

Stories Firehose > All Popular Polls Deals Submit

Search 

khayman80

Topics: Devices Build Entertainment Technology Open Source Science YRO

Follow us:     

“ Want to read Slashdot from your mobile device? Point it at m.slashdot.org and keep reading!



This discussion has been archived.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

[FAA To Drone Owners: Get Ready To Register To Fly 184 More Prefs](#)

[FAA To Drone Owners: Get Ready To Register To Fly](#)

Archived Discussion Load All Comments

Full On Abbreviated 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.

[What purpose does registration serve? \(Score:3\)](#)

by [JoeyRox \(2711699 \)](#) [Alter Relationship](#)

Registration will provide the FAA with the owner's name and address. How will this information be useful to them? Are they going to have airports reroute traffic around neighborhoods that have high concentrations of drone owners?

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

by Anonymous Coward

When idiots crash their drones into things then authorities will be able to hold the pilot responsible.

[Re: \(Score:0, Flamebait\)](#)

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

When idiots crash their drones into things then authorities will be able to hold the pilot responsible.

Will they?

Show me where in the Constitution, or in the Air Commerce Act, the FAA was given authority over all airspace in the U.S.

They don't have such authority. Any more than the EPA has legal authority over the birdbath in your backyard.

Unless you're flying your drone in "navigable airspace" (which is interstate airways and around the airports that serve them), FAA has no lawful authority over you.

[Re: \(Score:3, Informative\)](#)

by Anonymous Coward

Show me where in the Constitution, or in the Air Commerce Act, the FAA was given authority over all airspace in the U.S.

Of course, you're aware that those are not the only laws governing the operation, authority, and structure of the FAA, right? In fact, the law in question that gives the FAA the authority to regulate drones is the "FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012," specifically, Title III, Subtitle B, "Unmanned Aircraft Systems," in which Congress specifically directs the FAA as follows:

Not later

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

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

In fact, the law in question that gives the FAA the authority to regulate drones is the "FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012," specifically, Title III, Subtitle B, "Unmanned Aircraft Systems," in which Congress specifically directs the FAA as follows:

Do you know what "the national airspace system" referred to there is?

Do you know what the Commerce clause in the Constitution is (which is the ONLY Constitutional authority FAA has)?

Are you asserting that Congress doesn't have any authority to make this law,

No, I'm saying Congress' authority to make this law is limited to "navigable airspace", which is the concept which governs interstate air transportation. The "interstate" part is what gives the FAA its authority. rather than spouting off generalized inanities that demonstrate your lack of knowledge about aviation. If not, then perhaps you can take your claims that the FAA has "no lawful authority" over you, and shove them up your ass. It's not a generalization, it's Constitutional law. Read about it some time.

Re: (Score:0)

by Anonymous Coward

Do you know what "the national airspace system" referred to there is?

Yes, I do. Do you? Specifically, Class G airspace - the "uncontrolled" airspace up to 1200 feet, except in the vicinity of an airport, where the ceiling is much lower? Because that's part of the national airspace system, and the rules identifying and controlling it are the responsibility of the FAA. The FAA reauthorization of 2012 grants them the charter of "integrating uav flight" into the national airspace, which includes Class G - t

Re: (Score:2)

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

Yes, I do. Do you? Specifically, Class G airspace - the "uncontrolled" airspace up to 1200 feet, except in the vicinity of an airport, where the ceiling is much lower? Because that's part of the national airspace system, and the rules identifying and controlling it are the responsibility of the FAA. The FAA reauthorization of 2012 grants them the charter of "integrating uav flight" into the national airspace, which includes Class G - therefore, they are well within their legal rights to regulate that space.

That isn't an answer. You're defining something in terms of that something... a completely circular argument which has no meaning. I asked you a question which you haven't answered.

If you need it made more clear, then look this up: what was the Congressional authority under which the 2012 reauthorization was made? Here's a big hint: it's called a "REauthorization"... not a grant of new authority.

Your description of areas around airports are irrelevant, because I mentioned them myself, earlier. the CONGRESS has constitutional authority to regulate interstate commerce This is

Re: (Score:0)

by Anonymous Coward

That isn't an answer. You're defining something in terms of that something...

