

# Re: More speed confusion

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2009-06/msg00121.html>

---

- *From:* G <[gehan.ameresekere@xxxxxxxx](mailto:gehan.ameresekere@xxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Sat, 30 May 2009 06:24:39 -0700 (PDT)
- 

On May 29, 1:59 pm, "Androcles" <[Headmas...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:Headmas...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

"Peter Riedt" <[rie...@xxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:rie...@xxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message

[news:8019d7ca-8f18-4104-a6a2-a6cbb5f54f54@xx](mailto:news:8019d7ca-8f18-4104-a6a2-a6cbb5f54f54@xx)

On May 28, 11:37 am, "Androcles" <[Headmas...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:Headmas...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

"Peter Riedt" <[rie...@xxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:rie...@xxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message

[news:8a726271-3b2e-4921-87d9-304578c6c705@xx](mailto:news:8a726271-3b2e-4921-87d9-304578c6c705@xx)

On May 28, 2:57 am, "Androcles" <[Headmas...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:Headmas...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

"Peter Riedt" <[rie...@xxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:rie...@xxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message

[news:5c5ba431-1bc6-4b43-9195-3f80e7a78b70@xx](mailto:news:5c5ba431-1bc6-4b43-9195-3f80e7a78b70@xx)

On May 27, 3:30 am, "Paul B. Andersen"

<[paul.b.ander...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:paul.b.ander...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

Peter Riedt wrote:

Androcles, excellent and comprehensive derivation resulting in the answer  $1=1$ .

Re: More speed confusion

To which I like to add, if we add the speed of light to any other speed up to 300000km/sec, the answer is always 300000km/sec but if we subtract the speed of an object from the speed of light using the formula  $(c-v)/(1+c*v/c^2)$  [negative closing speed as in source and target approaching each other] the result is less than  $c-v$  e.g. for 300000km/sec-30km/sec the composite speed is not 299970km/sec but 299940.006km/sec. However if both  $c$  and  $v$  are 300000km/sec, they approach each other at a whopping  $c-v = 0$ km/sec!

Peter Riedt

The correct formula is:  $(c-v)/(1-c*v/c^2) = c$

--  
Paul

[http://home.c2i.net/pb\\_andersen/](http://home.c2i.net/pb_andersen/)

Paul, agreed.  
 $(300000-300000)/(1-300000*300000/300000*300000)=0$

Re: More speed confusion

=====

So you agree Tusseladd's  $c = 0$ .  
You are both raving mad and YOU, Riedt, left out the  
parentheses!

$$(300000-300000)/(1-[300000*300000]/[300000*300000])$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= (300000-300000)/(1-90000000000/90000000000) \\ &= (300000-300000)/(1-1) \\ &= 0/0 \\ &= \text{Divide by zero.} \end{aligned}$$

FAILED!

Riedt's gaffe:

$$(300000-300000)/(1-300000*300000/300000*300000)=0$$

Parsing left to right,

$$(300000-300000)/(1-90000000000/300000*300000)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &(300000-300000)/(1-30000*300000) \\ &(300000-300000)/(1-90000000000) \\ &0/(-8999999999) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

But  $c-v = 0$  when  $v = c$  anyway, you pair of idiotic cretins.

For Riedt's education:  
<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Parsing>

(Follow-ups set to alt.morons )- Hide quoted text -

Re: More speed confusion

– Show quoted text –

Androcles, if you insert additional parentheses as you did, the answer is division by zero

=====  
That's what the spreadsheet says!

but if you leave it as Paul suggested i.e.  $(c-v)/(1-c*v/c^2)$ , the answer is 0.

=====

Tusseladd can no more pull equations out of his arse than Einstein can. Einstein's idiotic equation is given in <http://www.fourmilab.ch/etexts/einstein/specrel/www/figures/img76.gif> (LOOK IT UP!)

"It follows, further, that the velocity of light  $c$  cannot be altered by composition with a velocity less than that of light. For this case we obtain

$$V = (c+w) / (1+ w/c) = c$$

It doesn't matter if you use  $u$ ,  $v$ , or  $w$  for the velocity, it is still the velocity.

If we set  $w = -v$  (i.e. travel backwards), then we can directly substitute:  
 $V = (c+ -v) / (1+ -v/c) = c$

If I have a spreadsheet and set cell A1 to 1, A2 to 1 and A3 to A1+A2 then A3 will display 2 .

If I then set A2 to  $-1$  then A3 will display 0.  
That's VERY basic algebra, which Tusseladd cannot manage.

Re: More speed confusion

=====

But this 0 is not = c as Paul indicated;

=====

So why did you agree with the moron? It's people like you that spread confusion.

And don't call him "Paul", he's a Norwegian troll (tusseladd).

=====

it is the composite speed of two objects (including two rays of light) approaching each other at c (negative closing speed). It means that if two particles at 300000km/sec each try to collide, they never can because their combined speed is zero, nada, zilch, nix.

Peter Riedt

=====

Absolute nonsense. I see cars coming toward me at -140 mph every day and they are only travelling at -70 mph with respect to the road.

The car directly in front of me that is doing 70 mph w.r.t. the road isn't getting any further from me, it is doing 0 mph relative to me.

How you can ever hope to understand Einstein's con when you can't even manage to add numbers for an opening speed is astounding.- Hide quoted text -

- Show quoted text -

Androcles et al, this is the end to the confusion: If two particles are in direct collision say at a speed of 300000km/sec each, their closing speed is 600000km/sec e.g. the distance between them shrinks at that speed.

Peter Riedt

=====

Right, Riedt.  
Right, Galileo.  
Right, Newton.

Wrong, Tusseladd.  
Wrong, Einstein.  
Wrong, Minkowski.

Re: More speed confusion

And it does happen if they ever make LHC work, so you can throw special relativity in the trash can because theoretical physicists are miserable failed mathematicians.

Here's another one:

<http://www.ivorcatt.com/2804.htm>

"

So the only information about electromagnetism contained in the apparently sophisticated equations (9) and (10) is about the two constants in electromagnetism: the fixed velocity  $c$ , and that  $E$ ,  $H$  at every point are in fixed proportion  $Z_0$ . The remaining content of Maxwell's Equations is hogwash.

"

Thanks for the link. Funny enough, this is what I suspected, however I cannot prove it.

Is the world really so messed up?

.