really? Where did "RespekMyAthorati" claim to be a PhD physicist?

Well, let's see if the rest of Slashdot has much of a problem with this logic:

For years now, I have had ONE person claiming to be a physicist, who seems to care (understatement; "obsessed" would be more accurate) about who he thinks I am outside of Slashdot, and who likes to argue -- nay, insists upon arguing -- fallaciously about physics.

And along comes "RespekMyAthorati", with marvellously coincidental timing, who apparently also likes to argue fallaciously about physics, and who also seems to care about some person outside of Slashdot who he thinks is me.

Rather astounding coincidence, wouldn't you say?

I would. I bet if I put together a group of Slashdotters, and showed this to them, they would conclude that the one account is very likely (understatement again) a sock-puppet of the other.

And I know you don't seem to care, but Slashdotters don't think very highly of sock-puppetry.

Parent

Share

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

■

■

Re:Not comprehensive (Score:1)

by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2015-03-23 22:14 ([#49325337](#)) [Homepage](#) [Journal](#)

... I would estimate in good faith that there is about a 99.9% probability that "RespekMyAthorati" is a man named "Bryan Killett", who demonstrably can't stand to be tied down to one pseudonym like his "Khayman80" account, he thinks it's fun to harass other people using multiple sock-puppet accounts. The other 0.01% would almost have to be one of Bryan's friends. If he has any. NOBODY ELSE, in all my years here, has bothered to try to harass me in this manner. Nobody. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-23\]](#)

Charming. I'm not "RespekMyAthorati" and I've never spoken to "RespekMyAthorati" even once. But it's fascinating that this is the [sixth time](#) Jane's accused me of pretending to be somebody else. I'll remember this the next time Jane pretends to be offended whenever I point out that Jane is Lonny Eachus.

... This guy's supposed to be a PhD physicist, and he doesn't know how information relates to the Second Law of Thermodynamics! ... [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-23\]](#)

... For years now, I have had ONE person claiming to be a physicist, who seems to care (understatement; "obsessed" would be more accurate) about who he thinks I am outside of Slashdot, and who likes to argue -- nay, insists upon arguing -- fallaciously about physics. And along comes "RespekMyAthorati", with marvellously coincidental timing, who apparently also likes to argue fallaciously about physics, and who also seems to care about some person outside of Slashdot who he thinks is me. ... [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-23\]](#)

Don't be ridiculous, Jane. Do you really want to see what a PhD physicist says about how information relates to the second law of thermodynamics? Six years ago [I said](#): most [information theorists](#) regard information and entropy to be closely related. So saying "information is increasing" is very similar to saying "entropy is increasing," ...

As you can see, a PhD physicist has already said that "RespekMyAthorati" is wrong. But feel free to keep accusing me of being six different people. The irony is delicious.

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

■

■

[Re:Not comprehensive](#) (Score:1)

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#) on 2015-03-24 17:15 ([#49332283](#))

As you can see, a PhD physicist has already said that "RespekMyAthorati" is wrong. But feel free to keep accusing me of being six different people. The irony is delicious.

I didn't "accuse you" but I did suggest the possibility. More than just a possibility, really.

And I find the "coincidence" (as I explained above) of him answering for you to be just a bit too unlikely. Actually, I think it's damned near impossible. Of course "nearly impossible" happens all the time in this world, but Slashdot is not the entire world.

You have also been caught sock-puppeting before. So that should be no surprise to anyone, either.

And it hardly surprises me that you would contradict yourself. You did it a lot when we were actually having our Spencer discussion. You never admitted it, but as I have stated before, it's all a matter of record.

Unlike you, while I certainly have made mistakes, and changed my mind on some issues over the years, I have been happy to admit it when that actually happens.

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

■

■

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

by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2015-03-25 11:44 ([#49337821](#)) [Homepage](#) [Journal](#)

... Slashdotters don't think very highly of sock-puppetry.
[\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-23\]](#)

I didn't "accuse you" but I did suggest the possibility. More than just a possibility, really. And I find the "coincidence" (as I explained above) of him answering for you to be just a bit too unlikely. Actually, I think it's damned near impossible. ...

[\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-24\]](#)

That might be the most hilarious bit in Jane's comedy act, where he wrongly [claims](#) that "there is about a 99.9% probability that "RespekMyAthorati" is a man named "Bryan Killett"".

And yet Jane's 100% wrong, despite being 99.9% certain. As always. And Jane refuses to admit he's wrong. As always. And Jane simultaneously insists that he's happy to admit he's wrong. As always.

But at least Jane [finally](#) admitted that Jane is suggesting anything. Baby steps.

Answered [here](#).

I see. So you admit "RespekMyAthorati" is one of your sockpuppet accounts? If not, why are you answering for "him"? [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-24\]](#)

Good grief, Jane. That link goes to my [clear statement](#) that I'm not "RespekMyAthorati". So it's difficult to imagine that Jane's asking that question in good faith.

But maybe Jane's chronic amnesia is kicking in again, so Jane might actually be honestly confused... once again. If Jane's actually just honestly confused, Jane should try to remember that I answered Jane's comment because Jane used my real name to wrongly accuse me of being "RespekMyAthorati":

... Is this your amateur attempt at the despicable practice of "doxxing"? Besides: I would estimate in good faith that there is about a 99.9% probability that "RespekMyAthorati" is a man named "Bryan Killett", who demonstrably can't stand to be tied down to one pseudonym like his "Khayman80" account, he thinks it's fun to harass other people using multiple sock-puppet accounts. ... [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-23\]](#)

Sadly, Jane will probably never appreciate the ironic contrast between those first two sentences.