Yes, I'm pointing out that "CLASS G AIRSPACE" - which is considered part of the "national airspace system" constitutes *every scrap of air* over US territory that is not a part of other classes of air space. Which means that the FAA claims as its jurisdiction ALL AIRSPACE over US territory. What about this are you failing to understand? You're claiming they have no jurisdiction- the FAA, Congress, and accepted constitutional law

Re: (Score:2)

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

You're claiming they have no jurisdiction- the FAA, Congress, and accepted constitutional law ALL DISAGREE WITH YOU.

No, they don't. "Accepted Constitutional Law" says that the Federal government has authority ONLY over the items specifically enumerated in the Constitution. One of those items is the Interstate Commerce Clause, which gives the Federal government to regulate some aspects of interstate commerce.

The Interstate Commerce Clause was the basis of authority for the Air Commerce Act of 1926, which was effectively the creation of the FAA. In fact it was a bureau of the **Commerce Department**. Look it up.

Regards

>

Re:What purpose does registration serve? (Score:-1)

by Anonymous Coward on 2015-12-01 2:19 (#51032031)

A political message being carried by a child? I consider this to be child abuse. I'm disgusted. Shame. [\[Lonny Eachus, 2015-11-28\]](#)

@eachus defends pedophiles, but holding a sign asking for a future is "child abuse"? <http://slashdot.org/comments.pl?sid=7961817&cid=50500503> [\[Dumb Scientist, 2015-11-28\]](#)

I didn't "defend pedophiles". This is simply libel, of the worst and most malicious sort. [\[Lonny Eachus, 2015-11-30\]](#)

So you deny [blaming John O'Sullivan's teenage victim?](#)

@ClimateRealists That's the first I had read about O'Sullivan's rebuttal of the Greenhouse Effect. He makes a compelling argument. [\[Lonny Eachus, 2012-02-23\]](#)

@GreatDismal See John O'Sullivan's "Slaying the Sky Dragon", for instance. If you think there is solid science behind AGW you are mistaken. [\[Lonny Eachus, 2012-02-23\]](#)

And I know that you don't like [John O'Sullivan](#), but I don't know him, either, and I don't belong to his org. So take your disgusting innuendo and shove it

[innuendo](#). This is baseless libel, nothing more. [[Lonny Eachus, 2015-11-30](#)]

That's no "defense of a psychopathic pedophile". You keep trying to falsely associate me with those people. Why? [[Lonny Eachus, 2015-11-30](#)]

Lonny, you've been spreading [John O'Sullivan's](#) Sky Dragon Slayer nonsense for years, even after many scientists tried to rescue you from that psychopathic pedophile's cult. Lonny/Jane **still keeps spreading** O'Sullivan's Slayer nonsense, even after I told Jane/Lonny that O'Sullivan and his fellow [Slayer Humlum](#) are taking advantage of the fact that Jane/Lonny doesn't understand calculus or [summer and winter](#).

I've even told Jane that he's quoted a creationist's article praising Sky Dragon Slayer "friend" and [dowsing guy Morner](#).

Jane/Lonny Eachus keeps associating **himself** with John O'Sullivan's Sky Dragon Slayers by helping them spread their Slayer nonsense. I'm trying to help Jane/Lonny finally **stop** associating himself with the Sky Dragon Slayers. Jane even gave his word that he'd admit he was wrong if he ever decided to stop associating with Latour and the Sky Dragon Slayers:

... if you can actually, successfully complete a refutation of Latour, and show us, and it checks out, I will be **happy** to declare to everyone that I was wrong and you were right about that issue. You have my word. I will shout it out loud. I'll admit it here on Slashdot and even open a Twitter account and post it there. ... [[Jane O. Public, 2014-09-09](#)]

[Jane/Lonny](#), you **gave your word** that you would declare to everyone that you were wrong about Latour's Sky Dragon Slayer claims. But over a year later you **still** haven't, even after [seeming to realize](#) your Slayer claims violate "kindergarten-level physics". That's how much Lonny's "word" is worth.

