

Re: Superluminal information transfer paradox

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2005-01/11005.html>

From: John Schoenfeld (j.schoenfeld_at_programmer.net)

Date: 01/29/05

Date: 28 Jan 2005 18:10:55 -0800

Bilge wrote:

> *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 of any context that makes them meaningful. The "algebra of the causal completion of space-time" is: [Insert mathematical definition of the algebra here].*

There exists a C^* -algebra A of the causal completion of a Minkowski space S and a C^* -algebra B of S such that $A \neq B$. You know nothing, idiot.

> *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].*

Contumaciously untutored idiot.

> *After doing that, explain the circumstances arising from the*

sci.physics: Re: Superluminal information transfer paradox

> *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.*

> >

> > *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*

>

> *Your argument is content free precisely for the reasons I stated.*

> *You use a lot of jargon that doesn't mean anything. Spend the time*

> *studying physics first.*

Idiot.

> > *wrong, so be it. But perhaps you would be better served elaborating on*

> > *your "superluminal anything is impossible" argument by explaining why*

> > *in the context of Local Quantum theory this result is not always hold*

> > *(I recommend you familiarize yourself with Haag–Kastler.)*

>

> *Which axiom do you contend supports you?*

All are consistent, idiot.

"Algebraic Quantum Field Theory".

> > *There is a lot of interesting physics in every subdiscipline, yet*

> > *the only ones that are constantly an issue on this newsgroup are*

> > *the ones that were answered long ago.*

> >

> > *This is a red herring which you are raising to divert the argument.*

If

> > *I'm wrong then explain why this result does not always hold in*

Quantum

> >theory.
>
> You are wrong because the result does hold in quantum field theory.

Idiocy protected by ignorance.

> What I've said is not a red herring because you have made an unwarranted
> inference for exactly the reasons I've stated. You are connecting sound-
> bites to avoid studying physics and have no idea what those soundbites
> mean. Your reference to "priests" indicates your motivations to
> "overthrow" relativity in spite of the fact that the very jargon you
> are using comes from members of the "clergy."

Nothing, idiot.

> [...]
> >> I know what you outlined. What you outlined is wrong.
> >
> >If you cannot show why, your argument is only opinion.
>
> That's okay with me. What I'm arguing with is your opinion and I have no
> intention of trying to figure out every possible way you could have
> misunderstood that upon which you've based your opinion. Once you state
> something specific, I'll address it specifically. The fact that, in
> another response, you say that you are unfamiliar with Shannon's work,
> only tells you me have no idea what information means. It's rather
> difficult to know anything about information theory without being familiar
> with the work done by the person who invented information theory.
>
> >
> >> [...]
> >> >"Comparing datasets" is a common red herring raised by priests, but
> >> >such comparisons are unnecessary. The receiver always assumes the
> >> >information is valid at the physical layer (otherwise it would be
> >> >constrained by $c/2$). Half-duplex information receivers like
> >> >televisions
> >> >and radios are perfect examples of this.
> >>
> >> I suggest, "Kolmogorov Complexity and Its Applications,"

sci.physics: Re: Superluminal information transfer paradox

> >> *vitanyi and li, ``The Physics of Information," ed. Zurek, W.,*
> >> *and john preskill's web site at caltech on quantum information.*
> >
> >*I am very familiar with the work of Kolmogorov,*
>
> *Which in what way obviates the textbook I suggested?*
>
> >*and it does not help your argument at all.*
>
> *I agree that what you know about the work of kolmogorov doesn't*
> *help my argument, but I never suggested that it did or that what*
> *you knew about kolmogorov's work was relevent. In fact, kolmogorov's*
> *work isn't relevant to the reason I suggested that textbook.*
>
> >*Instead it is the basis of my argument, and that is that the*
Kolmogorov
> >*zero-one law dictates superluminal information exchange can occur*
as
> >*a tail event.*
>
> *The basis of your argument is flawed and the textbook I suggested*
> *might even help illuminate you, since the book is concerned with*
> *complexity and information theory. Kolmogorov's zero-one law only*
> *states that a tail event has a probability of either zero or one of*
> *occurring. It says nothing about what defines an event in quantum*
> *field theory. Your entire argument hinges on erroneously equivocating*
> *tail events in a distribution, field amplitudes and information.*
>
> >*I also see you have omitted the links which I previously posted. I*
have
> >*restored them below.*
>
> *That's no surprise. Crackpots always do that, as if ``restoring"*
> *the links somehow strengthens an argument that isn't supported*
> *by the links. The links don't support anything you've said. The*
> *fact that have given no argument explaining why those links support*
> *what you've said, I have no way of determining why you think those*
> *articles support your argument. I'll leave the links if it makes*
> *you feel better, despite being irrelevant.*
>
> >> <http://physicsweb.org/articles/news/4/7/8/1>
> >> <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/sci/tech/781199.stm>
> >> <http://archives.cnn.com/2000/TECH/space/07/20/speed.of.light.ap/>
> >
> >*Also, observations in astronomy show an apparant superluminal*
motion:
> >http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Superluminal_motion
>
> *Just in case english isn't your first language, the word*
``apparent"
> *means ``not necessarily as it appears", which in this context means*

sci.physics: Re: Superluminal information transfer paradox

- > *something that it looks like superluminal motion, but really isn't*
- > *superluminal motion.*

God is the Ghost universe, Priest?