

# Re: In search of the perfect Disassembler

---

*Source:* <http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/Assembler/alt.lang.asm/2005-06/msg00560.html>

---

- *From:* "Beth" <BethStone21@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Fri, 10 Jun 2005 12:48:50 GMT
- 

T.M. Sommers wrote:

> Beth wrote:  
>> T.M. Sommers wrote:  
>>> Normal matter cannot exceed the speed of light. If tachyons  
>>> exist, broken speed limits will be the least of our worries.  
>>  
>> Actually, re-read your physics textbooks and you will note a \_very  
crucial\_  
>> "semantic" in the way it's phrased...  
>  
> I suggest you re-read yours. Taylor and Wheeler is a good place  
> to start. Come back after you have mastered it.

Ooh, get you...it's "handbags" time, eh? ;)

>> Nothing may accelerate up to and exceed the speed of light...this is  
>> because it requires more and more energy to accelerate further until,  
at  
>> the speed of light itself, you require "infinite energy"...which is an  
>> impossible condition to ever satisfy...hence, you cannot \_accelerate  
passed  
>> the speed of light\_...  
>  
> Thank you for the elementary physics lecture. I see that with  
> you to guide me through the mysteries of modern physics there was  
> no point in taking all those graduate physics courses. (That is  
> an example of irony, a form of sarcastic remark in which the real  
> meaning is the opposite of the surface meaning.)

Aww, diddums..."big authority man" is offended...

Had you considered that this was NOT for your benefit? This is a \_PUBLIC  
FORUM\_...other people read the posts...and that a post being made as  
"reply" to you doesn't always mean that it's directed specifically at  
you...

I was, in fact, as I made perfectly clear \_SECONDING\_ what you said...and  
specifically said "Sorry, T.M.'s on the money here" to \_BACK YOU UP\_...

## Re: In search of the perfect Disassembler

Plus, the end of my posting was clearly deliberately "stupid"...I was NOT taking this anywhere near as seriously as you appear to be doing...here, in the "elementary physics", I was SECONDING what you were saying and simply adding a little more to the discussion...in no way whatsoever was I contradicting a single word you said...in no way was it an "attack"...if you have become "offended" then I consider you review YOURSELF, not my posting, as I was BACKING YOU UP...

And as I referred to you in the THIRD PERSON throughout the posting, this is also a "big clue" that I was not directly addressing you...but was addressing the wider group and it was FOR THEIR BENEFIT that the "elementary physics" was there...why, indeed, you may be the "foremost authority" on the matter...but as you didn't bother to EXPLAIN anything – simply being "bowed to" and "believed inherently" for being "superior" seems to satisfy your "ego", it seems – then I was covering what you didn't bother to address...indeed, it's quite sad, really...because I KNOW I'm not any "foremost authority" by any means...I took no "courses" in the subject...it should NOT be me trying to help the group's understanding because I'm not fully qualified to do so...it appears YOU are, though...so, it's quite sad when someone with your learning, wisdom and experience seems to deem it "elitist members only club" when it comes to sharing that learning...

Note:

1. I referred to you in the THIRD PERSON; If you don't know what that means regards who the post was addressing, then may I suggest a similar "course" in the English language to match your clear understanding of physics...
2. I was SECONDING what you said; I even specifically said: "T.M.'s on the money" (re: point 1, you'll note the third person there)...and what I was saying was BACKING UP what you were saying...I was solely providing, yes, the "elementary physics lesson" in order for the rest of the group (those who had not done "courses") with a relatively simple "Plain English" explanation of why this was not possible (the "infinite energy" point was NOT mentioned by you in your reply)...
3. As the ending of my post was clearly stupid joke-making, then perhaps you should have worked out that I posted to: Help explain why YOU were right (the "elementary physics" reasoning for why you were right: You'll find that if you provide the REASONS – verifiable facts – then others won't try to suggest you're "wrong" because it's clearly demonstrable and verifiable that you're not...it was for YOUR benefit, not that your "ego" would ever let you come to Earth long enough to realise, it seems)...providing some mild "physics-based" jokes and "light relief"...which, no, weren't in the slightest bit seriously meant...

