

# Re: No infinite energy needed for lightspeed

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2008-09/msg01992.html>

---

- *From:* jonathan cyriax brast <[cyriax@xxxxxxx](mailto:cyriax@xxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Mon, 15 Sep 2008 07:38:51 +0200
- 

Spaceman schrieb:

jonathan cyriax brast wrote:

Spaceman schrieb:

jonathan cyriax brast wrote:

Spaceman schrieb:

jonathan cyriax brast wrote:

Spaceman  
schrieb:

Eric  
Gisse  
wrote:

Where's  
the  
motion  
in  
E  
=  
mc<sup>2</sup>,  
spaceshit?  
The  
particle  
ISN'T  
MOVING!

The  
parts  
inside  
the  
particles  
are  
moving

Re: No infinite energy needed for lightspeed

Eric.

ERROR:  
Doppler  
Effect  
would  
terminate  
specific  
quantisation  
of  
emitted  
Light.

Total bullshit talk.  
Doppler effect would not do  
anything of the sort.

Well, he would change the frequencies of  
the emitted photons, what  
is what I said.

Oh  
You mean like what color it looks like.  
That would correspond to the motion reflecting  
the light at different frequencies.  
Yet another silly thing that works with classical thoughts  
and simple doppler instead of stupid ass doppler that needs  
time dilations and length contractions instead.  
:)

Thats what I mean...  
Stupid classical Doppler would change the color of the light to a mix  
of all colors, gold wouldn't appear golden any more, bur everything  
would be the same color of white.

No it would not.  
It shows all the same "stuff" with the same speeds as the same colors.  
And when you change the speeds of the "stuff" like when you  
change a state or such you can even get different colors.

It can't have the same speed in every direction for it would dissipate.

Not at all:  
W, E, T, Q

Re: No infinite energy needed for lightspeed

Re: No infinite energy needed for lightspeed

and V are  
not the  
same for a  
reason.

LOL  
You truly have been  
brainwashed beyond help  
huh?  
they are all parts of the dang  
parts.  
Sheesh.

W is energy transformation  
E is energy itself  
T is kinetic energy  
Q is thermic energy  
V is potential energy

All finite numbers of any, means finite mass still.  
I am still wishing for this supposed infinite  
mass from non infinite motion to be proven.  
It still shows up as total bullshit and no matter  
what is done. you need infinite motion to make infinite mass  
still.

That's your delusion.  
You need just infinite mass OR infinite velocity for infinite energy.  
And it is just an increasing mass.

No again.  
That is your fantasy using your supposed unitless one and  
that silly division by 0 proof.

That  
is  
why  
gas  
can  
expodes  
and  
coal  
burns  
and  
nukes  
make  
realy  
big

Re: No infinite energy needed for lightspeed

booms

gas cans  
explode  
because of  
thermic  
energy  
coal burns  
because of  
chemical  
energy  
nukes  
explode  
because of  
nuclear  
energy  
first is  
kinetic  
energy form  
mechanical  
processes  
second is  
electromagnetic  
energy form  
electrodynamical  
processes  
third is  
chromodynamic  
energy from  
quantumchromodynamical  
processes  
three  
absolute  
different  
cases

All simply explained by  
mass in motion if you  
actually ever  
learned classical physics.

Actually I learned classical physics better  
than the relativistic  
approach. But as you will see in everyday  
physics there is no need  
for exact relativistic equations.

That would make sense because classical physics  
still uses logic.  
Everything can be explained by classical physics.  
No time dilation, no length contraction needed.

Re: No infinite energy needed for lightspeed

Re: No infinite energy needed for lightspeed

The first step is learning how the clock malfunctions with changes in g-forces.

Why would somebody try hard to invent complicated things like modern physics when old classical physics are enough.

And when every clock malfunctions with changes in g-forces, how can something like satellites in space work with computers on it when they need clocks to function.

Modern physics that advances the best uses old physics that are correct and enhances them to be even more accurate when better equipment and tools become available.

That is how it has worked fine for 1000's of years til the rubber ruler cults showed up.

Well I has worked for 100 of years, before that the local church dictated the world view, and science as community didn't exist.

Are all of  
the particles  
 $1/(\sqrt{2}) * c$   
fast?  
Then why  
don't the  
collapse  
when they  
get cold?

