

# Re: Even cranks get published

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2006-09/msg00039.html>

---

- *From:* "Sorcerer" <[Headmaster@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:Headmaster@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Fri, 01 Sep 2006 03:22:27 GMT
- 

"JanPB" <[filmart@xxxxxxxxx](mailto:filmart@xxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
[news:1157078112.722141.238790@xx](mailto:news:1157078112.722141.238790@xx)  
| Sorcerer wrote:  
| > "JanPB" <[filmart@xxxxxxxxx](mailto:filmart@xxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
| > [news:1157008520.754088.275210@xx](mailto:news:1157008520.754088.275210@xx)  
| > | Koobee Wublee wrote:  
| > | > Sorcerer wrote:  
| > | > <[rambus2005@xxxxxxxxx](mailto:rambus2005@xxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
| > | > [news:1156952763.771923.287980@xx](mailto:news:1156952763.771923.287980@xx)  
| > | > | Look what the cat dragged in from Apeiron (an antirelativistic  
| > | > | journal):  
| > | > |  
| > | > |  
<http://redshift.vif.com/JournalFiles/Pre2001/V05NO1PDF/V05n1lut.pdf>  
| > | > >  
| > | > > Yes...  
| > | > > Look what the cat dragged in from Annalen der Physik, a crackpot  
| > journal.  
| > | > >  
| > | > > <http://www.fourmilab.ch/etexts/einstein/specrel/www/>  
| > | > >  
| > | > > Even cranks get published.  
| > | >  
| > | > In that 1905 paper, I am discovering wrong mathematics everyday.  
Why  
| > | > is it that no one else has noticed?  
| > |  
| > | Think.  
| > |  
| > | > For example, in section 3,  
| > | > Einstein's derivation of Lorentz Transform is utterly nonsense and  
full  
| > | > of errors.  
| > |  
| > | No, you must have misunderstood something. The derivation is  
elementary  
| > | linear algebra and calculus.  
| >

Re: Even cranks get published

| > HAHHAHA!  
| > Elementary linear algebra and calculus:  
| >  
| > "2AB/(t'A-tA) = c" -- Einstein.  
| >  
| > Light travels from A to A in time t'A-tA = 0/0.  
|  
| Well, you assume nonsense, you get nonsense. What else did you expect?  
|  
| > The first thing to learn is not to divide by zero.  
|  
| It is you who is dividing by zero – why do you admonish others?

HAHAHAHA! That's not my equation, you drunken shithead.

|  
| > An error in Relativity "would be like Stephen Hawking dividing by zero  
or  
| > something equally trivial." -- Bielawski.  
| >  
| > ROFLMAO!  
|  
| The context of my remark which you do not provide was that the first  
| part of Einstein's 1905 paper contains very easy mathematics which is  
| thus fully transparent and can be fully checked.

In agreement with experience we further assume Bilewacky is  
a complete and totally vacuous moron.

|  
| > JanPB, Fri, Mar 10 2006 7:10 am :  
| > " kk's postings about physical content of Einstein's postulates made me  
| > look again at his 1905 paper and I noticed what I think is another  
| > experimental assumption.  
|  
| Exactly right. This was me answering someone who claimed SR was all  
| about mere mathematical redefinition of things, i.e., a theory without  
| physical content. I pointed out that SR's definition of synchronisation  
| did rest in fact on at least two significant experimentally verifiable  
| facts. One of them you quoted below (for some incomprehensible reason)  
| in which I talk about Fizeau's polygonal light path experiments on  
| which the consistency of Einstein's sync rests (the sync wouldn't be  
| transitive without them).  
|  
| > Recall Einstein's definition of synchronisation of two clocks A and B:  
| > send a light pulse from A to B, reflect the light at B back to A,  
| > register the emission and the arrival times: t\_A, t\_B, and t'\_A. The

Re: Even cranks get published

|> clocks A and B are synchronised if:  
|>  
|>  
|>  $t_B - t_A = t'_A - t_B$  (\*)  
|>  
|>  
|> (Equivalently, one can send two light rays, from A to B and from B to A  
|> and then the requirement is that:  
|>  
|>  
|>  $t_B - t_A = t'_A - t'_B$ , (\*\*)  
|>  
|>  
|> where  $t'_B$  is the second ray's emission time at B.)  
|>  
|>  
|> He then says: "We assume that this definition of synchronism is free  
|> from contradictions" and notes that the following two conditions are  
|> satisfied (thus guaranteeing the "freedom from contradictions"):  
|>  
|>  
|> "1. If the clock at B synchronizes with the clock at A, the clock at  
|> A synchronizes with the clock at B.  
|> 2. If the clock at A synchronizes with the clock at B and also with  
|> the clock at C, the clocks at B and C also synchronize with each  
|> other."  
|>  
|>  
|> This portion of the 1905 paper is frequently glossed over (I've never  
|> seen it discussed on this NG) but the second condition is in fact  
|> non-trivial and it demands that certain experiment yield certain  
|> result. Otherwise Einstein's synchronisation of clocks is vacuous.  
|>  
|>  
|> Try to prove condition 2 yourself: sync clock at A with clock at B  
|> (condition (\*) or (\*\*)) satisfied, and also clock at A with clock at C  
|> (ditto), and based on this try to prove that B is in sync with C  
|> (again, this means that (\*) or (\*\*)) must hold for B and C). While doing  
|> this remember that A, B, C are in 3D space, i.e., not necessarily  
|> colinear.  
|>  
|>  
|> You'll see you cannot prove it unless you know that the following is  
|> also true: the time it takes for a light ray to complete a triangular  
|> roundtrip A-B-C-A equals the time it takes for a light ray to complete  
|> the reverse triangular trip: A-C-B-A (imagine mirrors positioned at B  
|> and C to make the light ray go around). This must be verified  
|> experimentally, otherwise there is a chance the definition of Einstein  
|> sync is vacuous. "  
|>  
|> HAHAHAHA!!!

| > Androcles

|

| ?

| I have this feeling you are completely lost.

"If at the point A of space there is a clock, an observer at A can determine the time values of events in the immediate proximity of A by finding the positions of the hands which are simultaneous with these events. If there is at the point B of space another clock in all respects resembling the one at A, it is possible for an observer at B to determine the time values of events in the immediate neighbourhood of B. But it is not possible without further assumption to compare, in respect of time, an event at A with an event at B. We have so far defined only an "A time" and a "B time." We have not defined a common "time" for A and B, for the latter cannot be defined at all unless we establish by definition that the "time" required by light to travel from A to B equals the "time" it requires to travel from B to A. "

By the totally lost and clueless Bilewacky method,  
the time of the clock at B is  $1/3$  the time of the clock at A, C is  $2/3$ ,  
and on the return of the ray the time is  $2/3$  for B and  $1/3$  for C!  
You still have not determined a common time for A, B and C,  
vacuous head, and you never will.

I have this knowledge you would not know division-by-zero if  
it bit you on the nose, you "feelings" are useless, Mr. "You  
cannot prove it".

How far is it from A to A, shithead?

Whether you go via -B- or -B-C-D-E-F-G-H, it is still zero  
and the time for light to go from A to A is  $t'A-tA$ , totally clueless  
and lost fuckwit.

Androcles.

.