

Re: A few silly questions

## Re: A few silly questions

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2007-02/msg02422.html>

---

- *From:* "David L. Burkhead" <[dburkhead@xxxxxxx](mailto:dburkhead@xxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Wed, 14 Feb 2007 07:55:49 -0500
- 

Androcles wrote:

"David L. Burkhead" <[dburkhead@xxxxxxx](mailto:dburkhead@xxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
[news:e9ydnXCDop5mBE\\_YnZ2dnUVZ\\_sGqnZ2d@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:e9ydnXCDop5mBE_YnZ2dnUVZ_sGqnZ2d@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

Ben Newsam wrote:

On Fri, 09 Feb 2007 19:56:24 GMT, "Wayne Dobson"  
<[nospam@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:nospam@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

By the way, I'm not just asking these questions because I'm too lazy to do any study, but that without any outside input, I get the feeling that the person I'm arguing with feels at liberty to call anything I say, wrong, regardless of its merits.

We get a few of those in here.

Unfortunately, Mr. Dobson is one of them. He only came here looking for "ammo."

If you call education "ammo" then I can spare some.

If he ever actually showed any evidence of learning anything, that would be a valid point.

I'm the person he was arguing with. The context was from his claim that, in the case of a falling body brought to a stop by a cord (as in a hanging), "considering only those two factors [height and weight],

## Re: A few silly questions

the forces involved  
are very predictable." I immediately pointed out that those two  
factors  
don't define the problem, let alone lead to "very predictable"  
forces.  
Given only those two factors, the only thing that can really be said  
is  $0 <$   
 $F < \text{infinity}$ . And since F here is magnitude rather than vector  
force,  
that's really no restriction at all.

Pity they didn't rip Saddam Hussein's head off too, you mean?  
Seems to me that the amount a rope or a neck stretches before it  
breaks decides the outcome, otherwise it's a bungee jump.  
I'd say the force involved was predictable or people wouldn't  
bungee jump.

How much the rope or neck stretches. How much soft tissues sag. How  
much the body rotates.

Within broad limits, predictable. But not so predictable that even  
experienced executioners did not get the occasional hanging failure of both  
types—failure to break the neck or decapitation.

When we went around on this, the infinite force limit was brought up  
and Mr.  
Dobson said that of course that would require infinite energy (or  
words to  
that effect).

He's not Mr. Dobson, he's Dobby the House Elf. Be respectful  
of his chosen name.

Go read some of his posts in rec.martial-arts and then come talk to me  
about being respectful.

The force will not be infinite, the rope or the neck will break.

Had he said that, I would have had no problem with it. But that's not  
the argument he made. Instead, he was the one making the argument about  
infinite energy being required.

Re: A few silly questions

Which I disputed since, yes, you would have infinite force, but, since (by the initial stipulation of the condition), it would take place over zero distance. infinity \* zero, undefined but possibly meaningful if considered as a limit.

I get the feeling that the person Dobby was arguing with feels at liberty to call anything Dobby says, wrong, regardless of its merits,

You get the feeling wrong.

because the argumentative fuckheaded muggle brought infinity into the argument in the first place.

And, of course, everybody knows scientists and mathematicians never use infinity as one limit of an open interval.

\*plonk\*

---

David L. Burkhead "Dum Vivimus Vivamus"  
<mailto:dburkhead@xxxxxxxxxxx> "While we live, let us live."  
My webcomic Cold Servings  
<http://www.coldservings.com> --- Back from hiatus!  
Updates Wednesdays

.