Indeed, I now feel terrible, thank you...because the reason for my posting was to SECOND you...and to help out the wider group with the "elementary physics" you'd omitted for them to SEE that you were correct (with

## Re: In search of the perfect Disassembler

keywords like "infinite energy" and such, it's bound to show up in Google, where your aloof "I'm so fracking superior" vague reply would assist no-one who's interested in the subject from learning more)...and then I thought you might appreciate, as you clearly have a great understanding, as you say, of physics, at the "silly leg-pulling" jokes at the end...I thought you'd actually find that slightly funnier than others, due to the "subject matter" of the jokes, being something you'd appreciate more than most...

I come in peace; "Shoot to kill! Shoot to kill!"

>> [ Note that most sci-fi shows have "picked up on this"

>

> Science fiction is not physics, and trying to learn physics from

> science fiction is just plain silly.

Did I suggest such? Where did I say that someone should "learn physics" through fiction?

That's "straw man", "cowardly lion" and "brainless tin man" all-in-one there, Dorothy...

[ Ah, I'll give you a "freebie": Your "retort" should include calling me "Toto" in order to get the coldest dish of "revenge" in reply ;) ]

Ever considered that this was the "demarkation point" where I was switching from "actual physics" to "silly jokes and fiction", which marks the rest of the post as "just light relief", solely trying to perhaps get a smile or two...if you weren't such an "ego-maniac" to think that everything "in your subject domain" is some kind of "personal attack"...again, I referred to you \_THIRD PERSON\_ and I \_CONFIRMED\_ you were correct...at no point did I intend to cause you the slightest offense...entirely the contrary, I was \_seconding\_ you, showing to the rest of the group the \_reasoning\_ you were correct and then attempting to share a bit of "silly fun" with you and others about "nonsense physics"...

I mean...yeah, right...I think science fiction is such a good "teacher" that I did nothing but lampoon how \_WRONG\_ and \_STUPID\_ it often is...yeah, that's a great "recommendation"...

As "missing the point" as the reply about "LASERs", to my "disco lights" comment...obviously, it was a \_JOKE\_...hence, the deliberately mocking "disco lights" phrase...

Oh, I give up...if I handed you a million dollars, you'd find some way to be "offended" by it...whatever...you're determined to "dislike" me...well, okay, whatever...then, simply, I will cease to care and if you're "offended" then I won't care about that because you'll be "offended" whatever I say and do...if "damned if I do and damned if I don't", then I might as well \_DO\_ so that I get myself some "fun" in the process...

Eventually, you will learn...I will NOT give a single bit of "respect"

Re: In search of the perfect Disassembler

Re: In search of the perfect Disassembler

because you "did a course"...or if you have some "qualification", I don't care...you could have a doctorate in this, it matters not a bean to me...I bow before no-one...now, if you EARN respect, then you'll get it, no problems...if you treat me in a civil fashion, that's what'll you get back...indeed, you'd proved useful and informative on the Linux threads and I was SECONDING your correctness on this subject here...even sharing a joke or two...

Oh, no, wait...I get it...you don't want my "respect", just my "obedience"...well, sorry, screw you...it'll never happen...if you don't want to be disappointed by that, set your sights at a civil, reasonable and respectful target...and, sorry, this is, in part, your own fault as the fact that I do not have any such problems or conflicts with others on the group demonstrates...you are "offended" by me being "unreasonable"...guess what? I'm doing nothing more than paying you back in kind...you'd stop being "offended", you know, the second you stop posting to do nothing but "offend" me...I was frackin' SECONDING you here...I was sharing a joke with you and the others...I was helping to make the point that you were right...

>> Anyway, the "revelation" about Einstein's work – from an "overall" and  
>> "scientific" point of view – is actually more to do with him starting  
the  
>> whole "grand unified theory" stuff  
>  
> Sorry, but Maxwell unified electricity and magnetism before  
> Einstein was born.

