

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

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

[khayman80](#)

Follow us:

This discussion has been archived.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

[Reddit CEO Ellen Pao Bans Salary Negotiations To Equalize Pay For Men, Women](#) [883 More Prefs](#)

[Reddit CEO Ellen Pao Bans Salary Negotiations To Equalize Pay For Men, Women](#)

[Archived Discussion](#)
[Load 500 More 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.

[883 More Prefs](#)

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

by Anonymous Coward

Penalising better negotiators is hardly a good thing regardless if it's trying to promote equality. Really all they're doing is saving money.

-
-

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

by [Crashmarik \(635988\)](#) [Alter Relationship](#)

Really all they're doing is saving money.

Yep. I will bet good coin, that the average salary as a whole goes down over this.

-
-

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

by [uvajed_ekil \(914487\)](#) [Foe of a Friend](#)

Really all they're doing is saving money.

Yep. I will bet good coin, that the average salary as a whole goes down over this.

BINGO! And I see I'm not the only one suspicious of her bizarre excuse for refusing to negotiate.

--

This is a hacked account, for which the owner can not be held responsible.

■
■
>

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

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737\)](#) [Friend of a Friend](#) on 2015-04-08 20:48 ([#49435377](#))

BINGO! And I see I'm not the only one suspicious of her bizarre excuse for refusing to negotiate.

I'm of divided mind. I think she might actually be sincere but misguided. It seems like it must be one of the two. I think that we can agree that either way, it won't result in overall advantage for the employees, women or not.

I wonder if she will also propose that from now on, all employees will get the same raises.

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

■

■

[Re:Hmm](#) (Score:0)

by Anonymous Coward on 2015-04-11 5:13 ([#49452473](#))

Thanks for your comment. It's great to hear from women who are skeptical of these misguided ideas.

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

■

■

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

by Anonymous Coward on 2015-04-14 7:28 ([#49470083](#))

This "conversation" is [continued from here](#).

Pardon me again. Just for the sake of completeness, I want to post this:

[Answer](#)

In physics, we call "thermodynamics" something else. We call it "statistical mechanics." Meaning macroscopic and predictable based on statistics. Before you read further, please just consider this notion: "equilibrium" is *defined* in thermodynamics as a state where there is no net flow. Trying to prove that there is a net flow is just trying to prove non-equilibrium. There's no reason to try and say that there are counterexamples. That's like trying to say that a dog is really a cat. The very word "equilibrium" means that all the flows are equal in all parts of the system, in and out. If you find a counterexample that exists, then by

definition the system is NOT IN EQUILIBRIUM. So if you find a counterexample, then you've found a system that is not in thermal equilibrium. Done.

In the system I showed there IS net heat transfer. It is not in local thermal equilibrium. The point was important. [\[Lonny Eachus, 2015-04-13\]](#)

Notice that the quote you copied isn't restricted to **heat** flow. That point is important. Conservation of energy applies to **all** energy which crosses a boundary, even if it crosses that boundary in the form of electricity instead of heat.

Conservation of energy means that if you draw a boundary around some system (like the heated plate), power going in minus power going out of the boundary equals the rate at which energy inside that boundary changes. If nothing inside the boundary is changing, that rate is zero so power in = power out.

If power in = power out, physicists say there's "no net flow".

So Lonny's link is actually just repeating the same basic concept that I am: if there's no change with time, conservation of energy says that power in = power out. **ALL** power. **Not** just heat, because **any** form of energy has to be included in the energy conservation equation.

That's why if nothing is changing with time, electrical heating power depends on the cooler chamber wall temperature:

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

Once again, what matters is that the objects' temperatures aren't changing with time. It's just a matter of labels if we call this "equilibrium" or "steady-state".

But I generously let you choose "steady-state" seven months ago. And yet you're still using this nonsensical excuse to evade solving the very first step of this very simple thought experiment. Why?

@tan123 @SteveSGoddard These two bozos wanted to set me up. (I *DO* have a reply to their physics problem, by the way.) [\[Lonny Eachus, 2015-04-13\]](#)

Really? Then prove it. Show everyone how the enclosed plate doesn't warm, **without** using your previous nonsensical equation which violates what you call "kindergarten-level physics", and **without** wrongly claiming that "radiative power out" is held constant rather than electrical (or [Jane's cow fart](#) or [Lonny's horse fart](#), etc.) heating power.

Parent

Share

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

■

■

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

by Anonymous Coward on 2015-04-15 6:38 ([#49477791](#))

I've [failed](#) to communicate once again.

