

# Re: why lorentz transformation?

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-09/msg00945.html>

---

- *From:* "Androcles" <Androcles@ MyPlace.org>
  - *Date:* Sun, 11 Sep 2005 16:50:39 GMT
- 

"David McAnally" <D.McAnally@i'm\_a\_gnu.uq.net.au> wrote in message  
[news:dg1hsn\\$shuv\\$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:dg1hsn$shuv$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)  
| "Androcles" <Androcles@ MyPlace.org> writes:  
| >"David McAnally" <D.McAnally@i'm\_a\_gnu.uq.net.au> wrote in message  
| >[news:dffeka\\$1klh\\$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:dffeka$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.

$1/r^2$  doesn't apply to a beam.

|  
| 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.

Shut the fuck up with your pompous asshole attitude,  
you are embarrassing yourself.

|  
| 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.

## Re: why lorentz transformation?

Yada yada yada...

|  
|>| 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.

Light is two waves, phuckwit.

| 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).

| On the other hand, in dealing with Maxwell's Equations in vacuo,

the speed is undefined. Maxwell can keep his aether, nobody wants it.  
You should try to comprehend that there is no aether, no permeability  
of free space, no permittivity of free space, and that Einstein's only  
sensible paragraph was:

"It is known that Maxwell's electrodynamics—as usually understood at  
the present time—when applied to moving bodies, leads to asymmetries  
which do not appear to be inherent in the phenomena."

(KNOWN 100 years ago)

"Take, for example, the reciprocal electrodynamic action of a magnet and  
a conductor. The observable phenomenon here depends only on the relative  
motion of the conductor and the magnet, whereas the customary view draws  
a sharp distinction between the two cases in which either the one or the  
other of these bodies is in motion. For if the magnet is in motion and  
the conductor at rest, there arises in the neighbourhood of the magnet  
an electric field with a certain definite energy, producing a current at  
the places where parts of the conductor are situated. But if the magnet  
is stationary and the conductor in motion, no electric field arises in  
the neighbourhood of the magnet. In the conductor, however, we find an  
electromotive force, to which in itself there is no corresponding  
energy, but which gives rise—assuming equality of relative motion in  
the two cases discussed—to electric currents of the same path and  
intensity as those produced by the electric forces in the former case.

Re: why lorentz transformation?

Re: why lorentz transformation?

The "Take for example" he calls the "Principle of Relativity" and then denies it, the huckster making the royal proclamation:

[quote]  
we establish by definition that the "time" required by a turtle to travel from A to B equals the "time" it requires to travel from B to A.  
[end quote]  
Ref: <http://www.fourmilab.ch/etexts/einstein/spcrel/www/>

[quote]  
For velocities greater than that of a turtle our deliberations become meaningless; we shall, however, find in what follows, that the velocity of a turtle in our theory plays the part, physically, of an infinitely great velocity.  
[quote]  
Ref: <http://www.fourmilab.ch/etexts/einstein/spcrel/www/>

Einstein can "prove" (ha ha) nothing can go faster than a turtle.

Oops!... Did I say 'a turtle'? Sorry... 'light'.

You fell for that one hook, line and sinker, then phuckwits like you come along with your noses in the air and start telling people what they ought to comprehend, you fuck-faced babboon.

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.

You wouldn't have a clue, you can't think, all you can do is parrot what you've read and are too stupid to realize I've read it too.

|  $\alpha = c \, dt/dx \, \sin(k \, dx)$   
|  
| I note that you have written d here, where the original says "delta".

So you can't read either. That doesn't interest me, I expected it.

| This is particularly important with your factor dt/dx,

Re: why lorentz transformation?

Bullshit, nobody with any sense talks about hours per mile.  
You are a symbol manipulator with knowing what the symbols mean.

| 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,

Ah.... the dawning light. INDEPENDENT variables.  
So why cuckoo transformation, phuckwit?

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.

You pompous arsehole, I can lick you in a logical debate with  
1,000,000 neurons tied behind my back.

|  
| >Too hard for your non-existent neuron?  
|  
| Isn't it interesting when people of limited comprehension like  
| yourself  
| attack others with greater comprehension.

No, it's boring phuckwit, and I particularly don't like  
your bullying attitude. So shove off, phuckwit.

You attack those with  
greater  
| knowledge and greater comprehension by calling them stupid.

Which you are, phuckwit. t and x are INDEPENDENT variables  
but you fell for Einstein's definition and think it has something  
to do with physics.

| Your  
| definition of stupidity in others is that they do not agree with you.

Not at all. My definition of stupidity is that you'd fall for a  
senseless  
definition.

| For people of true intellect, this gives the people whom you insult  
| greater credibility, since you have no credibility whatsoever.

Re: why lorentz transformation?

Re: why lorentz transformation?

Fuck you too, "true intellect".

| Androcles, you have proven yourself to be ineducable in the past, and  
of  
| course, this time will be no different.

No, idiot, you are the one proving YOU are ineducable.

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.

Try thinking sometime instead of repeating what someone else thinks.  
Nah... You'll still be incompetent and unaware of it.

What  
| is being described there is appropriate to your situation with respect  
to  
| mathematics and physics.

Phuckwit, it's appropriate to YOU.  
Learn the basics before try to tell me about mathematics.  
[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vector\\_space](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vector_space)

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.

Sue has more competence than you ever will, phuckwit.  
Androcles

Re: why lorentz transformation?

- *Follow-Ups:*
  - ◆ ***Re: why lorentz transformation?***
    - ◇ *From:* David McAnally
  
- *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
  - ◆ ***Re: why lorentz transformation?***
    - ◇ *From:* David McAnally
  
- Prev by Date: ***Re: Einsteinhoax responds to Androcles***
- Next by Date: ***Re: The origin of the universe.***
- Previous by thread: ***Re: why lorentz transformation?***
- Next by thread: ***Re: why lorentz transformation?***
- Index(es):
  - ◆ ***Date***
  - ◆ ***Thread***