Re: Clear writing about relativity

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2009−06/msg02815.html

- *From*: blackhead <larryharson@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
- *Date*: Sun, 28 Jun 2009 14:05:04 −0700 (PDT)

On 27 June, 16:23, "Androcles" <Headmas...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

> "blackhead" <larryhar...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
>
> news:a229cf5c−6a99−46c5−a597−339c260cb4dc@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
> On 27 June, 14:31, "Androcles" <Headmas...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
>
> > "blackhead" <larryhar...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
> >
> > news:6f288024−100f−4e75−bcd9−6f8deee2ee06@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
> > On 26 June, 23:03, "Androcles" <Headmas...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
> >
> > > "blackhead" <larryhar...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
> > >
> > > news:bd3efb77−0773−4490−87e5−ef8010bf120f@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
> > > On 26 June, 19:32, "Androcles"
> > > <Headmas...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
> > >
> > > > "Uncle Ben" <b...@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in
> > > > message
> > > >
> > > > news:4cb4f187−1a2c−4fc1−8e3c−189b7762313c@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Through an unsatisfactory exchange with colleagues here recently I was reminded of the casualness of expression of most of us who are not mathematicians in using mathematical variables in algebraic discussions of physical things.

Example: When I say, "Let x = vt, then −−−", I will be understood to mean one thing, until I go on to say, "where x represents the mass of an object of density v and volume t." Most physicists in this newsgroup would be astonished and displeased. A mathematician or logician wouldn't care, but a physicist might insist on "M = dV" or "M=\rho\ v.

Our conventions let us abbreviate our discouse and remember our definitions. They cause no trouble in simple cases.

But when we start talking about several frames of reference and need symbols for the coordinates in each, we have to improvise symbols that fit our habits and yet distinguish different versions of similar things. Nowdays 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 unfamilar 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.

> 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

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 imples linearity of tau().

Androcles, victorious.− Hide quoted text −

− 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.
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

I'm not sure what you're doing. Your diagram shows B hitting the end of the larger rod, it remains there with C continuing to move forward so that the smaller rod and the clock on it becomes compressed. I think this is why your plot of Tau against t s wrong because you seem to have interpreted Einstein's derivation and hence Tau incorrectly.

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.

It's your interpretation of Tau, which doesn't seem to be correct.

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.
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(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.

Eisntein looks at the variation of Tau wrt each of the independent
variables one at a time to get a partial differential equation for
each. Using your example

Where @ is the partial symbol

@tau/@bananas = @tau/@dog's breakfasts = @tau/@railway time tables = 0

> 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

Your graph doesn't make sense to me.

> 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.
>
> "In the first place it is clear that the equations must be linear
>
> read more »− Hide quoted text −

− Show quoted text −...

.