

## Re: My definition of force!!!

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2005-03/8178.html>

---

**From:** PD ([pdraper\\_at\\_yahoo.com](mailto:pdraper_at_yahoo.com))

**Date:** 03/15/05

Date: 15 Mar 2005 10:27:47 -0800

TomGee wrote:

- > *Bjoern,*
- > *I did read some of them and I responded to the silliness of referring*
- > *posters to websites which contain a plethora of facts and opinions*
- > *useless usually to straight-thinkers like me. For those seeking to*
- > *be*
- > *educated, they end up confused all the more. Those who cannot*
- > *express*
- > *themselves properly or those who have no reasonable rebuttal to OP*
- > *claims, or those who cannot have any original thoughts, are those*
- > *poor*
- > *souls who refer others to websites. You don't have any favorite*
- > *sites*
- > *to refer others to so you refer us to Wormy's sites! How uncouth!*
- How
- > *gross!*
- > *TomGee*

This is baiting and you know it.

You hold the attitude that everyone should explain everything in narrative to you, without reference to outside sources. Indeed, the reason you want this is that you are having trouble following the material in the outside sources. You dismiss the outside sources as containing a plethora of facts and opinions. The only outside source you will consider (and which, in your mind and in contrast to all other sources and references, is unimpeachable) is Microsoft Encarta, which you obtained at a discount. The reason you like Encarta is that none of its explanations are longer than a paragraph or contain more than one algebraic expression. You would like all such explanations to be in this form, easily digestible and/or debatable.

Unfortunately, Tom, this is not going to happen for you. Outside references are long for a reason — it takes a bit to explain things properly. Moreover, to demonstrate the correctness and applicability of the thoughts therein, some calculations are required. The authors of those references spend a good chunk of their lives recording and

sci.physics: Re: My definition of force!!!

checking and rewriting those explanations, and all published references of that form are highly reviewed and externally checked, as well. (Note Wikipedia is NOT checked, by design. Note that the level of checking and \*who\* checks the articles is also different for Encarta than it is for physics references.)

There is no short-circuit for learning this stuff, Tom. If you want to get to Z, you'll have to do M, P, S, and W first. If M is too loaded with incomprehensible detail or the math is too hard, then you'll have to start earlier, with K or E or even A. If you find it daunting that you'd have to learn all of A–Y to get to Z, then my only advice is keep your eyes on the prize and labor through it. If you find A or B or C boring, even though you need them before understanding D, then you are not cut out to be a physicist, plain and simple.

PD