

Re: In search of the perfect Disassembler

Source: <http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/Assembler/alt.lang.asm/2005-06/msg00607.html>

- *From:* "T.M. Sommers" <tms@xxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 13 Jun 2005 07:23:11 GMT
-

Beth wrote:

```
> 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? ;)
```

Let's see: you **tell** me to re-read my physics books, I **suggest** that you re-read yours, but I'm the one with the Lady Bracknell attitude. Well, here's something else she said that suits you to a T: "I do not approve of anything that tampers with natural ignorance. Ignorance is like a delicate exotic fruit; touch it and the bloom is gone." (I assume the 'handbag' is a reference to Lady Bracknell; otherwise I have no idea what you are talking about.)

Also note that, despite what you say below, you were addressing me in the second person here.

```
>> 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.)
>
> Aw, diddums..."big authority man" is offended...
```

Re: In search of the perfect Disassembler

I do find your condescending attitude offensive. You need to stop assuming, like an adolescent, that you are the only one in the world who knows anything.

> 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_...

Had you considered that I did not need backing up by you? Of course you hadn't.

> And as I referred to you in the _THIRD PERSON_ throughout the
> posting,

Except when you didn't.

> ...why, indeed, you may be the "foremost authority" on the matter
>
Of course, that is your invention. I have never made such a claim. Just because I know more about physics than you do does not make me a "foremost authority"; you don't know enough to make that true.

> ...but as you didn't bother to _EXPLAIN_ anything -

I assume that the person I responded to, who had mentioned tachyons, knew what they were. I also assume that everyone else either knew, didn't care, could look it up and get a better explanation than I would give, or could ask. Unlike you, I do not assume that everyone is waiting breathlessly for me to lecture them on topics I know little about (and you call **me** an egomaniac).

> simply being "bowed to" and "believed inherently" for being
> "superior" seems to satisfy your "ego", it seems

You are being delusional again.

Re: In search of the perfect Disassembler

> 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

Knowing that, why do you do it? You do no-one any favors by giving out wrong information, as you too frequently do when you talk about subjects you know little about.

> ...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...

Coming from you, considering how you react whenever anyone dares point out your errors, that is a laugh.

> 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...

I suggest you need that course more than I do: 'you' is second person, not third.

> 2. I was SECONDING what you said;

Yet you started out telling me to re-read my physics books, and generally disagreeing. With support like that, who needs opposition?

> I come in peace;

No, you didn't. You came on aggressively, insultingly, and obnoxiously. If you doubt that, consider your own reaction when I parroted your opening back to you.

Re: In search of the perfect Disassembler

> 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

You are the one who began the ad hominem remarks a long time ago. *You* are the one who gets offended and throws a hissy fit every time one of your egregious errors is pointed out.

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

Frankly my dear, I don't give a damn.

> Oh, no, wait...I get it...you don't want my "respect", just my
> "obedience"

Are you high? When have I ever given you an order? *You* ordered me to re-read my physics books; I merely suggested that you re-read yours. But I'm the one demanding 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

You certainly are civil, aren't you? You sound more like Betov all the time.

> ...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

Sorry, but I have seen you fly off the handle when others have pointed out your errors. What makes me different from them is that I am stupid enough to keep coming back for more.

Re: In search of the perfect Disassembler

> ...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

In other words, you will stop the unprovoked personal attacks on me when I stop pointing out your errors. You seem to be admitting that the ad hominem comments you keep making about me are designed to silence me.

How's this for an idea? Next time you get an urge to post, check your facts before hitting the send button. Better yet, don't post unless it is on a topic you know well.

>>> 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...

Yes, he did.

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

'Unification', 'grand unification', it's all the same general idea. The term 'grand unification' did not come into use until almost 20 years after Einstein's death, and refers specifically to the unification of the strong force with the electroweak force.

> 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

Re: In search of the perfect Disassembler

> "personal attack" involved

I used to do that, but you kept responding with personal attacks on me. Eventually I got tired of those attacks, and decided not to make any effort to be civil in return.

>>> 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 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"...

That article, which I looked at before replying, talks about the fine structure constant, not the speed of light per se. It certainly does not claim that anyone measured a different speed of light from normal, which is what you claimed.

> 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...

See: the fine structure constant, not c.

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

I'll take a look at them.

>> 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...

Re: In search of the perfect Disassembler

Re: In search of the perfect Disassembler

But I was only seconding you, and explaining what you left out.

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

Talking to the mirror, again, I see.

>>> 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...

Negative mass is bad enough, but at least it is real; tachyons must have imaginary rest masses.

What this has to do with tachyons is beyond me, though.

> 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...

And I asked you to back up your opinion, which you apparently cannot do. I even said 'please'.

>> You are making the unwarranted assumption that the past can
>> be changed, even granted that it can be visited.
>
> Second, yes, this is an assumption I'm making.
>
>> 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:

Re: In search of the perfect Disassembler

>> 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...

You are missing the point. There is no paradox, at least no physical paradox, because you cannot change the past (assuming you can get there, of course). You can't go back and kill your grandfather, because you didn't. Nothing prevented you from doing it, you just didn't. There is only one past, unchangeable, and in it you didn't kill your grandfather, so when you visit it you won't kill him.

The only paradox, if there is one, is linguistic, not physical. Just because you can string words together in a superficially meaningful sentence does not mean that that sentence corresponds to anything in the real world. We can argue all day long about whether or not the present king of France is bald, but the argument is all gibberish, because there is no king of France. Likewise, you can talk all you want about killing your grandfather or otherwise changing the past, but that does not mean that you can do it. You can also talk about squaring the circle, but you can't do it, either. See Russell's essay "On Denoting" for a fuller explanation; it's on the web somewhere.

> 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!"...

Is it any wonder that I am sometimes rude to you after having to put up with tripe like this?

First, everyone in the world thinks that what they think is true is true, and what they think is false is false. Or do you think that your opinions are false?

Re: In search of the perfect Disassembler

Second, I expressed no opinion on the possibility of travel into the past, by whatever means. I *did* say that *if* it is possible, the past can't be changed. That is the general opinion of physicists who are interested in the topic.

>> 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"

That is a much-misused saying. It does not mean that you can assume that anything at all exists just because there is no evidence against it: "There is no evidence that there are little green men on the moon." "Absence of evidence is not evidence of absence."

> ...there are three "space" dimensions, after all...who's to
> say?

I could provide you with a citation to the only paper I know of that discusses the question analytically, but when I provide you with references you get offended, so I won't. (Anyway, the book that cites it is in the other room, and I don't feel like getting up to get it.) The paper finds that there are problems with time-like geodesics and with causality if there are more than one time dimension. I have not read the paper itself, but a book I have mentions it.

> wasn't that Einstein's "biggest blunder" to "not believe" in a
> universe where "chance" could play a part?

Einstein considered the cosmological constant to be his biggest blunder.

> Also, the "Many Worlds" hypothesis of quantum collapse

Re: In search of the perfect Disassembler

> 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"...

The many-worlds theory and multidimensional time are entirely different. In the former one cannot change the past because every possible past already exists in different universes, so changing the past is more a matter of jumping from one universe to another.

Multidimensional time is just what the name suggests: an extra time dimension, making a 5-dimensional world (ignoring for a moment all those extra dimensions in various string theories). I could cite a paper on the problems with multidimensional time, but since you throw a fit every time I supply a reference, I won't bother.

> 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...

Give me a break.

--

Thomas M. Sommers -- tms@xxxxxx -- AB2SB

.