

Re: Who will stun the world as next Einstein?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2005-02/13371.html>

From: Jeany (*ctiei_at_hotmail.com*)

Date: 02/28/05

Date: 27 Feb 2005 17:12:08 -0800

Dirk Van de moortel wrote:

> "Jeany" <ctiei@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:1109516555.438585.8740@g14g2000cwa.googlegroups.com...

>>

>> Dirk Van de moortel wrote:

>

> [snip]

>

>>> To be honest, I think the word theatrical was more appropriate

:-)

>>>

>>> As promised, I will look at 1.2 and beyond, as soon as you

>>> have fixed 1.1, and, in the process, prove to me that you really

>>> understand what you are talking about.

>>>

>>> Dirk Vdm

>>

>> Dear Mr. Dirk Vdm,

>>

>> These are what you posted:

>>

>> ++++++

> [snip]

>> ++++++

>>

>> Ok. As you said, you are talking about SR.

>

> Indeed, but that does not matter.

> The issue is that the text talks about SR, and that it

> shows that the author does not understand the most

> basic thing about SR.

> Now you can do something with that information,

> and fix the text, or you can continue ignoring it.

>

> Dirk Vdm

Dear Dirk,

sci.physics: Re: Who will stun the world as next Einstein?

Let me tell you a good news: The author of TAST has already proved in a math derivation that $LT=L'T'$ would result in $L=T=L'=T'=0$ or it would mean $0=0$ "When $u = -u'$ and $\cos(\theta) = 1$, we'll come back to Lorentz transformation", which means $L = T = L' = T' = 0$ or $0=0$. We can also say that when there is no space-time deflection or when deflection angle is zero, of course it is $L = T = L' = T' = 0$ or $0=0$ in TAST.

Even though you proved it for SR in literal words instead of