Fine structure constant: 137.9703144057 (derived earlier), B

Planck epoch: 1.6e-43 seconds after big bang

Modern (effective) structure constant, A: Wikipedia value

Golden ratio R

Visible light 560nm length = L

250 watts/m2 light = I

B = (4pi - 6)^R ^R

D = B^1/3

E = B^1/2

B^(1/mod(a)) \* D \* R \* planck epoch = current age of universe to within measurment error. Time variance of fine structure.

7.04773143E+20 photons of I per second

221,016,857.6448 times it's own wavelength squared

Times it's own wavelength again is 123.7694402811.

/B = 0.8970729741

.9 seconds is a natural unit where a photon hits its own wavelength every second B times.

>it's arbitrary

Try finding better units.

Avogadro number = Ag

B ^ R ^ 5 = 5.37757582E+23

0.8929674736 mol is a natural unit.

Carbon interatomic distance = 1.54E-10

Divide by lightspeed 1.94670427E+18

Light loses 1/8 its energy from collisions.

1.94^1.25= 7.27151621E+22

/mol = 0.1352192224

0.12130151 using natural second.

Times 12 = 1.45561812

Light hits every atom in 1.5 new grams carbon every second.

Quark radius 4.5E-19

Times lightspeed 5.97634915E+26

B ^ R ^ 5.25 = 5.81123966E+26

0.9723728508 times quark radius is a natural unit. This is 5.15883831E−19 meters.

Note that I didn't change the meter. If time and mass are natural length is irrelevant.

So far we've defined:

Universe age as a power of B

Time as 1 photon hitting its own wavelength every second

Gram as 1 photon hitting every atom every second

Quark radius as a power of B

This explains all the fundamental constants except force. Besides the quark all of these are macroscale things that are easy to measure.

Gravitational constant is arbitrary and has massive error.

Nuclear forces have no constants.

EM force is well measured. Using the natural units, light speed is 268,935,711.91081. Mass of a carbon atom is 1.85957397E−24 mols and mass of a proton-neutron pair is 1.54964498E−25 mols. Times 12 this is 1.85957398E−24 grams.

E = Mc2

= 1.34496323E−4 joules

Let's take two charges a quark radius apart. 5.15883831E−19 meters.

The SI math for two elementary charges is

F = k \* 1.60217663E-19 squared / radius squared

= 866,878,752.47165 N

Now we have to do dimensional analysis. Our mol is 0.8929674736 times normal and or second is 0.8970729741 times normal. Applied to newtons this is 0.718606574, so 1,206,332,900.138 newtons in our system.

Let's convert that relativistic mass to newtons. 1.34496323E−4 divided by the quark distance is 260,710,483,480,922 newtons. The ratio is 216,118.1904689.

B ^ 2.5 is 223,596.05400333, which is 3.5% off. This implies a smaller elementary charge, which makes sense as the measurement error is historically massive. This defines the electric force as the ratio of two elementary charges at quark radius to the relativistic mass of a proton-neutron pair divided by that distance. The ratio is 223596. It's how much total vs applied energy is present when two charges encounter each other at a short distance. The gas tank of a proton.

The system of natural units has the appeal of only being integer multiples of the fine structure constant, and also of always being 3-10% lower than the SI units. The SI alpha gets the quark radius wrong and offers little improvement otherwise, and gets the universe age 20% wrong.

So, A (alpha) is 137.035999084. The area of the unit circle minus six, to the power of the golden ratio twice is 137.9703144057. That's B. I'm just going by Wikipedia here, if anything is wrong then edit the page.

Now, the age of the universe from 1.85485866E-43 seconds (the planck epoch) is 4.4E59 units. One divided by A minus 137 is 27.7784845859. Let's call this D. B to the D is 2.75424650E+59, times the third root of B and the golden ratio is 2.30277937E+60. This guesses the current age of the universe with 97.9% accuracy. The rounding error on the cosmological estimates are about 1%, so this is expected.

As I understand, the universe is "a hexagon copying itself". Starting from a unit circle particles form a lattice and copy in two dimensions.

This structure constant defines epochs, and the time variance in the constant is such that it becomes 1/epoch. Then these structures copy themselves in 3 dimensions which leads to the other parameters.

Am I using significant figures correctly?

Physical constants are measured with low precision. 1 part per trillion is 50% error averaged over 30 particles. Each particle reduces the error by half so after 30 particles you get 1 ppt accuracy even though the actual measurement is awful and off by a factor of 50%, and if you are measuring more particles it gets worse. The "small" error bounds in physical measurements are enormous given how much averaging happens.

I gave my own explanation earlier. But the point is that physics is an ideal model and not a empirical science. You can calculate the ideal way fusion would happen and posit that as a constant. Defects in the universe and methodology will deviate from this so if you derive physics from pure math, and get a value that deviates from reality, reality is wrong.

Physics is easy, lesage theory etc. But empiricism is a poor test of physics because the question is why God made the universe, and his mistakes are just part of the measurement error and not that important. The fine structure constant is a hexagon copying itself and this is the basis for the other constants, and it doesn't matter if the empirical values deviate from this because to the extent they do they just reduce the efficiency of the result.

The gravitational constant equals the planck constant at a distance of one or two powers of the fine structure constant. It's scaled to the distance at which a quark can build structure.

The ampere is this force acting over one second on enough electrons to dislodge a single quark. The electromagnetic force is a cycle in the ether. Libs are too dumb to define cyclones but in meteorology the Fujiwara effect describes cyclones clinging and opposing each other and this explains the force. It just has to be average, and it's a coincidence all particles average to two integer charges.

With nuclear forces being fake- an artifact of gravity failing at the fine structure scale- and the gravity and EM forces defined as the scales at which quarks create information, the entire basis of physics is defined. Coupling constants can be ignored.

Errors in these are due to time variance and trivial factors.

The electron diameter is e-15 meters. This is e20 over the planck length. The planck constant is measured from photons bumping into each other, measuring the energy they produce for a detector and subtracting out temperature from internal collisions.

A unit sphere is 12.55, minus six to the golden ratio twice is the fine structure constant. A gas of matter in a circle forms a hexagon- like an organic molecule- then copies itself losing 1/n in two dimensions. This defines all structures- all structures are in a 137 ratio to smaller structures.

If photons are bigger, they collide less and impact the external world more, and this is interpreted as the planck constant, which is the minimum photon that is detected with human tools.

The masses of elementary particles are meaningless because bond energy. Gravity holds atoms together, not the strong force. The gravitational constant is e-11, and G times two proton masses is e-65 at 1 meter and e-25 at the atomic radius. A quark is e-13 joules which is e20 planck units. There are nine structure constant powers between a quark and a planck photon. These are the eight flavors plus a base. The flavors are up, down for mass, two charges, then antiparticles.

A photon travels between two quarks e27 or e13 times per second, if it follows a linear or oscillating path respectively. This averages toward the linear path to give the fine structure to the 9th power oscillations per second again. It takes a second for a fundamental particle to pass information between all its quarks.

Once mass, speed and distance are defined the elemental particles build up trivially from quarks.

The electron diameter is e-15 meters. This is e20 over the planck length. The planck constant is measured from photons bumping into each other, measuring the energy they produce for a detector and subtracting out temperature from internal collisions.

A unit sphere is 12.55, minus six to the golden ratio twice is the fine structure constant. A gas of matter in a circle forms a hexagon- like an organic molecule- then copies itself losing 1/n in two dimensions. This defines all structures- all structures are in a 137 ratio to smaller structures.

If photons are bigger, they collide less and impact the external world more, and this is interpreted as the planck constant, which is the minimum photon that is detected with human tools.

The masses of elementary particles are meaningless because bond energy. Gravity holds atoms together, not the strong force. The gravitational constant is e-11, and G times two proton masses is e-65 at 1 meter and e-25 at the atomic radius. A quark is e-13 joules which is e20 planck units. There are nine structure constant powers between a quark and a planck photon. These are the eight flavors plus a base. The flavors are up, down for mass, two charges, then antiparticles.

A photon travels between two quarks e24 times per second, to the power of .75 then to the inverse structure gives 1.35. This averages toward the linear path to give the fine structure to the power oscillations per second again. It takes a second for a fundamental particle to pass information between all its quarks.

Once mass, speed and distance are defined the elemental particles build up trivially from quarks.

The Geat Depression was fake. Calories fell a few percent, life expectancy rose because coal fell. Car production declined because the coal collapse freed up horses which went to consumers.

The unemployment was due to the huge growth in self employment, illegal small scale coal mining etc.

You were basically taught that this catastrophe for Jewish banks was real when it actually only affected a few areas of the economy and living standards actually stayed the same or improved.

Wtc was 1000c and holocaust ovens were more. wtc refutes holocaust

The point of vax is immunity isn't heritable. The smallpox killed natives thing refutes vaccines

Where did the idea originate that capitalism helps white supremacy?

Capitalism was originally used as an argument against it, see Malthus vs Marx. A concrete example being if cops genocide equally this harms K strategy. Marx was for, Malthus against. Malthus specific argument was that excess population (eg cops) would occur under equality.

So the entirety of politics is backward and in the 70s the left became Malthusian/environmental and this completely obscured the issue. Because the left both opposes cops and supports the excess population they are, communism is still white supremacy.

<https://web.archive.org/web/20210620225124/https://aviation.stackexchange.com/questions/87856/infinitely-large-airplane>

The US builds 30,000 miles of road or 750,000 acres a year. Scaling to population this means 25,000 acres in Los Angeles county. Double for other projects.

This means basically every parcel in Los Angeles would be road in 60 years. Not all these are seized with eminent domain but many are.

Is eminent domain really this extensive? What percent of land in Los Angeles county was ever seized?

There’s no math, it’s just obvious.

The betz equation says wind is 60% efficient and the rest damages the blade. Therefore wind can’t work because it’s easier to destroy than create.

As for the empirical consequences of this, consider that there’s around 1000 tons of material per mw. That’s 20% capacity factor 40 gwh over 20 years or 40 mwh per ton.

https://energyskeptic.com/2020/900-tons-of-material-to-build-just-1-windmill/

Now, concrete is 1 ton carbon per ton. That’s 10 mwh of oil.

https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/co2-emission-from-cement-industry-whats-best-estimate-claude-lorea

Now of course you’ll give some no u response and run away which is fine. So our eroi is now like 4:1. Throw in some maintenance expenses and wind turbines produce little if anything.

Wind turbines aren’t actually expected to last 20 years. They are upgraded frequently. So that already takes us down to 1-2:1 EROI.

We don’t know what the life cycle cost of a turbine is because until 2010 the industry was doubling every four years and able to hide this wall of death. Now that growth is 10% we are seeing decommissioning and other signs of failure.

But, you respond, why can’t we just be okay with producing wind at this pathetic EROI? Well we could, but in reality it comes down to business and basically the entire wind industry is collapsing anyway after the storm

There are 5 kg of co2 per square meter. That's about a inch. It is claimed a 1% increase of co2 raises temperature 1 degree or more, at 1 kw per square meter. Delta T between earth and space is 300K. That means we need a R value of .3 to insulate the earth. "Normal" insulation is around 1.

From [here](https://pmags.com/sleepings-pads-a-grounded-view) a R value of 1 insulates approximately a five degree difference. So we would need a 400% increase in co2 to raise temperature five degrees K.

Yet, climate models like IPCC require a ~5% rise in co2 for this. Converted to an R value this would mean co2 is 30 or more.

Why is co2 10-100x more effective as a insulator than in real life?

From [here](https://pmags.com/sleepings-pads-a-grounded-view) only the first few inches of insulation matter; it's like wrapping yourself in five feet of blankets versus five miles.

That means by diminishing returns doubling the co2 concentration has about 1 millionth the effect it would have in the first few inches.

You see the problem, diminishing returns make increased co2 useless as insulation for the earth.

Wind Turbines and Betz's Law

Betz's law shows that as air flows through a certain area, and as wind speed slows from losing energy to extraction from a turbine, the airflow must distribute to a wider area. As a result, geometry limits any turbine efficiency to a maximum of 59.3%. As a converse, 40% of the energy goes to waste or damaging the blade (in the ideal case; in reality more). Thus, wind turbines work by damaging themselves.

Gasoline engines work because heat tempers steel.

If this doesn't convince you wind turbines don't work, you can study their steel consumption. It requires around 400 tons of water to make a ton of steel. If it costs 10mwh per ton to heat something- imagine your home oven cooking a turkey, as a lower bound- then that is 4 gwh per ton of steel. A turbine might contain a hundred tons of steel and produce a few dozen gwh. Just on the basis of steel energy use the EROI of wind turbines is poor.

None of this is conclusive; perhaps wind turbines somehow sustain damage easier than they make it, although you'd expect it to be easier to destroy than to create. It simply shows how Betz's law demonstrates the Sisyphean nature of wind energy.

References

https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Betz%27s\_law

<https://www.wesa.fm/economy-business/2016-09-30/how-the-steel-industry-uses-billions-of-gallons-of-pennsylvania-water>

There is not enough oil to matter

World oil reserves are 2 trillion barrels. Of these, 20% each are in Venezuela or Canada, which are heavy oil. These are essentially useless; Canadian production doubled since 2000 and living standards were flat.

The Middle East countries, especially Saudi and UAE are investing in co2 EOR, also known as carbon capture. This is often considered a stupid idea but that is for another article. Iran is basically embargoed and doesn't care about liberals. This knocks out another 40% of global reserves.

Only 500 billion barrels or 14 years of production are even economically relevant or relevant to Co2. Given carbon targets are usually expressed in terms of decades there simply isn't enough oil to matter either in sustaining human existence or for carbon targets.

References

https://www.bp.com/en/global/corporate/energy-economics/statistical-review-of-world-energy/oil.html

https://www.globalccsinstitute.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/Slide-deck\_Building-Momentum-for-....pdf

The earths land to a depth of a mile is 1e19 barrels. That's a million times oil reserves. At a soluble fraction of 10% with 5% light products, and 20% of the earth being near fault lines there is 1e16 kerogen. This is the crustal abundance of carbon. Kerogen generates oil.

Saying reserves are wrong is equivalent to saying the crustal abundance of carbon is wrong. The earth is already entirely covered in oil and expecting significant reserve growth is enough for people to ignore your argument. It's physically impossible.

The USGS estimates kerogen reserves in the trillions of barrels. These are "economical" but the odds of ever using them are low, given they constitute a few percent of rock. This is simply mentioned to show reserve estimates are not made up; they are the maximum that could possibly fit in the earth.

References

Generation and migration of petroleum. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B9780123860316000059

<https://www.usgs.gov/centers/cersc/science/oil-shale?qt-science_center_objects=0#qt-science_center_objects>

How does society even function

If I go to a bank, and say I'm from the government an ask for money, they'll give it to me. They have no way of knowing. Government is just people doing things, it doesn't have any fundamental meaning.

