

Re: This is What Einstein Actually Did.

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2006-06/msg02303.html>

- *From:* "Sorcerer" <Headmaster@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
- *Date:* Fri, 30 Jun 2006 16:28:40 GMT

"PD" <TheDraperFamily@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
<news:1151672556.821403.270270@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

|
 | Sorcerer wrote:
 | > "PD" <TheDraperFamily@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
 | > <news:1151584161.736778.286470@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 | > |
 | > | Sorcerer wrote:
 | > | > "PD" <TheDraperFamily@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
 | > | > <news:1151547135.216172.284480@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 | > | > |
 | > | > | Sorcerer wrote:
 | > | > | > "PD" <TheDraperFamily@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
 | > | > | > <news:1151518607.218930.320160@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 | > | > | > |
 | > | > | > | Sorcerer wrote:
 | > | > | > | > "PD" <TheDraperFamily@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
 | > | > | > | > <news:1151496744.924923.260870@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 | > | > | > | > |
 | > | > | > | > | Sorcerer wrote:
 | > | > | > | > | > "tomgee" <tyropress@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
 | > | > | > | > | > <news:1151443331.684517.255630@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 | > | > | > | > | > |
 | > | > | > | > | > | Sorcerer wrote:
 | > | > | > | > | > | > "tomgee" <tyropress@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
 | > | > | > | > | > | > <news:1151431530.173601.106530@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 | > | > | > | > | > | > |
 | > | > | > | > | > | > | PD believes anyone that doesn't follow his religion
 is
 | > | > showing
 | > | > | > | > | > "*exactly*"
 | > | > | > | > | > | > what is wrong with their thinking. I call that
 bigotry,
 | > | > because
 | > | > | > no

Re: This is What Einstein Actually Did.

|> |> |> |> |> matter
|> |> |> |> |> |> how
|> |> |> |> |> |> you argue with him, he'll always be right in his
eyes.
|> He is
|> |> the
|> |> |> |> typical
|> |> |> |> |> |> shithead
|> |> |> |> |> |> and arsehole.
|> |> |> |> |> |> Androcles
|> |> |> |> |> |
|> |> |> |> |> | In your case, Androcles, it's pretty plain what's
wrong
|> with
|> |> your
|> |> |> |> |> |> thinking. It's a pretty short trip following your
thinking
|> |> before
|> |> |> you
|> |> |> |> |> |> run into something that's patently wrong.
|> |> |> |> |> |
|> |> |> |> |> |> Like how muons that are superluminal will leave the
same
|> |> amount of
|> |> |> |> |> |> energy in a scintillator regardless of their initial
|> speed,
|> |> and
|> |> |> still
|> |> |> |> |> |> come out to be just under c by the time they leave the
|> |> |> |> |> |> scintillator.
|> |> |> |> |> |> You say, "I don't know HOW it does that, but it's sure
|> more
|> |> |> believable
|> |> |> |> |> |> |> than time dilation." Apparently, to spit out something
you
|> |> thing
|> |> |> is
|> |> |> |> |> |> hogwash, you'd be happy to swallow something from
further
|> down
|> |> the
|> |> |> |> |> |> colon.
|> |> |> |> |> |> |
|> |> |> |> |> |> |
|> |> |> |> |> |> |> I was talking about you, not to you.
|> |> |> |> |> |> |> You say a muon slows down in a scintillator
|> |> |> |> |
|> |> |> |> |> |> |> I did? Where did I say that?
|> |> |> |> |> |> |> Liar.
|> |> |> |> |> |> |> "Like how muons that are superluminal will leave the same
|> amount of

Re: This is What Einstein Actually Did.