Parent

Share

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

■

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

by Anonymous Coward on 2015-04-15 7:54 ([#49478413](#))

For some reason that link didn't work: <http://davidappell.blogspot.co...>

Parent

Share

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

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

by Anonymous Coward on 2015-04-16 14:14 ([#49489207](#))

Lonny Eachus's [rant](#) is continued from [here](#).

No, did you read the part I referenced? Remember, radiant output power is solidly fixed to T for a gray body. Via Stefan Boltzman relation: $\text{Area} * \epsilon T^4$ Changing radiant output power changes thermodynamic temperature and vice versa. There are no two ways about it. Kirchhoffs law says AT EQUILIBRIUM, output spectra will shift subtly in such a way that radiant output power does not change, therefore T does not change. However, this is at equilibrium. It has been claimed (not by me) that this holds for gray bodies not at equilibrium. I am happy to patiently wait to see how such arguments play out. No tricks. I just want honest science. In the open where people can see it. Not much to ask. I am also happy to be proved wrong, if it happens honestly. That's how people learn, yes? Until I am presented with a cohesive rational chain of argument, it is impossible to answer or evaluate. I am no longer going to tolerate his piecemeal this argument here, that argument there, no i didn't say that bullshit. I am not asking you to sympathize, but I hope you can at least understand my position. And to be honest, far worse than the "I didn't say that" crap, was the "You said THIS", when I had repeatedly said no. So, not to be redundant, but that's why I want him to show an actual complete solution to the "problem" he presented himself and for which he even specified most of the parameters himself. I let him do it. And I want it in public. If he refuses, then he abdicates any right he may have to hound me for life over it. And I won't even bother to give details about that "hounding". You would probably think I was exaggerating. I have already stated that. However, see Kirchhoff's Law, as applies to the cavity experiments which were used to discover and formulate it. Edge cases like, for example, a black or gray body in a cavity of the same material. Radiative transfer is NOT intuitive. It has traps and pitfalls. Normal intuitive thermodynamic reasoning can fool you. I would quote one of my radiative heat transfer textbooks, a I did Killett, but I don't have it by my side. So... Robin, I ALREADY TOLD YOU I was describing an edge case. If you want to look it up, you can find it yourself VERY EASILY on the Wikipedia page on Kirchhoff's Law. I am NOT going to argue this with you here.

As I have clearly stated, multiple times: Killett made a claim of a solution to Spencer's gedankeneksperiment. I agreed to discuss it with him, and Latour's rebuttal to Spencer's blog post. That led to an argument about a very specific problem, mainly specified by Killett himself. As a result of that argument, over which he actually did not do very well, he became upset and started a campaign of ad-hominem via social media. My ONLY interest here is to have Killett show HIS problem, and HIS solution here in public where everyone can see it and understand it. So I can also honestly respond to his argument, also openly and in public, where everyone can see it. While I

have mentioned physics here on Twitter, I have NO intention of ARGUING physics here on Twitter, for the same reasons I just got done explaining. Are we understood? Twitter is my PERSONAL SPACE, where I interact with my friends. The only reason I gave you that long explanation before was because YOU ASKED, and it genuinely deserved a long explanation.

I use Twitter the way I wish to use Twitter. Thanks very much. Further, according to Twitter, you were not following me so there could be no DM exchange. Although Twitter has been known to get that wrong. Understood. Nothing personal intended, and at this time I have no reason for hard feelings. That sounded kind of stiff, didn't it? Apologies. Just a personal note: I have much going on, rather a minority of it pleasant, and if I seem short or stiff it is only because I have obligations, places to be, things to do, and often not much time for niceties. Also, I don't mind discussing things, in the way of friendly discourse. But most of the time this is my ... Wait... you're NOT the one from SkepticalScience? Are you Bromley Robin Levett? I don't mind having a friendly DISCUSSION. But my policy is not to argue here. I would like to know more about you.

I see. I did not mean to be intrusive, I just wondered about "lawyer for hire" interested in radiative physics. Are you representing anyone at this time who is involved in the "climate science" debate?

@davidappell is now censoring my comments on Quark Soup. Please see my most recent tweet. Bryan Killett had a long-running argument with me about whether hot objects will absorb radiation from colder objects and thereby get even hotter. This took place over many months. (Actually not 3 parts, this will be 5 or more.) Years, actually. So when @davidappell "invited" me to argue it with him on his public blog, I reluctantly accepted. But then I saw that Killett was up to his same old usual tricks... presenting only the parts of the past arguments which he wanted others to see. When I objected, and said I wanted Killett to make his ENTIRE argument and solution public, start to finish, THEN the problems started. Killed refused, @davidappell defended him, and then started to censor me. ... that Killett's errors could be seen by others. Apparently he doesn't want the embarrassing parts seen. Instead they want me to argue about simple math and other crap nobody disputes. Apparently they think I am some kind of idiot who will stumble over addition problems. So I'm showing my comments that @davidappel has been censoring here. I wrote that I have no more desire to participate in that shitfest... he won't even post that. They insist I prove that I "agree" with kindergarten-level physics: Which, by the way, I had already stated MYSELF much earlier on that same page. @davidappell says he won't post any more of my statements unless I discuss "the science"... But as I showed below, I *DID* comment about the science, which he didn't post. Apparently @davidappell thinks some people must show their work, but not others.