Even if that's the fake government, if it becomes large enough it becomes the government. Nobody has a way to tell.

How does society even function?

Good article. Relevant, on topic. A few points

1. Abortion replaced infant mortality.

2. Life expectancy is mostly calories, and those improved because people moved into cold areas with resources. The Midwest, north China, France and India produce all the food. "Technology" was irrelevant, its just geography.

3. Railroad construction peaked in the 19th century. Economic growth is fake, it's just using existing infrastructure.

4. Physical stature of native Americans was taller than liberals. Living standards fell with the growth of liberalism.

5. Unrecycled steel production is 10% of what it was in the fifties. Cars and houses are less. https://economics.stackexchange.com/questions/39365/cars-and-houses-per-capita-vs-1950s

So yes, things are worse. Good job op.

Renewables are actually fail.

Say a wind turbine needs just a 10 meter foundation for a mw. That's 1,000 tons of concrete.

It costs 10mwh to heat a ton and concrete needs 2 tons water per ton. So 30gwh.

Your turbine makes 2gwh a year. It's useless.

Now if you raise the capacity factor, that just costs more. And it costs 1kwh per ton to even heat something 1 degree, and 1mwh to 1,000 degrees. And given steam has a hundred times more area the heat transfer equation means it loses 1mwh as water or 100mwh as steam.

And if you try to reduce concrete, your turbine is absorbing 2 mw at half efficiency so the 100m2 foundation against 1 meter per second wind is 20 kilo newtons per square meter per second. It doesn't matter if we use E glass or concrete because the Young's modulus is 70gpa and area is same.

So, after 3 million seconds (a month), we reach the turbine has deformed on itself by double its original length. Adding the blade and steel might make this three months. Assuming half goes to energy that's six months.

Just from basic physical equations the turbine is going to be totally destroyed after six months. This is if the wind is blowing constantly so at 20% capacity it might last three years. Then with maintenance that can be extended. Eroi is 1:5 unfavorable in that case. It's 1:266 with 200 tons of steel at 50% waste with 400 tons water.

You're living on the infrastructure of decaying liberals. Steel is 99% recycled, industrial civilization only exists at all because it built up the steel stock over centuries and is collapsing to contamination. Liberals will be physically annihilated.

Obviously this question will be deleted. The Young's modulus of steel is around 400gpa. Therefore an hour flight could only put around 400 gj per square meter on the aircraft.

During a turn the aircraft is putting its weight on the wing root. So this comes out to around 40 million tons per square meter over the flight or 10,000 tons per second. The aircraft might also be accelerating a few times gravity so the effective weight comes out to a thousand tons.

So the maximum possible weight for structural reasons is around the size of an an225 and anything else is physically impossible.

A wrongful death lawsuit can be nine figures. A local police department has less.

Since there are about 100 major cities in America which kill ~1000 police shootings per year, would police be unable to survive without qualified immunity? Obviously police shootings were neglible in 1960. It seems they introduced immunity because it's the only way they can even survive.

Why were the casualties in the gulf war so low and hard to verify?

America produces 1m barrels a day. A tank consumes a gallon a mile. They could support a thousand tanks out of the 100k vehicles supposedly.

They spent 5000 m30s to destroy 400 artillery. That's billions of dollars vs $40m. They lost dozens of $100m dollar planes. And with damage and everything the plane loss alone might be $100 billion.

America spent 10% of industrial production to defeat a country 1% of its size. And it didn't even win. America lost after 4 days and retreated. In the Iraq war they lost even with local support.

Why is the American military pathetically bad? Why did it lose the gulf war?

Wind energy fails because Betz's law. Engines only work by damaging themselves. Engines require external energy or pressure to work, and wind is uncompressed, so it can never work.

Pretend a gas turbine has a eroi of 10 at 30x pressure. A wind turbine has a eroi of 1:3 because it's doing the same thing without pressure. If you accept fossil fuel eroi you must accept renewable eroi, because it's doing the same thing just worse.

That's why all the arguments for renewables are self defeating because your proposing the same thing but lower pressure. It's air pushing on air. The air pushing on the turbine is the same as the air causing friction. There is no pressure to rescue this relationship. In a gas turbine all the gas is pressurized to go in the same direction so no drag. In a wind turbine there's no pressure. It's air pushing on air.

Solar has the same problem. The very act of collecting solar energy is due to weakening the bonds that hold the panel together. The reason photosynthesis works in nature is that it doesn't actually matter. It's just nutrients (eg phosphate, nitrate) being supplied as external energy so their bond energy can be used. These nutrients form on their own non-deterministically, ie, you can't force their production.

The mass of fertilizer in a plant root system, about 10kg or 1% volume, is greater than the dry mass of a plant. The plant is merely a product of chemical bond energy transfer at a 10/1 loss to the original mass. It doesn't generate any energy, it consumes it from the chemical bonds of the surrounding area. Photosynthesis is merely a way to consume the provided energy.

Engines require a gradient to work. You can't just use disorganized natural energy to create energy. It's air pushing on air or electrons pushing on electrons. It has no structure and can't result in anything.

Solar panels break chemical bonds to form other ones and are therefore a perpetual motion machine.

https://uploads.disquscdn.com/images/278c8201ebb258f9efabc415282500381c6cd138eadc003660d5314e0b9213d1.png

Renewable eroi is impossible because engines require pressure to work. Renewables are more ordered than the energy they use, therefore they work by damaging themselves. It's like using a Ferrari to go grocery shopping- the order of the producing equipment is more ordered than the energy you're utilizing therefore it can never generate net work. You can't increase the order of your own system using the disorder of another system.

Renewables are a perpetual motion machine, there is no thermodynamic gradient on which they would work, that's why the industry is collapsing and growing slower every year besides tax credit expirations.

Another example. Say a 100m2 turbine takes wind at 1m/s, 1000 tons. Air is 1000 cubic meters per ton so you replace the a ton of the turbine every ten seconds. It takes a day for the turbine to get as much wind as it weighs.

Then because gas is a thousand times less ordered in terms of energy density, you need a thousand days to generate order equivalent to the turbine. Then the capacity factor is 20% at a Carnot efficiency of 60% per betz law. So it takes thirty years for the turbine to even recover its latent information.

We have no evidence the battle of Stalingrad happens. In other areas of Europe there are German remains dug up- a few thousand, not many but enough to count. In Stalingrad we have nothing. Bone didn't go anywhere. Any shells or anything else lost during the battle should be there in abundance. Yet we have nothing.

Even for mamayev kurgan we just know it changed hands. We don't know the units invoked, their number, their ammunition, any first hand accounts, or anything at all. Literally all we have is the claim that it happens.

For the rest of the battle we have literally nothing. The entire battle is a propaganda creation and we have virtually no evidence it happened besides pow deaths. The battle was all pow deaths.

In reality using tanks and artillery is expensive so that barley ever happens. All that happens is pow deaths and civilian massacres and partisans and it's physically impossible for anything else to work. At least half the soviet casualties are officially mentioned as pow deaths and all the rest could be accidents and whatever. America took hundreds of wounded in the gulf war without even fighting. In older wars the accidents are much more because America only fought for four days. It's obviously take if the casualties are so low, like claimed in Ww2.

So wars are fake, they're just not even physically possible. We have bones from events thousands of years ago but almost nothing for Ww2.

Capitalism was never profitable. All the complexity of capitalism goes away when you realize all products are priced on oil, which is priced by opec or whatever.

OPEC has nothing to do with capitalism, it's just a interest group. Everything you pretend is complicated or rational is just garbage because in reality there was never a profit motive, and even if there was, if opec was rational it would just hold oil and kill everyone. Civilization only exists by accident. You guys are too retarded to function in real life.

For example there was some article about the economics of coal or steel or whatever. In reality nobody cares, capitalism was never profitable, and more cost just means everything goes into shortage. The supply shortages happening now are an example, car production is falling faster than steel because they are producing steel without caring about higher production chains.

Communism is a market economy. Ford ran the soviet car industry. Capitalism has never had shortages because it's never been challenged in any meaningful way. In the past America threw billions of barrels into the strategic petroleum reserve because oil was so utterly abundant and easy to find that it didn't matter. This didn't raise prices, or do anything at all, because pricing is just an interest group process and the only reason prices go up or down is that money is printed or destroyed, not anything relating to reality. If the cost to produce oil is negligible this is fine- for most of history oil was primary recovery and required no effort whatsoever to extract besides drilling a hole. Capitalism has never had to rationalize or think about how to drill oil until recently, and only because it now wants condensate and other useless products.

The only thing that actually matters is food, and agriculture was never profitable. Almost immediately once any kind of non subsistence agriculture started, it became subsidized. You pretend liberals are at least able to survive when in reality they require government to subsidize otherwise people would refuse to buy food and starve to death. Liberals only exist because interest groups force them to, otherwise they would spend on garbage and die. Food isn't priced at cost, it's basically free, it's actual funding is agriculture subsidies. Stores only sell food to get you in the store to buy other things.

GM only exists because of truck riders from the military in ww1. Take away military sales and the entire car industry would never exist. Consumer cars are just a accidental result of the military wanting cars to kill each other.

Cops are actually leftwing. Progressives created them, basically every democrat up to gore ran on a law enforcement platform. The CPUSA supported eugenics and other cop positions.

Even the far left supported cops and calling them anti police is totally ahistorical and something that emerged very recently.

The Zeno effect says that if you keep measuring a particle it won't change. This means that in the absence of measurement there is drag or heat breaking it apart and a symmetrical measurement stops motion in all directions and cools the particle.

So there is quantum drag.

Theres e18 tons of dirt in the earth to a depth of a mile. E12 lithium. 10% each is in plates, appropriate clays and temperature. That's e9 reserves. USGS gives e8 and a car uses a ton of it.

Giving everyone an ev is simply physically impossible, production is already collapsing for model 3.

Say it costs 1mwh a ton to heat something. Uranium is 1twh. Mining from seawater is impossible at 1ppm.

Take a 1 ton fiberglass block facing 5 meter per second wind. The wind has a density of 1 kg per cubic meter or 5 kg per second. It's kinetic energy is 100 watts.

Fiberglass has a Young's modulus of 70gpa. That means it lasts 700 million seconds or 20 years. During that time it has a 50% Carnot efficiency and produces 35 gj of energy.

To produce a ton of fiberglass you need to heat glass for fifty hours using a similar amount of water. Steam has a heat transfer coefficient of 1 kw per square meter per degree and a ton of it is 100m2. That's 100 mw for a 1000 degree furnace. That's 18 terrajoules.

The energy required to make a turbine is 500 times greater than the energy it produces.

Car engines work because they recycle. The crystal structure of steel evens out damage. You could deform a turbine and flip it the other way but steel evens the random damage.

Engines only work if they have pressure. Pressure makes the fuel more ordered than the engine. Otherwise the engine supports its own weight and requires a different material.

Glass requires fifty hours because it takes a second to heat and a Planck mass is e18 atoms. So e18 seconds is fifty hours. It's the time to build a structure.

A hexagon has six sides. Add half. This to the 1.61 power twice is the structure constant of 1/137.

Silicon is 327 kJ per mol bonding energy. The fine structure cubed divides that to .13 joules.

Silicon has a density of 1 ton per cubic meter. Planck mass is e-5 grams or e-11 times less. That's e-3.7 meters in a side. Or 1/5000. That's the length of a planck cube.

The mean free path in air is 34e-9m. In solids it's ten times less or 3e-9 because solids are a thousand times denser and we're taking the cube in three dimensions. Light is 3e8 meters per second. It travels 3e11.7 cubes in a second. Thats e17 free paths, or 3e5 paths per cube. A plank mass also happens to be 3e5 times less than a gram so light travels to every atom in a gram in a second. A fine structure constant cubed is 2.5 million.

Our .13 j per planck mass which is 1/5000 of a meter is 2.5 mj per square meter. Assume similar water to silicon mass. Water at 3000 degrees and 1kj per square meter per second per degree is 3 mj per square meter per second heat transfer. Hence the fine structure relates a gram to the heat released in a second by water, at the molecular decomposing temperature. Of course were only doing 1k degrees, but steam is 100m2 so the heat comes to 100mw.

It takes 2e17 seconds = 50 hours to make glass because a planck mass has that many atoms. That's 18 terajoules. Our furnace is 90% efficient so 1.8 tj.

Then the strength. It takes 1.8tj to make fiberglass as above, it breaks at 1/137 or 13gj. The Young's modulus implies half deformation from 70gj.

So it's vastly easier to destroy fiberglass than create it and the eroi of wind turbines is around 1:25 at 100% efficiency and 1:50 by betz law.

It's really simple to understand. It's easier to create than to destroy so any engine made out of non recycled materials will always fail.

CFC thing is fake. A typical catalyst loading for organometallics is a few percent.

Flourine reacting with oxygen simply creates oxygen diflouride, a single ozone could actually destroy multiple CFC. Dichloride has a lower enthalpy of formation than mono. Furthermore it has the same enthalpy of formation as ozone from o2 so ozone would always dominate.

Destroying thousands of ozone with a CFC is impossible.

Du is not tracked. Total American uranium inventories are 50kt plus nuclear weapons. That's about two years of consumption. Also mine production is falling pretty fast, Canada closed some mines.

A nuclear reactor needs to remove 300 Celsius heat from two thousand square meters per second. At a concrete specific heat of 1 kJ per kg per degree for a 1gw you need 1,000 tons to hold that heat for a second. The heat transfer coefficient of concrete is around 10 joules per square meter second kelvin. That means our concrete puts out around 6 mj, so we need about 500,000 tons of concrete. The thickness of the material is largely related to support for the cooling tower.

Concrete needs approximately two tons of water per ton. At 1000 degrees it loses approximately 1 mj per second. Heating it for three hours is 12gj, with water 36 gj per ton. The reactor concrete comes to 36 terajoules per thousand tons. Steam has a hundred times more area so 3.6 petajoules or 1,800 petajoules for the entire thing.

The reactor produces 600 petajoules over its life, so eroi is 1:3. Nuclear doesn't work.

The earth has e18 tons of dirt to a depth of a mile. E12 is uranium and e10 is useful isotope. 10% each is at correct temperature, depth and geography. That's an e7 uranium reserve which is nothing.

The energy to compress gas is

W = nrt ln (v1/v2)

Lng is a thousand times denser so the last term is 30. 1 kg of gas is 3kwh, or 1,000 mols. R is .1 liter atmosphere per kelvin mol. Temperature is 300 kelvin so the constants multiply to 10 million atmosphere liters. Thats 1 trillion pascal liters or, since a liter is 1 thousandth if a cubic meter and a pascal is 1 n/m, that’s 1 billion Newton times square meter, giving a work per square meter of a billion Newtons. The 1 kg gas occupies a square meter so you need approximately a gigajoule or 300 kw hour to compress it to NGL. In other words the EROI of natural gas is around 1:100. Some of the energy to pressurize it is regained in use. If this process is 90% efficient the eroi improves to 1:10, if we only need to pressurize it 10x lighter than solid it’s 1:1.