|> |> |> |> energy in a scintillator regardless of their initial speed,
and
|> |> still
|> |> |> |> come out to be just under c by the time they leave the
|> |> scintillator." –
|> |> |> |> CUNT.
|> |> |> |
|> |> |> | I was referring to YOUR thinking, not mine, Androcles.
|> |> |>
|> |> |> | I know, asshole, and I'm referring to yours. You say a muon
slows
|> down
|> |> |> (i.e. loses energy) in a scintillator, slowing to subluminal <
c.
|> |> |
|> |> | Yes indeed. It was subluminal before hitting the scintillator and
|> |> | subluminal after hitting the scintillator. It slows an itty bit in
the
|> |> | scintillator, about 2 MeV/cm.
|> |>
|> |>
|> |> So apologise, I'm not a liar, you thick cunt.
|> |
|> | Certainly you are. It's been documented.
|>
|> Yeah, well, its been documented that you are a cunt.
|>
|> |
|> |> In your case, Phuckwit Duck, it's pretty plain what's wrong with
your
|> |> thinking. It's a pretty short trip following your thinking before
you
|> |> run into something that's patently wrong.
|> |>
|> |> MEASURING the speed of the cosmic muon BEFORE it hits the
|> |> scintillator, we find 62 miles (height of atmosphere) in less than
|> |> 2.2 usec > 299,792.4562 kilometers per second, plus or minus 1.1
meters
|> per
|> |> second
|> |> IN OUR FRAME OF REFERENCE.
|> |
|> | That's incorrect. It doesn't cover that ground in less than 2.2 usec
in
|> | our frame of reference, at least not that we measure.
|>
|> Top of the atmosphere to sea level, ignoramus.
|
| Not in less than 2.2 usec.
|
|>

Re: This is What Einstein Actually Did.

|>
|> | And in
|> | ground-based muon beamlines, the muons definitely do not decay with a
|> | lifetime less than 2.2 usec or even equal to 2.2 usec in our frame of
|> | reference.
|>
|> Lying cunt:
|> <http://websci.smith.edu/~pdecowsk/muons.html>
|> "The three parameter fit gave value of the average muon life time
|> (2.02+-0.08) microseconds"
|
| That's for lazy, pokey muons at very low speed, not for wild, feral
| muons.
|
|>
|>
|> |
|> |> The FoR of the muon
|> |> is irrelevant. Pay attention. Wipe the drool off your mouth, too,
it's
|> |> gotten on your glasses and impaired your calculator.
|> |>
|> |>
|> |> |>
|> |> |>
|> |> |> | Pay attention.
|> |> |> | Wipe the foam off your mouth, too, it's gotten on your glasses
and
|> |> |> | impaired your reading.
|> |> |>
|> |> |> Wipe your mouth out with soap, jackass. Your glasses need
cleaning
|> |> |> and that impairs your writing.
|> |> |>
|> |> |> |>
|> |> |> |>
|> |> |> |>
|> |> |> |>
|> |> |> |> |
|> |> |> |> |> and you don't know how
|> |> |> |> |> it does that,
|> |> |> |> |
|> |> |> |> | I don't? Where did I say that?
|> |> |> |> | Liar.
|> |> |> |>
|> |> |> |> Oh, you do know how they lose energy without slowing
down.... do
|> |> tell us
|> |> |> |> all, cunt.
|> |> |> |
|> |> |> | I know how they lose energy when they slow down.

Re: This is What Einstein Actually Did.

Re: This is What Einstein Actually Did.

|> |> |>
|> |> |> See, you say muons slow down, and when I say you say it, you say
I'm
|> a
|> |> |> liar, you cunt.
|> |> |
|> |> | Note the difference, you say it slows from superluminal to
subluminal
|> |> | speeds.
|> |> |
|> |> Perhaps you call 62 miles per 2.2 usec subluminal...<shrug>
|> |
|> | I don't know where you get the idea it covers that distance in 2.2
|> | usec. <shrug>
|> |
|> |>
|> |> |
|> |> |> It's a pretty short trip following your thinking
|> |> |> before anyone runs into something that's patently wrong.
|> |> |> (Not that you've ever measured the speed of a muon before it's
going
|> |> |> into a scintillator.)
|> |> |
|> |> | Sure I have. Ever heard of a muon beamline?
|> |> |
|> |> Not one that is 62 miles long, no.
|> |
|> | And that matters... why?
|> Wild muons come from the top of the atmosphere.
|
| And that matters...why?

You brought muons up. You tell me why, you moron.

|
|>
|>
|> |
|> |> You refer to domesticated muons,
|> |> I'm referring to wild, feral muons.
|> |
|> | And that matters...why?
|>
|> Fuck off. You brought muons up, now you question ME, you asshole?
|
| Yup. I brought up what YOU think about muons, and what YOU think about
| muons is wrong. So I question it.

Muons have fuck all to do with it. Velocity is DEFINED as $AB/(tB-tA)$,

Re: This is What Einstein Actually Did.