Why should they collapse?  
The smaller stuff inside it  
freezes too and everyone  
knows  
when you freeze things they  
pretty much always expand  
and  
don't collapse.

No, ONLY Water expands when it's frozen.  
EVERYTHING else becomes more dense.

Aha!  
You did learn classical physics!  
WOW I am impressed.  
I am sorry I had to test you with that one.  
I now will never say you never learned clasical physics again.  
I am sorry.

Re: No infinite energy needed for lightspeed

No, problem. Just for fun: How is your education going?

Great.

I will have my MCP hopefully within a couple weeks  
Just have to schedule the test.

Gambatte! (Good Luck!)

Probably going to take some other certs that are not MS  
also soon enough.

Well, get some Linux experience too, can't possible harm and is free of  
charge.

Thanks for askin.  
:)

And why  
don't the  
just  
dissipate?

Because you stopped the  
motion and they froze  
instead.

Braun motion like temperature is right.  
But where is the energy when it stopped  
moving?  
 $E=mc^2$  is only when it doesn't move.

No,  
 $E=mc^2$  actually changes with temperature.  
When the motion is slowed, you will not get the maximum  
energy from it such as energy that causes friction.  
(tis a simply reason super conductivity occurs with cold,  
and not heat.)

And where in  $E=mc^2$  is temperature?  
E is the energy but m is only mass and  $c^2$  is constant  
(c is everywhere 299792458m/s).

C is not actually constant.  
I though I showed you that already?  
c is only constant to "at rest" things.  
That is why  $E=mc^2$  only works "at rest" and you need  
KE and more once you get moving things involved.

## Re: No infinite energy needed for lightspeed

c is a speed, speeds can not be constant.  
(I forgot to warn you about the brainwashing part of relativity that makes you ignore the relative motion parts when needed to support the rubber ruler theory.)  
my bad..  
sorry about forgetting to tell you that.  
You can't ignore relative motion speeds and neither can light.  
Or is light able to violate relative motion even though it is moving at a speed and all speed should be relative?

Yes, thats the whole fun. Relative motion doesn't add normally.

The full equation is  $E = mc^2 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-v/c}} \cdot \frac{1}{2}mv^2$  .

No again that is using a unitless 1

well 1 is  $c/c$  which of course is 1

The full equation would be more like  $E = mc^2 + KE$ .

$E = m_0c^2 + KE$   
(KE is called T by the way and I will use it like that from now on)  
 $m_0$  is the mass when the movement is zero.  
But if  $T > 0$  there has to be movement.  
And when something moves the mass changes.

No,  
mass is a constant.  
Why do you keep changing that fact to support the other silly untrue facts?

And how the mass changes is adjusted by  $\gamma = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-v/c}}$  .  
As you see the 1 is just to make it easier to read for you.  
An  $\gamma$  has to be unitless for  $l = \gamma \cdot l_0$  and  $t = \gamma \cdot t_0$  and  $m = \gamma \cdot m_0$  .  
It's universal for relativistic transformations.

I told you,  
transforms are silly self limiting math tricks  
Why do you fall for such?  
Don't you know those things would make you smash into planets that were not there yet according to that math even though they would be there?

## Re: No infinite energy needed for lightspeed

Lets try a simple thoguht about such.

Two spaceships are heading towards a collision point  
(we will be nice and keep the spaceships sub c speeds)

Lets say both ships (A and B) are heading towards  
collision point (I)

A third observer (D) verifies the ships are moving at  $0.75c$   
towards that point (I) and heading directly towards each other  
and will crash at (I)

So A is doing  $0.75c$  and B is doing  $0.75c$ ,  
according to the third observer (D) those ships will crash  
in  $3/4$  second.

What time do do the ships think they will crash at  
with one observing the other  
(use you silly transform and you will crash before you thought  
you would since you would have slower speeds according  
to each other.)

It's all about your point of view. You are outside, not moving.  
I'm inside moving. We will appear not like  $1,5c$  to each other, but my  
time is also slower (think about how clocks work).

Try doing such different ways and even use (I) as an observer  
if you wish.

(bit of course that needs adjustments just as yours would  
with  
cold or heat being a surrounding problem.

If  $v = 0$  than  $v^2 = 0$  and only  $E=mc^2$  is  
left.

If  $v \rightarrow c$  than  $(1-v/c) \rightarrow 0$  and  $1/\sqrt{1-v/c}$   
 $\rightarrow$  infinity.

