

Re: why lorentz transformation?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-09/msg01406.html>

- *From:* D.McAnally@i'm_a_gnu.uq.net.au (David McAnally)
 - *Date:* Sun, 18 Sep 2005 06:57:15 +0000 (UTC)
-

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

>"David McAnally" <D.McAnally@i'm_a_gnu.uq.net.au> wrote in message
>[news:dggv0n\\$2ma\\$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:dggv0n$2ma$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)
>| "JanPB" <filmart@xxxxxxxxxx> writes:
>|
>| >Androcles wrote:
>| >>
>| >> Hey phuckwit! Deal with the math or shut the fuck up.

>[snip non-math bullshit from McAnally]

I notice that you left your earlier insult to me in your posting. It would appear, then, that to you, such insults is what you consider 'all important math' information. It would explain why your mathematics is so poor. Your insult goes with your added 'bullshit' insult. You obviously excel when it comes to dealing out insults to mathematicians – it is a pity that you don't exert such an effort where it really counts (i.e. on mathematics and physics).

Your 'non-math bullshit' slur was where I pointed out the well-known fact that you reserve insults for those who actually have mathematical ability. Your cutting of the observation won't hide the fact that you do this, since everybody with intelligence already knows that you do.

I was also pointing out your complete and absolute refusal to be educated about Einstein's exact meaning with one of his comments in his original paper. I note that you have removed all references to my explanation about what Einstein meant, so your response in this matter would appear to confirm the conclusion that I came to at the time that you kill-filed me, i.e. that you are too cowardly and small-minded to even consider what I wrote, and to consider the possibility that you were wrong.

The following is appropriate to your understanding of relativity:

<http://www.apa.org/journals/features/psp7761121.pdf>

check it out sometime. You might be surprised at how close it is to the way you really are, and how you really think.

Re: why lorentz transformation?

>| The second was your strange notation in which you mark off values
>| of x' equal to 0', 1', 2', etc, where the normal

><http://www.m-w.com/cgi-bin/dictionary?book=Dictionary&va=normal>
>1 : PERPENDICULAR; especially : perpendicular to a tangent at a point of
>tangency

The dictionary also gives the following definition:

2 a : according with, constituting, or not deviating from a norm,
rule, or principle b : conforming to a type, standard, or regular
pattern

Note particularly 2b: conforming to a type, standard, or regular pattern.

Other dictionaries give the following meanings:

adj.

1. Conforming with, adhering to, or constituting a norm, standard,
pattern, level, or type; typical: normal room temperature; one's
normal weight; normal diplomatic relations.

adj.

1. Conforming with, adhering to, or constituting a norm, standard,
pattern, level, or type; typical.

Note the meaning "typical" given in both those cases. The meaning that I
was using when I wrote "normal" was "conforming to type, standard, or
regular pattern" and "typical".

It is interesting that you looked up the word in the dictionary, and that
you *then* chose, accidentally or deliberately, to pick on a different
definition to that which I intended, and that you chose to ignore the
intended definition even though it was also there in the dictionary for
you to read. Do you have a comprehension problem, or something.

>I was referring to motion parallel (not perpendicular) to the x -axis.

Since *I* was the one who chose to use the word "normal", you didn't mean
any damn thing by it. When *I* used the word, I was using it with the
meanings "usual" and "typical".

>| and sensible thing to do

><http://www.m-w.com/cgi-bin/dictionary?book=Dictionary&va=sensible>
>1 : of a kind to be felt or perceived: as a : perceptible to the senses
>or to reason or understanding

The same dictionary also gives the following meaning:

Re: why lorentz transformation?

Re: why lorentz transformation?

4 : having, containing, or indicative of good sense or reason :
RATIONAL, REASONABLE <sensible people> <made a sensible answer>

This is the meaning that I meant.

This does raise an interesting question regarding your perception of words. Do you always assume that a word means the VERY FIRST meaning of the word as supplied by the Merriam–Webster Online Dictionary, and ignore all the other meanings? In both the cases under discussion, the Merriam–Webster Online Dictionary gave the meaning of the word which I had intended – it just did not give the meanings in the first selection for the meanings of the words. This is an interesting psychologically pathological behaviour on your part.

>You are not sensible, you don't know the difference between normal and >parallel.

Since I used "normal" to mean "usual" or "typical", your statement here is devoid of any meaning.

>| is to mark off the values of x' equal to 0, 1, 2, etc. You never did
>| explain why you adopted the odd notation of putting the prime on 0, 1,
>2,
>| 3, etc, when discussing values of x' .

