

Re: Special Relativity fails a simple algebraic test

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2008-01/msg02045.html>

- *From:* "Jeckyl" <noone@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 25 Jan 2008 15:24:18 +1100
-

"Albertito" <albertito1992@xxxxxxxx> wrote in message
<news:6ab546e0-4373-4300-972a-525bf49c3cf5@xx>

On 24 ene, 18:24, Eric Gisse <jowr...@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Jan 24, 9:14 am, Albertito <albertito1...@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

On 24 ene, 17:57, Eric Gisse <jowr...@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Jan 24, 7:52 am, Albertito
<albertito1...@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

On 24 ene, 16:31, Eric Gisse
<jowr...@xxxxxxxx>
wrote:

On Jan 24,
7:02 am,
Albertito
<albertito1...@xxxxxxxx>
wrote:

On
24
ene,
15:29,
Randy
Poe

Re: Special Relativity fails a simple algebraic test

<poespam-t...@xxxxxxxx>
wrote:

On
Jan
24,
10:25
am,
Albertito
<albertito1...@xxxxxxxx>
wrote:

On
24
ene,
14:17,
"Dirk
Van
de
moortel"
<dirkvandemoor...@ThankS-NO-

SperM.hotmail.com>
wrote:

"Randy
Poe"
<poespam-t...@xxxxxxxx>
wrote
in
messagenews:1f4e6459-472a-44bc-

[snip]

So
by
"not
unique"
you
mean
"unique,

Re: Special Relativity fails a simple algebraic test

but
not
Galilean."

Is
that
supposed
to
be
news?
I
agree,
SR
velocity
composition
is
not
Galilean.

Gee....
what
is
the
matter
with
this
kid???

Dirk
Vdm

So,
you
want
to
know
what's
the
'matter
with
this
kid'.
It

Re: Special Relativity fails a simple algebraic test

happens
that
I'm
not
a
kid,
I'm
already
16.

Ah.
Dirk's
hypothesis
was
correct.

Bad
news:
16
is
a
kid.

It
happens
that
I'm
trying
to
think
for
myself,
not
like
you,
believer,

Your
"independent
thought"
involves
using
things

Re: Special Relativity fails a simple algebraic test

other
than
logical
deduction.
Yes,
it's
true
that
we
shy
away
from
illogic.
And
it's
true
that
I
am
a
"believer"
that
the
rules
of
logical
deduction
are
valid.

that
only
can
think
by
means
of
the
sacred
gods
of
physics.
That's
the
reason
why
I
may
do

Re: Special Relativity fails a simple algebraic test

a
lot
of
mistakes.
I
can
learn
from
my
mistakes.
Can
you
learn
from
the
mistakes
sacred
gods
of
physics
may
do?
No,
that's
impossible,
if
a
sacred
god
makes
a
mistake,
you
still
believe
him,
you
still
think
there
is
no
mistake
at
all.
That's
the
matter
with
you,
believer!!!!!!!!!!!!!!.

Re: Special Relativity fails a simple algebraic test

Re: Special Relativity fails a simple algebraic test

The
usual
uneducated
nonsense.
But
in
your
favor
is
the
fact
that
you
sound
like
a
kid
and
you
are
a
kid.
I'm
not
sure
what
to
say
about
the
70-year-olds
who
also
sound
like
they've
never
had
an
education.

–
Randy

Re: Special Relativity fails a simple algebraic test

If
Under
SR,
the
norm
of
a
'sum'
vector
looks
like
this
 $|a*b|$
=
 $\sqrt{(|a|^2$
+
 $|b|^2$
+
 $2|a||b|$
 $\cos(\alpha))$
-
 $(|a||b|$
 $\sin(\alpha))^2/c^2$
)/(1
+
 $|a||b|$
 $\cos(\alpha)/c^2),$

I
wonder
how
it
would
look
a
'dot
product'
in
SR,
for
instance,
or
even
the
norm
of
a
'cross

Re: Special Relativity fails a simple algebraic test

product'.
Can
you
help,
dear
Randy?.
I
can't
figure
it
out,
yet
:-(

The dot
product is
 $g_{uv} a^u$
 b^v and the
cross
product is a
3
dimensional
construct –
the closet
four
dimensional
analog
would
be
the wedge
product a^u
 $\wedge b^v$.

Stop
whining
about
relativity
until you
have had a
university
education in
physics.

Thanks Eric for your
valuable information.

Re: Special Relativity fails a simple algebraic test

This is my last question, I
promise not to ask anymore.
What would be the physical
meanings of both dot
product
and cross product?.

...and you think you can "disprove" relativity
while being able to
ask
questions like this?

I can answer your questions, but I won't.
Find the answers for
yourself.

OK, I see. you are suggesting that 'relativistic cross product'
would be the velocity of a privileged observer, aren' you?.

Nope.

There is no four dimensional cross product.

As a preferred frame of reference (privileged observer) is
forbidden in SR, that would be a flagrant contradiction.
I can't believe it, that would disprove SR :-o

Ohhhhhhhh, what a pity! :-(.It would be wonderful there
were one. Uhhmm, could we construct one? :-)

There would have to be different laws of physics for it than every other
inertial frame .. how to you intened to change the laws of physics?

.