Re: Who will stun the world as next Einstein?

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005−02/6189.html

---

From: Jeany (*ctiei_at_hotmail.com*)
Date: 02/28/05

Date: 27 Feb 2005 17:12:08 −0800

Dirk Van de moortel wrote:
> "Jeany" <ctiei@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:1109516555.438585.8740@g14g2000cwa.googlegroups.com...
> >
> > Dirk Van de moortel wrote:
>
> [snip]
>
> > > To be honest, I think the word theatrical was more appropriate
:−)
> > >
> > > As promised, I will look at 1.2 and beyond, as soon as you
> > > have fixed 1.1, and, in the process, prove to me that you really
> > > understand what you are talking about.
> > >
> > > Dirk Vdm
> >
> > Dear Mr. Dirk Vdm,
> >
> > These are what you posted:
> >
> > ++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++
> [snip]
> > ++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++
> >
> > Ok. As you said, you are talking about SR.
>
> Indeed, but that does not matter.
> The issue is that the text talks about SR, and that it
> shows that the author does not understand the most
> basic thing about SR.
> Now you can do something with that information,
> and fix the text, or you can continue ignoring it.
>
> Dirk Vdm

Dear Dirk,

Let me tell you a good news: The author of TAST has already proved in a math derivation that LT=L'T' would result in L=T=L'=T'=0 or it would mean 0=0 "When u= − u' and cos(theta) =1, we'll come back to Lorentz transformation", which means L = T = L' = T' = 0 or 0=0. We can also say that when there is no space−time deflection or when deflection angle is zero, of course it is L = T = L' = T' = 0 or 0=0 in TAST.

Even though you proved it for SR in literal words instead of a math derivation, I would like to speak to you:

Congratulations!

Isn't that theatrical?

Jeany