Natural gas is a virtually useless energy source when derived from gas, but once already pressurized its a sunk cost and can be used like any fuel

http://naturalgas.org/overview/uses/

If you doubt any of this here's a overview, 40% of natural gas is used by industry and other with oil being a big industry. Then industry uses 20% of electricity so the natural gas used to make natural gas is 45%. Natural gas is a third of total energy consumption so only 10% of all energy is net result from gas.

https://www.researchgate.net/figure/World-diesel-fuel-consumption-by-sector-1971-2015-Mtoe-million-tonnes-of-oil\_fig4\_335988107

Then something like a third of diesel used goes to "other", and diesel is a large share of energy consumption so these diesel generators at oil fields are a lot of that.

Only two countries claim to run on natural gas, Argentina and Nigeria. Argentina is a gas importer and Nigeria has gasoline generators everywhere.

The 150 comment is tongue in cheek but it's not totally absurd. The eia table I keep posting

https://www.eia.gov/dnav/pet/pet\_crd\_api\_adc\_mbblpd\_m.htm

Shows up to 70-90% of New Mex production may be condensate despite eia claiming around 5% in C+C. The eia more or less directly contradicts itself or is using a conservative definition.

Condensate forms a mile or so deep, see https://www.offshoreengineering.com/oil-and-gas/petroleum-geology/1-hydrocarbon-formation

Tight fields are also light fields because depth, temperature and porosity correlate. Thus tight oil is almost synonymous with light products.

As for the second question

A) Strippers is going to be the older, good wells producing 30-40 api. Deeper, expensive, newer wells are lighter, there's probably also an increase in heavy production but EIA does not even go back that far.

B) Alaska north slope is API 32. It is probably some decent oil, but production is obviously declining and it's also not going to save things.

C) GOM is pretty accurately recorded in EIA. It's about half tar (heavy oil) and half oil. "Averages" to 30 but is really half light oil and tar each. Nothing fishy going on there. I gave the volumetric reserve estimate and it's already been blown past. The initial ultra deep water boom was around 2010 and presumably by the time EIA starts recording API in 2015 they already depleted some of the early projects and have an increasing share of tar.

If you use only the GOM api 30-40 you get a very nice hubbert curve that peaked in 2018. The total collapse of the car industry and all these catastrophic events going on for years that everyone ignores stems from this and import quality declining.

D) Ethanol is the original, organic structure which created oil and now stabilizes tar and the corroded, biodegrarded heavy products. Shallower oil has worse biodegradation.

On an unrelated note the northern hemisphere has more salt domes because heat moves stuff north, to cold areas and salt helps protect oil in places it would otherwise degrade. Inert minerals like copper and gold stay put, but that's another story. Europe has all the resources because heat moved heavy elements there and it helped to create the North Sea salt dome to prevent biodegradation. Correct me if I'm wrong but the North Sea has among the largest salt domes in the world.

Back to ethanol, it has 47 api, while gasoline is 55-60. Ethanol is slightly heavier than gasoline but can still be used more or less directly because as explained it is the basic, undegraded, organic progenitor of all oil. Thus the refining need is minimal.

Heavy oil is undesirable because large share of residue. A petroleum molecule has about 10 atoms and refining breaks one or so, raising specific gravity 10%. Thus 40 API oil becomes 55 api gasoline, and so on. Light oil is undesirable because refining things makes them lighter and thus you never get gasoline. Also as an aside the aromatics of oil are what matter because you get energy breaking the aromatic ring. Extremely light products are also undesirable due to their tendency to boil and temperamental behavior. You can use natural gasoline- drip gas or 55 api condensate- out of the ground but it will trash your car.

So if you combine ethanol with tar even in a relatively low percentage you get something sufficiently stable to be called gasoline. Because America hasn't built a single refinery for decades and doesn't maintain its existing infrastructure, if you cut all the corners, use ethanol and every desperate thing you can get usable gasoline out of tar. America consumes 9m bpd of gasoline. 4m from light oil and 1m from imports. That leaves 4m barrels, and because combining 47 api ethanol with 25 api Venezuelan tar gives something you can pretend is a 36 API normal refinery input. You can mix approximately 1 part ethanol and 4 parts tar and still get a reasonable input.

Of course the EROI of ethanol becomes low, half of all corn production goes into it, and even if ethanol is only waste parts like the stem, that waste is supposed to build topsoil and loss of it will impair future farming. Furthermore the cost of transporting and storing corn is high. Nevertheless in the short term it does allow more oil to be superficially useful.

I don't like focusing on America but it has the best statistics so you can extrapolate to the rest of the world.

Liberalism is collapsing in a way that delays the collapse as much as possible, and makes it appear in other areas. This is accidental. The important industries are simpler. Cars have a supply chain, utilities do but only for fuel, food comes out of the ground.

Industry is 20% of energy consumption. Yet diesel is a third of transport. And electricity is 10% industry. All together industry is 40% of energy consumption. The economy can be mostly dead before anyone notices.

The car industry collapsed due to peak oil in 2018, with Light oil imports collapsing in 2024. Were already halfway there. Currently hardly any cars are made. The chip shortage is a minor problem. It allocates collapse between industries so cars die first.

The tech startup industry died by 2020. It was the first casualty. Then cars died, now there are NGL inventory deficits. NGL will be gone in a year, fairly soon. At that point utilities will go into deficit and there will be blackouts like are already in China. China was hit hardest because it also has coal grade peak to deal with.

There have been no ghawar projects since gosp in 2005. It's a dead field in drilling terms. Uae last tried tertiary production in Zakum in 2000. There haven't been any projects that matter in any oil producer. Chinese coal in Mongolia has been flat and they are restarting mines in other areas.

Temperature is just sunspot area lagged fifty years. It doesn't matter. God is making it colder to kill liberals.

In Africa calories fell after 2013. There's refugees and terrorism all over the place. Daesh will expand to cover that and all these things liberals pretend are separate events will actually cause refugees crowding into Europe and hasten collapse. In America everyone is fleeing to America, to the southeast where GOM is. The white flight in 2020 boosted the southwest, from illegal immigration, and the south due to GOM. The coasts and interior were population losers.

Liberals won't die all at once. In 2 years the utility situation will get ridiculous and lots will die of cold. In 3 years they will switch food for alcohol because it's easier to transport.

Hunter gatherers live at a population density of 1 per square mile. Agriculture is 3 if topsoil is gone. Since it's left maybe 10. That means 30/sq mi in America is possible. Then alcohol covers the 90% of energy needed to store food. So the current density can be supported at a subhuman diet. Nothing dramatic will happen, no war or anything. Like alcohol caught the soviet collapse it will catch the American one. Alcohol prevents starvation because it's easy to store. However health will stop improving. Either it will stagnate or millions of people will die starting 2024 and life span will be 30. It barely matters. Libs are annihilated.

The smallpox crap is fake. Most zoonoses are spread by birds and fish, land animals are less diverse and interact with those other things anyway. Also there's no smallpox gene and it's all made up.

>muh anecdote

There are many pox diseases besides smallpox, most are spread by birds and fish.

Reality is that native population didn't change and if it did change there would be obvious evidence like genetics, bodies etc.

The entire idea of education is fake. Relying on authority simply makes knowledge worse.

Poincare said the fact ether has e50 energy or whatever makes it fake. A swimming pool with 1000 tons at 300 kelvin has a terajoule of energy, but it's all lost in internal collisions and doesn't matter. Lesage theory is correct because the mere existence of energy doesn't make it transferred. Liberals object because the mere presence of someone with authority disagreeing with someone is enough to make them disagree.

.9 to the power of infinity is zero which refutes .9... =1. Evolution is fake, liberalism is an entirely performative activity where obvious things are missed because some authority didn't like them. This is the result of education- if you don't think for yourself you just use this eroding base of knowledge.

The industrial revolution happens because cold areas populated last. That caused coal and iron production in northern England to increase and similar changes in other countries. This created an initial fertility boom in Europe.

Over the course of the nineteenth century growth slowed down. By the 1910s food was scarce and this led to World War I. Despite what libs claim food politics was the main reason given for ww1 and the other discussion is just irrelevant.

Ww1 and the aspirin overdose (Spanish flu) killed people and brought population back down. The several percent of population that died delayed collapse for a substantial amount of time. By the 1930s the loss was made back up and food consumption was falling in Germany and elsewhere. 1930 was also the peak of German and American anthracite causing the depression.

Fascism is corporatism and not business corporation. Germany was the most urbanized country in the world at the time except England, which was more developed. There is no substance to fascism, it's just a continuation of Weimar policies or whatever was there first.

Because Germany was especially overpopulated due to import dependence, it had food problems first. In 1939 the German ration was 2700 calories with 25% imported. Wars are when calories per capita minus imports are below 2000.

Soviets also had food problems and demanded Romania, causing Ww2. Germans advanced to Stalingrad and caught tularemia. There is no evidence combat happened, soviets destroyed the city but only video games ever claimed soviet and German troops fought. In reality there were mass surrenders on both sides and the entire war was pow deaths.

Kursk was a minor event. The only significant battle after that was Berlin, which had only 45,000 defenders. All the casualties were disease and pow deaths and there is not even a claim that combat happened.

Germany kept West Berlin which was the good side.

All ideology is leftwing.

The French Revolution was an exception. But jews moved in immediately afterwards and funded Napolean or something as we have vague record of what they were doing.

There's no significance to Jews. It's only that the left supports equality because of interest groups, the initial example being Jews. The French Revolution achieved religious equality with no apparent beneficiary except them. The tax change also was to pay debt to creditors, and financiers like Cerfbeer held the debt.

So it's not that ridiculous to say that by "equality" the left means "Jews" and later a few other interest groups. And there are severs interest groups which are rich, healthcare being an example. Overall the real dichotomy is between interest groups, cops and so forth and everyone else. Fascism is just a paperwork thing, it's an early welfare state that can maintain a corporate structure. Corporatism is not business corporation. Communism is a 10/1 ratio of oil or coal to iron production, it's nearly irrelevant, saying fascism and communism were opposed is like saying communism and Trotskyism were opposed because Ww2 was soviets killing each other with minimal fascism involved.

One issue this blog doesn't address at all is biofuel. It costs 10mwh to make a ton of corn. It takes a ton to turn 20api WCS to 2mwh light oil for diesel, then that stabilizes 5x more heavy products. If the economy ran on heavy oil alone, used to produce ethanol, it would fail.

Currently there is a biodiesel shortage because lowering crude api and high growth in Canada and Iraq is increasing demand. Eia does not even track biodiesel inventory.

Another thing is diesel generators. America has 2 million trucks running 50k miles per year at 5mpg. That's 1m bpd diesel. Only 20% of diesel consumption is accounted by trucks and the rest is these diesel generators in oil and agriculture nobody talks about.

Dominant ethnic groups of Africa

Equatorial Guinea: fang

Guinea Bissau: Fula, balanta

Gabon: Fang, Shira

Namibia: ovambo

Eritrea: Tigray

CAR: gbaya, Banda

Liberia: kpelle, basa, Grebo

Congo: luba, Kongo, mongo

Sierra: temne, Mende

Togo: ewe, Kabye

Burundi: Hutu

Benin: fon, Yoruba, Aja, bariba, Aryizo, fulani, gun

Rwanda: Hutu

Guinea: Fula, mandinka

Zimbabwe: Shona

Somalia: Somalis

Chad: Sara

Senegal: wolof

Zambia: bemba, Tonga, chewa, Lozi

Malawi: Chuwa, Lomwe

Burkina: Mossi

Niger: Hausa

Cote: Akan, gur

Cameroon: bamileke

Madagascar: Malagasy

Ghana: Akan

Angola: ovimbundu

Uganda: Baganda, banya, basoga, bakiga

Kenya: kikuyu, Luhya, luo

Ethiopian: Oromo

Nigeria: Hausa, Yoruba

Not only is there no physical evidence for the battle of Stalingrad, there's not even written evidence. Even for gay American battles there are biographies and accounts. For Stalingrad it's all pow deaths. There are no sources for the battle besides journalists, and those just make vague claims that it occurred.

The battle of Stalingrad is like the Bible talking about the Jewish empire, which later archaeologists found was a larp.

Why were there no battles besides one from 1942 to 45? Why was Berlin defended by a few thousand old people and underageb&?

When does life begin? Anything with a nervous system is alive. This means animal experiments are bad, not only are they murder but also unscientific.

Meat is unavoidable and necessary. Cloning, issues about bioethics are meaningless. Only a normal organism with a real nervous system will ever exist and anything else is so complicated it would never happen or isn't worth talking about. This is the dilemma of bioethics, the entire idea of stretching to definition of life to absurdity makes the question absurd.

There are particular forms of life eg liberals which have no value, therefore abortion is justified in those cases. Abortion is libs bragging about exterminating themselves, just as cops kill each other and everything liberals do is of no consequence.

The only thing you need to know about Europe is gdp=tourism, at least in the south.

Albania was anarchy until 1997.

Armenians are analogous to jews.

Austria was once the largest oil producer.

Azerbaijan is Turks now.

Belarus has a giant soviet concert hall.

Belgium has nukes.

Bosnia has the tallest.

Bulgaria has not had any religious reformation like the others.

Croatia made music videos.

Cyprus was invaded by Turks and ethnically cleansed.

Czech Republic had hussites.

Denmark is night almost all the time.

Estonia was slaughtered by soviets.

Finland had illegal immigration to ussr.

France formed its state from genocide of religious minorities.

Georgia has a pipeline.

Germany has tourism in the south.

Greece got its iron from scythians.

Hungary was the only fascist state without secret police.

Iceland has steam.

Ireland has tax evasion.

Italy was formed by peasants thinking talia was garibaldis wife.

Kosovo has coal. It gets half it's gdp from Rita Ora.

Latvia has forest brothers.

Luxembourg is the descendant of European monarchy. Liechtenstein is the other half.

Malta survived Ww2.

Moldova is a puppet state of Russia.

Monaco imports all its labor.

Montenegro has a big tourist chapel.

Netherlands has a port.

Fyrom has st Cyril.

Poland resisted until the fifties.

Portugal is the smallest imperial power.

Romania has a palace.

Russia lost to Poland.

San Marino gets money from alcohol.

Serbia is glorious

Slovakia is the poor half that wanted to secede because of taxes.

Slovenia has artists.

Spain has Andalusia as a Catalonian vassal.

Sweden has telecom.

Switzerland is Templar's.

Turkey has a deep state.

Ukraine was scythians.

Uk didn't have tea before India.

