

Re: Do evolutionists have the answers? (don't be silly)

Re: Do evolutionists have the answers? (don't be silly)

Source: <http://newsgroups.derkeiler.com/Archive/Talk/talk.origins/2009-09/msg02506.html>

- *From:* Desertphile <desertphile@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 13 Sep 2009 10:54:24 -0600
-

On Sun, 13 Sep 2009 07:51:41 GMT, Ye Old One <usenet@xxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Sat, 12 Sep 2009 23:27:45 -0300, Nashton <nana@xxxxx> enriched this group when s/he wrote:

Ye Old One wrote:

On Sat, 12 Sep 2009 13:34:31 -0700, Hatunen <hatunen@xxxxxxx> enriched this group when s/he wrote:

On Sat, 12 Sep 2009 13:04:09 -0700 (PDT), Boikat <boikat@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Sep 12, 1:15 pm, Nashton <n...@xxxxx> wrote:

Hatunen wrote:

On
Sat,
12
Sep
2009
15:32:05
+0100,
martin
<use...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote:

Re: Do evolutionists have the answers? (don't be silly)

spintronic
wrote:

So
i'm
thinking
about
a
rocket,
and
how
0
mass
enters
a
black
hole.
And
then
it
occurs
to
me,
(again,
&
agIn).
You's
guys
*DON'T
KNOW*
what
you
are
talking
about.
You
cant
even
get
a
simple
physics
thought
experiment
correct,

Never
mind
a
thought
experiment,

Re: Do evolutionists have the answers? (don't be silly)

Re: Do evolutionists have the answers? (don't be silly)

show
the
maths.

I
doubt
there
are
many
people
here
that
would
understand
the
math.

Speak for
yourself.
Relativistic
theory is
quite easy,
mathematically
speaking.
But you are
correct, for
the most
part, most
of the
ignorant
evo-cheerleaders
in this
group know
nothing
more than
the fact that
they
believe in
evolution.–

So, do you agree with
spinny: A falling object
loses mass because
it's converting some of it's
mass into thrust?

Not thrust. A falling object loses mass
because it is losing
potential energy. It's a very small amount of
mass, but
nevertheless mass is energy, energy is mass.

Re: Do evolutionists have the answers? (don't be silly)

Re: Do evolutionists have the answers? (don't be silly)

No, a falling object in a gravity well gains energy in the form of
Kinetic Energy.

No, idiot. This is simply Newtonian stuff and you can't even handle it.
The energy is lost when the movement stops and is dissipated.

Correct, but while it moves it has kinetic energy.

Yes, and at rest it still has Energy of Position.

The object
has less mass/energy than when it started it's movement.

Oh good grief.

Nope. Wrong, as usual.

Naffoff and perhaps others may have failed to note that when an object falls towards Earth, the object gains kinetic energy and EARTH LOSES energy—— with the sum equal to exactly zero. Earth will fall towards the object as the object falls towards Earth, and, since Earth is rotating, Earth's rotation will slow down as the object approaches. This is true even when the falling object is a mote of dust, a planet, an asteroid, or a human jumping off a bridge because he cannot live in the same world where ignorant shit-for-brains fucktards like Naffoff and spintronic exist.

What a complete and utter retard.

Says NashtOff looking in the mirror.

That's the first time Naffoff ever wrote anything correct in talk.origins; he should gaze into his mirror more often.

Re: Do evolutionists have the answers? (don't be silly)

Re: Do evolutionists have the answers? (don't be silly)

Spincronic was talking of an object of 1Kg mass falling into a black hole. He had it start at an infinite distance (which was daft to start with) and then claimed that by the time it reached the event horizon of the Black Hole there would be no mass left – a totally ridiculous claim.

If a mass is "an infinite distance" from another mass, presumably the two masses would never meet.

Ignoring the expansion of the universe, the 1Kg mass doesn't merely fall into the black hole: the black hole also falls into the 1Kg mass.

Once in the black hole, the 1Kg mass still has 1Kg of mass unless it has reached relativistic speed in relation to the black hole.

What I don't understand (among an infinite other subjects I also do not understand) is: if the 1,000 gram mass approaches the speed of light it will gain mass, and the black hole must therefore lose mass and energy; how does that mass and energy escape the black hole to be imparted on the 1Kg mass? I assume if the black hole is rotating, its angular momentum would decrease: what if the black hole lacks angular momentum?

MIT's channel on YouTube has four videos on the subject, but I did not understand what the professors said.

As the object gained speed to reasonable proportions of the speed of light then its mass will increase, it gains kinetic energy from the gravity of the BH which it only releases when it impacts (if that is a valid concept) the BH. It can never reach light speed, because there is not enough energy in the whole universe to allow it to reach light speed.

Now do stop making yourself look even more stupid than usual by supporting Spintoxic, one of the few trolls more scientifically illiterate than you.

--

<http://desertphile.org>

Desertphile's Desert Soliloquy. WARNING: view with plenty of water "Why aren't resurrections from the dead noteworthy?" — Jim Rutz

.

Re: Do evolutionists have the answers? (don't be silly)