

Re: SMAL DICK ken seto, INTELECTUAL MIDGET

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2006-07/msg01312.html>

- *From:* "Sorcerer" <Headmaster@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 16 Jul 2006 07:28:21 GMT
-

"The Ghost In The Machine" <ewill3@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:pan.2006.07.16.01.31.05.924006@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

| On Mon, 10 Jul 2006 08:12:02 +0000, Sorcerer wrote:

|

|>

|> "The Ghost In The Machine" <ewill3@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message

|> news:pan.2006.07.10.03.02.15.617899@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

|> | On Sun, 09 Jul 2006 20:26:23 +0000, Sorcerer wrote:

|> |

|> |

|> |> "The Ghost In The Machine" <ewill3@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message

|> |> news:pan.2006.07.09.16.34.53.177334@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

|> |> | On Sun, 09 Jul 2006 07:46:28 +0000, Sorcerer wrote:

|> |> |

|> |> |

|> |> |> "The Ghost In The Machine" <ewill3@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in
message

|> |> |> news:pan.2006.07.08.20.50.50.727239@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

|> |> |> | Pedant Point: TWLS=c and OWLS isotropic would indeed be more
or

|> |> |> less

|> |> |> | sufficient, and I believe this has been done in two separate

|> |> |> | experiments.

|> |> |>

|> |> |>

|> |> |> Pedant point: It is physically impossible to go two ways.

|> |> |> Therefore

|> |> |> your

|> |> |> belief is faith, not fact, and it is fact that you are a fucking

|> |> |> idiot. Androcles

|> |> |

|> |> | Please explain the procedure of "going two ways" and why it is

|> |> | impossible.

|> |>

|> |> There isn't procedure, that's why it is impossible. Try it. Take a

|> |> step forward

|> |> as you take a step back. Then put on your strait-jacket and take
your

Re: SMAL DICK ken seto, INTELLECTUAL MIDGET

|> |> medication.
|> |> The velocity of light, c , is measured from A to A in time $t'_A - t_A$. A
|> |> mathematician would call that "undefined" and say $AB/(t_B - t_A) = c$. A
|> |> shithhead would build cuckoo transformations out of it and pretend he
|> knew
|> |> mathematics, like this:
|> |> <http://www.androcles01.pwp.blueyonder.co.uk/Rocket/Rocket.htm>
|> |
|> | The speed of light in a TWLS is 0, according to your logic.
|>
|> And according to the definition of a vector.
|>
|> | The same
|> | logic would require that a person traveling from NY to Boston back to
NY
|> | would also have an average speed of 0.
|> |
|> Tell us, what is the speed of a person that travelled from NY to NY,
|> starting at t_{NY} and ending at t'_{NY} , given that there are no clocks in
|> Boston
|> and his wristwatch is unreliable?
|> Answer: You haven't the faintest idea. You have insufficient
information.
|> It is UNDEFINED.
|
| No, it's zero.

Ok, you make my point. In Einstein's theory, the speed of light is zero according to Ghost. Case closed.

|
| Proof:
|
| event 1: (0,0)
| event 2: (0,t)
|
| where t is unknown. The velocity is d/t ; since t is unknown but greater
| than zero, that yields 0.

Ok, case confirmed closed. Well done for providing a proof of $c = 0$.

Good enough for physics, although to a mathematician we have:
event 2: (0,0)

|
| Now, a more reasonable sort would probably include as an intermediate

| event

|

| event 1A: (d, t/2)

|

| and thereby work out that the average speed is nonzero (if unknown),

A reasonable sort doesn't say "average" when he is asked about "constant".

An even more reasonable mathematician would definitely include as an extrapolation of the intermediate event:

event 1B: (d+delta d, t/2+delta t) where delta>0.

$$c = [f(d) - f(d+h)] / h = -300,000 \text{ km/sec}$$

| but never mind.

You should mind. c is negative by your "reasonable sort" reasoning. I wish you'd make up your unreasonable mind and prove c = the set {300,000, 0, -300,000} instead of handwaving.

I call that UNDEFINED, but never mind, I'll settle for c = 0 as a compromise to be a reasonable sort.