Vatican was recorded as pedo by Mussolini.

Poor job op.

Historically communism was a 10/1 ratio of oil to iron production. Here are the figures for 1970.

Oil tons

Ussr 350m

Iran 190m

Algeria 48m

Angola 6m

China 30m

Egypt 5m

Coal

Ussr 770m

South Africa 100m

China 300m

North Korea 10m

Iran 1m

Iron (pig iron)

Angola 6m

Ussr 100m

Iran 500k

Algeria 100k

South Africa 5m

North Korea 2.5m

China 23m

Egypt 400k

Angola hit the ratio from growth. Cuba got it in 2000s. Kerala has it if you include trade.

Ratios

Communist

Ussr 10

China 10

Egypt 10

North Korea 4 plus aid

Not

Iran 1000

Algeria 500

Angola 1

South Africa 20

So it's a ratio, coal higher.

France was 10m coal in 1870 and 100k iron. By 1910 it was 30m coal 300k iron. Then it stayed around 1m iron and it crossed the ratio in the eighties but then the industry collapsed.

Germany was 1m iron 1885 40m coal, 10m/100m around the time of the german revolution, then iron crashed and coal stayed high. Uk was 1mt iron in 1880 and 200mt coal. It was 10mt in ww1 iron. It hit the ratio going down also but then the industry collapsed.

I made a bunch of excels with ethanol math explaining why everything is failing due to falling ethanol and biodiesel stocks- the pixie dust used to raise tar api.

https://i.ibb.co/6wY2qDY/D8-A85-AAB-D19-A-40-B8-8-FA4-75674-FE29-F18.jpg

There's a critical ratio here. 15m BOE makes 5m diesel. That makes 3m corn and 1m ethanol.

Ethanol api 50, but with better structure, tar api 25. Light oil is api 35-45 which is 50-80% residue.

1 refined barrel makes .2 diesel.

.2 diesel makes .2 corn.

.2 corn makes .05 ethanol.

.05 ethanol makes .2 light oil from tar.

.2 light oil makes 1 refined barrel.

Refineries have no awareness of any of this. The entire ethanol game delayed collapse by five years. Without ethanol it would be as simple as light oil died in 2021 and you're dead. Because ethanol allowed some medium grades it delayed things 5 years.

All Saudi production except ghawar, khurais, abaqiq is unconventional or soon to be. Kuwait and Iraq are heavy. Bazhenov has some heavy. Russia imports oil (???).

I made a separate ghawar decomposition, already posted

https://i.ibb.co/Tt87hsd/BCF2-DC54-47-E0-4-C4-A-8-BE1-AF79-BDF33-DFA.jpg

Ghawar is an old field and everything points to collapse.

Saudi production is a wedge between their own consumption and exports. I assume they keep light oil for themselves. That gives something like

https://i.ibb.co/SwtY9rd/6-C7-EFE2-F-857-D-4784-9794-A05867-D23698.jpg

So there are multiple wedges here

1. Light oil running out

2. Saudi keeping it for itself

3. The new expansions being heavy

4. The wedge between (1) and (2) tightening

And everyone dies in like 3 years.

I want to explain what's happening with the oil industry. I know you get a lot of emails but this one will tell you everything.

It takes 1 barrel oil to make 1 barrel food. America produces 5m bpd diesel, 3m corn and 1m ethanol.

50 api ethanol turns 4 units of 32 api crude or tar into 35 api light. Api 35-45 is the ideal range. 20% of oil has to be light.

The current average api of imported oil is 24. At api around 21 the math becomes unfavorable and society collapses.

The api superficially increased due to diluent.

Using the 4:1 ratio above 1 unit of ethanol makes 4 light oil. Then that light oil makes 5 products out of heavy oil. So a 5% ethanol requirement is need at a 32 api medium input. With a 20 api input we need 1 ethanol for 1 tar, for 5 products. With a 27 input we need 1 ethanol per 10 products. Currently the total refinery input of tar is around 7m bpd while ethanol is 1m. There's another 3m shale but that's useless because water cut.

So from this simple math, just averaging the API values, you get a certain amount of ethanol needed to raise the API. If you ask most oil experts they have no knowledge of this because the entire ethanol thing is just some interest group policy they got dragged into. But as heavy oil becomes a larger share of production less diesel can be made and based on current trends everyone dies pretty fast. Canadian oil too heavy, shale too light.

So this is really about your articles like

https://www.google.com/amp/s/www.nasdaq.com/articles/canada-crude-heavy-crude-discount-narrows-trans-mountain-pipeline-temporarily-shut-down%3Famp

The reason canadian crude is being rejected by refineries is that its too heavy and useless. It has become too large a share of inputs for ethanol to work, as well as natural gas and other blending components. So now society will collapse rapidly as diesel cannot be made from tar.

You'll probably just file this away somewhere, but if you end up in total confusion this is the reason.

>>352605812

When refineries buy oil, they don't buy WTI. They send a truck with technicians to a well and do testing and make sure it's real, and truck back the oil. WTI isn't used by any serious refinery, the price refineries pay for oil is higher than the oil price in the news, and it's all these custom arrangements that don't come out of the official oil trade.

I have no idea where WTI goes but it's just a investing benchmark, the total end user volume on WTI is about a million barrels a day without the HFT and other noise trading, and it apparently gets exported.

America produces 10m of the 25m bpd of global gasoline while consuming a quarter of the oil. It's possible these light products being exported are thrown out and never used to make anything.

Total world consumption of gasoline, kerosine and diesel is 70m bpd and the other third of global production could just be wasted.

There's 20,000 jets in the world consuming 100 barrels per day if they flew all the time. The global jet fuel production is 3m bpd. Some of the fuel is probably overstated and wasted.

Capitalism appears zero sum. Take this example.

Company has 1 dollar. Worker has 0.

Company pays worker 1. Then worker buys stuff for 1.

Company ends up where it started and therefore has no reason to trade.

Even besides being zero sum, the company will always lose money, because any funds that aren't spent are lost. If worker spends .9 then company has less money than it paid in wages.

The only way the system could have positive cash flow is inflation or some similar accounting error. The market loses money to inflation when you do the math correctly.

So what I'm asking is simple: is capitalism zero sum mathematically?

Dozen score years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent, a new nation, conceived in Liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

Now we are engaged in a great peak oil, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We gaze on inventory data of that social collapse. We have come to dedicate a portion of that data, as a final resting place for those who here gave their lives trolling 4chan that that illusion of normality might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this.

But, in a larger sense, we can not dedicate -- we can not consecrate -- we can not hallow -- this data. The brave libs, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished social collapse which they who fought here have thus far so delayed. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us -- that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion -- that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain -- that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom -- and that government of the people, by the people, for the libs, shall perish from the earth.

Let's say elon musk sells all his stock tomorrow. That's absurd, he sold 10% of it a few days ago and it destroyed the price.

The realistic limit of what billionaires have historically gotten away with seems to be around 1% their net worth per year.

Ok, so musk makes $100m after taxes. But then where does he put it? Banks will not let you exceed 250k in a checking account. I've tried it. So he gets a line of credit or something. But those last approximately ten years, and if banks ever perceive his wealth as declining, they will not roll over the debt. What happens then? Does he just get stuck with the 250k in his bank account going to collections?

Basically what I'm asking is, what is the actual liquid worth of these guys? If I sue elon musk, and he has to pay a lawyer using his actual net worth, and his liability insurance (which usually caps at a million dollars, even for big policies) runs out, what is he left with? Could I match his legal spend just with fairly low net worth due to him not actually being able to access anything?

Also, it seems like the property taxes and everything actually fall within this. Bill gates has a property tax of $1 million, which seems doable with a spouse and friends within the retail banking cash limit. Is the reason these guys only spend .1% of their wealth on homes, and the rest of their business (blue origin, spacex etc) is investor owned because they can't afford to maintain it?

China ran out of RE and is clamping down on all the tesla stuff.

Since this blog doesn't discuss the total social collapse due to peak oil, I'll add it here. Aramco inventory is annihilated. Furthermore, when you see stats like "Germany is increasing coal consumption", they don't actually run a meter in coal plants and count power. It's impossible because the electricity system is a network, any power flowing through it is an aggregate and can't be further divided.

This is why we get illogical results like China growing 30twh of power last year but growing 70twh of wind thus resulting in all sources of power growing despite a total amount greater than the aggregate amount. They would have to multiply the heat content of coal by tonnage, and content falls over time so they overstate coal production.

Abortion replaced infant mortality. Also libs don't seem to understand the concept of life expectancy. People born before Ww2 had good life expectancy and bad life span.

When they say life expectancy increased that's because mass mortality events (Ww2, COVID) make the total 20th century life span similar to ancient times when you do the math correctly.

So the question is, is there a diff between life expectancy and span?

Here's a amusing anecdote, has nothing to do with the question but I'll share it.

https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Life\_expectancy#Life\_expectancy\_vs.\_maximum\_life\_span

>] Studies like Plymouth Plantation; "Dead at Forty" and Life Expectancy by Age, 1850–2004 similarly show a dramatic increase in life expectancy once adulthood was reached.[156][157]

This just seems factually wrong. The 1840s cohort died in the civil war. Then the period 1870-1914 didn't have any wars but males born in the 1880s died in ww1. Then the 1920s cohort died in Ww2. The 1950s cohort is dying in COVID. So it proves the point that life expectancy hasn't changed except in the most superficial ways.

This is a really obvious conclusion, truly this blog doesn't have anything to report.

As for peak oil, well that's pretty obvious. Aramco already cut production and is taking stuff out of inventory. By June that will be gone.

I originally extrapolated Aramco would cut in February 22, in reality they cut in early 21 and the rest is inventory. Libs are being physically annihilated.

China is the obvious one because it has coal. China is having 30% vegetable inflation. Of course this blog doesn't have China articles anymore because it's so obviously collapsing.

In Germany restaurants are obliterated. This wipes out a lot of calories and reduces the countries to almost a third world level. Libs don't have any awareness of this but it shows up as mortality.

In Germany 10% more people died than last year. Libs don't really get why this is happening but it's totally expected from the falling energy production and resulting business closures and lack of food. If that continued the average life expectancy by the end of the decade will be 40.

German statistics say LE in 2020 fell .3 years for men. We will not have stats for 2021 until late next year. The trends aren't obvious because of the calculations. If everyone dies age 80-85, then everyone 85 dying only lowers LE 1% despite deaths growing 20%. Then as this continues by 2025 everyone age 80 dies and LE only fell 5% despite deaths doubling. Then in 2026 a 10% increase in death is a seven year loss of life expectancy. Once deaths breach the threshold where young people die the change in death rate is far more consequential.

Race is a leftwing position. The original argument for race was that blacks don't control their actions and thus deserve help. Darwin, engels and so forth created race.

The argument is that this somehow causes hierarchy, but that's stupid, the question of which race you support is separate from the reason why differences exist. Race is always a leftwing position, even if we take the "neo nazi" (neo Nazis are just 1940s allied) position, it's just acting in the interest of a particular group, it doesn't say anything about the allocation of resources inside that group.

And just demographically, racists are leftwing, because they are an interest group (usually neets and IT subhumans). Because they are such a concentrated interest they need government to protect them from other groups (in the form of police control and other leftwing ideologies). Because police are lumpen, they are leftwing by definition.

And this doesn't even relate to hierarchy. The idea that race exists doesnt relate to which race is better. It's a totally accidental fact that the belief in race happens to also disadvantage a poor group. If it was the opposite would it be leftwing? This is why defining race as hierarchy is meaningless, the belief in race is pretty much unrelated to relative status of individuals in a race. So the hierarchy definition can't be linked to race.

The only thing that matters is whether these differences are caused by controllable factors or not, and resolve on their own, or if welfare is needed. Therefore race has to be leftwing, in fact even white supremacists supporting police is actually just creating jobs for the zog functionaries who are of other races.

So basically race is leftwing, no matter how you cut it, and the left supporting healthcare or whatever also supports the rentacop interest group that overlaps with white supremacy.

[![enter image description here][1]][1]

[1]: https://i.stack.imgur.com/xO805.jpg

Life expectancy increased between ancient times and today due to "modern medicine". What does this mean?

In 1900 half the causes of death (senility, accidents, nephropathies, cvd, gastrointestinal infections) were nonspecific. Of the rest, heart disease and cancer did not change. Other diseases were added which seem to be redefinition.

Only three seem to have changed (diphtheria, tb, flu). A working flu vaccine still does not exist. The TB vaccine was a well known failure. No treatment seems to exist for diptheria, and the evidence for a diptheria vaccine is spotty.

So what actually was specific to modern medicine which caused these diseases to decline? Did abortion simply kill individuals before they could acquire these diseases?

I am gathering physical evidence for the battle of Stalingrad. One thing I noticed is the extremely small number of destroyed buildings. There are only a handful of such examples, in a city of hundreds of thousands. It seems strange there is a lack of shell craters, ammunition, bodies, explosives, and bullet holes given those things are pretty obvious in European countries from some past wars.

I also looked at the graves. The total graves on mamayev kurgan are a few thousand, not necessarily those who died in combat, and overall it just seems an extremely small number given the size of the event.

What is a "normal" level of physical evidence for a major battle that killed millions of people?

4 pi is 12.55, minus 6 is 6.55, to golden ratio twice is 137

This will of course be deleted immediately. The fine structure constant is derived as follows.

A unit sphere has a 12.56 area, make a hexagon and get 6.56. Then make copies of the hexagon getting smaller in proportion each time. This is 6.56 to the golden ratio twice. The result is the fine structure constant.

The value is 137.6 at low energy. The 137.0 value is the laboratory measurement at 1 ev.

So I just derived the entire basis of physics. But of course, stack exchange has no interest. The fine structure constant is just a hexagon copied on itself.

Pol is legitimate retards and will not understand this, but I will post anyway.

Politics isn't supposed to be liberals versus conservatives. Conservative ideology doesn't exist, it's a placeholder for whatever disagrees with your opinion. Democracy inevitably becomes a one party state because liberals are the only organized side and conservative politics never existed.

Capitalism isn't an organized, intentional system. It's something that happened pathetically by accident by technicalities like cops assuming poor people have drugs. Nobody ever intended property or capitalism or exist, those things are completely accidental and the only people defending them are Mises.org and retards on 4chan. When someone defends capitalism, they're disagreeing with a particular aspect of your position, they're not defending a specific system called capitalism because that never existed. Some of what you call communism overlaps with your definition of capitalism, because it's just a rhetorical stance, the null hypothesis.

This is why natural law and other lib concepts are meaningless because nature isn't capitalism, it's just whatever libs decide to do, and it's libs creating artificial rules and ideas. However, they perceive themselves as fighting this organized, intentional entity called conservatives or whatever, but that doesn't exist, it happened on accident and often due to their own actions.

