

# Re: Clear writing about relativity

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2009-06/msg02814.html>

---

- *From:* "Androcles" <[Headmaster@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:Headmaster@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Sun, 28 Jun 2009 21:38:50 +0100
- 

"Mike" <[eleatis@xxxxxxxx](mailto:eleatis@xxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
[news:56e85372-5def-4e1d-af54-f9c6cf22592e@xx](mailto:news:56e85372-5def-4e1d-af54-f9c6cf22592e@xx)  
On Jun 27, 11:23 am, "Androcles" <[Headmas...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:Headmas...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

"blackhead" <[larryhar...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:larryhar...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
  
[news:a229cf5c-6a99-46c5-a597-339c260cb4dc@xx](mailto:news:a229cf5c-6a99-46c5-a597-339c260cb4dc@xx)  
On 27 June, 14:31, "Androcles" <[Headmas...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:Headmas...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

"blackhead" <[larryhar...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:larryhar...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
  
[news:6f288024-100f-4e75-bcd9-6f8deee2ee06@xx](mailto:news:6f288024-100f-4e75-bcd9-6f8deee2ee06@xx)  
On 26 June, 23:03, "Androcles" <[Headmas...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:Headmas...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

"blackhead" <[larryhar...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:larryhar...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
  
[news:bd3efb77-0773-4490-87e5-ef8010bf120f@xx](mailto:news:bd3efb77-0773-4490-87e5-ef8010bf120f@xx)  
On 26 June, 19:32, "Androcles"  
<[Headmas...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:Headmas...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

"Uncle Ben" <[b...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:b...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in  
message



## Re: Clear writing about relativity

and yet distinguish different versions of similar things. Nowadays we use primed and double-primed variables, whereas in earlier times when classical learning was assumed among the intelligensia, we would use greek letters or even hebrew or arabic letters.

Einstein's 1905 paper on relativity was translated into english more than once with more than one degree of accuracy. Some translations even improved on the orginal by correcting small errors or oversights. The paper is not difficult to read, although what is said is quite unconventional to the ordinary mind.

If we focus just on length contraction in Section 4, we find the derivation quite unfamiliar to students using modern textbooks.

Then that would be "Lorentz dilation", thus rendering your use of the term "Lorentz Transformation" highly unsatisfactory; indeed, it is deliberately and maliciously designed to deceive the unsuspecting student. It should be made quite clear to the newbies that Einstein's change in length INCREASES with increasing speed, AS SHOWN algebraically.

Re: Clear writing about relativity

But if we edit  
Einstein's words, using  
memorable terms and  
modern  
rigor to resolve normally  
insignificant ambiguities --  
in the minds of naive  
readers -- we may help  
these  
readers comprehend the  
astonishing simplicity of  
Einstein's demonstration.

Yes, I agree. The naive student would have  
to be astonishingly  
stupid not to comprehend the English  
translation of Einstein's  
ridiculous

<http://www.fourmilab.ch/etexts/einstein/specrel/www/figures/img22.gif>

Astonishingly simple (and simple-minded)  
is:  
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, spewed out  
in that inequality  
which purports to be an equation. The "="  
sign is a LIE.

Most relativists hasten to say "Einstein did  
not say that", but he  
did and it is there in black and white for  
those that can read  
algebra, which a prerequisite for relativity.

For an example of better  
choice of terms, let us  
describe a sphere

Re: Clear writing about relativity

Fuck the sphere! You have no 'gamma'  
without

<http://www.fourmilab.ch/etexts/einstein/specrel/www/figures/img22.gif>  
you useless old fart.

You LOST, Bonehead. Squirming around  
piss-poor terminology  
can't save you. The exchange was highly  
satisfactory and so is  
rubbing your nose in your worthless shit.

Wanna fence some more? Bring a battleaxe  
next time and derive gamma.

"In the first place it is clear that the  
equations must be linear on  
account  
of the properties of homogeneity which we  
attribute to space and  
time." – Einstein

In the second place the function  $\tau()$  is not  
linear.

A theoretical physicist wouldn't care, but a  
mathematician or  
logician  
will insist on a proof that the function  $\tau()$   
is linear.

A competent electronic engineer should know enough maths  
to understand  
why homogeneity of space and time implies linearity of  $\tau()$ .

Androcles, victorious.– Hide quoted text –

Re: Clear writing about relativity

– Show quoted text –

A schoolboy should know enough maths to understand a graph.

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

Is this plot of tau against t linear? No.

Does  $x'/(c-v) = x'/(c+v)$  ? No.

Does  $\tau[x'/(c-v)] = \tau[x'/(c+v)]$ ? No.

Does  $1/2 \tau[x'/(c-v) + x'/(c+v)] = \tau[x'/(c-v)]$ ? No.

In McCullough numbers and paraphrasing the idiot Einstein, half of (16 second +4 seconds) = 16 seconds and the other half is 4 seconds.

$1/2 \tau(20) = \tau(16)$ , we'll just forget about the other  $\tau(4)$  seconds.

If  $\tau(16) = 8$ ,  $1/2 \tau(20) = 8$  and  $\tau(4) = 8$

Hence  $\tau(4) = \tau(16)$

Hence  $\tau()$  is not linear.

Is x linear? Yes.

Is t linear? Yes.

Is  $v = x/t$  linear? Yes.

Is  $c = x/t$  linear? Yes.

That's good, because is clear that the equations must be linear on

account

of the properties of homogeneity which we attribute to space and time.