Oh wait.... you said AVERAGE speed. So you are right, it is zero.

| > Constant velocities do not contain a reversal of direction, and speed is

| > the magnitude

| > of velocity.

|

| In a circular orbit, is the speed constant?

Your question is ambiguous.

The instantaneous speed is the magnitude of the instantaneous velocity.

The instantaneous velocity is not constant, therefore the speed is not constant.

The average is zero. You did ask for average, right? Average doesn't mean constant.

Now if you want the angular speed you can use the angular velocity, measured in radians/sec, not fps.

If you want to include rotating frames of reference, use a rotating coordinate system and don't call it "inertial."

Y'know, your concept of "reasonable" is "be persuaded by the unreasonable", and your examples are non sequitur. You've gone from c = 0 to average c to c in water and flint glass to c going round in circles. You are not succeeding in your persuasions.

You are not reasonable. You are fuckin' unreasonable, and we haven't even gotten past 2AB/(t'A-tA) yet, let alone the cuckoo transformations.

|
|> Try to understand: Einstein ASSUMES the time of arrival in Boston is
| half
|> of $(t'_{NY}-t_{NY}) + t_{NY}$. For everyday purposes that assumption is
| reasonable
|> (if imprecise),
|
| Actually, it depends on one's assumptions.

Mathematicians do not make assumptions, mathematicians prove.
Physicists make assumptions. The worst assumption a physicist
makes is that he understands mathematics.

| For instance, one might direct
| the light beam through a tube of water on outbound, and through a tube of
| flint glass on inbound.

Non sequitur, das Licht im leeren Raume was stated. It isn't possible for a
reasonable sort to assume flint glass or water.
You are fucked, c is a set of velocities $\{ 300,000, 0, -300,000 \}$, average
zero.

|> but in rigorous mathematics assumptions are definitely out of order.
|> Einstein didn't understand differentiation either. He reduces the
| distance
|> from
|> NY to Boston to zero. "Hence, if x ' be taken infinitesimally small". It
|> is impossible to differentiate (ie find the slope) at a discontinuity.
| He
|> is violating the rules of mathematics. You cannot tell me the person
|> taking the trip to Boston and back takes 2 hours,
|> therefore he takes 1 hour one way. That's a strawman and I can bowl it
|> over easily.

|
| Noted. However, one might take into account the fact that the MMX showed
| no anisotropies as it was rotated between measurements.

Yes it did as it was rotated, you didn't look. Rotating MMX is Sagnac.

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

You'd measure the velocity of cars on a toll road at the toll booth, you
would.

Re: SMAL DICK ken seto, INTELLECTUAL MIDGET

You didn't measure, therefore you didn't see. That doesn't mean it didn't happen, why should one take into account missing measurements?

| > It takes 59 minutes one way and 61 minutes the other, both by the clock
at
| > Boston and the traveller's wristwatch. Why? Because Einstein says
| > himself,
| > $x'/(c-v)$, $x'/(c+v)$, which are clearly different times. Then he plays
his
| > frame-hopping
| > game and pretend to use rigorous math, bur we really don't care what the
| > time
| > is by a photon's wristwatch.

| Here's a thought for you. Assume a canoe is traveling 10 m/s
| (relative to the water) along a river that is moving 1 m/s. There are two
| posts in the river, 100 m apart. In a nearby lake a second canoe is also
| traveling 10 m/s between two posts in the water, 100 m apart.

| In the river context, the canoe going from post 1 to post 2 will take
| 100/11 seconds. If one assumes an instantaneous turnaround time, then
| going back from post to post 1 will take 100/9 seconds.

| Total roundtrip time: $100/11 + 100/9 = (11+9)*100/(99) = 2000/99$ seconds.

| In still water, the roundtrip time is simply $2 * 100/10 = 2000/100$
seconds.

| As you can see, the first canoe will take slightly longer, at least given
| the parameters of this thought-experiment.

| If one takes a third canoe and two posts 100 m apart with the canoe going
| crosswise to the river, one gets $2000/(10*\sqrt{101})$ seconds, as the canoe
| is traveling along the hypotenuse of a right triangle if one plots its
| course relative to the river.