The left is the interest group party. The debate is supposed to be within liberals, within different interest groups. The only reason this doesn't happen is that liberals are too incompetent to see contradictions within their own interest groups and instead see the enemy as generic instrumental obstacles like "conservatives" because their thing never developed to the point where these contradictions would matter.

This is why racism is leftwing, it's race based medicine or whatever, racism is originally a progressive policy based on eugenics and social engineering which the left forgot about but still does. The rightwing policy is to simply not care and allow cops to die so it all collapses.

The conflict between racism and anti racism is supposed to happen within the left, not between the left and right, because the right is just whoever disagrees with your opinion and has had different positions hoisted on it. Everything rightwing now is leftwing a century ago, you're just all retards and don't know history.

So your entire frame of debate is meaningless. It's not left vs right. It's the left developing to a point where it even matters, like this bizarre vaccine hierarchy, and then you realizing you were retards all along and never defined your position.

There's a few undeniable facts about history.

War victory = iron

Crime = density

Population = rainfall

Fertility = density

Gdp = tourism

Communism is a 10/1 ratio of oil or coal to iron production.

Wars are calories per capita below 2000 minus imports.

All of history is explained by these six sentences, there is no further point in discussing history.

Your haplgroup studies are only accurate to a decimal point. You have 100 ancestors, 1 is 10% black, your study claims you are 100% white. It's silly. The fact that you have any black ancestry at all means you have trash tier white genetics, but you record yourself as 100% aryan.

"Genetic distance" is a cope. Haplgroups are based on faulty assumptions, like there is no recombination in chromosomes. That has all been confirmed to happen, just in a different way, like transposition. Population genetics is largely retards and you never hear these limitations.

In reality it's mathematically impossible for anyone who lives in america for a few generations to stay white. Even if you are .1% black, having a few of the thousands of "low iq" genes you claim exist instantly tanks your entire iq.

I just want to note how dumb video games are, especially turn rates of airplanes. Here's a example.

Young's modulus of steel is 100 gpa. A f 14 wing is 200kg. That's a modulus of 20 tpa. A 1% deformation is bad. So 200gpa is about as bad as it gets.

The wing root is 10 cm and wings are 10m. The root is 1% the wing so it's really 1% of the deformation or 2gpa.

10 G is 10k KE times 200 weight or 2 mw. That's about 15 minutes it can sustain a turn.

Now the turn rate. A 10g turn is 100 m/s. The plane is 10 meters from center of gravity which is about 5 meters tall so this is a 200 m/s acceleration at the nose or wingtip.

Air is about a kilogram per cubic meter. The wing is about 30 m2 or 5 kg per m2 per side because each side is being dragged or pushed. Then towards the tip it gets thinner, maybe 1-2kg. That's 200 kg of air per kg of plane, per second. The air has 40kj of kinetic energy per kg. That's 10 mj of energy per kg of plane. That kg occupies about 100 cm2 so it's 100 mj per m2. Or 100 mpa.

Then with a 100 gpa Young's modulus and 1% deformation we can tolerate 1 gpa of force. That's about ten seconds of turn, which is about the time needed to do a 180 degree turn.

The 6g structural limit given by Grumman is the limit of what it can do to complete a full turn. It's implausible to turn a plane like in dcs, the air hitting the wing would break the plane.

All replies will be ignored as this is a retard board.

Rules

Adenosine stuff has more mass in nh2 stuff

Cytosine has less complete rings

Thymine has more oxygen

Earlier molecules more effect

For example, the structure of the GNRH protein is defined. It's a specific sequence of amino acids, it's known.

Yet if you look at the gene that creates gnrh, it has no relation to this known sequence. The idea of a stop codon is especially absurd because the stop codons TAG, TAA etc occur constantly in many genes and the gene keeps going on like nothing happened.

Likewise the GH hormone is incredibly vague- it has "about" 190 amino acids- and it's hard to find the structure on the internet. The code for the growth hormone gene in the fasta file is surprisingly small and has no relation to its structure.

Is it a myth that specific genes code for specific proteins, in a controlled way, and if not can you give a example?

Only two battleships were ever sunk by air attack, and those are design flaws/torpedo nets. If Yamato simply dispersed its ammo then it would not sink.

Any Ww2 battleship would easily defeat any modern navy. There are no missiles that will do anything to a battleship. There are bombs, but like I said it takes a lot of those, at a close range, to do anything. The only reason bombing works is in stupid situations like all the ammo is in 1 unprotected place. Otherwise battleships are indestructible for anything besides another battleship.

Battleships went away because it's impossible to make solid steel objects. What's called steel today is scrap and useless. Living standards peaked in the 19th century and ever since then steel objects are getting weaker and smaller.

The reason carriers were prominent in Ww2 is that japan had very few battleships and used them incompetently, and even if it didn't america had more battleships anyway, which is the real reason it won.

Armored land vehicles, tanks and so forth on the other hand are very slow and impractical. Modern MBTs are crippled by air filter problems and aren't used in real life. America lost the gulf war and ran away in 4 days. Iraq just surrendered and didn't care. On land, armor is useless and slow. At sea it's indestructible, the only problem is modern navies have no steel and can't build them.

Genetics is fake. Evolution is also fake for that reason.

There's no gene that codes for a specific protein. Genetic disorders are vaguely defined and there's no specific body part that constantly and always malforms from a mutation, it's all just made up. Biology isn't a science. It's a bunch of simplifications and guesswork that happen to be useful sometimes.

When you say, for example, that testosterone causes muscle growth, what scientists call testosterone is really a jumble of unrelated molecules, which have some fat or something that causes muscle, and the neat diagrams in textbooks for chemical structure don't exist in real life. Chemistry is a approximation, in real life only parts of it are true.

You can remove dna from a organism and put filler there, and it will work fine. This is called XNA. Babies don't form from genes. The mother has a neural connection with parasympathetic nerves in the umbilical that forms the fetus. It's even proven that language is learned in the womb.

Evolution is fake. There's no specific gene that codes for a specific protein. In reality every animal has the same body plan with same number of digits and organisms develop convergently, there is no "reason" things happen.

Scientists have created genetic knockouts with crispr and they don't... work. Genetic disorders exist but healthy genes are inert filler and do nothing.

Here's a quick pro tip about human society.

There's only a fairly brief time in history where libs are even able to exist. Labor participation was increasing in america until about 2000. Jobs existed, boomers prospered.

The economy isn't creating jobs fast enough for libs to actually survive. For one thing, Hispanic employment is higher. For another thing, capitalism is subhuman by its very nature- whatever group isn't adapted to the climate prefers cities, and builds ethnic networks to take over. These networks are mostly poltards, which is why pol is obsessed with race.

Obviously this is unsustainable as you quickly end up with a situation where libs lack any kind of job. Evictions collapse and bureaucratic obstacles are added as libs aren't actually able to survive.

Even this part isn't really sustainable because if there is no rent then the entire edifice of liberalism collapses. Money exists because of taxes. If there is no rent, taxes are unpaid, and everything goes into foreclosure. As a result the absence of rent leads to virtually immediate communism.

Then communism causes libs to die immediately. The amount of stuff that's unaffordable, or just plain doesn't exist will immediately kill all of them.

4chan - or rather, mutt subhumanity - represents the lowest form of human social organization. This is liberalism at its peak. Urban liberals, larping as something else, demanding to slow the collapse of capitalism they depend on to survive. None of them even have the reading comprehension to understand what is happening.

Even in the countries which did have negative population growth, the cattle population is falling, and without protein you die of disease. Ethanol and other things crimp feedlots.

You will all die, it's great.

Is there any position leftwing now that wasn't rightwing 100 years ago? Besides economic positions.

>religion

Social gospel, the left was favorable to religion, even Marx didn't have any real opposition to religion just capitalists using it.

>race

Eugenics, progressives, imperialism were all left positions.

>gun control

Marx opposed it.

>feminism

Feminism meant voting rights, it didn't carry all the other issues it does now.

>global warming

Wasn't an issue but Soviets supported oil and opposed environmental.

>drug laws

Created by progressives.

Besides economics every single left issue became rightwing, because the interventionist social positions just became less popular.

Take GNRH, for instance. The chemical formula for GNRH is known and given on Wikipedia. The FASTA file for the relevant gene is also available.

Yet, the chemical formula for GNRH has nothing to do with the gene that codes for it, and there is no apparent way the code could produce it.

Does any protein actually match the code of the base pairs that code for it? If not, is there any worked example of the base pairs coding for mRNA to make the protein?

As an aside, there is something similar to growth hormone - T cells have a similar structure to the growth hormone molecule, and growth hormone itself is just a guanine and thymine overlaid with each other. But the GH gene is not like that.

Cold winters theory is proof white Americans have lower iq than sub Saharan Africans.

Africa has the worst climate of any continent. Europe has the easiest and most mild climate. Europe is all by sea with a constant annual temperature, there is no need to prepare for winter and europe requires the least iq of any continent.

Because Africa has the lowest crop yield the winters require more preparation and central and Eastern Africa have the largest temperature variance in the world, temperatures go from hot to freezing in a single day.

So the fact mods even allow cold winters theory to be discussed is proof of how worthless this board is.

The cold winters theory, race and whatever are hilarious. It's not about their specific arguments, it's that from their entire goals and assumptions are wrong.

Being able to apply technology and build civilization are a low form of intelligence. You could train a bird to build a jet engine, in fact industrial robots that do that are at a bird level of intelligence. It takes very little intelligence to merely operate existing infrastructure and produce goods.

The next argument is about design, and invention. But design is essentially random, you can design anything through trial and error and it's not a sign of intelligence. There are eight year old children who design airplanes and equipment. Using the age adjusted iq that libs use, you need an iq of 40 or 50 to design even high technology. Another argument is iq is impulse control, but that's irrelevant and plenty of scientists were total morons and borderline murderous.

It doesn't take any intelligence to follow directions, to use trial and error, and create civilization. The "supply side" of intelligence isn't constrained in any meaningful way. At some point intelligence is just ability to answer trivia questions and do party tricks, and that point is reached fast as nothing in the real world is difficult. Any complex task becomes meaningless.

What really matters is the entire assumption and goal behind behavior, not the difficulty of performing the behavior. Smart people kill themselves, survival is a negative value and a sign of low intelligence. The fact 4chan sees otherwise is proof this forum is one of npcs- in fact that's the exact definition of npc, you are stuck at the iq 40 or 50 point where being able to design or use technology is even a problem, as opposed to the goal of using it. It's this belief that existence, survival, technology and progress are a positive value that is a sign of intelligence, and not pointless, is what defines NPCs. Npcs themselves are too stupid to understand anything in this post anyway and will give some one line greentext reply.

Another level of misunderstanding is that intelligence is a sign of civilization. In reality civilization is R strategy, it's low quality, low intelligence behavior. Being more successful at civilization and external things that don't benefit your own physical strength and health is a waste of time. It is only to create a synthetic environment for more low quality offspring.

A last, final misunderstanding is that civilization \*is\* the K strategy, or that civilized people are healthier, stronger or whatever and militarily defeat the uncivilized. As if, say something like the defeat of the native Americans by libs is proof that libs are better.

In reality that is wrong and gets into tedious details. Natives were already civilized. The eastern native Americans were farmers, were living at a high population density and simply didn't have iron. The western native Americans are still there and never left. They became redefined and moved into other groups. It's just that europe had overwhelming numbers and resources and won, the fact they were civilized is incidental, even if Europeans came over with crude iron clubs and rafts they would still win.

Then the belief that life span and life expectancy are the same- like how the Ww2 cohort had high expectancy and low span- is another belief. And then life expectancy itself being a marker of health is another. As if the old, decrepit people today are comparable to hunter gatherers. Modern societies have a hundred times more people, but removing all the old fat people who aren't physically fit, the real population has barely changed. Bone can easily be stronger than steel, none of the weapons libs used are especially lethal.

There will never be a chance to test this out, as apes are overpopulated, all the situations where civilized met hunter gatherers were very late in history and they were already R strategists and malnourished. But a real hunter gatherer, with a 3g/cm3 bone density would easily stop bullets and kill any liberal. The apes and the things that came before humans would be invincible at that density, a nuclear bomb airburst a thousand feet away is a petajoule, or 30 gigajoules pee square meter. A punch from a primordial ape, weighing a ton and traveling at 30 meters per second is a mega joule, or maybe ten per cubic meter. Being punched a hundred times by a ape is more force than a nuclear explosion.

It can be seen here that in no way is civilization a reflection of intelligence. Civilization itself is a R strategy, needed for the survival of low quality offspring. In terms of survival or military strength, civilizations are only accidentally powerful, because if the things nature creates happen to be defective or not yet evolved then weapons appear stronger. In reality civilization will collapse from resource depletion and its own stupidity, and any argument for, or relying on the supposed of intelligence of civilization is in fact a defense of the npcs which constitute it.

Now give your retarded reply, or none at all.

You realize Saudi is collapsing and you'll all die in 6 months.

95% of oil produced in the world is fake. Look at eia imports for api 35-45 oil. Diesel is 30% efficient and 30% of fuel, and biofuel adds some. So 10% of the total fuel supply is real and it's held up by ghawar.

Ghawar built GOSP in 2005 with a 20 year life. There are no new developments in any light oil field, and shale is useless. OECD oil inventory is 20% of annual consumption and has fallen a fifth since last year. Then fujairah adds a similar amount. Only diesel inventory is falling, so all these values are 3x greater in the real oil supply.

So if 10% of production is on inventory, that's 30% of light part. Ghawar peaked in 2018 and dies 2024 so that's 15% fall per year. The 30% decline we see is in line with that.

If they were to use the oil they were producing now, consumption would fall by a third and the 3000 calorie countries would go into civil war. America would fall to 2600 calories, like Russia. By the end of the year you'll be in third world living standards, and by next year you'll starve.

It’s rather impressive how all this sites predictions are failing and mine are working. Of course this site knows nothing about economics and is too dumb to make predictions, but you still fail.

Oil inventory continues to collapse. At this rate inventory will hit zero in six months and American will starve by 2025.

Millions of Indians and Chinese already dying. This site is nothing but Chinese propaganda, you ignore the obvious reality of peak oil.

This board will continue to mindlessly spam liberal propaganda, and delete all comments, until you all starve.

Iraq was a good military in 1980. It had one of the largest air forces, had decent tanks, and was building its own equipment. Iraq upgraded its type 59s with more armor which is more than most countries could do. It also was working on a missile program.

After years of war, sanctions and debt, it sucked. The Iraqi military in 1990 was mostly inoperable worn out equipment, combined with not having any domestic refining capacity and being totally dependent on imports. Iraq tried to build oil refineries in caverns to protect them from air strikes but it was not very significant. Israel supported Kurds which caused the wars.