... I can show clearly, to someone with high school level math skills, that he was utterly, abjectly, and rather pathetically wrong, and the "Slayers", as he calls them, were right all along. ... Spencer and khayman80 were wrong. Latour was right, and I was correct to stick to my guns and say so, despite all of khayman80's public bullying and insults and braying like an ass. [[Jane O. Public, 2014-09-10](#)]

You have spread misinformation about ME. Example: your false comment (I can prove it) about "defending pedophiles). [[Lonny Eachus, 2015-11-30](#)]

Lonny, you **blamed John O'Sullivan's teenage victim**. You even **objected** when I described O'Sullivan as a psychopathic pedophile, saying that you "*do not know a single person, either in or out of that group, who has been shown to be a 'psychotic pedophile' or 'child raper'.*"

The person you identified as a [pedophile](#) was completely unknown to me until you showed me his info. And I still know zero else about him. So you know better, and you have no excuse for this [libel](#). I will repeat: I didn't even know who the guy was until YOU sent me [information](#) about him. Why did you do that? [[Lonny Eachus, 2015-11-30](#)]

Jane, you [told me](#) to "*make these same arguments to Latour and his friends*" or I'd else have "*no courage to engage the actual authors of ideas*". You repeatedly accused me of lacking courage just because I don't want to talk with psychopathic pedophiles. Remember? **That's** why I sent you that information.

I was astonished and disgusted when you defended those pedophiles, blaming O'Sullivan's victim and [braying](#) that if you were O'Sullivan, you'd "*sue khayman80's ass without a second thought. And probably win.*"

That makes me wonder why YOU seem to know so much about him. I don't even remember his name. [[Lonny Eachus, 2015-11-30](#)]

[Again](#), never heard of WUWT or "Slayer" book? Couldn't read to [3rd sentence](#) at WUWT? Never heard of Curry's website?

Lonny pretends to forget [a lot of things](#), like [defending him](#): "*Even if that Manuel guy had been a member, he isn't a 'convicted child raper'.* And since you saw the charges against him (YOU showed them to me!), you already know that."

Again, it's disgusting that Lonny could defend that convicted child rapist by denying he's a convicted child rapist even after [all this](#).

Jane/Lonny Eachus "didn't" defend pedophiles just like he "didn't" [defend a homophobe](#).

How about YOUR apparent defense of Pachauri? At least, that's the impression you gave me before. [[Lonny Eachus, 2015-11-30](#)]

LOL! Jane keeps "paraphrasing" without links. Why do you hate context, Lonny? <http://slashdot.org/comments.pl?sid=8084143&cid=50633189> [[Dumb Scientist, 2015-11-30](#)]

Hilarious. You speak context while forum-hopping to one of your gnarly exercises in out-of-context. [[Lonny Eachus, 2015-11-30](#)]

LOL! Jane, I've repeatedly told you that you keep "forgetting" to link your "paraphrasings" because a link would let readers grasp the context and discover that your "impression" is just another lie. Ironically, [that link](#) documents Jane/Lonny Eachus repeatedly and dishonestly "paraphrasing" his impressions of me without ever giving links that would reveal Lonny's dishonesty.

Here's yet another example. Jane/Lonny Eachus baselessly ["paraphrased" me](#) calling others d***ers, but of course he couldn't provide a single link because (a) I've never done that, and (b) Jane/Lonny was just [projecting his own behavior](#) again.

[Again](#), it's astonishing that Lonny can keep dishonestly "paraphrasing" me while "forgetting" to provide links, **and** keep whining about how my exact quotes with links included are somehow not up to Lonny's exacting LonnyLand standards.

[Again](#), Jane has tended to get angriest when I tell him I'm simply trying to [help him see clearly](#). Why?

[Again, you have been manipulated](#). Wise up. [Reserve your anger](#) for the people who did that, not everybody else.