Jane probably also won't appreciate the irony that Jane uses my real name to wrongly accuse me of posing as someone else, while complaining bitterly and threatening to call the police and/or sue whenever I point out that Jane is Lonny Eachus. But again, I'll remember this the next time Jane pretends to be offended whenever I point out that Jane is Lonny Eachus.

... You have also been caught sock-puppeting before. So that should be no surprise to anyone, either. ... [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-24\]](#)

Good grief. [Once again](#), the irony of Lonny Eachus's sock-puppet "Jane Q. Public" wrongly accusing me of sock-puppeting is overwhelming.

Once again, Jane's completely wrong. This "khayman80" account is the

only account I use at Slashdot. What Jane actually means is that his crippling paranoia has led Jane/Lonny Eachus to [repeatedly](#) and [baselessly project his own sock-puppeting onto me](#).

... And it hardly surprises me that you would contradict yourself. You did it a lot when we were actually having our Spencer discussion. You never admitted it, but as I have stated before, it's all a matter of record. ... [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-24\]](#)

I just explained that "RespekMyAthorati" was wrong, and showed that I'd already disagreed with his statement 6 years ago. A real skeptic might interpret this as evidence against Jane's accusation.

But Jane simply interprets that evidence as support for his accusation. This is [known as](#) a 'self-sealing' ideology: "(Keeley [1999](#), Bale [2007](#), Sunstein and Vermeule [2009](#)), whereby evidence against a conspiratorial belief is re-interpreted as evidence *for* that belief."

... And it hardly surprises me that you would contradict yourself. You did it a lot when we were actually having our Spencer discussion. You never admitted it, but as I have stated before, it's all a matter of record. ... [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-24\]](#)

Good grief, Jane. You've been baselessly accusing me of contradicting myself, but if you'd learn how to apply conservation of energy then you'd realize that your accusations are misplaced. For instance, from our Spencer discussion:

... As long as the power used by the source and the power used by the cooler are constant as required, any relationship between them has no bearing on the experiment. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2014-08-02\]](#)

... 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. ... [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-20\]](#)

Really? Because you'd previously and wrongly claimed that the power used by the cooler was constant. To the untrained eye, that might look like a contradiction. But I'm sure Jane could grace us with a long-winded evasive pile of nonsense which miraculously concludes that Jane's been perfectly consistent.

I've repeatedly [explained](#) that only the power passing through a boundary is included in the energy conservation equation across that boundary. I've even [linked](#) to textbooks so Jane can verify that this is how "conservation of energy" works.

If Jane ever reads and understands those textbooks, he'd know that the cooler power isn't relevant for the same reason that he could know that a crayon mark doesn't cross the lines in a coloring book. Again, this is **really** basic physics.

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

boundary should be included in the energy conservation equation across that boundary.

... I will state again what I have stated so many times before: I don't mind admitting that I am wrong, but first I have to be shown that I am indeed wrong. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2013-05-06\]](#)

I don't know about you, but if I say something that is incorrect, I appreciate being corrected. As long as it's done politely. ... I can be stubborn, but if someone can show me I'm wrong, I'm willing to change. But all too often, they've just tried to TELL me I'm wrong, rather than showing me I'm wrong. That's the difference. [\[Lonny Eachus, 2014-02-07\]](#)

Really? I showed that you were [wrong about GPS](#) by writing down the equations showing that 4 satellite locks are required unless the GPS receiver has an atomic clock, but you couldn't bring yourself to admit that you were wrong. Will you do that now, or were you lying when you said you're willing to admit that you're wrong?

... I've made mistakes here and admitted them when they've been pointed out to me. But unless I made a recognizable blunder, I won't admit to being wrong unless someone actually shows that I am. Insults don't quite make it over that line. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-02-27\]](#)

Insults [like these](#)?

... If you **show** that I was wrong or ignorant of some subject, I'll happily admit it and correct myself. But calling names doesn't cut it, and I doubt you can do the other. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-05\]](#)

... Unlike you, while I certainly have made mistakes, and changed my mind on some issues over the years, I have been happy to admit it when that actually happens. [\[Jane Q. Public, 2015-03-24\]](#)

Good grief, Jane. The last time you made this absurd claim, I [listed several examples](#) where I've admitted mistakes.

Again, it's so ironically meta for you to argue endlessly that you admit your mistakes. For instance, after I [debunked](#) your lecture on neutrino oscillation, you [repeatedly claimed](#) that I missed where you admitted you were wrong. Despite the fact that the last quote in my post was the closest example I could find to a genuine admission that you'd been wrong. Even then, you manufactured unwarranted doubt by inserting words like could and theoretically. At the same time, you made additional claims which were never challenged, like equating the MSW effect with lasers.

You even repeatedly refused to answer my [simple question](#): when [you asked](#) "why didn't you **bother** to repeat the part...?" you actually meant that I **had** repeated that part and responded to it?

If you're actually happy to admit mistakes, couldn't you start by answering that very simple question?

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

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

■

■

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

by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2015-03-27 21:04 ([#49359485](#))

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

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

[Parent](#)

[Share](#)

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

■

•

[Slashdot](#)

Archived Discussion

- [Get 78 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](#)