

Re: The Present.

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2006-06/msg02305.html>

- *From:* "Sorcerer" <Headmaster@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 30 Jun 2006 16:35:52 GMT
-

"Spoonfed" <good4usoul@xxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:1151682459.180536.138660@xx

Sorcerer wrote:

"Spoonfed" <good4usoul@xxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:1151621786.053622.110780@xx

Sorcerer wrote:

"Alex" <dralexgreen@xxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:1151572565.855095.162940@xx

|

| Sorcerer wrote:

| > "Alex" <dralexgreen@xxxxxxxx> wrote in message

| >

| news:1151498035.048666.171660@xx

| > | Relativity has a lot to say about the present moment. See:

| > |

| > | http://en.wikibooks.org/wiki/Special_relativity

| >

| > The derivation of the cuckoo transformations is given in

| > <http://www.fourmilab.ch/etexts/einstein/specrel/www/>

| >

| > which is explained at

| > <http://www.androcles01.pwp.blueyonder.co.uk/Smart/Smart.htm>

| >

| > Notice the claim:

| > "Given that the equations are linear", which they are not, the
lying

| > garbage at

| > <http://tinyurl.com/qc5o6> is NOT Einstein's SR.

|

|

| The equations are linear,

$\tau(0) = 0$

$\tau(4) = 8$

Re: The Present.

$$\tau(10) = 8$$

$$\tau(16) = 8$$

$$\tau(20) = 16$$

No way is that linear.

| I assume you mean that linear equations are
| inappropriate.

You can assume all you want, I'm talking mathematics, not assumptions.
The equations are not linear, no matter how much you assert they are.

| In this derivation the assumption is that space is
| homogenous and isotropic, ie: it is assumed that space has a form that
| can be described by the linear equations (Special Relativity).

Isotropic:

$$\tau_x = (t - vx/c^2) / \sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}$$

$$\tau_y = (t - vy/c^2) / \sqrt{1 - u^2/c^2}$$

$$\tau_z = (t - vz/c^2) / \sqrt{1 - w^2/c^2}$$

$$\xi = (x - vt) / \sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}$$

$$\eta = (y - ut) / \sqrt{1 - u^2/c^2}$$

$$\zeta = (z - wt) / \sqrt{1 - w^2/c^2}$$

You need three time axes to be isotropic. Spacetime is not isotropic.

| There
| are no lies, the assumption is stated, obviously the equations would
| need modifying if space were curved.

I've just modified them – obviously you need three wristwatches.

The lying garbage is either

$$\tau_y = t$$

$$\tau_z = t$$

$$\eta = y$$

$$\zeta = z$$

or

$$\tau_x = (t - vx/c^2) / \sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}$$

$$\xi = (x - vt) / \sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}$$

Re: The Present.

It's kinda hard to say which since the idiots Einstein and Minkowski use the Galilean transforms for the y- and z-axes. If people want to play mathematical games they should at least be consistent or they'll be caught in a contradiction, aren't you? :-)

Androcles

Let me see if you understand what you are doing. You are arbitrarily defining a set of equations which do not resemble the Lorentz Transformation.

My equations are DERIVED, they are not arbitrary.

Who cares?

You do.

So who cares about Einstein's shit?

They are not the Lorentz Transformations. And pointing out that they are not correct won't get you anywhere.

Fuck off then, lying cunt. Unless you can prove the derivation of the cuckoo transformations they remain cuckoo like you, you fucking asshole.

Then you are pointing out that this set of equations you have arbitrarily defined leads to inconsistent and impossible values. From this, you conclude that the Lorentz Transformations are "cuckoo."

Quit saying arbitrary:

$$\frac{1}{2}[\tau(0,0,0,t)+\tau(0,0,0,t+y'/(c-u)+y''/(c+u))] = \tau(0,y',0,t+y'/(c-u))$$

$$\frac{1}{2}[\tau(0,0,0,t)+\tau(0,0,0,t+z'/(c-w)+z''/(c+w))] = \tau(0,0,z',t+z'/(c-w))$$

Re: The Present.

Re: The Present.

What?

<http://www.fourmilab.ch/etexts/einstein/specrel/www/figures/img22.gif>

What? You fucking ignoramus.

Androcles.

.