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

[Re:What purpose does registration serve? \(Score:0\)](#)

by Anonymous Coward on 2015-12-06 15:54 ([#51068833](#))

As I told you in the past, I discussed evidence behind a legal case YOU brought up. I wasn't aware of it before that. Discussing evidence behind the case is not "blaming" the victim. As usual, you have distorted my comments out of context. [[Lonny Eachus, 2015-12-01](#)]

Again, unlike you I actually gave links to your comments so readers can grasp the context:

... To the best of my knowledge, none of the members of "Principia Scientific" (which seems from the context is pretty obviously who he is referring to) have ever been convicted of any sexual wrongdoing of any kind. O'Sullivan was once **accused** of improper sexual conduct by a known troubled (and repeatedly IN trouble) teenager his family was trying to help. **He was acquitted of all charges, as khayman80 already knows**. If he knew about the charges, it is only reasonable to believe he knew about the acquittal as well. ... Khayman80 refuses to refute someone's science to his face -- or even properly read up on the topic -- because (he says) the people involved are reprehensible lowlifes. But not only is that not science, that charge is blatantly false. To publicly call someone a pedophile and "child rapist" based on NO real evidence is a serious breach indeed. He didn't mention any actual names, but that is no excuse because from the context it is very apparent that he meant John O'Sullivan, and if I were him (I am not) I would sue khayman80's ass without a second thought. And probably win. [[Jane O. Public, 2014-08-08](#)]

If Jane/Lonny Eachus wants to keep insisting that his comments don't constitute blaming O'Sullivan's victim or defending O'Sullivan, no power in the

verse could stop him. That's all Jane/Lonny can muster about any topic anyway: bizarre pedantic arguments. This time, Lonny seems to be disputing the definition of phrases like "blaming the victim" and "defending pedophiles" while hoping people don't read the disgusting statements Jane/Lonny **actually** made defending O'Sullivan. Jane/Lonny also seems to be disputing the term "discussing evidence" because what he actually did was uncritically regurgitate O'Sullivan's "[blame the victim](#)" act.

A case in which the defendant was ACQUITTED of all wrongdoing, I might add. When did you become judge and jury? [\[Lonny Eachus, 2015-12-01\]](#) [Seriously](#), Jane/Lonny Eachus "didn't" defend pedophiles just like he "didn't" [defend](#) a [homophobe](#). Again, if Jane knew about the acquittal, it is only reasonable to believe he knew that John O'Sullivan later wrote "Vanilla Girl: A [fact-based](#) crime story of a teacher's struggle to control his [erotic obsession](#) with a schoolgirl."

John O'Sullivan even [illustrated](#) "Vanilla Girl" but think twice before clicking that link. Not just because it depicts child nudity, but also because you'll have to wash your eyes with bleach to banish the image of a nude John O'Sullivan leering at a topless girl. That leer doesn't seem too different from O'Sullivan's "serious" [expression](#).

"Vanilla Girl" is **much** more fact-based than "[Slaying the Sky Dragon](#)" so Jane might want to read John O'Sullivan's fact-based book before defending him any further. Keep a barf bag handy, though. It's a disturbing glimpse into the mind of a [psychopathic pedophile](#).

John O'Sullivan is [CEO](#) of the PSI Slayers, and his behavior makes his [smears against Michael Mann](#) an unbelievably ironic example of psychological projection. Even for a climate contrarian.

He (@DumbSci) has a years-long habit of "supporting" his own arguments by quoting his own old statements. Truly laughable. [\[Lonny Eachus, 2015-12-01\]](#)

Amazing how you defend your libel by simply repeating past libel. It's an interesting way of "doubling down". [\[Lonny Eachus, 2015-12-01\]](#)

Think very carefully, Lonny. Notice that you can't even provide a link to back up the charming "impression" you [graced us with above](#)? Again, the reason you keep "forgetting" to link your "paraphrasings" is because a link would let readers grasp the context and discover that your "impression" is just another lie.

[Once again](#), it's astonishing that Lonny can keep dishonestly "paraphrasing" me while "forgetting" to provide links, **and** keep whining about how my exact quotes with links included are somehow not up to Lonny's exacting LonnyLand standards.

You seem to think repeating past untruths makes them more true. It doesn't. It's just more attorney-fodder. [\[Lonny Eachus, 2015-12-01\]](#)

[LOL!](#) Oh, cupcake. You crack me up. You're gonna do that **ANY DAY NOW**, right? Hehehe. Say it again, Jane/Lonny. [Keep proving me right.](#)

Again, it's almost like the Men In Black wipe your memory on a weekly basis, condemning you to publicly and repeatedly humiliate yourself in exactly the same way.

[Parent](#)[Share](#)[twitter](#) [facebook](#) [linkedin](#) [Slashdot](#)[Archived Discussion](#)[Get 184 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](#)