It seems @davidappell thinks this comment is not worthy of his blog discussion since I posted it about 1/2 hour ago and it isn't there. However, perhaps he is busy. I'll give it time. Please see: Killett's tirades are STILL ad-hominem-style crap about inconsequential... but nobody answers substantive questions. And also: And very definitely last: To give all eyes plenty of chance to see, this is my comment that somehow never got posted on @davidappell website: Haha... except it was followed by one more: Sigh... further attempts at ad-hominem required an adult reply. Or, to show it from the blog page: I won't bother you further. I just wanted witnesses. Blog post:

The argument with Brian Killett continues on Quark Soup. I reasonably had to concede his heat transfer equation. But no big deal. I have much more to say. Bryan, not Brian. @davidappell is censoring his page again. I don't understand why he asks me to discuss the science, then censors me when I do. This was @davidappell's reply to the comment I just showed you: He hasn't posted ANY of my replies, even the ones that

directly addressed the issue, as I showed earlier. This is his latest. My reply: HIS reply to that:

FINAL response. They may be physicists but they don't know logical argument when they see it. These two bozos wanted to set me up. (I *DO* have a reply to their physics problem, by the way.) They're trying to claim that the central object shown in the first picture here... <http://www.drroyspencer.com/20...> are in "thermal equilibrium". One of them at 150F and the other at 0F, vacuum in between. !!! Is that even remotely anything like your understanding of thermal equilibrium? I simply told them that if they won't agree that it is not thermal equilibrium, there was no point in continuing. They say it's only a matter of labels. I disagree, saying it's relevant to the solution to the problem. I'm not asking you as an "authority" to agree with me. I'll leave it up to others to decide.

Hahahaha. According to these guys a combination of one-sided argument and censorship is a "scientific discussion". I disagree. I won't bother you any more with this. I'm done with them. As I said, I just want witnesses because he's censoring. Pardon me again. Just for the sake of completeness, I want to post this: In the system I showed, there IS net heat transfer (flow). Therefore it is not in equilibrium. This was important. In the system I showed there IS net heat transfer. It is not in local thermal equilibrium. The point was important.

Protip to climate scientists: The WAY you argue can have a profound effect on whether other people WANT TO argue with you. Get a clue.

Protip to climate scientists 2: Context-shifting, ad-hominem, unequal application of the rules of debate do matter.

Protip to climate scientists 3: Censorship takes it right off the table. Don't expect others to go along with it.

Protip to climate scientists 4: If you want a civil discussion of science, leave your ego and "what so-and-so said last year" at the door.

I don't pretend my Protips are about science. They're about whether anybody wants to be in the same room with you to hear your case.

But in my argument with David Appell and Bryan Killett, it was simple science that was the last straw on the camel. No apology here.

I've been resisting it, but I think I'm going to have to start my own real blog. Haven't had one for a while. I think I'll start with "How Climate Scientists Argue" with Appell's blog as example. This time uncensored. Because of course I saved all my own censored comments. I'll emphasize how bad they are at taking their own medicine.

I told Bryan Killett a long time ago I won't argue with him anymore because he doesn't know how. He has a long history of misrepresenting comments taken out of context, ad-hominem, bullying tactics, etc. He's busy talking to himself, trying to get me to come back and argue. I told Appell I wouldn't argue with him. Up front. Because of the way he argues. He wouldn't know a fair logical debate if it bit him in the ass. And when I finally did start to give my side, what did they do? Exactly what they accused me of doing earlier... and whining about it when I didn't buy it. But of course I'M the one accused of whining. He claimed IR imagers work in a way they don't, tried to support other argument with that. No. Pardon. I'm done now. Not saying I didn't make mistakes in the process, but when I did I admitted them and continued on.

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

•

■

•

[Slashdot](#)

Archived Discussion

- [Get 883 More Comments](#)
- [Submit Story](#)

"Go to Heaven for the climate, Hell for the company." -- Mark Twain

- [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 SlashdotMedia. All Rights Reserved. **DHI** Slashdot is a [DHI service](#).

[Close](#)

[Slashdot](#)