

[Byron Allen Black](#) shared [Christopher S Simmons's post](#).

December 1 at 5:42pm ·



[Like](#) Show more reactions

[Comment](#) [Share](#)

8 [Maisie Morris Freedman](#) and 7 others

**Comments**



[Laurence Garrett](#) Goddam commies, after our precious bodily fluids

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [2](#) · [December 1 at 1:52pm](#)



[James Morse](#) The soviets have systematically contaminated our water supplies and interfered with our precious bodily fluids. Gen Ripper

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [1](#) · [December 1 at 4:30pm](#)



[Daniel G. Kuttner](#) Interesting twist on reality.

That 97% figure reminds me of the "exactly 57 communists in DC" from "Manchurian Candidate."

<https://youtu.be/j0WZwSx7UdU>



[The Manchurian Candidate | 57 card-carrying members of the...](#)

YOUTUBE.COM

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [2](#) · [December 1 at 7:37pm](#) · Edited



**Byron Allen Black** Oh boy. That's a choice clip. Wow.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [1](#) · [December 1 at 8:26pm](#)



**Daniel G. Kuttner** [Byron](#): Did you ever see the movie? There's a lot in it that seems revelatory.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [December 2 at 12:44am](#)



Write a reply...



**John Blanton** You don't have to go back 50, or even 60, years. The 21st century Manchurian Candidate is alive and well and prowling the Internet this very day. <https://skeptict78240.wordpress.com/2012/04/12/heinz-57/>

**Heinz 57**

Angela Lansbury practically stole the spotlight from Frank Sinatra. The movie was a Cold War thriller about a...

[SKEPTIC78240.WORDPRESS.COM](#)

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [Remove Preview](#) · [1](#) · [December 2 at 3:56am](#)



**Daniel G. Kuttner** Interesting blog. I do agree with you about Allen West. To me, he's a blowhard war-monger.

As to the number of commies... There was a number; there still is one. You could take a snapshot, but the number would change the next day.

Now, when I say "communist," it's not in Marx's imaginary concept. It's really a fascist using the bait of a socialist paradise to bring people under his control. Or hers.

As before, Andrew Wilkow is right: "Socialism is for the People, not for the Socialist." They have their own, special sources of everything. Mostly off our backs.

Under that definition, you could name the "communists" as easily as I can.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [December 2 at 3:13pm](#)



**Daniel G. Kuttner** Hmm... I left a reply on your blog... it seems to have disappeared.

As the Submariners say: "You flush, and where does it go?"

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [December 2 at 3:15pm](#)



Write a reply...



**John Blanton** A perspective from Freethought Blogs <http://freethoughtblogs.com/.../the-righties-get-their-.../>

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [1](#) · [December 2 at 4:01am](#) · Edited



**Daniel G. Kuttner** As I expected, that article slung some nice mud, without citing one error in Breitbart's article.

Further, he (?) says, "This lefty gets his climate information from published, peer-reviewed science" Yet... he gives not one example of such a source.

Global Cooling/Warming/Climate Change is pseudo scientific drivel, used to further expand governmental power, shut down parts of the economy, line the pockets of insiders, and of course, further subjugate Us, the People.

Has anyone checked Algor's Nobel Prize winning predictions lately? He still has those ocean-side mansions, last I heard, and they're not flooded yet.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [December 2 at 3:24pm](#)



Write a reply...



**Laurence Garrett** Now you have Mad Dog as a candidate for high office, the irony is palpable. General Ripper has the last laugh from the celluloid..

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [December 2 at 4:11am](#)



**John Blanton** Daniel, if I could be sure you are sincere, and not just pulling a joke at our expense, I would respond to your comments about global warming (AGW). Give me a clue if you are really interested in this topic but recall how it went the last time you took a stab at it.

<https://skeptic78240.wordpress.com/.../interesting.../>



### Interesting Conversation

It's no secret I glean a passel of my story ideas from Facebook. Friends post all kinds of stuff, some things I...  
SKEPTIC78240.WORDPRESS.COM

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [Remove Preview](#) · [December 2 at 7:59pm](#) · Edited



**Daniel G. Kuttner** [John](#), I am, but no need to respond.

I certainly would appreciate, if there is a next time, that you ask before using my name in a blog, too. I would do the same for you.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [December 3 at 12:13am](#)



**John Blanton** Dan, this is Facebook. Anything posted here is open to the world.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [December 3 at 3:41am](#)



**Daniel G. Kuttner** [John](#): It is open, but common courtesy is not outlawed.

Quoting and deriding someone by name is still trolling, and rudeness is still rudeness.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [December 3 at 1:24pm](#)



Write a reply...