There is your unitless 1 again causing the problem that does  
not occur in reality.  
(the photon would be an infinite mass if that was true)

No the photon could have any mass.  
It's anything divided by zero is infinite.

Division my zero is not proof  
You should not even be using anything that comes up  
as division my 0 since that means you have a big problem  
with that math that is coming up with anything being  
devided by 0.

## Re: No infinite energy needed for lightspeed

It states: IF you try to accelerate up to  $c$  THAN you'll get problems.  
IF you stay below  $c$  everything is OK, a little strange but still reachable.

You can make some easy equations:

$$a/0=i$$

$$a*0=0$$

$$a/i=0$$

$$a*i=i$$

$$i/i=a$$

$$0/0=a$$

$$i/0=i$$

$$0/i=0$$

Division by 0 is the joke you seem to not get?  
If you are coming up with anything that is going to divide by 0 you have done something wrong to get to that math to begin with.

That's why you have to look where it applies.  
It applies for speeds  $v < c$ .  $c$  can't possibly be reached.

And Photons can have any mass if they move at  $c$ .

In that case the Energy itself increases too.

Again,  
I would love to know how you can allow an infinite  
from a bunch of finites without seeing that that 1 unitless  
thing  
is bullshit?

^ S.A. ^

I would love to know what keeps you from doing it.

I would never do such because there is no physical reason  
for dividing lightspeed by lightspeed and there is no reason  
for removing the units that lightspeed had by simply dividing  
it by itself.

Do you also divide 80 apples by 80 apples

Re: No infinite energy needed for lightspeed

and you will be left with a unitless 1 "non apple"?

It's like at start I had 100 of 100 apples that's  $100\% = 100/100 = 1$

No, Spaceman, don't worry.  
I like to discuss things with you,  
<irony\_sarcasm\_detection="True">  
because it will improve my skill in dealing  
with people who are not  
blessed with the knowledge of the  
monolithic church of science we  
physic students humbly obey till death  
against our highly  
intelligent, brilliant minds.

You got the church part correct even with the <isd = true>  
:)

Well everyone should believe something...

Logic is my choice.  
For some reason you would rather follow math  
that states basic math is wrong.

Logic is math in the purest form.  
All math derives from logic.  
Your "logic" is a mix of common cases without the exceptions and ockhams  
razor.

That is not very logical really.

That's relativity theory for you.  
Your side looks over here not that logical too.

Since your basic math that proves basic math wrong

Where?

must also be wrong via your own proof.  
:)

Well you didn't prove it wrong, but you just couldn't get the reason.  
Having no access to the reason you thought it would be unreasonable.

Re: No infinite energy needed for lightspeed

## Re: No infinite energy needed for lightspeed

The tree words should not be: "The clock malfunctioned" but "Why did it?" or "What is wrong" or WTF.

It is bound by Newton laws of motion and force.

Newtons law of Motion and Force are propagated via electromagnetic and gravitational force.

It malfunctioned because of the acceleration or change in external forces that caused the slowdown of speeding up of action/reaction.

But it also does this without external forces and just velocity.  
 $F=mdx/dt^2$   $v=dx/dt$  velocity can be without force, and clocks still malfunction.  
two spaceships with clocks fly though space and passing each other.  
everyone sees the other clock going slower. but there is NO FORCE AT ALL  
for the spaceships are not accelerating. How comes?

Does water boil faster on the mountain top?

That is because of a lower air pressure it needs less temperature.

Funny clocks run faster up there too.

An atomic clocks behavior is not dependent on airpressure or temperature

actions and reactions change rate with surrounding forces

There are less forces in space but the effects are bigger.

"including" gravity.  
The clock malfunctioned because of surrounding forces.  
Acceleration, freedom of motion... etc..  
It has always been a problem with clocks,  
that is why I had told you to learn the history of time  
to understand more about clocks.

They just use clocks to describe regular units of change.  
It could be a brain functioning or tree growing too.

P.S.: (Just for fun)  
I believe the Universe is a selfassembling hyperbolic cellular  
automate and every system in it is equal.

Re: No infinite energy needed for lightspeed

That is fine.

But you will need absolute time and absolute space to finally prove it.

Or you will just run into more paradox laden silliness.

:)

But I can't have absolute space when it's hyperbolic.

.