America waited for Iraq to use up the little supplies it had. A 500k daily barrel refining capacity is maybe 100k diesel. A tank burns a barrel an hour. Combined with all the equipment they could barely run a hundred tanks, and their Air Force had no fuel at all.

Logistics crippled the Iraqi military, had it had new equipment, refineries, and supplies it would have done ok, although it was out numbered. Even then it's mig 25s hit an eagle and killed a hornet, and it also killed a f 16 that isn't recorded over Baghdad. This is claimed as a unknown or as a SA 2 kill. The Saudi eagle that crashed "accidentally" after Samurah might have been a kill.

I'm pretty sure that the two identical incidents of f 15 kills on the first day of the war are a duplicate, and they were actually Iraqi friendly fire. A mig 29 pilot was trained to hold down the fire button and go in dogfight mode and killed his wingman and crashed on takeoff. The lack of pilot training was a symptom of equipment, nobody sane wanted to fly if they would lose anyway. This is what "pilot training" means, if you're going to lose anyway nobody competent will fight.

There were still aspects of things that Iraq did well, like scuds. If Iraq had as many scuds as america did tomahawks it would kill a lot. Even if again it didn't really care about accuracy, for scuds, accuracy doesn't matter.

About 70 warthogs had some degree of damage in the gulf war. 170 were deployed. Of those not all flew, maybe 50% readiness. Warthogs we're torn up really badly by Iraqi air defenses and america never used them against Serbia or the Taliban very much. The warthogs were the only planes that did anything, the falcons bombed power plants, office buildings and large indefensible civilian targets.

On the ground america lost multiple Abrams at Medina ridge it claims were friendly fire. Iraq mostly surrendered as it had no supplies. The one time it did resist was Medina, and Americans changed their objective. The original goal was to advance into Iraq and seize the rumailah oil fields. That failed and TF 1-37 left Iraq and went to Kuwait. Kuwait itself had no American involvement in its liberation and the Kuwaiti resistance expelled the Iraqis.

After the war was over and ceasefire declared TF 1-37 moved back into Iraq and took some undefended oil fields. During this time america ran a occupation government which apparently taxed and took supplies from the locals, or something, it's not really documented.

At rumailiah an Iraqi unit came by the oil fields and america opened fire and claimed this as a victory. Obviously america was unable to actually hold the fields, it was just taking advantage of the cease fire, so they retreated immediately after.

Even the occupation of Kuwait was Iraq intervening on behalf of Palestinian refugees. When Iraq left Kuwait killed them, that was the war. Kuwait was irrelevant, the US goal was to conquer iraqi oil and it failed.

For some reason people aren't aware that battleships are invincible. The real problem is that magazines were unprotected, it's a design flaw, but otherwise let me explain in a way pol is dumb enough to understand.

For every plane killed, there's ten damaged. These few kills are really the entire strike force being destroyed.

Roma was taken by surprise. Japan lost air superiority in Southeast Asia and never bombed anything again. The navy never bombed anything after Yamato. The Tirpitz destroyed British naval air power. All of the ones that sunk totally devastated the opposing forces air power, and allies had battleships anyway.

Battleships won Leyte and Guadalcanal. They were critical in all of the landings as well. Carrier aircraft attacked Kure and Yokosuka and failed to do any damage and took horrendous losses. Battleships killed American air power, except the Air Force killed civilians and forced japan to surrender plus Soviet land invasion won anyway.

Without carriers the course of the war wouldn't change at all. Without battleships the allies would lose. Midway was strategically irrelevant. Okinawa was also mostly irrelevant and Leyte was won by battleships which is where they got the best bases. British were never able to sink the Italian battleships, and their BB prevented Germany from ransacking the Atlantic and the English coastline. If there were no surface forces Germany would tow back the Bismarck with its other capital ships and be unstoppable at sea.

>harbor losses

Irrelevant, no damage control.

The Iowa class was the only battleship built with protected magazines. The majority of battleships were 1920s designs where air power was irrelevant. It's easy to secure a battleship against bombs and torpedoes. And modern weapons are even weaker, a sunburn or GBU is totally useless against a Iowa.

Living standards peaked in the 19th century and it's impossible to make solid steel anymore.

This site is too mentally retarded to understand, but gdp is a silly figure.

Most gdp is healthcare and crap. If things were allowed to continue then all of the statistics would become insane, there would be vast differences in "per capita income" due to minor differences in healthcare accounting.

Living standards have declined for decades and gdp went up. Japan has less calories than African nations and a high gdp. You can take a car from a junkyard and sell it as gdp. In reality gdp measures inflation wrong- underweights meat, ignores car inflation, ignores housing completely, ignores health insurance- and ignores the fall in living standards since the fifties. What little manufacturing america does is really recycling and re purposing, it doesn't make things anymore, yet it's counted as that in gdp. Libs don't even measure new steel production. Battleships died and nobody makes things anymore because only small, thin, scrap pieces of steel exist.

Gdp is silly, it's just a measure of inflation, a better measure of living standards is the amount of materials being produced and even then that's measured wrong. Ore grade has collapsed while some of the material measures stay the same, and nobody makes steel.

GM is claiming to end most of its car production. Renewables are just a mask for rapid social collapse. And most of all, this site is retards because you focus entirely on the American oil industry, which is useless and makes condensate, and you haven't posted about Saudi Arabia ever. This requires understanding and interpretation because they don't publish statistics which of course the unemployed phds on this site cannot do.

In construction likewise 3d printing is taking over, which in practice means no large steel buildings or anything difficult. All your technology is simply reducing and not making things, you don't care. You wait for libs to die physically and run out of food and they are just running on inventory now.

Yamato, Roma, POW, all used ducol.

>Much of the load-bearing portions of King George V-class battleships including the weather deck and the bulkheads were made from Ducol[14]

>The Italian Navy used a similar type of steel to Ducol in its Pugliese torpedo defense system.

Now notice these all sank by air attack, while other battleships took extensive air attack (the Japanese survivors of the Kure/Yokosuka raids, the other Italian battleships, the other British battleships etc).

Why did only the ducol steel ships sunk?

If I punch jidf at 100kg and 10m/s, that's 10kw. I am applying mechanical energy.

Let's look at human powered aircraft libs.

https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/UTIAS\_Snowbird

https://www.morson.com/blog/2017/09/the-fastest-aircraft-you-didnt-know-about#:~:text=With%20a%20slimmer%2C%20lighter%20version,%2Dpowered%20aircraft%20%E2%80%93%2027.5mph.

This thing does a short flight at 15 m/s with 100-200kg total weight. That's 50kw. At least 5 kw if it takes ten seconds. They pretend the power supplied is only 1 kw. Note that fighter pilots are usually chuds and pull a lot more than research nerds.

A jet accelerates around 10 tons at 30 m/s. That's 10 mw. However the jet is using a auxiliary power unit sustained by the work the pilot does to set it up. The apu provides a few kilowatt hours of energy. These short bursts of acceleration are actually the pilot revving the apu.

Even 30 minutes of 5kw provide a second of acceleration for the plane. That's about 10% the energy it needs to take off and climb for ten seconds. From there the energy required is super low. The drag coefficient of a laminar flat plate is .001, meaning it needs a fraction of its kinetic energy to stay flying.

In fact, the .001% of the "engine power" on takeoff the pilot supplies to the plane is exactly enough to cancel out drag. If a airplane actually consumed 10 mw all the time it would accelerate at some incredible speed. When air approximates a solid (the sound barrier), it's like moving 200 m/s at 200kg per square meter of air out of the way per second. That's approximately 10 MPA, so the only time you need that surge of energy is brief periods crossing the sound barrier. After that the plane isn't limited by drag, it's limited by thermally burning and falling apart.

The force of gravity on the plane is around 1 mw. The pilot is proving around 1% of this energy. If the heat transfer air to steel is 25 w m2 k, the engine is 1000k, and 10m2, that's that's 250kw of energy just from the engine heat creating a thermal to lift the plane.

This heat has to be recycled of course. If we take the engine as analogous to a steel smelter or a similar furnace because it is basically two chambers between compressors with a tiny gap to introduce new air, it's 90% efficient. Thus we only need 25 kw of energy to create this thermal and half that comes from the pilot. If the pilot is a super chud this energy is multiplied, and most fighter pilots are turbo chuds in top physical condition.

Economics is literally retards. Libs already use 5% of the earths land surface for the extraction of oil and other minerals. The permian basin alone is half of texas. Oil fields last 20 years.

An oil well produces less than a thousand barrels a day, 10% is productive, spaced a mile apart. That’s 1% of the entire land area just to make oil.

The earth to a depth of a meter is 20 trillion tons of iron. 1% is in rich countries which is iron reserves.

In order to support the entire world at first world living standards libs would need to consume an area the size of Australia every 3 years.

Inventory is collapsing, you’ll all die of peak oil in 6mo.

This is basic arithmetic, your site is too retarded to add numbers. Production is down 20% and there’s a month of inventory so it hits zero in six months.

And as there’s more oil than freshwater, and it’s all gone, at last you die. This site is so obviously wrong it can’t even do basic arithmetic, or math, even if you covered the earth in wells spaced a mile apart producing a barrel a day you would die.

Libs don't know about airframe life. It's the main factor in air combat.

Until 60s the planes were new. By 1971 Vietnam migs were old, and usaf still build phantoms. Thus kill ratio especially for navy models grew.

In 1973 it was the same thing. Nesher got all the kills because it was new. Israeli f 4e in the kippur war were really bad and got few kills, overall Israeli Air Force was bad, it was the Nesher carrying it because it was a new airframe.

Then same for other wars into the 90s.

Then america stopped making planes and there was also no air combat the whole period from Serbia to now.

Now Usaf planes are so totally destroyed they can't even defend Ukraine. Su 27 is a slightly newer plane and mig 35 have been upgraded.

The new falcon models are really just rebuilds and not new airframes. The delta wing European fighters have lots of sustainment issues and will never fight.

Airframe life is virtually the only factor in air victory.

The most important weapon is you, your physical strength and ability to do things. Libs are currently being annihilated on this basis.

Height growth peaked in 1900. The cattle population was flat since then while population grew. Wheat and vegetable production also grew little while sugar exploded. Modern diets have less beef, iron and fiber than before. Even if muh vitamins it's not bioavailable unless it's chelated and stored in an organic form.

Population has a target height set by nutrition. K is a retard board and will disagree. Genetics is fake and height is completely environmental and based on fat and protein consumption in adolesence. The actual height converges on the target height. In 1900 libs grew 3 inches a century and their target height was around 6ft2. This is similar to nilotes. Then height growth fell into negative, libs are currently decreasing in height by .1 inch a year or 10 inches a century. In 2010 libs were 5ft9 and they're now 5ft8

Also race is irrelevant, these are all countries, of course race spam will rule the thread.

In a few generations of current nutrition libs height would average five feet. The velocity of height growth is negative .1% a year. Interestingly the countries with more growth like east Asia had bigger falls because they saturated their beef production faster.

The point where libs were close to their target height was around the boomer period. Since then it's just rapid deterioration and everyone is getting shorter. The growth in calories was overwhelmingly in soft drinks and snacks, which is where most corn is used. Wheat is used for bread and that hasn't really changed. Milk grew a little.

Chicken offset the loss of beef, but it has less iron and vitamin d. These are what is meant by animal protein, the other things are available in other ways but iron is impossible to obtain from plants.

You don't realize how pathetic you are, and how low modern living standards are. Your natural height, which you could sustain for a generation, is five feet tall. Modern people are only comparable to cave men or the Middle Ages because there was a time in the 19th century when cattle grew. Living standards have been collapsing since 1900, and since at least the fifties libs have been taller than their diets are able to sustain. People born in 1960 became adults in 1980 when height started falling. That was when the poltard hordes emerged, worthless retards ignoring how personally weak and physically degenerated modern people are. Besides you getting older, the people born now just won't have a real puberty and their height will never exceed five feet, as they consume half as much iron as someone in 1900. The calories growth is all sugar and HFCS.

This is the last post, spam away jidf.

Libs don't understand the concept of total war. It doesn't exist. What happens instead is lib war.

Even conflicts that libs pretend were highly contentious, like ww1, were nothing. You could just walk to the other trench and hang out with people, it was nothing, less than 10% of people died and most were disease.

Nobody fights a war in real life. The losing side will negotiate instead of obviously fighting a losing battle. People are not stupid enough for wars to happen. The giant death tolls in wars are 1 or 2 tularemia or aspirin epidemics. The actual death rate from intentional combat (not just being run over by accident) is low.

Likewise even things called genocides and the most savage ideological wars were nothing. There were genocides, but it's no different from a school shooting or something, if you added up all the hate crimes and gang wars in a moderately violent country you would get the holohoax. 1 million people dying in a European population of a billion over ten years is a homicide rate of 10/100k. It's moderately higher than the normal murder rate worldwide. Libs don't care how low their numbers are. If one group is more affected that's just because they are where the density is.

Likewise a lot of wars historically were just confusion. When Alexander the Great marched to Persia nobody really hated him, there were just some random bums in the way who were mad about something and Alexander called it "a army" he he had to defeat in "a war". The Persians never declared war or defined what was happening as a war, they were simply mentioned as a enemy in history books. It means nothing because states didn't exist. Romans even defined their enemy as barbarians, they weren't fighting a war, they were just fighting whoever wasn't Roman.

Most of the world didn't have a state until the fifties. In fact, there weren't many events called wars between the French Revolution and World War I which is when states were forming. And the world wars were highly confused and Soviets mostly killed each other.

The United Nations was the first thing which defined what a state was. States existed in a abstract way, there were some people in Russia who killed Nicholas and stole the oil and it wasn't clear what they were. Or the most populous country in the world was run by a foreign backed terrorist group funded by that state. Nobody said who was a state or wasn't until the United Nations, before then it was just states naming themselves. Even basic stuff like embassies and diplomats weren't used consistently until the 20th century.

States define themselves by wars, and attacking people. Everything that led to the creation of the un defined what the sides were and what states existed. It could be said that the peak of "states" was the period between World War II and the collapse of the soviet union which fragmented Europe into weak and artificial states. If you can just live somewhere and not pay taxes or follow the law, it's not a state, even if the un calls it that. This state fragmentation is what prevents wars from happening. Wars are different from violence, and violence continues but without sides or politics.

World War II was the war that defined what wars were, even if nothing happened. The UN was supposed to mediate the real war, which was Soviets versus america. That never even pretended to occur, the big conflict that justified the entire military and the core functions of the state just never happened and Soviets collapsed. The resulting states themselves were very weak states, and fake proxies created by nato to try to provoke the war into happening. It was always nato forcing everything, the west even created communism, it went out of its way to create its own enemy just so it could justify being a government.

Now that all of that failed completely, and terrorism also failed, the state is collapsing. Nobody is joining the military and instead they just kill each other in real life, not in a war, just over their own reasons. Wars are dead.