**John Blanton** Dan, when I write something I sign my name to it, and I stand by what I write. I am willing to deal with any push back I receive. If you don't feel comfortable with certain positions you hold, then maybe you should consider there is something wrong.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [December 3 at 2:17pm](#) · Edited



**Daniel G. Kuttner** What's wrong is, somehow, I can't get certain things through to you. I'm sure there's a way. I will not give up on this challenge! You are an intellect worth reaching.

Let me rephrase what I meant: Quoting someone is one thing. Usually, without permission, I may just say "a friend said..." You may've seen, I had one friend out himself by objecting to THAT!

What you did, though, wasn't just quote me. It seemed, as I recall, you took bunches of my statement out of context, and held them up to derision. That's a whole different kettle of fish.

Days or a week later, I happened to catch it\*, and I think I did say one or two things in rebuttal.

(\* you might have pointed it out in a discussion such as this)

That is way different.

I know how sensitive you are. I doubt you'd have let it slide if I'd publicly been that disrespectful to you.

You may note I said nothing at the time. Reason? It was already done, and I figured at some time I'd just mention it to you.

I'm doing that now.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [December 3 at 5:40pm](#) · Edited




Write a reply...



**John Blanton** Here is what I put up with on a daily basis. When Steve Rudd says this about me, I know I'm doing something right. <http://www.bible.ca/.../john-blanton-north-texas-skeptics...>



**John Blanton, (atheist, evolutionist, humanist, Bible hater, North Texas Skeptics)**

BIBLE.CA

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [Remove Preview](#) · [December 3 at 2:23pm](#)



**Daniel G. Kuttner** I found the audio for the debate. Interesting, it has two affirmatives.

I watched a little so I could see what you look like these days... without a helmet, too.

I'll listen to it in my car.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [December 3 at 4:46pm](#)




Write a reply...



**John Blanton** Dan, I challenge your "out of context" assertion. As I said in the writeup I made the best effort to include all the context. If there is anything I left out, now is the time to provide the missing parts. If you don't want your statements held up for ...[See More](#)

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [December 3 at 5:40pm](#) · Edited



**Daniel G. Kuttner** I'll concede the context, I should have said "as I recall." I will correct the above comment.

You must be kidding, though, about CO<sub>2</sub> not being heavier than air. You've used a CO<sub>2</sub> extinguisher, right? You have to know molecular weight, right?

Here's a part of the calculation (didn't want to buy the paper):

<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/.../JZ062i003p00351/epdf...>

In any case, most of the air at sea level is composed of mostly N, about 15% O<sub>2</sub>, and only about 1% being other gases. Its average molecular weight is 28

A molecule of CO<sub>2</sub> has a molecular weight of  $12 + (16)2 = 44$ . So CO<sub>2</sub> is about 1.4x the weight of air.

<http://www.engineeringtoolbox.com/molecular-weight-gas...>

Your rebuttal?

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [December 3 at 5:55pm](#)



Write a reply...



**John Blanton** Dan, I do not deny that CO<sub>2</sub> is denser than air. However, you did not say, in your argument, that CO<sub>2</sub> is denser. You said that CO<sub>2</sub> is so many times heavier than the rest of the atmosphere. It's not the same thing, and it's not the kind of statement you want to make when arguing a technical point. Apparently your field has been in communication, and taking care what you say is a big part of communicating clearly. You are a non scientist, and you are arguing technical points with scientists, including me. You need to have at least as much knowledge about the subject as the scientists in order to make a successful argument. I get the impression you are pulling text from questionable sources and passing it off as knowledge. You need to pull from reliable sources if you hope to make headway in this kind of discussion.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [December 3 at 6:40pm](#)



**Byron Allen Black** <http://imgur.com/hAB2N9s>



[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [December 3 at 6:55pm](#)



**Daniel G. Kuttner** I never said it was denser. I still don't. It is heavier. My link shows that.

Density is a function of altitude and temperature.