Yes, a good point; But then, in a certain sense, Newton "unified" the motion of the planets with the falling of objects on the surface of the Earth, by proposing "gravity" that applied to Earth as much as the Heavens...

Obviously, I was talking about specifically the notion of "grand unification"...not just any old "unification"...

But, if you weren't being deliberately disagreeable, argumentative and attacking, then you'd perfectly well know this...just trying to pick at whatever trivial pedanticisms you can find to criticise...

What is your major problem with me, T.M.? And I mean the REAL REASON, not such "excuse" masquerading...because this is clearly "personal" in the way you attack...if only "concerned for technical accuracy" then you'd "correct" without the "personal attack" involved...and you also just "attack" when there's no particular reason or correction or anything, so it can't be that...

>> You'll note that once all the physicists agreed that light was a constant,  
>> they measure it and, oh dear, it appears it's not as "constant" as first

Re: In search of the perfect Disassembler

Re: In search of the perfect Disassembler

> > imagined...and it's changed over time  
>  
> Citation, please.

I thought I'd given it, in fact...I did mention an article in "New Scientist", 19th March 2005 about "13 things that don't make sense", which included "not-so-constant constants"...

The article states: "In 1997 astronomer John Webb and his team at the University of New South Wales in Sydney analysed..."

The article also cites "Physical Review D, volume 69, P.121701" regards Los Alamos National Laboratory measuring a 4 per cent decrease in Alpha since Oklo in Gabon (a natural nuclear reactor, active 2 billion years ago), which is also equally registering a similar "change in Alpha" that Webb's team measured...

The article can be read at this URL:

<http://www.newscientist.com/article.ns?id=mg18524911.600>

And "not-so-constant constants" is number 12 in the "13 things that don't make sense" (the other ones are an interesting read too :)...

Using "John Webb" and "speed of light" in Google, I found the following:

<<http://www.ldolphin.org/constc.shtml>>  
<<http://www.phys.unsw.edu.au/STAFF/ACADEMIC/webb.html>>  
<<http://www.abc.net.au/lateline/stories/s347215.htm>>  
<[http://www.space.com/scienceastronomy/generalscience/constant\\_changing\\_010815.html](http://www.space.com/scienceastronomy/generalscience/constant_changing_010815.html)>  
<<http://www.newscientist.com/article.ns?id=dn6092>>  
<<http://www.rense.com/general28/erin.htm>>  
<<http://msnbc.msn.com/id/3077354/>>  
<<http://msnbc.msn.com/id/3077354/>>

And on "speed of light constant":

<[http://math.ucr.edu/home/baez/physics/Relativity/SpeedOfLight/speed\\_of\\_light.html](http://math.ucr.edu/home/baez/physics/Relativity/SpeedOfLight/speed_of_light.html)>  
<[http://66.102.9.104/search?q=cache:X\\_r0-T6vhBYJ:curious.astro.cornell.edu/question.php%3Fnumber%3D630+speed+of+light+constant&hl=en](http://66.102.9.104/search?q=cache:X_r0-T6vhBYJ:curious.astro.cornell.edu/question.php%3Fnumber%3D630+speed+of+light+constant&hl=en)>  
<<http://www.phys.unsw.edu.au/~dzuba/varyc.html>>

....and so forth...

Just because you're paying attention, don't blame me...

> > No, sorry, T.M.'s "on the money" here, I'm afraid...because he did say  
> > "normal matter" in his reply (which just means that which is  
"sub-light" to  
> > begin with)...  
>

Re: In search of the perfect Disassembler

## Re: In search of the perfect Disassembler

- > Normal matter—that is, matter with real mass—is also the only
- > matter ever observed.

Weird, totally weird...you're trying to "sound disagreeable" even when you're not...

I'm saying that you're completely correct...and you're still trying your best to disagree with me, even if you're not actually doing so...

You are weird...this is some personality disorder or something...

- >> As for tachyons, I don't see there's an actual problem with them
- >> existing
- >
- > Then please explain the physical meaning of imaginary mass, and
- > where the infinite energy radiated by a charged tachyon comes
- > from, and ...

