

Re: Geometrical interpretation of c^2

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2008-07/msg03056.html>

- *From:* cjcouness <cjcouness@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sat, 26 Jul 2008 09:38:58 -0700 (PDT)
-

Hi Autyumn D.C
This is Conrad Countess

You are using a different math system. But as math is a man made measuring system of what we hope may be reality, my math as unorthodox as it is cannot be that far off. Two vectors of motion applied by two equal and 90 degree angular forces will create circular motion., its as simple as that.

see this.: http://docs.google.com/Doc?id=dsn5q6f_11vv737cck

You said: Vectors do both. But the cc in $E=mc^2$ is a linear square in time, not

a rectangular square in span. Your maths suck.

Its not either in this case although it might be translated into each other. The cc in this case is c in circular motion such as a trajectory that would follow a 90 degree arc which if constant creates a circle

or a balance of centripetal and centrifugal forces to produce orbital or circular motion. v^2 and c^2 can be interpreted and translated into all of these forms, but in this situation where energy turns to matter at the high end of the EM spectrum it is precisely because it takes on a circular or spherical form in order to form a particle or matter wave, not a linear x linear form or a square form.. I only use the rectangular form as an analogy and start off point to show that the same two 90 degree angular lines that create the square can also create a 90degree arc trajectory which if constant creates a circle. The amount of energy in a rest mass particle can probably be illustrated by comparing a square area to a straight line, but the trajectory of the wave can only be shown by the 90 degree arc which if constant creates a circle, that it would take following the two 90 degreed lines of force.

As an example see this :

http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/nova/transcripts/3213_einstein.html

Re: Geometrical interpretation of c^2

Containing this passage:

EMILIE DU CHÂTELET: Using Newton's formulas, Monsieur Voltaire, he then drops a second ball from a higher height, calculated to exactly double the speed of the first ball on impact.

So, Messieurs, care for a little wager? Newton tells us that by doubling the speed of the ball, we will double the distance it travels into the clay. Leibniz asks us to square that speed. If he is correct the ball will travel not two, but four times as far. So who is correct?

They are demonstrating the difference between Newton's ($F=mv$) and Leibniz ($F=mv^2$) as an indication that force increase 4x as velocity doubles, not that velocity is multiplied by itself in a linear manner v^2 and c^2 can be interpreted in all these ways.

Conrad Countess

.