

## Re: The Cost of Relativity

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.astro.amateur/2004-07/4026.html>

---

*jimp\_at\_specsol-spam-sux.com*

**Date:** 07/27/04

Date: Tue, 27 Jul 2004 18:44:47 +0000 (UTC)

In sci.physics Tom Potter <tdp@earthlink.net> wrote:

> "Bilge" <dubious@radioactivex.lebesque-al.net> wrote in message  
> news:slrncgaic9.2b2.dubious@radioactivex.lebesque-al.net...  
> > Tom Potter:  
> >  
> > > I wonder of 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 and utility of the tek 511 have been replaced by slipshod knockoffs like  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, I'll bet your pappy never once mentioned a satellite  
> > failure all the 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 a revel in the past. Yes, it's remarkable just how  
> > much technology has disintegrated.  
  
> "Bilge" what you state above looks like a bunch of bullshit to me.

That's because of your warped vision of reality. It looked good to me.

> What is your position, and  
> can you provide any honest, concurrent information  
> that validates your position?

That should be obvious. He thinks you are a crackpot.

The information to validate that position is just about every post you have made.

- > *There is no doubt that as technology improves,*
- > *that products also improve.*

One of the very, very few rational statements you have made.

- > *You seem to be claiming credit for physical models,*
- > *that should go to the folks who made all the little*
- > *technological improvements all along the way.*

That is not in the post at all.

You are just using the salesman's trick of trying to divert the conversation to a different topic because you are in deep doo.

- > *I was party to many of the key technological improvements*
- > *in oscilloscopes, electronics, solid state devices,*
- > *and computer fields during the 50's, 60's and 70's.*

You were a sales droid taking people to lunch and trying to convince them your product was the best with glossy brochures and arm waving.

People with education and intelligence were doing the technological improvements.

- > *Vas you der charley?*
- > *If so, provide some facts,*
- > *rather than bullshit.*

Subject diversion again.

Whether he was "there" or not is irrelevant to the validity of his post.

Once an arm waving sales droid, always an arm waving sales droid.

--

Jim Pennino  
Remove -spam-sux to reply.