

Re: why lorentz transformation?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-09/msg01714.html>

- *From:* D.McAnally@i'm_a_gnu.uq.net.au (David McAnally)
 - *Date:* Fri, 23 Sep 2005 10:16:32 +0000 (UTC)
-

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

>"David McAnally" <D.McAnally@i'm_a_gnu.uq.net.au> wrote in message
>[news:dgj34b\\$eoe\\$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:dgj34beoe1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)
>| "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@xxxxxxxx> writes:
>|>|
>|>|>Androcles wrote:
>|>|>>
>|>|>> Hey phuckwit! Deal with the math or shut the fuck up.
>|
>|>[snip non-math bullshit from McAnally]
>|

>[snip non math bullshit from McAnally AGAIN]

Isn't it nice to know that Androcles thinks that using abuse and obscenity is mathematics. If he didn't think that it was mathematics, then his leaving his usage of it here makes him a hypocrite (of course we already knew that he was a hypocrite, but the assumption that he isn't one leads to the conclusion that he thinks that "Hey *****wit! Deal with the math or shut the **** up." is mathematics). If this is all he had learnt in mathematics, then no wonder he is so incompetent at it.

I note that, although you are using a British ISP, you betray your true origins by the fact that you are consistently using the Americanism of "math", instead of the more usual "maths".

The fact that you use a pseudonym, so that you can't be identified, demonstrates your utter craven cowardice.

>Note particularly that I said
>Hey phuckwit! Deal with the math or shut the fuck up.

You sound like a broken record. You only have the one response for everything. You are on automatic without any reasoning going on between

Re: why lorentz transformation?

your ears.

Why don't you wash your mouth out with soap. Your mother failed miserably in her job of bringing you up as a human being. This is obviously the cause of your subhuman behaviour. Obviously you will never grow up emotionally.

>| >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 xi, eta, zeta, tau.
>|
>| 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.

>| >Hey PHUCKWIT!! Deal with the math or shut the fuck up, you stupid
>| >whining moron!

You posted something completely irrelevant to the question which you had just been asked. It is my responsibility to point out your attempts at diversion. You are just upset because you got caught out. What you wrote had ABSOLUTELY NO CONNECTION with the question at hand. It is your own personal delusion that it has.

>| >Incidentally, we now use the notation x', y', z', t', to denote
>| >Einstein's
>| >new coordinates xi, eta, zeta, tau, and no symbol is used to denote

Re: why lorentz transformation?

Re: why lorentz transformation?

>the

>| variable denoted by Einstein as x' .

>I don't give a fuck what you change it to, I'm discussing Einstein's

>paper,

>not yours. Deal with the math or shut the fuck up.

Obviously you do "give a ****", since the question of the change of notation became important for you later in your posting. See below for details.

>[snip more crap]

>|

>| We can count to three.

>PROVE IT.

1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10.

There. I've counted to ten.

As we are into asking people to do things, give me an exact definition of the Poincare group. This is relevant to relativity because of the strong connection between the Poincare group and special relativity.

>[snip more crap]

>|

>| Why not give it now?

>Because you continue to run insults

Talk about the pot calling the kettle black. YOU give out MANY more insults than almost anybody else here, and YOUR insults are of a much more vile and offensive nature than anybody else's.

>and I have to snip them without

>reading them to get to the math, you fucking stupid cunt.

This is a point in case. I have never used terminology as offensive as this when addressing you. My responses to you have been to do with mathematics, or in frustration at the perversity of your mind as you offensively reject the assistance of those who have far greater knowledge and understanding of the subject than you could ever hope to achieve, and who have given freely of their time in an attempt to educate you.

You want people to write to you with courtesy and respect, but you feel free to pour offensive foul insults and vitriol upon them in return. Why don't you start addressing people personally in the same way that you address people in this newsgroup, or are you too much of a coward to do so. You wouldn't last long if you started to do so.

Re: why lorentz transformation?

Re: why lorentz transformation?

>[snip more crap]

>|

>| >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

>|

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

>Ah... we get to math at last. It took you long enough.

That's what you think. I tried to educate you for ages, until I came to the conclusion that you were completely ineducable.

>So.... x_i is not x' .

But x_i is now denoted by x' , and what Einstein denoted by x' is not denoted by anything. I pointed this fact out in the post to which you have offensively responded.