Wars don't actually exist, they're actually just low intensity conflicts plus some uniforms and larping. I would say the closest thing that ever happened resembling a war, like two organized groups motivated to fight over a clearly defined resource, would be just the personal disputes that were always there.

>>52367669

Excellent work jidf.

The warnings of peak oil in 2005 were correct. Car travel and calories per adult outside China have declined.

Globally there were 5b people in 1990, half kid. Now it's 7b and a third. That means 50% growth in adults.

Calories went 2300 to 2700. That's 17% since 1960 and 10% since 1990. Calories per adult collapsed.

Vehicle ownership outside China and the west was never significant. European vehicle miles are a few percent lower since 2000. America grew because shale, and because gasoline is a fake fuel. China grew 3m barrels but that didn't offset the soviet collapse of 5m. Russia produces 10m, consumes 3m and exports 2m plus 2m condensate.

<http://azgs.arizona.edu/ask-a-geologist/how-much-water-required-mining-gold#:~:text=Estimates%20for%20average%20water%20consumption,rock%20(Gunson%2C%202013)>.

Mining takes a ton of water per ton of ore.

Let's say we wanted the world to live at first world living standards. The world has 100k cubic kilometers of freshwater polluted at 1 part per thousand.

That's 800 billion tons of water. If libs consumed 10 billion tons of iron per year that's 200 billion tons of ore. That's four years. At 1 billion tons, that's forty years, which is why global steel production is collapsing.

It's logically impossible for the entire world to live at first world living standards, you would run out of land and water within a few years. It's so obvious your thing failed and you can't even do math. You're not even human, you're just a retarded lib saying obviously wrong things. There is no way you'll survive.

1% of the earths land surface is used for oil.

Permain basin is 100k miles and 5% of the oil.

Mesabi range is a thousand square miles and .1% of the iron.

There's not enough space for the world to live at first world living standards and it's pathetic you can't do math.

I have seen on websites like here a rather simple and obvious claim that simply a 100kg person standing up against gravity requires 10kw of kinetic energy. This is rather trivial to see. However the human metabolism is supposedly 100 watts.

What accounts for this vast discrepancy in the kinetic energy humans are able to supply versus their supposed energy metabolism?

American production is collapsing. The eia production plus net import plus stock loss is 300k bpd less than refinery input.

EIA data does not mathematically reconcile and ignores the obvious collapse in consumption. The eia reports end user gasoline sales collapsing.

https://www.eia.gov/dnav/pet/hist/LeafHandler.ashx?n=PET&s=A103400001&f=M

EIA data doesn't mathematically reconcile with itself.

There should be a simple way to do common tasks- like use a website, or a file.

String s = Foo.open(file name)

Or,

String s = foo.open(url, hashmap headers)

Why doesn't this function exist? Why was so much effort put into software yet getting a simple string from a URL requires lines of code?

Atgms don't actually matter. Only 45,000 javelin were ever built. Millions of tanks and apcs have ever been built.

The issue that nobody builds things anymore, not missiles themselves. Missiles are expensive and don't work. They only work if society has collapsed so drastically that there are no tanks left anyway.

America lost the gulf war and ran out of fuel in four days. They lost khafji and the basra uprising. Now pol will disagree and give some idiot reply.

Only 1% of the Iraqi army surrendered and america attacked the reserves and units that didn't matter. The regular army was by basra and they were fine. In fact, Iraq shot down all the warthogs and they weren't used in Serbia. America stopped advancing when it lost air support.

Iraq left Kuwait on feb 22 and agreed to a ceasefire, so that was irrelevant.

B 52 sorties peaked at 47 on 25th February. They fell to 29 on 27th February. Two b 52 were hit by SAM on the 26th and some unrecorded were hit by gunfire. Libs pretend they're invincible but they actually run away whenever their airpower is lost and it began taking heavy losses the last two days of the ground war.

Quick post to rile jidf. F 15 is fail. There will be no replies.

The most direct soviet equivalent to the phantom was the mig 23. The mig was faster, had a better gun, and had better climb rate.

The sparrow sucked before the aim 7m, it was only better than the export migs which had nothing. In 1974 Soviets released the apex which was the first working BVR AAM. It was used in Angola and the Cuban Air Force was dominant. In the 1982 Soviets began to export the mig 23 MLD. Israel stopped violating Syrian airspace and its kills were all against the early models that had no real missiles.

Today the Alamo has better range and Soviets were always better. Libs ignore all the African wars Soviets won.

This forum is of course morons, so I'll explain how to do math.

Cushing inventory is collapsing. You'll die in six months. The in transit oil is not inventory, because it can't be drawn. When Cushing hits zero the in transit can't be drawn faster so consumption will fall.

Currently fujairah middle distillates fell by half in a year. If inventory is a month of consumption that's 5% of consumption on inventory. Other countries are drawing at similar rates. All together 20% of consumption is on inventory or already gone.

By 2025 this will reach half and you'll starve at last.

Obviously there is no way oil production and grow and the fake EIA statistics contradict state data.

This forum is of course morons, so I'll explain how to do math.

Cushing inventory is collapsing. You'll die in six months. The in transit oil is not inventory, because it can't be drawn. When Cushing hits zero the in transit can't be drawn faster so consumption will fall.

Currently fujairah middle distillates fell by half in a year. If inventory is a month of consumption that's 5% of consumption on inventory. Other countries are drawing at similar rates. All together 20% of consumption is on inventory or already gone.

By 2025 this will reach half and you'll starve at last. Even a 20% hit is significant in most countries, the global average is 3000 calories. A 20% hit is halfway to ww3.

Obviously there is no way oil production and grow and the fake EIA statistics contradict state data.

Graph of aircraft turn rates. Watch jidf seethe out of control.

Soviets have always had better missiles. The original missile was the atoll, which was simply a sidewinder clone. In 1974 they introduced the Apex and Soviets had the first working BVR missiles. The sparrow before M was awful. It was better than the export migs which had nothing at all.

Syria began receiving Mig 23 MLD models in 1982. Immediately afterwards israel ran away and never violated Syrian or Libyan airspace again. There was an entire period between 1982 and 2006 the Syrian Air Force was superior to Israel and Israel did nothing about Lebanon.

The Alamo is greater range than the amraam. Soviets have always had better bvr capability. The export migs before 1982 had no radar or even real IR missiles.

The Cuban Air Force dominated against South Africa. Libs ignore all the African wars the Soviets won. The Mideast states got export models, cuba and some African countries got better equipment than the Arabs did. As a result Soviets won in Angola and also in ethiopia and their other client states. Ethiopian mig 21/23s vs Somali f5s is a battle libs will never speak of.

Also, india got soviet stuff, won against western equipment in Pakistan. Libs don't mention that either.

The only thing they talk about is israel vs Arabs, and Arabs had export models until the 80s and were completely dominant afterwards. Technically israel was able to bomb Syria recently but they stopped.

Battleships are indestructible. Yamato was rivet construction.

Mods are sheltering the retarded pieces of shit here. Carriers are useless and filed to sink a Iranian frigate. You also ignore all the times carriers ran away and didn't sink the opposing navies. Belgrano took a 1920s torpedo and modern weapons are useless.

As for tirpitz, it didn't sink. This really exposes how stupid this board is. Tirpitz took a 60 degree list, which stabilized, and the turret exploded which pushed it another 30. In real life you would just counterflood; they abandoned so it doesn't matter. Wikipedia counts libs losses as anything totally destroyed and obvious while it counts other countries as anything damaged or abandoned. If you measured carrier losses the way Wikipedia does then all the American carriers died and they went to Korea with five ships left.

America lost the gulf war. You can look in archive. They ran into a minefield at medina ridge, lost a bunch of Bradley's and were unable to breach it. The reason Abrams we're not lost is they all had sand filter problems and never got to battle. Bradley's did everything and lots of them were damaged.

Soviets built 100,000 tanks in Ww2 and lost 70 per day. That's 1/1000 per day. 2000 Bradley's were sent to Iraq and 20 were lost in 4 days. America lost tanks at twice the rate the Soviet Union did in Ww2. The Iraqi losses were all surrenders, just because a side surrenders doesn't mean it's overwhelmingly weaker.

In conclusion america lost tanks in the gulf war at a higher rate than world war 2, and all its kills were abandoned equipment. This ignores it was a high intensity operation that wasn't sustained.

Let's just have a reality check on tank logistics.

A semi truck weighs about the tons. A tank weighs 50 tons. America has 2 million trucks. The actual mileage is like 2 gallons per mile vs 5mpg. Also it has to be diesel,

If you used tanks like trucks you could run 200,000 of them.

A truck moving from Riyadh to Kuwait is 1000 miles. On road this is easy. Off road mileage is much worse, maybe 1mpg for a 2000 gallon truck. The truck uses its fuel just to get there and back.

As a result every gallon to the tank means 2-4x overhead. Combine this with other services taking 75% of the fuel and that's 10,000 tanks left. The actual largest tank force anyone has run is about 5,000.

Then of these tanks they're going to spend like 90% of their time in maintenance. Failure rate of a car is about once per thousand hours. For a tank it's once a day.

So you end up with 500 tanks in the field, of which about 100 are operating at a given time. A US Army tank battalion is something that only exists on paper, it would be physically impossible to ever operate it in the field.

I doubt anyone here has enough historical knowledge to answer. I'm just asking at what point evictions even started.

There were no small claims courts before the 1960s. To evict you had to go through the real court system and get a lawyer which isn't at all practical. Thus it seems evictions started then. Just looking at ngram you can't see any much use of the word until the twentieth century.

Just because you can see ads from 1900 advertising apartments for rent doesn't mean it happened. The rents are absurdly low too.

[![enter image description here][1]][1]

Hourly wage in the 30s was around a dollar. You could work a week and get a giant apartment in Manhattan. Given that people today spend around a tenth of their income on utilities, the rent back then was slightly more than a utility payment.

So the question is in the title, given nobody here is a historian I doubt it will be answerable.

[1]: <https://i.stack.imgur.com/Rxn4N.png>

Ethnic groups don't exist. You don't hear anything about ethnic groups, or ethnicity, until the cia was founded and decided to destabilize countries by finding minor differences between people.

If you go to africa you'll see people say they're Congolese, or just a person, or whatever, they don't identify with some obscure ethnic group. Everyone speaks English and eats and McDonald's, and even before then, they just used a different language. The Native American tribe names mean "the entire world" or "everyone", and they thought they were it, then they realized there were other people and liberal academics called this misunderstanding an ethnic group.

Religion exists, other differences exist, but ethnic conflicts don't. Ethnic conflicts are some fake thing created by the cia to destabilize countries after Ww2, they don't exist in other contexts. Even if there is ethnic food, ethnic dress or ethnic music it isn't well defined. It was just the materials available, or their version of the homogenous global culture before they had access to the internet and better music.

This is supposed to go in his but it bans everything so it will just rot here.

Ironically this does relate to pol because all the idiotic Americans identifying with ancient Greeks are doing this. There's no meaningful ethnicities, or separate cultures, there's just what people decide to do. Mall goths are a more clearly defined, regulated culture than the Igbo or Ojibwe. It's actually the subcultures, like poltards, which are the culture. The ethnic groups and what people call real cultures are actually poorly defined, and it's the subcultures that become the culture.

Like when pol defends the white race, it's actually defending its mutt subhumanity and confusion, none of you are white. What you're defending is the poltard race, which probably could be well defined as a culture given that you have the common element of being garbage, but you're too dumb to describe it using words.

I doubt this site will be able to answer it because nobody here is even a historian. But I want actual evidence that evictions happened in the Roman Empire. A specific case and not just 1 sentence in a paper.

As for prior research and clarification this doesn't require any. It's obvious that evictions are a modern concept and the Romans didn't have cops or anything like that, judgments were enforced by citizenship not any actual direct police force. But because this site is just a bunch of amateurs you're going to claim your vague claim in a paper is proof evictions actually existed.

Mods are asleep, post Romanian propaganda.

Now that I have your attention, for the real topic. Tanks aren't really supposed to be used for assault, they're more like mobile artillery or self propelled guns. The t72 was explicitly designed to be capable of indirect fire.

The other situation is during a breakthrough, like you're chewing up a logistics base and there's no real opposition, and you just need something resistant to rifle fire to destroy all these easy targets, that's what tanks are for. Originally in Ww1 artillery and infantry would make the initial penetration, lay a filler over the trench as a bridge, and tanks would assault all the rear area stuff. Even in ww2 tanks were never capable of frontal assault, halfaya pass proved that, at El Alamein tanks weren't used because they ran out of fuel.

On the eastern front there were never actual tank battles. There was a skirmish between reconnaissance tanks, prokovka, there was never a case where, say panzer iv and t 34s fought each other.

In the iran iraq war and 1994 Yemen libs never talk about it, but there were actual tank battles. Most were lost to breakdowns and infantry weapons killed the rest. Even in the desert tanks are pretty ineffective, and air filter problems will destroy many tanks.

The type of environment that's good for tanks is something like France in 1940 when they just surrender and you have to mop up light resistance quickly. They're not for assault situations, you would never send tanks against prepared infantry with heavy weapons.

Even if tanks used literally as artillery guns it's actually pretty common for them to be used in a similar manner. You can put a tank behind trees or smoke where it can barely see the enemy and ATGM will not function. In that case you can use it like close range artillery, it doesn't see the target, it just fires in a general direction. You would never send tanks in an open plain against infantry, that's idiotic.

Here is the real kill ratio of various planes, in bvr engagements were both sides tried.

Eagle 0-1 (samurrah), it also lost some at bekaa but that was because a bvr fight that eagles failed to kill everyone.

F 16: 0-2 (1996 agean and 2019 mig). Additional gulf war loss wrongly recorded as a Sam but that was an attack mission so there's a excuse. Mig kill is likely genuine and wasn't denied.

F 18: 0-1 or 2 (obviously spicher, then a mechanical failure that could have been a air kill). B 52 might have been shot down in the gulf war and misrecorded as a mechanical failure.

Mig-29: 1-0? 1 apparent kill in Ukraine. In Eritrea they were all trainers and didn't resist. Additional gulf war kills but those were against bombers.

Su 27: 0-1, see above.

Mig 25: 1-0, against eagle. The other kills were peacetime attacks and other things. Iran got some possible kills.

Tomcat: ?-?, iran was the only country that used it.

Mig-23: 0-0. The export migs had no radar. There was a friendly fire f 16 that might have been a mig 23 downing a Pakistani plane in the 80s over Afghanistan.

Phantom: accurately recorded. Vietnam got new migs in 1965 and has a good kill ratio. Then phantoms got new airframes and those won. Airframe life is the only factor that matters in air combat.

Nesher: about 50-0. Nesher is by far the best western kill ratio because it was a new airframe. Comical that k is too dumb to know what it is.

