

sci.anthropology: Re: You might be a fundiementalist atheist if:

Re: You might be a fundiementalist atheist if:

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology/2004-10/0229.html>

From: Seppo Pietikainen (*s.pietikainen_at_kolumbus.fi*)

Date: 10/07/04

Date: Thu, 07 Oct 2004 08:27:28 +0300

Bob Weigel wrote:

> "Seppo Pietikainen" <*s.pietikainen@kolumbus.fi*> wrote in message
> news:2sjtgcF119k6iU1@uni-berlin.de...

>

>> Bob Weigel wrote:

>>

>>> 2nd law of thermodynamics for the layperson, is expressed in Psalm 102

>

> btw.

>

>> I'm not interested in how you interpret how your babble describes the 2LOT

>

> to

>

>> laypeople. I'm interested in how *you* describe the 2LOT in *scientific*

>

> terms.

>

> Been done in another post here Seppo. Search the text of nearby

> articles..should take a second to find it.

>

Lying again, I see. The *only* reference to 2LOT from you in this thread was:

(quote)

1) 2nd law of thermodynamics says all physical matter HAS a STARTING point...elsewise it would be at 'heat death'.

(end quote)

2LOT says *nothing* of the kind.

So, it looks like you're just another dishonest American Taliban.

>

>>

>>> Saying that everything in the heavens even wears out like an 'old

>

Re: You might be a fundiementalist atheist if:

sci.anthropology: Re: You might be a fundiementalist atheist if:

> garmet'
>
>>> *In a submicroscopic way...this is basically what happens indeed.*
>
> The
>
>>> *universe is progressing towards a state of disorder. Every plant that
>>>photosynthesizes 'order' costs the SUN a MASSIVE amount of 'disorder
>>>conversion'. The processes in the sun are the most inefficient
>>>imaginable. It like all the other stars just converts organized
>
> 'matter' to
>
>>> *photonic energy.*
>>
>> *What is this "photonic energy" you're babbling about?*
>
>
> *Ohh LORD! Heheh. You say to describe things in scientific terms they you
> have trouble telling that I'm referring to the 'energy of photons' when I
> say 'photonic energy'.*
>*

So, why don't you say "Electromagnetic radiation", but rather babble about photonic energy?

>
>> *"The processes in the sun are the most inefficient imaginable"? OK,
>
> describe
>
>> *those processes and why do you think they are "the most inefficient
>
> imaginable",
>
>> *especially when compared to other processes (btw. conversion of $H+H \rightarrow He$
>
> is
>
>> *anything but inefficient).*
>
>
>
> *Look at the context. I was speaking about 'efficiency' in terms of
> transferring ENERGY PRODUCED into processes that produce MORE order.****

So f**cking what? The sun has plenty of fuel left.

> *Morons..er..I mean..atheists...CONSTANTLY refer to photosynthesis as an
> example of how the 2nd law 'doesn't hold' in their utter ignorance.*

Re: You might be a fundiementalist atheist if:

sci.anthropology: Re: You might be a fundiementalist atheist if:

Perhaps the "Morons" know what they are talking about, whereas you don't. Of course 2LOT holds, but there is nothing to prevent localized decrease in entropy as long as the total entropy of the system increases.

It looks like you still have ways to go before you advance *even* to the level of Moron.

.FAILING

> *to see that while a few calories of energy were used to increase the order*
> *in a small system...billions and billions of calories (dont' you just love*
> *saying that...Billions and BILLllions....has a ring to it doesn't it?*
> *heheh) WERE WASTED in terms of every producing any kind of order AGAIN!*
>

So f**cking what? See above.

> *Anyway I can tell you need school for asking these kinds of questions. I*
> *earn money to tutor. Do your homework and talk to me some other day. Sound*
> *Doctorin' is always around, Lord willing. –Bob*
>
>

Looks like you were homeskooled...

>
>>> *That photonic energy just...flies around the universe. And from*
>
> *what we*
>
>>> *can tell...since everything is linearly 'red shifting' as the distance*
>
> *from*
>
>>> *us increases....there is likely an energy loss of those photons even*
>
> *just*
>
>>> *from travelling through the 'aether' as it was called. We don't*
>
> *understand*
>
>>> *it. But regardless....it looks very likely that energy is actually*
>>> *'dissipated' as light/EM radiation moves.*
>>
>> *Your babbling is getting incoherent. "Tired" light theory has been*
>
> *discarded*
>
>> *a long time ago, "aether" theory has been dead and buried for close to a*
>> *hundred years.*
>>

Re: You might be a fundiementalist atheist if:

sci.anthropology: Re: You might be a fundiementalist atheist if:

>>
>>> *ANyway, that's the story. At time t=infinity, science thus predicts*
>
> *a*
>
>>> *state called 'heat death' where matter either no longer exists, or*
>
> *exists*
>
>>> *ONLY in a completely dormant state where it can't react in any way. Of*
>>> *course as far as we know, as long as photons fly, there will be*
>
> *interactions*
>
>>> *and eventually the matter will completely break down to utter*
>
> *'disorganized'*
>
>>> *state of raw photonic energy or 'particles' that do not interact with*
>>> *photons at all. There ya be.*
>>> *NOW WHY would you be speculating that I'm dishonest or whatever.*
>
> *That's*
>
>>> *kind of..bizarre. What did I say that looked like a lie to you? –Bob*
>>
>> *First of all, I think the jury is still out as to the universe ending up*
>> *in heat death. The Big Crunch is still within the realm of possibilities.*
>>
>> *While it is a fact that our sun will eventually die, but it won't happen*
>> *real–soon–now.*
>>
>> *What makes me think that you are dishonest is your incoherent babbling*
>
> *about*
>
>> *things you obviously know nothing about.*
>>
>> *So, how *do* you formulate the 2LOT, again?*
>>
>>
>>> *"Seppo Pietikainen" <s.pietikainen@kolumbus.fi> wrote in message*
>>> *news:2sidkmF1mkd4vU1@uni-berlin.de...*
>>>
>>>
>>>> *John Ings wrote:*
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> *On Wed, 6 Oct 2004 00:06:30 –0600, "Bob Weigel"*
>>>>> *<dontuwish@nothing.net> wrote:*
>>>>>

Re: You might be a fundiementalist atheist if:

sci.anthropology: Re: You might be a fundiementalist atheist if:

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>>Hard to figure some people out here. Regardless, because

>>>>>>

>>>>>>1) 2nd law of thermodynamics says all physical matter HAS a STARTING

>>>>>>point...elsewise it would be at 'heat death'.

>>>>>

>>>>Since you claim to know what 2LOT says, would you be kind enough to

>>>>provide us what **is**, or what you **mean** by the second law of

>>>

>>>thermodynamics?

>>>

>>>

>>>>Or, are you perhaps simply ignorant? There's another possibility: Are

>

> you

>

>>>>simply dishonest?

>>>>

>>>><snip>

>>>>

>>>>Seppo P.

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>Seppo P.

>

>

>

Seppo P.