>Then I'll explain it, you only had to ask.

That is not true. I asked you ages ago, and you ignored my request for you to do so.

>There are TWO (2) frames of reference; one (1) uses coordinates
> x,y,z,t and is called the "stationary" frame by Einstein, which
>sometimes
>appears in quotes, as in 'Let us take a system of co–ordinates in which
>the equations of Newtonian mechanics hold good. In order to render our
>presentation more precise and to distinguish this system of co–ordinates
>verbally from others which will be introduced hereafter, we call it the
>`stationary system.' ' and sometimes not, as in "Thus with the help of
>certain imaginary physical experiments we have settled what is to be
>understood by synchronous stationary clocks located at different
>places", and the other (2), called the "moving" frame, uses the
>coordinates x',y,z,t as in
>'If we place $x'=x-vt$, it is clear that a point at rest in the system k
>must have a system of values x', y, z , independent of time.' and the
>THIRD (3) frame uses the coordinates ξ, η, ζ, τ .

The above paragraph by you is completely irrelevant to the question that I asked. You are just evading the question again, as you always do, since you know that your usage of the symbols $0', 1', 2'$, etc, for the values taken by x' is just plain stupid. And you must be really desperate to use such an obvious diversion.

Re: why lorentz transformation?

Re: why lorentz transformation?

Incidentally, we now use the notation x', y', z', t' , to denote Einstein's new coordinates x_i, η, ζ, τ , and no symbol is used to denote the variable denoted by Einstein as x' . This is a fact that you have been told many times (a fact which I have no doubt that you will continue to ignore).

>When you and Einstein have learned to count to three (use your fingers
>if you must),

We can count to three. What you actually meant was the you would give an explanation when you started to understand logic, and you could actually think up an explanation – that you would tell us when you had no further need to misdirect our attention from your own inadequacies.

Furthermore, you told a deliberate and outright lie above. You promised an explanation, and then you twisted and turned in order to evade giving the explanation that you promised. You should go into politics, since you are as dishonest as those politicians.

>then you can discuss mathematics with me and I'll explain
>my use of $0', 1', 2'...$

Why not give it now? Possibly because you have no explanation for that pathetically stupid notation.

$x, y, z,$ and t are variables which take values in the real numbers (such as 0, 1, 2, 3, 8.5, etc). x' is the symbol for ONE variable (which is denoted by the entire string, x') which takes values in the real numbers (such as 0, 1, 2, 3, 8.5, etc). $0', 1', 2', 3', 8.5'$, are not known symbols for any numbers – they are just ordinary numbers with primes attached to them for affectation. The equality $x' = 1$ means something concrete (just as the equalities $x = 1$ and $y = 1$ mean something concrete). The formula $x' = 1'$ doesn't mean a thing since nobody has ever told us what $1'$ represents. These considerations are independent of anything that you could ever say about coordinate systems.

Perhaps if you tried to read what you read with *understanding*, you would get a lot further. Reading is simple to do. Reading with comprehension is not, and you are too lazy to bother with the comprehension as well as the reading (or perhaps the comprehension is beyond your capabilities).

>In the meantime, tell me how fast x' approaches x_i .

The variables denoted by x' and x_i in Einstein's paper are different variables, and neither "approaches" the other. They are related by

$$x_i = x' / \sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}.$$

>[snip rest of crap, ask again when you can count to three]

Re: why lorentz transformation?

Re: why lorentz transformation?

I can count to three. The real reason why you cut the rest of what I wrote was because you are too stupid to cope with it, and you are too cowardly to admit, even to yourself, that you are too stupid to understand what Einstein meant when he wrote what he wrote, and that you had to have somebody with more brains, than you, to explain it to you.

.

• *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*
 - ◆ *Re: why lorentz transformation?*
◇ *From: Androcles*
 - ◆ *Re: why lorentz transformation?*
◇ *From: David McAnally*
 - ◆ *Re: why lorentz transformation?*
◇ *From: Androcles*
 - ◆ *Re: why lorentz transformation?*
◇ *From: JanPB*
 - ◆ *Re: why lorentz transformation?*
◇ *From: David McAnally*
 - ◆ *Re: why lorentz transformation?*
◇ *From: Androcles*
- Prev by Date: *Re: Shubert's Derivation of the Lorentz Transformations*
 - Next by Date: *Re: Black holes radiate – the end of GR is there*
 - Previous by thread: *Re: why lorentz transformation?*
 - Next by thread: *Re: why lorentz transformation?*
 - Index(es):
 - ◆ *Date*
 - ◆ *Thread*