Re: This is What Einstein Actually Did.

not as $0AB/(t'A-tA)$, shithead.

|
|>
|>
|>
|> |
|> |> Cheetahs run much faster than moggies.
|> |
|> | And that matters...why?
|> |
|> |>
|> |>
|> |> |
|> |> |> Anyway, the aurora are Cherenkov radiation, so clearly
|> |> |> particles entering atmosphere are superluminal.
|> |> |
|> |> | They don't travel faster than c . They travel faster than c/n , at
least
|> |> | for a while.
|> |>
|> |> 62 miles in 2.2 usec is faster than 299,792.4562 kilometers per
second,
|> |
|> | Yes, indeed it is, but nothing goes 62 miles in 2.2 usec.
|>
|> Muons do. You brought 'em up, cunt.
|
| Nope, they don't.

Ok, then they don't. So why bring them up, cunt?

|
|>
|>
|>
|> |
|> |> but I agree, nothing is faster than $c = 0/0$.
|> |> "the velocity of light in our theory plays the part, physically,
of an
|> |> infinitely great velocity."– IFC Einstein
|> |> You are confusing physics with mathematical games, shithead.
|> |> Perhaps you don't know how to use a calculator.
|> |>
|> |>
|> |> |
|> |> |>
|> |> |> | I didn't say that I
|> |> |> | don't know how it does that. You did. Would you like a

Re: This is What Einstein Actually Did.

reference

|> to

|> |> |> | where you said that?

|> |> |>

|> |> |> I know what you said, shithead. of course I said you don't know.

|> |> |> You didn't know how the aurorae glow, either, until I told you.

|> |> |>

|> |> |> |

|> |> |> |>

|> |> |> |>

|> |> |> |> |

|> |> |> |> |> so it must have gone in at just under $c = 0/0$ and come

|> |> |> |> |> out at $c = 1/0$. <shrug>

|> |> |> |> |

|> |> |> |> |> $c = 299,792,458$ m/s (or 1, depending on your system of units).

|> |> |> |> |> | Are you a bonehead, Androcles? Why yes, yes, I believe you
|> are.

|> |> |> |>

|> |> |> |> |> See what I mean? No matter how you argue with him, he'll
always

|> be

|> |> |> |> right in

|> |> |> |> |> his eyes.

|> |> |> |> |> He is the typical shithead and arsehole.

|> |> |> |> |> The speed of light from A to B is $AB/(t_B - t_A) = 299,792,458$
m/s

|> |> |> |>

|> |> |> |> |> Yes indeed.

|> |> |> |> |> Yes indeed.

|> |> |> |>

|> |> |> |> |> whereas c from A to A is $0/(t'_A - t_A) = 0/0$ m/s.

|> |> |> |>

|> |> |> |> |> No, that's not a speed during a round-trip, that's the
magnitude

|> of

|> |> the

|> |> |> |> |> velocity on a round-trip. Do you not know the difference?

|> |> |> |>

|> |> |> |> |> There is no velocity for a round trip, arsehole. Velocity is a
|> vector,

|> |> |> |> |> it has both direction and magnitude, not two directions.

|> |> |

|> |> | Really?

|> |>

|> |> | Yes really.

|> |>

|> |> | This seems like a pretty common problem in basic physics

|> |> | textbooks.

|> |>

|> |> | So a lot of shitheads babble shit they don't understand. <shrug>

Re: This is What Einstein Actually Did.

|> |> What do you want me to do about it? Educate the arseholes? I'm trying.

|> |

|> | And so you have the same problem as Seto. You use terms differently |> | than the way that they are taught to freshmen. And you suppose that is |> | a problem with everyone else?

|>

|> Freshmen are taught velocity is distance/time. You've never learned that.

|

| No, they're not. They're taught that velocity is the rate of change of | (vector) displacement with time, and there is care taken to distinguish | displacement from distance, speed from velocity, and other useful | things you apparently never used in your engineering years.

|

|>

|> |

|> |>

|> |>

|> |>

|> |> | Billy runs around a closed track and crosses the finish line

|> |> | at the same point he started the race. What is his average *velocity*

|> |> | during this race?

|> |>

|> |> Zero.

|> |

|> | Yes, exactly. And yet you just told me there is "no velocity for a |> | round trip, asshole". But you just found one, asshole.

|>

|> There are no bananas in a round trip either, stupid cunt. But anyway, c

=

|> 0/0 which

|> doesn't equal 300,000 km/sec, moron.

|

| But there IS a velocity in a round trip. It's zero, just like you said.

