

Re: Anti-relativists in an IOP article – recognise names

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2006-07/msg00249.html>

- *From:* dubious@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx (Bilge)
 - *Date:* Mon, 03 Jul 2006 09:32:40 GMT
-

Koobee Wublee, still the stupid Bumbling Boobie:

"Bilge" <dubious@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message news:slrneae378.5j.dubious@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Koobee Wublee, the bumbling boobie:

"Phineas T Puddleduck"
<phineaspuddleduck@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote
in message
news:290620062334517523%phineaspuddleduck@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

http://www.iop.org/EJ/article/0143-0807/26/6/S09/ejp5_6_s09.pdf

Here are my responses to Mr. Raine's paper above.
Although I cannot
say for all cranks, this crank is a little bit different from the
rest.

In what way? The only difference between you and any other crackpot is
your choice of personal pet peeves about which to wax ignorant while
claiming to be an expert. It goes without saying that all cranks are little
different in that respect.

One day, the students of physics will regard the faithful believers of
Lorentz Transform as cranks. For more than 100 years of crackpottery.

Wouldn't you have more fun fantasizing about women? I mean, at
least you might be able to pay money to realize that type of fantasy,
especially if the lack of imagination in your posts is indicative of
the rest of your life.

[...]

That conflicts with your next comment about the mathematics being simple. Rutherford had an excuse. You don't.

You don't need any excuses to distance yourself away from the absurdity

Learn to read.

[...]

Then why is it that you cannot understand the resolution of the twin paradox?

I do understand it.

In that case, why are you asking about how to do the math?

Again, I challenge you to resolve the Twin's Paradox through math.

Integrate the two world lines. The inertial twin's world line is trivial (and obvious). The world line of the accelerated twin is:

$$d\tau = \int \sqrt{1 - \beta(t)^2} dt$$

Pick any function you like for the acceleration (which is just the time varying velocity, $\beta(t)$). Excuse me. Pick any function you can find in an integral table, since you can't integrate anything yourself or you would already have resolved your conundrum.

You can present complex integrals if you wish.

Don't kid yourself. Odds are you won't be able to integrate a function of your own choosing even with a table of integrals. Your attempt to posture your way into mathematical expertise is a joke.

[...]

Which are self-consistent if the "basics we all have learnt in high school" are self-consistent.

Algebra, calculus, physics before MMX, etc. Did you even learn and understand these topics?

Care to compare your knowledge on these subjects with mine?
I already know how that will turn out. You'll try to mitigate your lack of knowledge by claiming everything is "non-traditional mathematics."

[...]

No. Read my post. I have said the (Einstein) Equivalence Principle has served no useful purpose in the development of GR.

<http://relativity.livingreviews.org/Articles/lrr-2006-3/title.html>

esp. sec. 3.1.

[...]

Which "vast number of postulates," and why are you neglecting the fact that classical physics requires an equivalent set of postulates which differ only in what is assumed by the postulate? For example, galilean relativity assumes (1) an affine space to define the spacetime,

Spacetime is merely a postulate.

What's your point? Are you also claiming that galileo and newton were idiots because newtonian mechanics is based on galilean spacetime?

[...]

(2) a metric,

The metric was a mental, abstract exercise started with Gauss.

No, idiot. It started with pythagoreas and euclid. Are you claiminmg that it is impossible to measure distance? What part of the pythagorean theorem and high school geometry eludes you?

[...]

Re: Anti-relativists in an IOP article – recognise names

(3) a group of transformations which define a lie algebra.

That is why Poincare failed. His interpretations to SR was totally based on group theory not based on sound mathematics in which it is the only way to reconcile the observations with theories.

Are you claiming that euclid, pythagoreas, galileo and newton also failed? Or are you claiming that they succeeded because they lacked the mathematical knowledge to put their work on a solid mathematical foundation? By "traditional mathematics," do you mean the mathematics known prior to the 19th century? Galois invented group theory circa 1832.

To this day, when directly confronted with this issue, I would get a lecture on group theory (Dr. Robert's foliation of spacetime for example).

What's your point? If you have difficulty understanding what that means, you aren't in a position to offer an opinion of any merit. I for one am not willing to restrict an explanation of physical phenomena to operations you can find on a four-function calculator.

Face it. Lorentz Transform is not about the group theory although it forms a group of your Lie stuff. Big deal! It does not address the real world issues.

Which real world experimental data is incorrectly predicted?

You need to use traditional mathematics to deal with everyday experiences.

Some of my "everyday experiences" have included, measuring lifetimes for β decay, counting gamma rays and positrons, measuring masses of nuclei, designing and building apparatus to polarize protons and deuterons and precess their spins, all of which require more mathematics than your everyday experiences require. Since I've also done an assortment of mechanical, electrical and cryogenic engineering work, for which relativity is not needed, I can only conclude that your lack of mathematical skills means you have no experience doing any engineering either. Just because you've never been in a situation that required anything more complex than counting on your fingers, doesn't mean you can expect people to waste their time explaining things within your limitations. While relativity is rather simple, you need to recognize that you are simply not going to ever grasp it and move on to something more your speed, like becoming a professional

lawn ornament.

[...]

Since mach's principle has no rigorous definition which is used consistently, why should anyone bother mentioning it?

To deny Mach's Principle is to turn your back on Newtonian physics and GR. Do you even know what you are talking about?

Look up "Mach's principle" in the index of wald.

[...]

For you, yes. But only because you think you understand relativity despite the glaring evidence to the contrary.

What evidence? My point-blank appeal to resolve the Twin's Paradox through the very basis of this paradox manifests ——— Lorentz Transform?

Your inability to understand how to do a line integral is not my problem. Are you excluding line integrals and the pythagorean theorem from "traditional mathematics?"

[...]

On your planet? I don't know. Here on earth, one can take a trip to a library and seek resources called textbooks. One can also exploit the world wide web.

Believe me. I am residing on the same planet earth as you are.

I find it hard to believe that people as stupid as you exist on earth.

[...]

Have you proved that hyperbolic geometry is inconsistent? If so, you have proved that euclidean geometry is inconsistent. You should immediately stop posting to usenet and write an article for Nature, as that would be one of the more amazing discoveries of the past several millenia. If not, you should stop posting to usenet and slink away in embarrassment.

Re: Anti-relativists in an IOP article – recognise names

I do understand the subject of SR and GR. You can only stop me from posting by evil means. Would you try?

Do you consider it evil to point out your lack of intelligence and your inability to realize you don't know what you are talking about? Personally, I seriously doubt you are capable of discussing any subject at the level of the average physicist.

[...]

It has nothing to do with Einstein. It has all things to do with logic, science, and math. Yes, all the things science is supposed to stand for. Einstein is a nobody. His works were plagiarisms from other cranks and certain alchemists.

In other words, it really is all about einstein.

No, no, and no.

If you plan on using that bullshit, you need to learn to lie better as you are too transparent.

[...]

I certainly hope no one ever trusted you to do any engineering that the unsuspecting public presumes to be safe unless you had someone checking every number you calculated.

Care to write a book about me?

I don't think, ``Koobee Wublee: Poster Child for Failure and Misguided Self-Delusion" would be a best seller. People would tire of reading about your attempts to mitigate a lifetime of failure by ever more ludicrous posturing.

.