

Re: The Cost of Relativity

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2004-07/2623.html>

From: mitch perkins (*mitchperkins_at_yahoo.com*)

Date: 07/29/04

Date: 29 Jul 2004 14:18:40 -0700

"Tom Potter" <tdp@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<2mna0hFodjtoU1@uni-berlin.de>...

> "Bilge" <dubious@radioactivex.lebesque-al.net> wrote in message

> news:slrncgaic9.2b2.dubious@radioactivex.lebesque-al.net...

> > Tom Potter:

> >

> > > I wonder if Farnsworth ever used Relativity

> > > in his numerous tube designs?

> >

> > My guess is no. Had he used relativity, the quality of the picture would

> > have as bad as modern televisions. Haven't you noticed that technology

> > peaked in the 1920's and 1930's and since that time televisions have

> > gotten worse, the space program went down hill, receivers can no longer

> > receive satellite signals, MRI scanners lie in a state of disrepair,

> > computers have slowed down to a crawl, oscilloscopes with the precision

> > and utility of the tek 511 have been replaced by slipshod knockoffs like

> > the TDS3000B. It's just awful. Oh, what I wouldn't give for a real

> > television set with a steel case full of vacuum tubes, mechanical contact

> > tuners, 20 lb high voltage transformers and a floating chassis all sitting

> > behind a piece of glass spanning a good chunk of the forward 2 pi

> > solid angle.

> >

> > Come to think of it, I'll bet your pappy never once mentioned a satellite

> > failure all the way through the 1950's. After that, the decline in computing

> > power coupled with the declining quality of electronics test equipment

> > made every satellite a crap shoot. Yes, I can see why you pine for

> > the good old days and revel in the past. Yes, it's remarkable just how

> > much technology has disintegrated.

>

More typos nowadays, too.

Mlitch