

Re: Basics series proposed

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2004-10/4624.html>

From: Androcles (*dummy_at_dummy.net*)

Date: 10/16/04

Date: Sat, 16 Oct 2004 17:02:04 GMT

<ande452@attglobal.net> wrote in message news:417099F8.6270@attglobal.net...

> *Androcles wrote:*

>>

>> <ande452@attglobal.net> wrote in message

>> news:416F4731.AFF@attglobal.net...

>> > *Paul Draper wrote:*

>> >>

>> >> *Since these are the three most active s.p. newsgroups, and also the
>> >> forum for the highest concentration of misguided souls, I propose that
>> >> we start a series of threads on fundamentals. It should be aimed at
>> >> the "tripping points", the places where it's easy to get confused or
>> >> misdirected, or where modern ideas confront popular but incorrect
>> >> preconceptions. As far as possible, the lead articles should be
>> >> accessible to laypeople and non-mathematical. Mathematical development
>> >> of the ideas can be expanded further in each thread. The aim of the
>> >> lead article is to carefully define terms, elucidate core concepts,
>> >> and specifically drill at misconceptions or things that apparently
>> >> defy "common sense". The lead articles would be done Wikipedia-style,
>> >> with volunteers titling a new thread from one of the topics listed
>> >> below with a "(Basics)" prefix in the the title.*

>> >>

>> >> *The purpose of this series is to establish reference articles both to
>> >> educate the interested and to explain where misguided proposals go
>> >> wrong. In essence, it is a "positive force" in the n.g., some signal
>> >> above the noise, a proactive rather than a reactive approach.*

>> >>

>> >> *In the "table of contents" below, I've marked ones with * that have
>> >> posted recently. If good articles on some of the other topics have
>> >> already been posted, then please amend the list appropriately. The
>> >> list is not intended to more strategic than comprehensive, but if
>> >> there is a topic that needs attention, feel free to propose it. Each
>> >> article would be posted to all three newsgroups. The topics listed are
>> >> those that would be of value to all three groups.*

>> >>

>> >> - *How to tell if a theory is a good one **

>> >> - *How to tell if an experiment is a good one*

>> >> - *The role of math with physics (*?)*

sci.physics: Re: Basics series proposed

>>> – *What things are said to be "conserved"?*
>>> – *The connection between conservation laws and symmetry*
>>> – *The four "fundamental" interactions and why they appear distinct
>>> from each other (at accessible energies)*
>>> – *Why length is not an inherent property **
>>> – *Why time elapsed is not an inherent property between events*
>>> – *Why simultaneity is not an inherent relation between events*
>>> – *What is really changing in a Lorentz transformation?*
>>> – *How curvature can be detected by creatures living in that space*
>>> – *What is wave–particle duality, and is light a wave or a particle?*
>>> – *What is symmetry breaking?*
>>> – *What does the cosmological constant mean and where might it come
>>> from?*
>>> – *What is the anthropic principle?*
>>> – *How does a massless particle behave differently than a massive
>>> particle?*
>>> – *What is a virtual particle? **
>>> – *What is a field?*
>>> – *What does it mean to quantize a theory?*
>>>
>>>> *PD*
>>>
>>> *Don't you think that correct explanations of these things have
>>> been posted over the years in this group?*
>>>
>>> *Do you think that the cranks accept them?*
>>>
>>> *What is the FAQ supposed to be for?*
>>
>> *Cranks like Koks, who can't count to 14, and you, of course.*
>> *"correct explanations" indeed!.... LOL.*
>
> *Just because you don't or won't understand the explanations
> doesn't mean that they don't resolve the objections that you
> have.*

Snipping what you have no answer for? You really are as stupid as Koks, a crank who cannot count to 14. Neither can you.

<http://www.androc1es.pwp.blueyonder.co.uk/KoksDoppler.htm>

>
> *Physics is based on experiment.*

Yes, it is. That's why relativity isn't physics.
Relativity isn't based on experiment. Relativity is based on ludicrous assumptions that are clearly (to those with intelligence) false.

Show us an experiment that
> *disproves relativity.*

Don't be so stupid. You can't show me an experiment to disprove bright green flying elephants lay eggs, or that Harry Potter can do magic. Relativity is a work of fiction, not physics. Even if I shot the moon with a laser from the ISS you'd still go on believing in fairy tales.

And then address the responses.

Fuck the responses. You for one have chickened out of responding to KoksDoppler.

<http://www.androcles.pwp.blueyonder.co.uk/KoksDoppler.htm>

Go on, display your ignorance, snip and flame.

>

> *Show us that relativity theory is inconsistent.*

I have. All you and any other stupid relativist can manage is a snip.

And then

> *address the responses.*

What, deny I'm a crank? That's all the response I get from cranks like you Snip and flame, you crazy cunt.

Here, just to prove it, pick the bones out of this (snip coming up).

The Seven Deadly Sins of Special Relativity.

For quotations following, reference:

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

("On the Electrodynamics of Moving Bodies" by Albert Einstein)

1) "light is always propagated in empty space with a definite velocity c which is independent of the state of motion of the emitting body", a totally unproven assumption without any evidence to support it.

2) "In agreement with experience we further assume the quantity $2AB/(t'A-tA) = c$ to be a universal constant– the velocity of light in empty space.",

an admitted assumption that is quite worthless when there is any relative motion between A and B, yet essential to the derivation of the remainder of Einstein's nonsense.

3) The equation

$\frac{1}{2}[\tau(0,0,0,t)+\tau(0,0,0,t+x'/(c-v)+x'/(c+v))] = \tau(x',0,0,t+x'/(c-v))$,
the $\frac{1}{2}$ of which is derived from 2) above and is tantamount to saying $(1/3 + 2/3)/2 = 1/3$.

4) The missing $0'$ from that equation, since $x' = x-vt$, hence $0' = 0-vt$, and the equation should be

$\frac{1}{2}[\tau(-vt,0,0,t)+\tau(-vt,0,0,t+x'/(c-v)+x'/(c+v))] = \tau(x',0,0,t+x'/(c-v))$
at the very least.

5) The further assumption "IF we place $x' = x - vt \dots$ " without considering IF we place $x' = x + vt$, from which we derive (using Einstein's method)
 $\tau = (t + xv/c^2)/\sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}$
 $x_i = (x + vt)/\sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}$ " –Paul B. Andersen

6) The statements

"But the ray moves relatively to the initial point of k,
when measured in the stationary system, with the velocity $c - v \dots$ "
and

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

which are contradictory, the first being Galilean, the second being contrary to the vector addition of velocities, an axiom of a vector space.

7) The lack of a check to verify the theory is self-consistent by feeding the new PoR given in 6) into the equation given in 3) and finding a total failure.

Check:

$(t_1 - t)/(t_2 - t) * [\tau(-vt, 0, 0, t) + \tau(-vt, 0, 0, t + x'/V + x'/V)] = \tau(x', 0, 0, t + x'/V)$
where $V = (c + v)/(1 + v/c)$ as required by the redefined PoR.

Androcles.

> *John Anderson*