

Re: OT: Gravity explained

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2007-02/msg02027.html>

- *From:* Terry Given <my_name@xxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 12 Feb 2007 18:51:18 +1300
-

John Larkin wrote:

On Mon, 12 Feb 2007 16:31:59 +1300, Terry Given <my_name@xxxxxxx>
wrote:

John Larkin wrote:

On Mon, 12 Feb 2007 14:39:49 +1300, Terry Given
<my_name@xxxxxxx>
wrote:

John Larkin wrote:

On Sun, 11 Feb 2007
16:57:22 -0300, YD
<yotechHAT@xxxxxxxxxx>
wrote:

Late at
night, by
candle light,
John Larkin
<jjlarkin@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
penned this
immortal
opus:

Re: OT: Gravity explained

On
Fri,
09
Feb
2007
21:55:53
GMT,
Rich
the
Philosophizer
<rtp@xxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote:

On
Fri,
09
Feb
2007
16:23:47
-0500,
default
wrote:

"Things
fall
not
because
they
are
acted
upon
by
some
gravitational
force,
but
because
a
higher

Re: OT: Gravity explained

intelligence,
'God'
if
you
will,
is
pushing
them
down,"
said
Gabriel
Burdett,
who
holds
degrees
in
education,
applied
Scripture,
and
physics
from
Oral
Roberts
University.

Gravity
is
Love.

Cheers!
Rich

This
seems
to
be
the
original
version:

<http://www.theonion.com/content/node/39512>

The
Christian
haters
are
happy

Re: OT: Gravity explained

to
pick
up
a
parody
like
that
and
widely
repeat
as
serious
Belief,
so
they
can
then
mock
it.

Like
the
bumper
sticker
says,
mean
people
suck.

John

What's
wrong with
making fun
of goofy
beliefs? The
ID people
truly
believe
they're on to
something,
however
wrong. If
they'd keep
it to
themselves
it would be
allright but
trying to
legislate it

Re: OT: Gravity explained

down
everybody's
throat is a
big no-no
in my book.
That makes
them a fair
target for
everything
thrown at
them.

– YD.

Evolution, as it applies to
the origin of DNA, is
arguably a goofy
belief. I've seen calculation
by serious scientists that
resulted in
probabilities than most
statisticians would classify
as "impossible."

go shuffle a deck of cards, thoroughly.

Then spread them out.

then calculate the probability of that
particular arrangement.

Its ~ 10^{68} , about the same as the number of
atoms in the universe.

remarabkly though, it happened.

Clearly God did it :)

But the overwhelming fraction of those arrangements is
useless. Hell,
you probably can't find a run that makes a decent poker hand.

John

Re: OT: Gravity explained

indeed. but it dose a fairly good job of explaining the "its jolly unlikely" argument (via the weak anthropic principle)

The WAP always bothers me. The overwhelming probability is that, right now, neither you nor I should exist.

personally, I have no problem with the concept of something creating our universe. I expect in a century or two we will be able to do just that, and will have sufficient knowledge to understand the consequences.

All this shit about houses, an eternal afterlife at Jesus' right hand et al, the ascension of Mary, blah blah, is absolute twaddle though; the tooth fairy makes more sense. And as far as ID is concerned, how come 75% of all pregnancies self-terminate as the blastocyst is FUBAR.

Certainly the idea of a benevolent God who supervises the health of every sparrow is hard to accept; He would *not* be a nice person. But I find it interesting how adamant many people are to not be associated with believers; adamant to the point of taking silly dogmatic positions to dispel any suspicion that they may be closet Christians.

indeed. And a good read of the bible(s) suggests He isnt very nice either.

Interesting that dogs or horses can mate just once and be practically guaranteed of delivering a live offspring or three. I think humans are, evolutionarily, still in the "kluge" stage of development.

did you ever read the article (IEEE spectrum IIRC) about reliability modelling and humans? the authors basically applied weibull-style stats to humans, and got interesting results – we look a lot like massively parallel machines that start with huge numbers of flaws, but kinda work anyway.

which makes sense from an evolutionary (AKA compounded kluge) perspective

Explain Eeyore, Phil and Homer (who never seems to post anything except silly diatribes against America, without which most of electronics just wouldnt exist).

Eeyore is OK, often.

true, but he's currently messing up the opto thread, and Keith is just encouraging him. plus most posts seem to be pointless requests for (often unnecessary) details. Still at least he's polite.

The others are beyond explanation, unless you buy
the "kluge" thing.

All religions are equally silly. I just wish religious zealots wouldnt come knocking on my door early on saturday morning. I dont pester them about my non-beliefs. Its a great pity the 11th commandment wasnt "thou shalt not proselytise"

We get a lot more environmentalists than bible-bangers, but the bangers are more polite.

John

indeed. I once had a T-shirt that said "Jesus nukes gay whales"

although environmentalists do have one good point: industries (it matters not which ones) really shouldnt be allowed to make horrid messes without cleaning them up.

Here in NZ dairy farming is responsible for 50% of our greenhouse gas emissions (methane from burping ruminants), and almost all of our water pollution issue, via nutrient and cow-shit runoff. Not much can be done about the former, but you should hear the farmers scream when it is suggested they keep the cow shit out of rivers.....almost as loud as they scream for government assistance whenever floodplains flood.

I do like the environmentalist take on electricity, which looks kinda like this:

No nuke plants – OK, the economics are dubious, and the messes are astonishingly hard to dispose of.

No coal power plants – hmm, modern coal plants are a lot better than the old ones. greenies hate the coal mines, but hell, if they clean up the resultant mess when their done, whats wrong with that.

No hydro plants – getting silly here. they object to drowing perfectly good valleys (which could house burping ruminants ;). its almost a moot point here, as there are only so many suitable sites, and we have already used most of them.

Re: OT: Gravity explained

No windmills – because they are ugly. this is just plain stupid.

(I'm surprised no-one is mootng coppicing for wood-fired power plants, which is carbon neutral)

I guess ultimately all zealots are cut from the same cloth :)

Cheers

Terry

.