

[Stories](#) [Firehose >](#) [All](#) [Popular](#) [Video](#) [new](#) [Jobs](#) [Deals](#) [Submit](#)

Topics: [Devices](#) [Build](#) [Entertainment](#) [Technology](#) [Open Source](#) [Science](#) [YRO](#) [khayman80](#)

Follow us: [RSS](#) [Facebook](#) [Google+](#) [Twitter](#) [Email](#)

This discussion has been archived.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

[Modern Cockpits: Harder To Invade But Easier To Lock Up](#) [374 More Prefs](#)

[Modern Cockpits: Harder To Invade But Easier To Lock Up](#)

Archived Discussion

[Load All Comments](#)

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

[374 More Prefs](#)

[Ummmm ... duh?](#) (Score:4, Insightful)

by [gstoddart \(321705\)](#) [Alter Relationship](#)

So, after 9/11 they rushed to put door locks on the damned things.

And, now, to the utter shock and amazement of everybody ... someone in the cockpit can lock people out of it. Exactly as they designed it.

I'm stunned, I tell 'ya.

Of course, now when the pilot has to take a leak there is one less cabin crew, which I'm sure you can construct a scenario in which that's not a good idea.

--

Lost at C:>. Found at C.

-
-

[Re:](#) (Score:5, Insightful)

by [gstoddart \(321705\)](#) [Alter Relationship](#)

And, of course, we can construct the scenario in which the co-pilot and one of the cabin crew conspires so that when the pilot has to take a leak it's the two of them in the cockpit, and then they can do the same damned thing.

There's really no way you can 100% prevent this kind of thing.

--

Lost at C:>. Found at C.

■

■

Re: (Score:3)by [Vlad the Inhaler \(32958\)](#) [Alter Relationship](#)

Much less likely, I'd be more worried about the "depressed narcissistic arsehole" overpowering the stewardess and crashing the plane anyway.

I suspect (ok, assume) this is what happened to that Air Malaysia plane just over a year ago, the one which vanished without trace.

--

Mielipiteet omiani - Opinions personal, facts suspect.

■

■

Re: (Score:5, Interesting)by [gstoddart \(321705\)](#) [Alter Relationship](#)

Know many pilots?

The difference between "depressed narcissistic arsehole" and "perfectly normal narcissistic arsehole" isn't as far as you'd think.

Airline pilots are largely convinced of their own superiority to begin with.

Hell, I suspect the C-level of executives in most large corporations gets you your "narcissistic areshole" out of the gate. All the ones I've ever met certainly are.

--

Lost at C:>. Found at C.

■

■

>

Re:Ummmm ... duh? (Score:2)by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#) on 2015-03-27 20:46 ([#49359415](#))

The difference between "depressed narcissistic arsehole" and "perfectly normal narcissistic arsehole" isn't as far as you'd think.

Yes, it is, because there's no such thing as a "perfectly normal narcissistic arsehole". A real thing and an imaginary thing are not comparable.

Airline pilots are largely convinced of their own superiority to begin with.

Arrogance and narcissism are not even remotely the same things... though they may be related. In the same way, for example, that narcissism and sociopathy are sometimes related. But NOT the same things.

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

■

■

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

by [khayman80 \(824400\)](#) on 2015-03-27 20:55 (#49359443) [Homepage](#) [Journal](#)

Speaking of arrogance, narcissism and sociopathy, Jane ran away like a snivelling coward instead of showing that he wasn't lying when he repeatedly claimed he's happy to admit his mistakes:

... 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 i 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](#) [g+](#)

■

■

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

by Anonymous Coward on 2015-04-10 5:05 ([#49445295](#))

Lonny [keeps lecturing](#) physicists about physics, and has another [forensic wet dream](#):

I suspect you are taking someone else's word that there is a disagreement about "net", but that person is not correct. I stated "net", which you can find in the textbooks. If someone disagrees, I suggest you use the textbook definition. I am no longer going to respond to arguments that did not

originate on twitter, on twitter. Take them elsewhere. Pardon me, you of dubious provenance: I am busy and I do not recall. What was the context again? Which bodies? You honestly expect a meaningful argument about thermodynamics on Twitter? REALLY? Even if it WEREN'T obvious that this is a sock-puppet account, so you don't have to identify yourself? What possible reason would I have to answer you AT ALL??? Arrogant asshole, thinks everyone else is a fool. Fuck off. By the way: all these exchanges are being recorded, and circumstantial evidence of identity noted. Have a nice day. Evidence is as it is: no avatar, no history, narrow focus, a few comments to "establish account credibility"... comments suspiciously timed with arguments being made elsewhere, etc. You're a forensic wet dream. And what's really hilarious is that I've told you that before but you still don't get it. Explain what possible relevance that has. So you have used this ID elsewhere? So what? Evidence of exactly nothing. What's RELEVANT, is evidence of what use you have made of it NOW, and HERE. Existence elsewhere is weakest straw-man. I'm not arguing with you, I'm telling you what is evident.

