

# Re: why lorentz transformation?

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-09/msg00920.html>

---

- *From:* [D.McAnally@i'm\\_a\\_gnu.uq.net.au](mailto:D.McAnally@i'm_a_gnu.uq.net.au) (David McAnally)
  - *Date:* Sun, 11 Sep 2005 15:18:47 +0000 (UTC)
- 

"Androcles" <Androcles@ MyPlace.org> writes:

>"David McAnally" <D.McAnally@i'm\_a\_gnu.uq.net.au> wrote in message

>[news:dfdeka\\$1klh\\$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:dfdeka$1klh$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

>| "Sue..." <suzysewnshow@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> writes:

>| >I don't see any  $1/r^2$  term in your work.

>|

>| That is about a SOLUTION of the equations.

>|ROFLMAO!

>|I don't see sine or cosine mentioned anywhere!

First of all, I was talking about a term which incorporated a  $1/r^2$  dependence. The term was not explicitly given by Sue or myself.

Secondly, not all solutions of Maxwell's Equations involve sines or cosines.

The radiation terms are also a solution of Maxwell's Equations.

Try to learn the difference between equations and their solutions, then you won't embarrass yourself by mixing them up.

Also, you should try to comprehend that there is more than one solution to Maxwell's Equations, and there is more than one type of solution.

>| Can't you even tell the

>| difference between equations and their solutions, or is this

>| distinction

>| too hard for your minuscule intellect?

><http://www.sst.ph.ic.ac.uk/angus/Lectures/compphys/node28.html>

This deals with numerical solutions (and computational solutions using computers) to an equation in 1+1 dimensions. This is not the full wave equation. The wave equation in 1+1 dimensions is decomposed into two simpler equations, and this section deals with a COMPUTATIONAL solution of the first of the two equations (or, more accurately, a computational approximation to the solution).

## Re: why lorentz transformation?

On the other hand, in dealing with Maxwell's Equations in vacuo, we can derive the (possibly inhomogeneous) wave equation in 3+1 dimensions, and we are not interested in a computational approximation to the solution.

The fact is that the webpage is completely irrelevant to the discussion to date. But I do find it interesting to see what connections your mind makes.

>alpha = c dt/dx sin(k dx)

I note that you have written d here, where the original says "delta". This is particularly important with your factor dt/dx, since the discussion in that section of the work had nothing to do with any derivative of t with respect to x (in fact, t and x were independent variables, so that discussion of such a derivative was pure nonsense in that context). The fact that you misinterpreted that factor as the derivative of t with respect to x demonstrates that you did not understand the first thing about the derivation on that page.

>Too hard for your non-existent neuron?

Isn't it interesting when people of limited comprehension like yourself attack others with greater comprehension. You attack those with greater knowledge and greater comprehension by calling them stupid. Your definition of stupidity in others is that they do not agree with you. For people of true intellect, this gives the people whom you insult greater credibility, since you have no credibility whatsoever.

Androcles, you have proven yourself to be ineducable in the past, and of course, this time will be no different. You will undoubtedly ignore the rebuttals of above (including the very important point that Equation 2.19 in the webpage that you quoted had nothing to do with any derivative of t with respect to x – that was just something that YOU tried to force onto it).

Try reading [www.apa.org/journals/features/psp7761121.pdf](http://www.apa.org/journals/features/psp7761121.pdf) sometime. What is being described there is appropriate to your situation with respect to mathematics and physics. The only reason why you have such confidence in your abilities in these disciplines is that your incompetence is so great that it hampers your ability to recognize it, or to recognize competence in others.

-----  
.

- 
- *Follow-Ups:*
    - ◆ *Re: why lorentz transformation?*
    - ◇ *From: Androcles*

Re: why lorentz transformation?

- **References:**

- ◆ **why lorentz transformation?**  
◇ From: francisco
- ◆ **Re: why lorentz transformation?**  
◇ From: Sue...
- ◆ **Re: why lorentz transformation?**  
◇ From: David McAnally
- ◆ **Re: why lorentz transformation?**  
◇ From: Sue...
- ◆ **Re: why lorentz transformation?**  
◇ From: David McAnally
- ◆ **Re: why lorentz transformation?**  
◇ From: Sue...
- ◆ **Re: why lorentz transformation?**  
◇ From: David McAnally
- ◆ **Re: why lorentz transformation?**  
◇ From: Androcles

- Prev by Date: **Re: Mathematical Inconsistencies in Einstein's Derivation of the Lorentz Transformation**
- Next by Date: **Re: Acceleration**
- Previous by thread: **Re: why lorentz transformation?**
- Next by thread: **Re: why lorentz transformation?**
- Index(es):
  - ◆ **Date**
  - ◆ **Thread**