



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

“ [Idle.slashdot.org](#) is a total waste of your time. Never go there.


Same 10 cards & cash.
Very different wallets.


Discover how we do it 

✗ GO FROM THIS ...



✓ TO A BELLROY





This discussion has been archived.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

[Thanks To the Montreal Protocol, We Avoided Severe Ozone Depletion](#) [133 More Prefs](#)

[Thanks To the Montreal Protocol, We Avoided Severe Ozone Depletion](#)

[Archived Discussion](#)[Load All Comments](#)

8 Full 0 Abbreviated 0 Hidden

Comments Filter:

Score:

[Insightful](#)

[Informative](#)

[Interesting](#)

[Funny](#)

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

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

by [caviare \(830421 \)](#) [Alter Relationship](#)

Obviously the CFC industry wasn't as big and powerful as the fossil fuels industries, didn't spend enough money obfuscating the issues, perverting public opinion by telling them what they wanted to hear and getting Rupert to agree with their point of view.

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

by [demonlapin \(527802 \)](#) [Alter Relationship](#)

It's not the industry that provides the product. The entire global economy is dependent on energy inputs, which we have been able to exploit most efficiently since the Industrial Revolution, when we began to be able to use energy sources other than people and animals. CFC's were nasty chemicals, but they weren't generally crucial to modern life.

I'm not in love with the fossil fuel industry, but for all their problems it's also dangerous to assume that installing wind farms on every decent hillside won't ha

[Re:](#) (Score:3, Interesting)

by [drinkypoo \(153816 \)](#) [Foe of a Friend](#)

I'm not in love with the fossil fuel industry, but for all their problems it's also dangerous to assume that installing wind farms on every decent hillside won't have climatic effects.

No. You are being an asshole or an idiot. I and others have covered this material exhaustively here repeatedly in the past, and I thought we were past this. This has been studied and the result was that there is a localized heating effect in a small area immediately downwind of the wind turbine which is rapidly lost in the noise of the already-chaotic system in precisely the same way that the butterfly effect is bullshit — if an entertaining thought exercise.

Now, are you trolling, or just talking igno

--

"You're right," Fisheye says. "I should have set it on 'whip' or 'chop.'"

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

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

This has been studied and the result was that there is a localized heating effect in a small area immediately downwind of the wind turbine which is rapidly lost in the noise of the already-chaotic system in precisely the same way that the butterfly effect is bullshit â" if an entertaining thought exercise. This causes me to think you haven't understood what the Butterfly Effect actually is. It says that slight differences in the *initial conditions* of some nonlinear systems can have a profound effect on later outcome. It doesn't apply to all chaotic systems by any means, nor does it *necessarily* mean a persistent change... just a big one. Nor, just off-hand, would it seem to apply to your windmill example at all.

You might be interested to know that the Butterfly Effect has made a profound contribution to wea

>

Re:suckers (Score:1)

by [khayman80 \(824400 \)](#) on 2015-05-28 13:52 ([#49793179](#)) [Homepage Journal](#)

You might be interested to know that the Butterfly Effect has made a profound contribution to weather and climate modeling. Without it, we would not know even the relatively small amount that we do know.

Does the "relatively small amount that we do know" include how adding CO2 warms the Earth's surface? You've been [vigorously disputing](#) these fundamental physics [for years](#). Can you finally admit that mainstream scientists know how adding CO2 warms the Earth's surface?

Parent

Share

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

Re:suckers (Score:2)

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737 \) Friend of a FriendFoe of a Friend](#) on 2015-05-30 18:33 ([#49806857](#))

Does the "relatively small amount that we do know" include how adding CO2 warms the Earth's surface?

Did I say anything of that nature here?

Your despicable habit of attempting to attack me at every turn, and trying to turn everything into a discussion of "Greenhouse Effect" will not be forgotten.

By the way... what ever happened to your comment to me here on Slashdot that you only expected to live a few months? That was many months ago. Dishonest much?

As I stated to you before, my position on the physics from long past may not necessarily be related to my current position... but your insistence on persistently dragging up bullshit from 5 years ago only serves to muddy the waters, and makes me not want to discuss it with you.

As I told you very clearly, on many occasions: I will not debate this topic with you, because you refuse to discuss it impersonally, logically, or even honestly. I have many recorded examples I could cite, if I cared to do so. But I'm not going to bother. It will all be written up, eventually.

Parent

Share

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

Re:suckers (Score:1)

by [khayman80 \(824400 \)](#) on 2015-05-30 18:52 ([#49806945](#)) [Homepage Journal](#)

I'm sorry for still being alive. Think carefully about context, and you'll realize your accusations of dishonesty are baseless. Once again.

As I stated to you before, my position on the physics from long past may not necessarily be related to my current position... but your insistence on persistently dragging up bullshit from 5 years ago only serves to muddy the waters, and makes me not want to discuss it with you.

Jane, you [repeated](#) your incorrect position on the physics just last month. [Again](#), were you lying when [you insisted](#) you DO have a reply to that physics problem?

Parent

Share

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

Re:suckers (Score:2)

by [Jane Q. Public \(1010737 \) Friend of a FriendFoe of a Friend](#) on 2015-06-03 17:55 ([#49835381](#))

Jane, you repeated your incorrect position on the physics just last month. Again, were you lying when you insisted you DO have a reply to that physics problem?

No, I didn't. You are misinterpreting my words, as usual. I was pointing out a subtle error in David's description of what happens. But you both insisted on carrying that conversation elsewhere, then wouldn't even discuss it in a reasonable manner. Instead, you wanted to have things your usual one-sided way.

Your own behavior (and David's) caused that discussion to be shitcanned, so you won't get any further illumination about it here. When you learn to discuss issues in a polite and impersonal manner, maybe that will change. I'm not holding my breath. But I repeat: all I was trying to do was point out a **subtle** error in David's description. You interpreted it otherwise. As you have always seemed to do.

Parent

Share

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

[Slashdot](#)

Archived Discussion

[Get 133 More Comments](#)

[Submit Story](#)

Man is an animal that makes bargains: no other animal does this-- no dog exchanges bones with another. -- Adam Smith

[FAQ](#)

[Story Archive](#)

[Hall of Fame](#)

[Advertising](#)

[Terms](#)

[Privacy](#)

[Opt Out Choices](#)

[About](#)

[Feedback](#)

[Mobile View](#)

[Blog](#)

Trademarks property of their respective owners. Comments owned by the poster. Copyright © 2016 SlashdotMedia. All Rights Reserved.

[Close](#)

[Slashdot](#)

Working...