Part of my proof also involves a thing called Partial Pressure. At altitudes of "greenhouse" effect, CO<sub>2</sub> is less abundant, as is Oxygen and other heavier gases. This is one reason why humans require supplemental oxygen at altitude. CO<sub>2</sub> is heavier than O<sub>2</sub>, so it's even less abundant at altitude, resulting in a lower partial pressure of the CO<sub>2</sub>.

Just add the molecular weights in the table I linked.

Gosh, I'm beginning to sympathize with that religious guy. Can you please stay on topic and not change the argument each time? Maybe even answer a question or two?

Try to stay off the ad hominem, too. Calling someone a "non scientist" and oozing condescension while YOU're being non scientific doesn't bolster your argument, nor refute theirs.

OK.. You get the last word.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [December 3 at 9:33pm](#) · Edited



**Daniel G. Kuttner** [Byron](#): Are you so easily swayed to applause by haughty attitudes? Or was the applause for me?

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [December 3 at 9:35pm](#)



Write a reply...



**John Blanton** Dan, calling somebody a non scientist is not ad hominin. It is not an insult. It's just a fact of life in your case. You never made a serious study of science, and you never obtained a degree in science. I'm merely pointing out this fact as a precaution you need to take when wading into a discussion of matters scientific with one who does have considerable training and experience in the field. When you make these kinds of remarks, such as the ones regarding weight, density, carbon dioxide, the mixing of gases in the atmosphere, the problem becomes apparent.

Your discussion of concentration variation illustrates you are not acquainted with principles of gaseous diffusion, for example. It's high school science. As a result, your assertions regarding the distribution of carbon dioxide are completely wrong, and undermine the remainder of your argument.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [December 4 at 3:43pm](#)



**[Daniel G. Kuttner](#)** You have no idea of my qualifications. You throw your ample supply of tomatoes at me, rather than my assertions, which are backed BY science (e.g. that engineering reference link). Thus, you were replying ad hominem, literally.

I could be a bum on the street and still report correct - or incorrect - science. My lack of a white lab coat has no import.

If you are so full of science, where is your scientific refutation of my numbers? All I see from you is condescension and sarcasm.

Saying something is "clearly wrong" is not refutation, it's disagreement; an opinion. You are, of course free to have those.

This has not been a learned debate or even a discussion, in my book. Sad, actually, because I'm convinced you DO have the capability. It just appears you have an agenda you accept, and won't accept anything that conflicts with or undermines that belief.

That's not Science, that's Scientism; a religion, of which there are many practitioners on the talking-head box.

Your political positions I've seen are supported the same way: Talk down to the opposition and question their credentials according to some amorphous standard.

Again, I await your analytical critique of my numbers. Maybe you can also support why the key members of the Global Warming "science" supporters have been caught THREE TIMES falsifying or cherry-picking their data.

That's the only type of refutation I'll answer hereafter on this subject.

PS: I was also hoping at some point you'd reply to my IM about your inventions. I am definitely interested in those!

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [December 4 at 5:49pm](#) · Edited



Write a reply...



**[John Blanton](#)** Additionally, I am working off-site and am forced to keep my responses brief. Details later.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [December 4 at 3:45pm](#)



**[John Blanton](#)** Once again, I'm on a short leash here. I don't have access to my computer, so I will respond as I can for the time being. You are conflating weight and density. Keep the two straight. CO<sub>2</sub> is denser than air, as you have discovered. You are wrong in concluding that CO<sub>2</sub> is unevenly distributed. Below 90 km the gases remain evenly mixed. The remainder of your argument falls apart from there.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [December 4 at 7:06pm](#) · Edited



**[John Blanton](#)** Once again on the ad hominin - I am not stipulating that you are wrong because you have insufficient scientific training. I am saying you are wrong. I am further concluding (can possibly be wrong) that a contributing factor is your lack of scientific training. Good to see you are acquainted with the concept of partial pressure as it relates to gases. I am sure you learned that in pilot training. The concept explains why pilots go on pure oxygen above 10,000 feet.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [December 4 at 7:15pm](#)



**[John Blanton](#)** Dan, regarding inventions. I don't recall the reference. There are some American and international patents, of little interest to Facebook readers. For details, send an email. My address is on the Skeptical Analysis site.  
[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [December 5 at 4:38am](#)