Is the function  $\tau()$  linear? No.

Is  $t/\tau$  linear? No.

Well, Larry thinks it should be.

Well, too bad, it fucking well isn't.

Re: Clear writing about relativity

But Einstein said it must be. Why isn't it?  
Because Einstein was not a competent electronic engineer,  
he was a competent bullshitting bastard!– Hide quoted text –

Write down what the Tau you're referring to, so I can have a look at it.

=====

This tau(), boy:

<http://www.fourmilab.ch/etexts/einstein/specrel/www/figures/img22.gif>

which is this tau, boy, when the length x' is reduced to nothing:

"Hence, if x' be chosen infinitesimally small,"

<http://www.fourmilab.ch/etexts/einstein/specrel/www/figures/img23.gif>

"or"

<http://www.fourmilab.ch/etexts/einstein/specrel/www/figures/img24.gif>

Just which of Einstein's many tau's were you planning on taking a look at?

Read all about it here:

<http://www.fourmilab.ch/etexts/einstein/specrel/www/>–Hide quoted text –

– Show quoted text –

These expressions don't say anything about whether Tau is linear or not.

=====

A schoolboy should know enough maths to understand a graph.

**THIS GRAPH!**

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

Is this plot of tau against t linear? No.

Does  $x'/(c-v) = x'/(c+v)$  ? No.

Does  $\tau[x'/(c-v)] = \tau[x'/(c+v)]$ ? No.

Re: Clear writing about relativity

Does  $\frac{1}{2} \tau[x'/(c-v) + x'/(c-v)] = \tau[x'/(c-v)]$ ? No.

In McCullough numbers and paraphrasing the idiot Einstein, half of (16 second +4 seconds) = 16 seconds and the other half is 4 seconds.

$\frac{1}{2} \tau(20) = \tau(16)$ , we'll just forget about the other  $\tau(4)$  seconds.

If  $\tau(16) = 8$ ,  $\frac{1}{2} \tau(20) = 8$  and  $\tau(4) = 8$

Hence  $\tau(4) = \tau(16)$

Hence  $\tau()$  is not linear.

Is  $x$  linear? Yes.

Is  $t$  linear? Yes.

Is  $v = x/t$  linear? Yes.

Is  $c = x/t$  linear? Yes.

That's good, because is clear that the equations must be linear on account of the properties of homogeneity which we attribute to space and time.

Is the function  $\tau()$  linear? No.

Is  $t/\tau$  linear? No.

Well, Larry thinks it should be.

Well, too bad, it fucking well isn't.

But Einstein said it must be. Why isn't it?

Because Einstein was not a competent electronic engineer, he was a competent bullshitting bastard!

Do let us know when you've learnt to read, boy.

=====

They are additional properties of  $\tau$ .  $\tau$  being linear wrt  $t$  and  $x$  means  $\tau(x,t) = Ax + Bt$  where  $A$  and  $B$  are constants and the additional properties help narrow down what the constants  $A$  and  $B$  are.

=====

$\tau(\text{bananas, dog's breakfasts, railway time tables, } x, y, z, t)$  is a time. Oddly enough, the bananas, dog's breakfasts and railway time tables vanish along with  $x, y$  and  $z$  when

"Hence, if  $x'$  be chosen infinitesimally small,"

<http://www.fourmilab.ch/etexts/einstein/specrel/www/figures/img23.gif>

See, that inequality has no mention of bananas, dog's breakfasts, railway time tables,  $x, y$  or  $z$ , and  $x'$  is infinitesimally small.

Why not?

Could it be they are irrelevant, put there by the idiot Einstein to confuse poor Larry?

Oh wait... Einstein only put the  $x, y$  and  $z$  in it. Naughty Androcles added the other irrelevancies.

Re: Clear writing about relativity

Let us try this again, perhaps it will sink in:

A schoolboy should know enough maths to understand a graph.

THIS GRAPH!

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

Is this plot of tau against t linear? No.

Does  $x'/(c-v) = x'/(c+v)$  ? No.

Does  $\tau[x'/(c-v)] = \tau[x'/(c+v)]$ ? No.

Does  $1/2 \tau[x'/(c-v) + x'/(c+v)] = \tau[x'/(c-v)]$ ? No.

One more time:

A schoolboy should know enough maths to understand a graph.

THIS GRAPH!

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

Is this plot of tau against t linear? No.

Does  $x'/(c-v) = x'/(c+v)$  ? No.

Does  $\tau[x'/(c-v)] = \tau[x'/(c+v)]$ ? No.

Does  $1/2 \tau[x'/(c-v) + x'/(c+v)] = \tau[x'/(c-v)]$ ? No.

Hi Androcles. I haven't been around for a long time because there are cranks like Dirt of the Motel around. However, you are wrong on this one.

=====

Use a kill-file.

The linearity is a property of the TRANSFORMATION equations. If you look at the tranformation equations for each point they are linear.

Tau as a function of t, or vice versa, need not, and should not be linear because we are talking about a trajectory now, not a transformation from one point to another. Your graph shows the evolution of time t as a function of tau, or vice versa.

Think of it this way: Each point in K transforms linearly to a point in k at each infinitesimally small instant of time. There is the continuous linear transformation taking place.

=====

$$y = x^3$$

Each point on the X-axis transforms to a point on the Y-axis.

Re: Clear writing about relativity

You'd call that linear.

AS I have said before, do not try to find any problems in the math of SR.

=====

As I've said before, you are babbling.

.