

# Re: On the multiplication of negative numbers

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2008-07/msg02809.html>

---

- *From:* "Androcles" <[Headmaster@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:Headmaster@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Mon, 28 Jul 2008 13:42:42 +0100
- 

"harry" <[harald.vanlintelButNotThis@xxxxxxx](mailto:harald.vanlintelButNotThis@xxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
[news:1217244260\\_798@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:1217244260_798@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

|  
| "Dirk Van de moortel" <[dirkvandemoortel@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:dirkvandemoortel@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote  
| in message [news:g6k7qu\\$R21\\$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:g6k7qu$R21$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

| > Uncle Ben <[ben@xxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:ben@xxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
| > 5277af6b-2456-4669-bec1-24e62a6f14a0@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

| >> It might seem strange to consider this plebian topic in a newsgroup  
| >> having to do with such an esoteric subject at the theory of  
| >> relativity, But, believe it or not, a controversy has arisen between  
| >> certain frequent posters in this newsgroup as to the result of  
| >> multiplying negative numbers, a topic generally treated in the U.S.  
| >> educational system before the 6th year (12-year-olds).

| >>  
| >> Numbers have interested people for both practical purposes and  
| >> amusement for centuries. The negative numbers arose to provide  
| >> solutions to questions such as "What number, if any, added to 5 gives  
| >> 3?" Before the invention of negative numbers, there was no such  
| >> number. With negative numbers admitted, there is.

| >>  
| >> Negative numbers pose no problem in addition and subtraction. And  
| >> multiplication of a negative number by a positive integer is quickly  
| >> understood as repeated addition. But multiplication of two negative  
| >> integers is not so quickly dismissed as a problem. I admit that I  
| >> groped for a while to think of a way to make the solution obvious in  
| >> terms of more elementary operations. One doesn't want to say: It's a  
| >> rule! Obey it!

| >>  
| >> The way I came up with may not be simplest (if you know something  
| >> simpler, tell me about it), but it works:

| >>  
| >> Consider  $5 * 5 = 25$ . If one is silly enough to write 5 as  $6+(-1)$ , one  
| >> would have  
| >>  $(6+(-1))*(6+(-1))=25$

| >>  
| >> By the distributive law, one could expand that to  
| >>  
| >>  $6*6 + 6*(-1) + (-1)*6 + (-1)*(-1) = 25$

Re: On the multiplication of negative numbers

|>>  
|>> We all agree that  $6*6=36$ . Now  $6*(-1) = (-1)+(-1)+(-1)+(-1)+(-1)+(-1)$   
|>> which reasonable people will agree amounts to  $-6$ . Similarly  $(-1)*6$   
|>>  $= -6$  again. So far, we have  
|>>  
|>>  $25 = 36 + (-6) + (-6) + (-1)*(-1)$   
|>> or  
|>>  $25 = 24 + (-1)*(-1)$   
|>>  
|>> which shows that  $(-1)*(-1) = 1$ . Ta-dah!  
|>>  
|>> As a gift, we get  $\text{sq.rt.}(1) = -1$ ,  
|>  
|> If by  $\text{sqrt}(\dots)$  you mean the square root function (as the notation  
|> strongly suggests), or the standard root sign, then you write  
|>  $\text{sqrt}(1) = 1$   
|> and  
|>  $-\text{sqrt}(1) = -1$   
|>  
|>  
|>> Of course we already knew that  
|>>  $1*1=1$ , so we have discovered by this simple and obvious means that  
|>> numbers can have two different square roots.  
|>  
|> Yes, in a sloppy way of speaking, but \*the\* square root of a  
|> positive real number is defined as a positive number and it is unique.  
|>  
|>>  
|>>  $\text{sq.rt.}(16) = 4$  or  $-4$ .  
|>  
|> No, we write  
|>  $\text{sqrt}(16) = 4$   
|> and  
|>  $-\text{sqrt}(16) = -4$   
|>  
|> Dirk Vdm  
|  
| It's storm in a wine (or whine) glass:  
| [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Square\\_root](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Square_root)  
| Harald  
|

It's a sloppy way of speaking.  
Dork is a sloppy, ignorant, pathetic local village idiot, like you.

Why did Einstein say  
the speed of light from A to B is  $c-v$ ,  
the speed of light from B to A is  $c+v$ ,  
the "time" each way is the same?

Re: On the multiplication of negative numbers

Re: On the multiplication of negative numbers

"Easy: he did NOT say that." – cretin harald.vanlintelButNotThis@xxxxxxx  
According to moron van lintel, Einstein did not write the equation he wrote.

According to xxein:  
It is an artefactual/superficially imposed yin–yang of sorts.

According to Lamenting Shubert:  
Why do you want to know?

" In neither system (meaning frame of reference in modern–day terminology)  
is the speed of light  $c-v$  or  $c+v$ . In both systems the speed of light is  $c$ ."  
— cretin Jimmy Black fmlast3@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx  
According to the imbecile Jimmy Black, Einstein did not write the equation  
he wrote.

According to Dork Bruere  
"I don't give a damn what Einstein wrote."

'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' because I SAY SO and you have to  
agree because I'm the great genius, STOOOPID, don't you  
dare question it. — Rabbi Albert Einstein

<http://www.androcles01.pwp.blueyonder.co.uk/Smart/tAB=tBA.gif>

"I know that in the past Androcles has used  $t_{AB}=t_{BA}$  to  
claim Einstein thinks  $\tau_{AB} = \tau_{BA}$  (the travel  
times in the frame in which the clocks at A and B are  
moving)." — Blind "I'm not a troll" Poe.  
<http://www.fourmilab.ch/etexts/einstein/specrel/www/figures/img21.gif>

"Neither [frame] is stationary, which is your problem." — Blind  
"I'm not a troll" Poe.  
Ref: [news:1189468758.944626.39450@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:1189468758.944626.39450@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

'we establish by definition that the "time" required by  
light to travel from A to B doesn't equal the "time" it requires  
to travel from B to A in the stationary system, obviously.' —  
Heretic Jan Bielawski, assistant light–bulb changer.

Ref: [news:1188363019.673281.67710@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:1188363019.673281.67710@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

Re: On the multiplication of negative numbers

(How many Polacks does it take to change a light bulb?)

"SR is GR with  $G=0$ ." — Uncle Stoopid.

The Uncle Stoopid doctrine:

<http://sound.westhost.com/counterfeit.jpg>

"What can be asserted without evidence can also be dismissed without evidence." — Uncle Stoopid.

"Counterfactual assumptions yield nonsense.

If such a thing were actually observed, reliably and reproducibly, then relativity would immediately need a major overhaul if not a complete replacement." — Humpty Roberts.

Rabbi Albert Einstein in 1895 failed an examination that would have allowed him to study for a diploma as an electrical engineer at the Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule in Zurich (couldn't even pass the SATs).

According to Phuckwit Duck it was geography and history that Einstein failed on, as if Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule would give a damn. That tells you the lengths these lying bastards will go to to protect their tin god, but its always a laugh when they slip up. Trolls, the lot of them.

"This is PHYSICS, not math or logic, and "proof" is completely irrelevant." — Humpty Roberts.

|

.