> x_i is related to x' by the equation you've just given, but now you want
>to change the name of x_i to x' ,

That is the present standard notation.

>so that

> $x' = x'/\sqrt{1-v^2/c^2}$, is that correct?

That is wrong. I have already told you that the x' on the right (what Einstein denoted by x') is not represented by any symbol in the present day notation. I pointed this out in the very post to which you were responding. But your only response to when I pointed it out was "I don't give a **** what you change it to, I'm discussing Einstein's paper, not yours. Deal with the math or shut the **** up." Obviously, you did "give a ****" what we changed it to, since you made a special point of asking, and then used the fact to make the claim here. Apparently my pointing out the fact was much more relevant to your way of thinking than you had given it credit for. It also demonstrates that YOU can't deal with the maths since the relevance completely escaped you.

My guess is that the bit that you didn't "give a ****" about was my extra comment that no symbol is used for the variable that Einstein denoted by x' , since that completely destroyed your fantasy that you could claim that we were stating that " $x' = x'/\sqrt{1-v^2/c^2}$ ".

In fact, that was the very reason why pointed I out that

"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' "

Re: why lorentz transformation?

Re: why lorentz transformation?

since I *knew* that you would resort to using the change in notation to support your fantasy that we have stated that " $x' = x/\sqrt{1-v^2/c^2}$ ", and I was trying to head you off before you proclaimed your fantasy. Thank you for confirming that I was correct to judge you to be of such low character.

>Is this so that you can avoid counting to three?

Irrelevant, since what you just wrote demonstrated YOUR OWN MATHEMATICAL INCOMPETENCE.

>You see, I'm using two functions. One is the transformation
>from the stationary frame to the moving frame,
>call it $g(x) = x-vt$

That is not a function of x alone. It is a function of TWO real variables, x and t . This means that the appropriate notation is $g(x,t)$, and not $g(x)$, as you have it here.

>and the other is the transformation from the moving frame
>to the moving frame, call it $f(x) = x/\sqrt{1-v^2/c^2}$,
>and
> $f(g(x)) = (x-vt)/\sqrt{1-v^2/c^2}$

WRONG! The CORRECT way to write this is:

$$f(g(x,t)) = (x-vt)/\sqrt{1-v^2/c^2}$$

>Now, when $x=1$, under my function g I have $x' = 1'$,

This is not an acceptable notation. $1'$ does not mean the value of x' evaluated at $x = 1$. x' does not mean a function on x . x' is a variable in its own right whose notation is the composite symbol x' .

Also, just having $x = 1$ is insufficient information to evaluate $g(x,t)$. You need a value of t as well before you can make an evaluation.

>but when $x = 2$ I still have $x' = 1'$ and so I want to make it clear
>that $1'$ is not equal to 1 or 2, because the frame is moving.

x' takes real values. x' is a variable. In Einstein's paper, x' is introduced as variable whose values are given by $x' = x-vt$.

The following is part of what you cut out from my previous posting on the subject:

:: $x, y, z,$ 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

Re: why lorentz transformation?

:: 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.

There is mathematics in that paragraph, and only mathematics. In that paragraph, I was making the point that I just had to make again, because you were too obtuse to take it in, first time around. x' does NOT mean a function of x . x' means a specific variable.

>You did say you could count to three, right?
>I don't want to get too far ahead of you.

Don't be so condescending. That manner is particularly offensive coming from an ignoramus like you. That manner is not how you should treat your betters, and I am certainly one of your betters.

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

>[snip more crap]

>Deal with the math or shut the fuck up.

You should set a good example as far as this is concerned. When YOU see some maths that you don't like, then you ignore it and cut it out, and you refuse point blank to actually deal with it. Your constantly writing the above makes you a hypocrite since you don't deal with the maths yourself, if you find it inconvenient. Let's see you deal with the maths in that paragraph first. Deal with the maths in that paragraph or "shut the **** up".

>So far you've shown you can only count to two
>so that you can confuse x' with ξ .

No, that's you. You tried to use x' simultaneously to denote the variable that Einstein used the notation for, and the variable that we now use the notation for (what Einstein denoted by ξ). In this, you deliberately disregarded where I had explicitly pointed out that there is no current notation for Einstein's variable x' , since that would spoil all your fun. If you had learnt ANY proper mathematics, you would know that you do not simultaneously use the same symbol for two distinct quantities. That you *do* simultaneously use the same symbol for two different quantities shows how mathematically incompetent YOU are. It is also enlightening to note that the concept of a change of notation is beyond you.

