

Re: Superluminal information transfer paradox

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2005-01/10954.html>

From: Bilge (*dubious_at_radioactivex.lebesque-al.net*)

Date: 01/28/05

Date: 28 Jan 2005 23:21:57 GMT

John Schoenfeld:

> *Bilge wrote:*

>> *Bzzzzt. There is no theoretical basis for superluminal anything.*

>

> *As I suggested in my previous post, some QFT models do not require the*

Which for some reason, you failed to specify in detail.

> *algebra of the causal completion of space-time to be equivalent to the*

> *algebra of space-time. This means that under certain circumstances*

> *Lorentzian maximum frame velocity does not apply. If one only considers*

> *Relativity, this result is underivable.*

There's nothing I find less illuminating than a lot of words that mean nothing either because the words are nothing but strings of soundbites or because the words are taken out any context that makes them meaningful. The "algebra of the causal completion of space-time" is: [Insert mathematical definition of the algebra here].

If you think the algebra of spacetime is something other than the poincare algebra then you think the algebra is: [Insert mathematical definition of the algebra here].

After doing that, explain the circumstances arising from the inequivalence of those two algebras lead to the results you assert. My responses are based on the information you supply and what you've supplied so far looks like jargon and soundbites. If you expect a response based on something other than the jargon and soundbites supplied, supply something other than jargon and soundbites. I'm not obligated to become a telepath just to refute the misuse of terminology.

>> *The real question is why you (and others) find it more satisfying*

>> *to try and "overthrow" relativity at the level that relativity*

>> *is simply a fact rather than put the same effort into studying*

>> *enough basic physics to understand what the real questions are.*

>

sci.physics: Re: Superluminal information transfer paradox

>*You are now moving the argument into a personal one and attacking my
>motivations instead of the content of my argument. If my argument is*

You argument is content free precisely for the reasons I stated.
You use a lot of jargon that doesn't mean an