Re: Question about Kepler's second law

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2007−04/msg02031.html

- *From*: mmeron@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
- *Date*: Tue, 17 Apr 2007 04:21:34 GMT

In article <1176779703.715199.274320@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, PD <TheDraperFamily@xxxxxxxxx> writes:

> On Apr 16, 9:09 pm, mme...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:
>
> > In article <1176769985.828987.58...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, "PD" <TheDraperFam...@xxxxxxxxx> writes:
>
> > > On Apr 16, 5:49 pm, mme...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:
>
> > > > In article <1176754884.114148.59...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, "Peter" <Poakfi...@xxxxxxx> writes:
>
> > > > > On Apr 16, 3:41 pm, "PD" <TheDraperFam...@xxxxxxxxx> wrote:
>
> > > > > > On Apr 16, 8:06 am, "Peter" <Poakfi...@xxxxxxx> wrote:
>
> > > > > > > On Apr 14, 8:48 pm, "PD" <TheDraperFam...@xxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Apr 14, 6:42 pm, "Peter" <Poakfi...@xxxxxxx> wrote:

> On Apr 14, 6:54 pm, Phineas T Puddleduck <phineaspuddled...@xxxxxxxxx> wrote:
>
> > In article <1176590209.784235.154...@xxxxx
> >
> > "Peter" <Poakfi...@xxxxxxx> wrote:
> >
> > > Angular velocity is a vector too, hence the cross product
> >
> > (Point of contention –

−actually
a
pseudovector,
but
it
still
uses
the
cross
product)

–
Show
quoted
text
–

The
cross
product
is
also
a
pseudovector.

Peter

Are
you
trolling,
or
deliberately
obtuse?

You
tell
that
to
Douglas
C.
Giancoli

(Physics for Scientists and Engineers, 2nd ed., page 220).

Peter

Ah, well, at least you've moved up to an (old) college text. You'll note that the terms "pseudoscalar" and "pseudovector" are not listed in that freshman text. What does that tell you?

PD−
Hide
quoted
text
–

–
Show
quoted
text
–

Giancoli
does
talk
about
pseudovectors.

Peter

My error. I
was looking
at a
different
edition.
Now, you
will note
that
Giancoli
also tells
you how a
"pseudovector"
is defined
by its
properties
under
transformation.
You'll note
that it is not
distinguished
as being a
"false" or
"not real"

vector.

PD− Hide
quoted text
−

− Show
quoted text
−

I am not sure I understand
what you mean. But I know
that if something
is not a true vector, it is just
not a vector. You know why
angular
displacements are not
vectors: they fail the
commutative law for
addition.

Sigh. A clear waste of time.

Well, to be fair, this is the risk of introductory to
sub−introductory
level material of the sort that Peter is trying to wrestle with.
Material like that has to skirt (at least) two hazards:
− it gives the reader the impression that he understands more
than he
really does;
− it uses some jargon flippantly and without fully explaining
the
meaning of those terms, leaving the reader to (usually
wrongly) fill
in the gaps.
Writers of material like that are playing with fire for a
reason. They
have to engage the interest of the novice, and they can't
subject the
casual reader to the full−blown exposition that would
produce a better

> > understanding.
>
> Yes, very true.
>
> > > The problem is that, while most novices know they're getting only part
> > > of the picture, folks like Peter want to be able to work with the
> > > introductory material as sufficient for full understanding, and it's
> > > tremendously frustrating to learn that this just isn't possible.
> >
> > Well, that's extending lots of "benefit of the doubt" to Peter. Yes,
> > it is no utterly impossible that he's just confused and trying to
> > reach some understanding. Not impossible, but highly unlikely. Too
> > many of the telltale signs of a troll are there.
>
> Maybe you're right. I've also seen people on this group who say, "But
> it says RIGHT HERE in my Archie and Jughead Discuss Physics book that
> [something inane and misleading]. Why would the authors of the Archie
> and Jughead Discuss Physics say something deliberating inane and
> misleading?"
>
> Some of these people REALLY DO rest their hopes of understanding
> physics on material they read on the web or in coffee−table books or
> in Newsweek magazine. Porat or Seto, for example, maintains rigidly
> that the information he finds on the web is better and more reliable
> than the material in journals or textbooks. Sometimes it's because
> they've taken a stab at studying a real book but their skills are too
> rusty or undeveloped for it to be a useful to them. And so they go
> back to what they THINK they understand, and extrapolate to the point
> of utter confusion.

Yes, a common (unfortunately) sight. Most of our cranks are in these
category. Note, though, that cranks tend to stake a position and hold
to it, ignoring all argument and evidence to the contrary. Trolls, on
the other hand, tend to be slippery. With each post they introduce a
new tangent till few posts down the line you find yourself arguing
about something hardly related to the original topic.

Mati Meron | "When you argue with a fool,
meron@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx | chances are he is doing just the same"
.