

Re: why relativity almost make sense?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2008-04/msg00834.html>

- *From:* The TimeLord <math-n-physics-not@xxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 10 Apr 2008 19:52:15 -0500
-

Am Wed, 09 Apr 2008 12:32:51 -0700 schrieb Vastus Lateralis
<fsh4twg@xxxxxxx> in
045717bc-feaa-41e2-a955-1cb285d35641@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx:

understan this for me gentelmen

my intuition tells me that tha
confusion induced by relaticity
is deliberated

first, they are deliberately ambiguous using heuristic and holistic
terms in their theories

I don't know what you mean by that. There are three things that define
Relativity:

1. The speed of light in a vacuum is the same for all observers.
2. The laws of nature are the same for all observers.
3. There is no way to tell the difference between inertial mass and
gravitational mass.

Implied in Relativity is that mathematics (as defined by mathematicians)
is correct.

then they pass tha job to mothafaka
lawyers and mathematicians, which

Lawyers have nothing to say about Relativity.

use symbols in stead of words and
explanations, for instance

$e=mc^2$ or $c=\text{inv}(\text{sqrt}(eu))$ and similar

Re: why relativity almost make sense?

Note that $E=mc^2$ is true only for objects at rest. Not sure what the other thing is.

therefore when fat rats gets in troubles, they just pretend that they ment somthin completely else with those symbols

Actually it's usually that people who don't understand what they are criticizing end up making nonsense criticisms.

for instance they may pretend that c stands not for c but for speed of light, or for speed of light in vacuum, or a speed, or belo

c for the speed of light in vacuum is by convention. You are free to use another symbol just as long as your conclusions correspond to what turns up by experiment. After all, it's reality that's the final arbiter of truth.

.