If the Higgs boson exists and is responsible for giving things "mass" then "supersymmetry" would suggest that the Higgs field could be capable of both "positive" and "negative" mass...

As to whether it does prove to exist is something we'll have to wait to see once the Large Hadron Collider, being constructed at CERN, is finished and whether it will discover the "God particle", as the Higgs Boson is also sometimes referred to...

Anyway, have you not detected the subjectivity of saying "I don't see there's an actual problem" rather than "there is no actual problem"...that is a statement of opinion, not fact...

Oh, grow up...you're just disagreeing for the sake of disagreeing..."big man" wants to show off his muscles...get "small people" to bow to "superior god man"...yeah, right...go develop a personality first...

- >>...just that us "forward motion in time" people are going to have
- >> immense headaches trying to work out what the hell is going on...things are
- >> confusing enough when everything can only go forward in time...if they
- >> can start going backwards in time and "paradoxes" spring up
- >> everywhere...then, well, your granny isn't safe...billard balls start
- >> flying around in all directions...and, basically, screw all that...it's
- >> much too complicated...I mean, the plot of "Back to the Future" was tricky
- >> enough to follow and that completely ignored "chaos theory" (as all those
- >> "time travel" things do...if you went back in time, then you would not need
- >> to do a single thing whatsoever to "violate causality"...your very
- >> existence has already done that...you know, the air has been displaced

## Re: In search of the perfect Disassembler

(so,

> > if someone was going to later breath that air, you've altered the future!

>

> You are making the unwarranted assumption that the past can be changed, even granted that it can be visited.

First, this whole "time travel" stuff is partially a joke...

Second, yes, this is an assumption I'm making...though, I did point out that it is theorised that even if "time travel" were actually possible (by hypothetical use of wormholes), it is assumed that it is not possible to travel back further in the past than the initial creation of the "time machine", anyway...

> What happened in

> the past already happened. If you decide next week to visit me last Christmas, I could show you the snaps today, because you were already there (Don't worry: you weren't really there). It doesn't matter about all that air you breathe in your visit to the past, because you already did it.

>

> If you can visit the past, then not only does the past already exist, but the future already exists, too, otherwise there is no place for the time traveller to come from.

Yes, which is the fundamental "paradox" of backwards time travel...

Popularly exemplified by the "granny paradox" where a time traveller travels back in time and murders their own granny...but, in doing so, they could not have been born...hence, they could not have travelled backwards in time...which means they didn't murder their granny...which means they were actually born...but, if actually born and then they travel back in time, what physically prevents them from murdering their grandmother?

This "paradox" brings many scientists to that backwards time travel must be impossible...or, alternatively, that there is a "cosmic censor" which somehow physically prevents time paradoxes...but though the "cosmic censor" is a philosophically appealing way out of the paradox, there is nothing whatsoever to suggest that it exists...

One other possibility opened up by the "Many Worlds" hypothesis of quantum collapse, though, is that such "paradoxes" could exist by such time travel visiting "alternative worlds", as the "Many Worlds" hypothesis stipulates that all possible infinite quantum collapses occur but in "different universes"...hence, backward time travel would be to a "different past" where the events transpired in that way...and the "future" from which you travelled from is one of the "Many Worlds" possible futures that, due to your arrival, does not actually happen in the "world" to which you've travelled...

## Re: In search of the perfect Disassembler

Of course, if the Copenhagen or Neo-Copenhagen view of quantum collapse holds more true than "Many Worlds", such notions are impossible...

You personally appear to be unable to differentiate between your own personal opinion and the truth, though...hence, you have probably judged the various "hypotheses" that contradict your worldview as being "untrue"...this may very well be exactly the case...but until PROVED, the door is open...Stephen Hawking is one who has changed his mind back and forth as to whether such "time travel" truly is or isn't possible...let me guess, you want to claim greater "authority" on the matter than Stephen Hawking? "Ego, doest thou know no bounds!"...

> The ability to change the past, as envisioned in typical science  
> fiction, implies an extra time dimension. The past was  
> something, and not it is something else. 'Was' and 'now' imply  
> time, but obviously it can't be the same time as we know, since  
> that would make no sense at all. So there must be another time  
> dimension. There is obviously no evidence that such an extra  
> dimension exists.