| This is of course a variant of the old "headwind/tailwind/crabwind"
| problem, and it's quite clear that it's going to take longer to make a
| trip in a headwind, tailwind, or crosswind (or, if one prefers, with the
| current, against the current, or across the current) than it would in
| still air or water — or, for that matter, unmoving luminiferous aether.

| And of course MMX was designed to measure two canoes at once (one might
| contemplate, for instance, mounting five posts in a gigantic wheel within
| the river; the fifth post is at the center of the wheel — and the canoes
| are racing through different paths).

| That it measured no difference was very surprising, and lead to Einstein's
| "fraudulent" theory, which was vehemently objected to at the time, but
| slowly gained acceptance as alternative explanations were discarded.

Re: SMAL DICK ken seto, INTELLECTUAL MIDGET

| This may be because scientists were desperate for grant money, and quite
| willing to perpetrate worldwide fraud in order to gain that money. After
| all, look at the profligate waste of the Texas Superconducting
| Supercollider (it would have been cheaper to mothball it!).
|
| However, I for one think scientists are a little more reasonable than
| that. :-)

Trivial crap about canoes ignored.
Here's a thought for you.

"Scientists" includes biologists, geologists, archeologists, astronomers,
chemists, even surgeons. Just about any discipline that employs the
scientific method.

Mathematics is not science, it is a tool and an art, as the hammer and
chisel
are the tools of the sculptor, the screwdriver is the tool of the
electrician,
the wrench the tool of the mechanic. Mathematics can be use to describe
Nature, it is the lingua franca of science, but we can't create Nature with
math.

Physicists are failed mathematicians and greedy bastards without qualms.
Physicists are not scientists. Scientists are a little more reasonable than
that.

"Tom Roberts" <tjroberts137@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
[news:P4Hqg.60105\\$Lm5.3167@xx](mailto:news:P4Hqg.60105$Lm5.3167@xx)
| This is PHYSICS, not math or logic, and "proof" is completely irrelevant.

That's someone who calls himself a "physicist", partially responsible
for the relativity FAQs.
With that single "awshit" Roberts has totally wiped the slate of every
"attaboy" he ever earned. No brownie points left. He's finished, done for,
dead. He may as well go home, he has nothing left to offer.

This IS because physicists still are desperate for grant money, and quite
willing to perpetrate worldwide fraud in order to gain that money.

I'm a mathematician, engineer and astronomer, not a physicist, but I
understand physics.

BTW, the guy that headed the team that designed the electronics for
Concorde was a civil engineer, I worked with him. He knew more about
electronics than bridges because he chose to. What does this tell you?
It tells me he was competent at both, but he wasn't an artist. Bridges
have to do more than span gaps, they have to be beautiful.
Whatever design is submitted, all are expected to function. The
chosen design is the one that pleases aesthetically, and that decision
ultimately rests with someone that doesn't design bridges. The bridge

Re: SMAL DICK ken seto, INTELECTUAL MIDGET

has to hold up mathematically, sure, but it has to look good.

| >

| > Einstein wants to use the everyday approximation of 1 hour and then say

| > he's

| > being precise, and he is LYING. The guy was simply a buffoon who didn't

| > know

| > what he was doing or he was a malicious huckster who did.

| > Either way, relativity is crap, and you arguing a case for it is

belief,

| > faith.

| > I'd be facetious and say "by your logic", but you have no logic.

|

| I'm assuming, therefore, that you have a coherent explanation for various

| phenomena which SR and GR explain well. Stating that Einstein's

| computations were fraudulent doesn't cut it without alternatives that can

| show various phenomena that are well-documented in the scientific

| literature.

|

| Put it to the test, if you want; describe an experiment which shows a

| result that SR and GR cannot predict.

Sure:

1) Sagnac.

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

2) V1493 Aql. Stars do not blow up twice in 3 months.

<http://www.androcles01.pwp.blueyonder.co.uk/Copernicus/LightCurveVariations.htm>

.