So.. okay. I did look you up, and you do appear to be a real person. I am a bit set back, because there was A LOT of evidence ... that you were LIKELY someone else. Among that evidence is that person engaged in sock-puppetry regularly. So pardon me if I jumped the gun; but you started arguing about things I hadn't mentioned to you personally... which ... reinforced the idea that you were sock-puppeting for someone else. If I was mistaken, I apologize, but you must ... understand how it looked from my point of view. You have no avatar, you have no established presence on Twitter... and I have been battling someone who has a nasty sock-puppet habit. It has nothing to do with "Liberal Conspiracy". Don't put words in my mouth. The fact remains: if you want to have meaningful discussion of radiative physics, it won't happen on Twitter. So don't insult yourself by asking. "Forensic" evidence you have been conferring with others is still there; they don't put words in my mouth, either. Although certain among them have repeatedly tried. Even so, I would have to ask what is unclear about this, re: this comment and the next. Your meaning is unclear. Honestly, if you act like a sock-puppet (you have), expect to be perceived as a sock-puppet. I retract my apology. If you want to be taken seriously, establish a presence, and don't argue things others NOT here said behind my back. Having said all I said, I am willing to accept that the situation was not intentional on your part. SO... please explain your comment about there being two terms in the calculation of flux. I *WILL* apologize if your argument about net was not prompted by a certain individual who has misrepresented.

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

■

■

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

by Anonymous Coward on 2015-04-10 8:44 ([#49446797](#))

Lonny [keeps digging](#):

Don't be ridiculous, and stop trying to put words in my mouth. I

repeat: the timing was suspicious, given past behavior of other people. As I stated before: I am not accusing you... of being a sock-puppet. But I retract my apology for thinking you were, given the timing and circumstances. As I mentioned: I have had to deal with them in the past, and your Twitter history did not inspire confidence. I am aware of this, in fact it contributed to my perception that you could have been a sock-puppet. And I was not aware of a "Liberal Conspiracy" blog, so again I will not apologize for not understanding the reference.

As for who appears to be saying otherwise, his name is Bryan Killett, aka Dumb Scientist. Not that he disagrees with the statement, but he appears to have some custom definition for "net" that allows thermodynamically hotter gray bodies to absorb radiative energy from colder gray bodies, so further heating.

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

■

■

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

by Anonymous Coward on 2015-04-10 10:52 ([#49447969](#))

Lonny Eachus [keeps digging](#):

Per him, in general, a hotter gray body will accept radiative heat transfer from a colder body to become hotter yet. Not only does he assert this, he has hounded and harassed me over it for a long time, won't let it rest.

In brief, he seems to feel the presence of a colder body somehow alters the Stefan-Boltzmann radiative power output of the hotter body. He further asserts this is a result of Kirchhoff's Law, which frankly, would appear to be a direct contradiction or failure to understand it. At equilibrium (which the relevant circumstances are not), Kirchhoff's Law states that absorption effectively results in a shift of output spectra to keep the total radiative output power constant. What the source of his apparent failure to understand these concepts is, I have no idea. The result of this is no NET absorption of energy from the other body, no increased thermodynamic Temp.

This has been the essence of my argument to him: radiative power output unchanged, therefore T via the Stefan-Boltzmann relation, must also remain unchanged. it is a simple logic chain.

My argument also follows directly from the very same cavity experiments which led to Kirchhoff's Law. Per Killett's version of transfer, a sphere in a cavity would spontaneously heat relative to the walls. He has failed to explain why that would NOT happen, if his version of the physics were true. That result would not only be counter to observation, it would

violate 1st & 2nd laws of thermodynamics... which even Wikipedia clearly explains on its page about Kirchhoff's. No radiative physics book needed.

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

■

■

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

by Anonymous Coward on 2015-04-10 11:44 ([#49448523](#))

Lonny Eachus [keeps digging](#):

I have explained this to Killett multiple times, in various ways, which he continues to misrepresent. Claiming that this textbook explanation is an expression of some kind of "cult physics" or something. Killett's primary tactic of ad-hominem has been "out-of-context + misrepresentation", which he has practiced on me for some years, in part on his "Dumb Scientist" blog.

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

■

■

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

by Anonymous Coward on 2015-04-10 12:18 ([#49448835](#))

Lonny Eachus [keeps digging](#):

I objected to this malicious habit of his in writing years ago, and often since, but he has persisted. So: in closing, I apologize for the long stream of tweets, but you DID ask. Waitâ€¦ I will add a bit more. I donâ€™(TM)t claim to be perfect, and I have made mistakes. But I admit them. Any mistakes I have made do not excuse Killettâ€™(TM)s behavior, which has been unprofessional and malicious. He accuses me of â€œbaseless accusations of fraudâ€œ, for example. I do not make â€œbaselessâ€œ statements. He parades around errors I made in the far past, admitted then and corrected, as though they were today. Those are SOME OF the reasons I no longer engage in argument with him. I have no desire to have statements of mine even further taken out of context and misrepresented.

Further, this is why I created a new account on Quark Soup for my reply: he has â€œcyber stalkedâ€œ my social media accounts, going back years. That is not normal behavior. I have evidence he has used sock-puppeted

social media accounts to suppress my own comments.
Etc. So I shall not apologize for a certain amount of
âoe paranoiaâ, if you will, over such things.
Killettâ(TM)s demonstrated, persistent behavior has
been the direct cause.

If Lonny's rant keeps going after this article is locked, they'll be
copied [here](#).

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

■

•

[Slashdot](#)

Archived Discussion

- [Get 374 More Comments](#)
- [Submit Story](#)

Administration: An ingenious abstraction in politics, designed to receive the kicks and cuffs due to the premier or president. -- Ambrose Bierce

- [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](#)