True, there is no evidence of such...but, at the same time: "absence of evidence is NOT evidence of absence"...there are three "space" dimensions, after all...who's to say? Especially if we get "supersymmetric" about things, that there couldn't also be "three dimensions of time"? Though, I would also severely doubt such a possibility too, I would stress...but it is NOT scientific to discount a possibility, simply because you don't "believe" such could be true...this is hardly an "objective" approach to science...wasn't that Einstein's "biggest blunder" to "not believe" in a universe where "chance" could play a part?

Also, the "Many Worlds" hypothesis of quantum collapse suggests "infinite alternate dimensions", in which all possible quantum collapses occur in one of these "infinite other dimensions"...as such, this could function as your "extra dimension of time", even though this is not supposed to be any actual "dimension of time" but more "alternate realities"...

Is this true or is this false?

Sorry, ego-maniac, but NO-ONE knows...the best minds in the field debate these possibilities vigorously and, truth is, "the jury is still out"...though "consensus" would, indeed, be to "err on the side of caution" and presume it is simply "fanciful" and probably simply an impossibility...BUT, not everything confirms that (theoretical black hole physics opens up the possibility of such "time machines"...NOT that anyone's going to be building them soon, as the forces and physics involved are absurd, as well as, indeed, yes, still completely "theoretical" that very little is "proved")...and nothing as yet discovered actually "prohibits" the possibility...

I was merely making a "joke" of the matter by messing around with "silly paradoxes", just to mess around...indeed, while "the jury is still out" on

Re: In search of the perfect Disassembler

the subject, it's ripe for "science fiction" to have some "fun and games" with...and, yes, the ending of my post was complete tongue-in-cheek "science fiction", playing deliberate "games" with such "paradoxes"...

It is NOT my fault if you have a sense of humour failure, just because I unintentionally help demonstrate this point by your failure to recognise "messaging around" in your response...so eager to "attack", you even failed to notice when I was "taking the mickey" out of myself a little and was NOT being wholly serious...

You did the "course" in physics...this is good...well done...now try doing the "course" in "human nature and communication", as this seems a weak point in your education...never mind, I'm a firm believer that no-one is beyond all Hope...though, it is, indeed, not possible to help someone who refuses to admit they have a problem...you must get over your "denial" that your attacks on me aren't "personal", when they are...or you'll never find the subconscious "root cause" for your anger and resentment against me...I'll happily be the "punchbag" in your potential quest to discover what motivates this deep-seated "insecurity"...but you have to admit that you've got this "insecurity" issue or no-one can help you...

Beth :)

---

• *Follow-Ups:*

- ◆ ***Re: In search of the perfect Disassembler***  
◇ *From:* T.M. Sommers
- ◆ ***Re: In search of the perfect Disassembler***  
◇ *From:* Annie
- ◆ ***Re: In search of the perfect Disassembler***  
◇ *From:* Frank Kotler

• *References:*

- ◆ ***Re: In search of the perfect Disassembler***  
◇ *From:* Charles A. Crayne
- ◆ ***Re: In search of the perfect Disassembler***  
◇ *From:* T.M. Sommers
- ◆ ***Re: In search of the perfect Disassembler***  
◇ *From:* snowman
- ◆ ***Re: In search of the perfect Disassembler***  
◇ *From:* T.M. Sommers
- ◆ ***Re: In search of the perfect Disassembler***  
◇ *From:* Beth
- ◆ ***Re: In search of the perfect Disassembler***  
◇ *From:* T.M. Sommers

- Prev by Date: ***Re: Why use RosAsm when you can use NASM ?***

Re: In search of the perfect Disassembler

- Next by Date: ***Re: In search of the perfect Disassembler***
- Previous by thread: ***Re: In search of the perfect Disassembler***
- Next by thread: ***Re: In search of the perfect Disassembler***
- Index(es):
  - ◆ ***Date***
  - ◆ ***Thread***