>Try it with me. One..... two..... (what comes next?)
>YES! It's three!

Re: why lorentz transformation?

Re: why lorentz transformation?

Nice to see you talking at the level of your OWN mathematical competence, Can you add two two–digit numbers yet, or do you learn that next week?

As I see it, the reason why you claim that people can't count to three is because the change of notation is beyond your comprehension, and your mind can't cope with the reduction from three sets of coordinates $((x,y,z,t), (x',y',z',t), (xi,eta,zeta,tau))$, in Einstein's notation) to two sets of coordinates $((x,y,z,t), (x',y',z',t'))$, in the present notation), and your mind can't cope with the change of notation from $(xi,eta,zeta,tau)$ to (x',y',z',t') , or with the fact that we use x' to denote a completely different variable to that which Einstein denoted by x' , or with the fact that we use no notation for the variable which Einstein denoted by x' .

In other words, all your Pavlovian knee–jerk venom is as a direct result of the fact that your mind cannot cope with the changes wrought by the last hundred years. For the usage of the word "Pavlovian", look up Pavlov's dogs – since you exhibit Pavlovian conditioning.

>Well done.

> Now see if you can do it alone

>without your fingers, we've several years to go before you can

>understand

>what a frame or a function is.

This is a bit rich, coming from somebody who obviously thinks that a two–argument function can just be expressed as a function of x alone.

A function is a set of ordered pairs in which no two distinct ordered pairs have the same first component (i.e. a function f is a set of ordered pairs such that for all x, y, z , if (x,y) and (x,z) are both elements of f , then $y = z$; for any x in the domain of f (i.e. any x which occurs in the first component of one of the elements of f), $f(x)$ is uniquely defined by the requirement that $(x,f(x))$ is an element of f).

I have a very strong suspicion that your mathematical education did not go far enough for you to have ever come across this specific definition of "function", so perhaps you should look up the definition in an online encyclopedia before you start engaging your automatic Pavlovian knee–jerk reaction of spewing venom, since that will only confirm our suspicions of your complete ignorance of the matter.

You seem to want to believe that every function is from \mathbb{R} to \mathbb{R} (i.e. that for every function, the domain [the set of the first components of its elements] is \mathbb{R} , and the range [the set of the second components of its elements] is a subset of \mathbb{R}). In deriving the Lorentz Transformation, we need four functions from \mathbb{R}^4 to \mathbb{R} (i.e. functions for which the domain is \mathbb{R}^4 (so that they have four arguments) and the range is a subset of \mathbb{R}). Alternatively, we need one invertible function from \mathbb{R}^4 to \mathbb{R}^4 , that is, a four–component object, each component of which is a real–valued function

Re: why lorentz transformation?

Re: why lorentz transformation?

of four arguments, i.e. a one-to-one function whose domain is \mathbb{R}^4 , and whose range is \mathbb{R}^4 .

An inertial frame (in special relativity) is a coordinate system in which inertial motion is represented by a linear relationship between the coordinates.

Morally, intellectually, emotionally, and ethically, you are the dregs of society, among the worst that humanity has to offer. It is degrading to continue to interact with you, so I will stop doing so. There is nothing to be gained from trying to converse with you, since you are unreceptive of any attempts to help you, and your ingratitude is great. I had not needed to kill-file you before, since you lied about having kill-filed me. But now your lie has been exposed. I do not intend to ever read your garbage or disgusting abuse again. Good-bye.

PLONK!

.

• 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?](#)

Re: why lorentz transformation?

◇ *From:* David McAnally

◆ ***Re: why lorentz transformation?***

◇ *From:* Androcles

◆ ***Re: why lorentz transformation?***

◇ *From:* David McAnally

- Prev by Date: ***Re: Kerr–Newman metric and entangled electrons***
- Next by Date: ***Re: Bile awski the Janitor.***
- Previous by thread: ***Re: why lorentz transformation?***
- Next by thread: ***Re: why lorentz transformation?***
- Index(es):
 - ◆ ***Date***
 - ◆ ***Thread***