The number of potatoes in a round trip is zero, so there are potatoes in a round trip.

The number of bananas in a round trip is zero, so there are bananas in a round trip.

The number of miles in a round trip is zero, so there are miles in a round trip.

Duh...

You are totally off your fucking rocker, you cunt.

|>

|>

|> |

|> | Now Billy runs around the same closed track at a speed of 8 m/s and

|> | crosses the finish line at the same point he started the race. What is

Re: This is What Einstein Actually Did.

|> | his average *velocity* during this race, asshole?

|>

|> Still zero, you stupid cunt.

|

| That's right, it is zero.

So what are you arguing about, stupid cunt?

| Now light runs back and forth on a closed circuit at a speed of

| 299,792,458 m/s

It can't, speed is the magnitude of velocity and the velocity is zero.

| and crosses the finish line at the same point it

| started the race. What is the average *velocity* during this trip,

| asshole?

Zero, ignorant cunt.

|>

|>

|> |

|> | It's been a pretty short trip to find out exactly where you are wrong,

|> | asshole.

|>

|> You haven't found me wrong yet, imbecile.

|

| Really?

Yes really.

| So you are wrong AND blind.

I'm not wrong or blind, cunt. Geschwindigkeit is the magnitude of Geschwindigkeit.

|

|>

|>

|> |

|> |>

|> |>

|> |> | Would you like a textbook reference for a problem

|> |> | just like this one? I bet it even has an answer in the back of the

|> |> | book.

|> |>

Re: This is What Einstein Actually Did.

Re: This is What Einstein Actually Did.

|> |> Produce it, then. Cite the shithead author that doesn't know what
|> |> velocity is, unless he says the answer is zero, in which case you
lose

|> |> again, Phuckwit Duck.

|> |

|> | Giancoli, 3rd edition. Look it up. Do you need a page reference, or
can

|> | you find it?

|>

|> Never heard of him. Does he claim the distance from A to A is greater
|> than zero?

|

| It appears you don't need him, anyway.

That's right, I don't. But you brought it up.

| You know the average velocity of
| a round trip circuit is zero even though the speed is not

Nonsense, Geschwindigkeit is the magnitude
of Geschwindigkeit.

| -- you said so yourself.

Where did I say that, liar?

| You also apparently know that there IS a velocity for a
| round trip circuit, despite saying earlier that there isn't.

You keep coming up with "apparent", you lying cunt.
I have NEVER said there is a banana for a round trip. I said
there are NO potatoes in a round trip (or miles either).

|

| It's been a pretty short trip to find out exactly where you are wrong,
| Androcles.

You haven't done so yet, lying cunt. All you've done is agreed with me
that $c = 0/0$, whereas the speed of light is 299,792,458 m/s.

"the velocity of light in our theory plays the part, physically, of an
infinitely great velocity." – IFC Einstein

Phuckwit Duck plays the part, physically, of a phuckwit cunt.

Androcles.

|
|>
|> Androcles
|>
|>
|> |
|> |>
|> |> |
|> |> | Or do you want to dispute the Newtonian mechanics that is taught
in
|> |> | freshman physics books?
|> |>
|> |> Not at all, unless they are wrong like you.
|> |> Try this one, although it may be too advanced for you:
|> |>
<http://www.glenbrook.k12.il.us/gbssci/phys/Class/vectors/u311a.html>
|> |>
|> |>
|> |> |
|> |> | Wait, you're an ex-engineer aren't you? Didn't you have to pass
this
|> |> | class at some point?
|> |>
|> |> Yes. I did. And I've put it into practice.
|> |> Androcles
|> |>
|> |>
|> |> |
|> |> |>
|> |> |>
|> |> |> |
|> |> |> | You're a math major. You know the difference between an
average of
|> |> |> | magnitudes and a magnitude of an average?
|> |> |> |
|> |> |> |>
<http://www.androcles01.pwp.blueyonder.co.uk/DominoEffect.GIF>
|> |> |> |> Everybody knows a constant velocity reverses direction,
don't
|> you,
|> |> |> Phuckwit
|> |> |> |> Cunt?
|> |> |> |> Us boneheads will continue with speed of light from A to B
is
|> |> |> |> $AB/(tB-tA)$
|> |> |> |> =
|> |> |> |> |> 299,792,458 m/s
|> |> |> |> |
|> |> |> |> | That's fine.

