

# Re: A few silly questions

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2007-02/msg02616.html>

---

- *From:* "Wayne Dobson" <nospam@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Thu, 15 Feb 2007 19:54:59 GMT
- 

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

Ben Newsam wrote:

On Fri, 09 Feb 2007 19:56:24 GMT, "Wayne Dobson"  
<nospam@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> 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."

How come I didn't fire it, then?

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], 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

Re: A few silly questions

<

$F < \text{infinity}$ . And since  $F$  here is magnitude rather than vector force, that's really no restriction at all.

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). Which I disputed since, yes, you would have infinite force, but, since (by the initial stipulation o