Mirage 2000: 1-0. Agean 1996.

Mirage f1: Never fought against a peer aircraft, never had working missiles, was basically a ground attack plane. Migflug has a typo, it thinks a f 1 was shot down in agean.

F-111: at least one fighter kill, maneuvered a mirage into the ground. F 111 might have a better kill ratio than tomcat. Shows how stupid jidf is to use kill ratios.

Sea harrier: no real kills. The neshers in Argentina were at the limit of their range and had no missiles. Few skyhawk kills, the harrier was mostly good at hitting neshers which were forced to fly a narrow flight path.

Tornado: migflug ignores the gulf war loss to a mig 29. It was a attack plane though.

F-5: Unclear, all the kills were Iranian, they don't publish them. Several f 5s were lost, probably because they were used in a attack role.

Mig 21 has better wing loading and is slightly smaller, it can dogfight easily. In Somalia they never declared war so it wasn't much combat, but the f5 did well. The fact the f5 was mostly used for ground attack rules it out as a fighter, it really isn't supposed to engage anything.

F 5 has worse instantaneous turn (17 vs 20), Ethiopia also got its planes in the sixties while somali planes were 1974 with the signing of the friendship pact. However Ethiopia got Israeli aid in 1977 that probably completely overhauled the aircraft and left in 1978. The confirmed kills on both sides are about 8-8 and the American and Soviet stuff fought to a draw.

So in conclusion there is one American plane that looks good (the Phoenix), jidf will whine but the reality is acrid is better than the sparrow by a long shot and delta wing French planes are also better.

The best plane for it's time period was the Nesher just because it was used when it was new. Now k will give some idiot reply and the thread will die.

Libs don't know about turn rate. Now k will give hordes of idiot replies that have no relation to the thread topic.

A Learjet will turn like a fighter. It has the wing loading, everything a subsonic fighter can do. Problem is relaxed stability, planes are made unstable to turn faster.

Furthermore there's structural limits on the plane. So, a phantom can turn 11g and then fail. A tomcat also pulled this but it wasn't loaded. And so on. So a unloaded phantom might turn 15g which is 50 degrees for a second, then get reduced to a lot less. This is the real instantaneous turn rate. The recorded rate is actually with a reasonable load.

Never seen a explanation for this. Too large to be a sabot, obviously Abrams killed by t55.

America lost the gulf war. For every loss there's ten damaged. If they lost 4 tanks at medina ridge that's like 40 damaged and 400 breakdowns. The entire division had about a thousand tanks so those losses are pretty much complete destruction of the American forces. The human casualties are irrelevant because it's far more common to be mobility killed. The power pack and electrical system are about half the cost of any vehicle so a mobility kill is effectively a kill.

In World War Two only a small fraction of tank crews died. The reality is all the mechanical losses of tanks are always greater than the total destruction and there is nothing special about the Abrams not recording any crew fatalities.

Iraq never invaded Kuwait, it made a special forces raid with helicopters and that's all they defeated. Kuwaits own resistance movement did all of the work, expelled the Palestinians and apprehended the coup leaders.

The reformists in the military, like the Bradley designers, had the right idea for the wrong reasons. They believed that older cheaper technology was better. Hence they fitted the Bradley with what they thought was cheap, like a mediocre gun and aluminum.

In reality older equipment is better, because it's the better equipment. Cost is a neurotic concept, economists are retards. In reality there's only one thing you can make using available materials, like plastic crap.

Medieval siege cannons were quite simply vastly superior to modern weapons. They would penetrate a Abrams, they would squash it like a bug. It's only that mobility and some minor features got better, not the core structure of the material.

Middle Ages might be a extreme example but even the ww1 420mm siege artillery is a 30x bigger shell than the largest artillery today. The kind of stuff they were capable of in the past would simply crush modern technology, a single one of those shells, regardless of accuracy has a blast radius of hundreds of feet. They would just spam this in the general location of the enemy and completely flatten the terrain. That doesn't exist anymore because it isn't possible and the older technology is better because it can't be done anymore.

And just taking the reformist understanding of a cavemen with sticks defeating a tank, the real life equivalent of that is modern people are extremely weak, will be 5ft tall within a generation at current rates of height loss and smallpox disappeared because immune systems got weaker. The organic technology and health of the troops is crap now even if aspects of technology compensated.

Remember, five percent of world land area goes to mining.

20 trillion tons of iron exist to a depth of a meter. 1% is in rich countries which goes to iron reserves.

The mesabi range is a thousand square miles and produces ten million tons on a global production of billions. Scaling that up, a million square miles of land goes to mining.

Then multiply that by other resources and five percent of the worlds land goes to mining. Even if resources are unlimited you still die that way. Australia is collapsing from mine pollution.

Precision weapons don't matter. For one thing cost. Because they use silver only a few thousand cruise missiles are made and it's hard to do.

Assuming a blast radius of a few thousand square feet and a refinery complex covers a mile you would need thousands of missiles against it. It's generally not possible, when you hear of air strikes they are bombing the distillation column or some small part of the thing. Usually this can be replaced fairly easily and you cannot cripple a refinery using missiles.

There's cheap missiles like the Maverick. Problem then becomes sighting. Detection and targeting limit range to a few miles. Video games understate all the rifles and small arms that kill you. Aircraft don't work in real life at low altitude.

So then it becomes a matter of high altitude precision bombing. This is actually possible, you can slather the facility in thousands of bombs.

However in that case precision doesn't matter, the type of targets you need the bombs are the exact cases they don't matter. So now you move on to tank plonking and small mobile targets.

In that case it gets extremely difficult if the target is moving. Because of the aforementioned you're going to be flying at 20k ft and a megapixel camera gives you less than a pixel per several meters. It's basically impossible to spot anything so that also fails.

Basically all the cases for precision munitions fail, I add basically because k is mentally retarded.

Libs let's go over t72 versions. All the replies will be retarded as this is a moron board of people who cite Wikipedia.

T72B is the basic main tank model.

B3 is the same with ERA and some internal changes.

T55 has a gap in front wheel to aid climbing.

T62 has a back wheel double gap to aid recovery because trenches are perceived as less common.

T80 has multiple gaps. It has a higher turret fuel, the track front is square and padded, smoke grenades more rear and closer. Rear of t80 turret is square. Wheels are rimmed. No girth difference chassis vs track. "Cleaner" look than t72.

All these tanks have command versions which simply add radios and make the tank more a target.

Abrams is 400mm KE. Jidf will cite idiot numbers. T-72 is essentially same armor as Abrams. Gun has higher muzzle velocity and is larger.

T-80U is simply ERA.

Reformers believed cheaper weapons were better. Specifically they defended the f5 over the f15, which is easy because the f15 was a interceptor and didn't do the same job. Obviously for a wrong task the other thing will work. This is like saying you shouldn't go grocery shopping in a Ferrari and thus it's a bad car.

In reality the older equipment is better, because it's the expensive equipment. They're right that medieval siege cannons are more powerful than the Abrams. It's because technology gets worse over time and the modern technology is the cheap stuff. Reformers have the right idea for the wrong reasons. They understand technology gets worse over time but then they support this trend with their own technology.

The Bradley doesn't exist, they were replaced by the mrap because they couldn't survive. All the expensive mediocre equipment like using a IFV as a tank is fail, or using f 5s in BVR. In reality Iran had both f5s and f14s- which is like the eagle they were opposing. Tomcats got all the kills and the f5s were kind of useless.

The reality is the last tank factory closed in 1996, even when reformers were writing the most capable aircraft were all gone, and reformers are just delaying the collapse of capitalism. They think the inability to make proper equipment is a good thing, like you can make better stuff with the deteriorating industrial base. They don't accept you'll just die of peak oil in 6mo, trying to save things is futile and the move toward worse and cheaper weapons is in fact things getting worse and not somehow the worse equipment being more efficient.

Tanks are not built anymore anywhere in the world. Jidf will pretend Lima is a real tank factory. Eagles are not built either, no airplane is being built, and the Bradley were withdrawn almost two decades ago. All the equipment the reformers cared about or opposed are all gone, and the reality is everything failed, and the future will be sticks and stones.

America lost the gulf war.

Iraq never invaded Kuwait, it used helicopters.

America lost the basrah uprising and never reached highway 8.

Find me one firsthand account of coalition winning a battle.

And this has nothing to do with Ukraine, you're mentally retarded.

>He escaped his vehicle through a back door and fled on foot. He found his driver dead. He found the vehicle commander with his left leg blown off.

>Knight got into one of the three (of six) surviving Bradleys. They pulled back into an aid station. He could hear the explosions from the ongoing firefight.

Note that america claims three Bradley losses yet this single incident is all of them, and there were additional losses at wadi al batin. So it's a myth that 3 Bradley's were lost to enemy fire, it's probably around 30.

Dennis, you think I explained this poorly, but it's that simple. Tar and condensate are not oil. The dumbell effect is crushing and middle distillates are declining faster than overall production.

By opecs own statements their production will peak in September and then billions will die over the next few years.

Libs america lost the gulf war. Iraq never deployed any tanks to Kuwait.

America lost 3 Bradley's in a single incident at medina ridge. Then pl bullet. Total Bradley losses were like 10 with 30 damaged.

73 easting was a surrender and at medina ridge Iraq lost 200 tanks. 90% of those were abandoned. All the warthog kills were abandoned as they were restricted to 20 miles of the border.

Total Iraqi tank losses in the gulf war were 20 and American losses were 20. Bradley losses from enemy fire were 10 and not 3 as libs claim. Damaged american tanks and Bradley's might be 20-30 total Bradley losses and 50 Abrams lost. Then additional Abrams losses from sand filters.

Make a actual reply without Ukraine spam.

America lost the gulf war. Iraq never had tanks in Kuwait. 20 Abrams are recorded lost meaning 50 actual losses. Reddit claims 3 Bradley's were lost, but 3 were lost in a single incident at medina ridge, then PL bullet, and others. 10 or so documented Bradley losses meaning 20 total.

Sources are in archive.

Total damaged Abrams is probably 100 and similar number of Bradley's. The lack of crew casualties

Iraq lost 200 tanks which were 90% abandoned. That's 20 tanks. America took tons of losses

Army does not report missing in action. The 147 dead number is aircrew, the army did not report losses in the ground war. Also, tank crews wear body armor so they only die if the round hits them.

Entirely possible america lost more tanks than Iraq did, they were just mines, rpgs, and atgms which america did not have. America had no light antitank weapons of any value so it probably had a hard time killing tanks.

73 easting was a surrender and medina ridge was the only battle. Arthur Sailey (Bradley driver) gave a account of the battle. America advanced with a screening force of Bradley's. Bradley's hit mines and were ambushed by infantry. Half the force was lost and the rest retreated. Remaining American forces advanced on other objectives with no resistance and then withdrew.

How does this matter? Gulf war and World War II were the only large tank wars that ever happened. Any combat lesson on tanks comes from them.

Lesson is that not only does fuel cripple tanks, but also, when they do fight they are destroyed easily by infantry.

America lost the gulf war. Iraq never had tanks in Kuwait. 20 Abrams are recorded lost meaning 50 actual losses. Reddit claims 3 Bradley's were lost, but 3 were lost in a single incident at medina ridge, then PL bullet, and others. 10 or so documented Bradley losses meaning 20 total.

Sources are in archive.

Total damaged Abrams is probably 100 and similar number of Bradley's. The lack of crew casualties

Iraq lost 200 tanks which were 90% abandoned. That's 20 tanks. America took tons of losses

Army does not report missing in action. The 147 dead number is aircrew, the army did not report losses in the ground war. Also, tank crews wear body armor so they only die if the round hits them.

Entirely possible america lost more tanks than Iraq did, they were just mines, rpgs, and atgms which america did not have. America had no light antitank weapons of any value so it probably had a hard time killing tanks.

73 easting was a surrender and medina ridge was the only battle. Arthur Sailey (Bradley driver) gave a account of the battle. America advanced with a screening force of Bradley's. Bradley's hit mines and were ambushed by infantry. Half the force was lost and the rest retreated. Remaining American forces advanced on other objectives with no resistance and then withdrew.

How does this matter? Gulf war and World War II were the only large tank wars that ever happened. Any combat lesson on tanks comes from them.

Lesson is that not only does fuel cripple tanks, but also, when they do fight they are destroyed easily by infantry. And this is a repost but mods are asleep.

>america recorded its losses

For example on March 6 the Iraqi government listed five Americans captured at khafji. The army did not report anything, it took the Iraqi government to list missing, then an unknown number were slaughtered without being recorded.

<https://history.army.mil/chronos/mar91.htm>

https://history.army.mil/chronos/mar91.htm

Desert storm log of 101st airborne division.

>nothing happens

>somebody dies in a car accident

Just a reminder nothing happens in wars, AAR don't exist, anything you can't find readily available posted a million times on YouTube just doesn't exist and nothing happened.

At Stalingrad there's no physical evidence the battle happened, there were too many planes for the airfields and the airfields were out of range, there are no bullet holes in buildings. Wars are fake and a larp.

>>53228717

Let's go case by case.

>phantom and tomcat

Fine.

>falcon

The Alamo is simply greater range. Alamo is 120km while amraam is 100km, besides the D which is a software change.

When fired from 40k ft at mach 5, or whatever is used for this range, the time of flight is 50 seconds or 100km. Basically all the missile range in these stats is altitude.

Amraam propellant is about 300 lbs. Thats 6000 m/s of acceleration. However it's 90% oxidizer so the real energy is 600m/s.

This gives a theoretical range against gravity of 20 miles after which the missile goes ballistic. A faster missile requires less lead, and even if the missile is turning 17 degrees a second, less than a b52, it is going faster and needs less turn. However if the target is accelerating away the solution becomes a lot harder.

This is why the effective range is usually given as 10 miles as it has enough to outrun the plane and also resist gravity. The amraam is 1% the size of the plane and thus has 1/10 the radar strength, so a 50 mile radar on the eagle is 5 miles on the amraam. Therefore the amraam could probably go pitbull immediately and doesn't need a SARH phase.

All together, if the Alamo has a few percent more range it can fire when the amraam can't reach it, still be able to outrun the target and still resist gravity.

What's the difference between surgery and assault?

There's a separate law for unlicensed practice of surgery to explain if surgery is assault. It's really bizarre that they would need a separate law for something that's already assault. Or that licensing laws, a civil law, would change criminal laws.

Even licensing laws don't exist. Licensing is done by private entities like the AMA, there is no government that licenses doctors. So you're saying that this private entity has unlimited power to determine what is assault.

This is why euthanasia laws are meaningless because if you already allow surgery to not be assault then you can allow it to be murder also. There's not a real reason a separate euthanasia law if you already allowed a private agency (the doctors licensing) to override criminal law. In the 1930s in Germany there were a bunch of lawsuits against doctors under assault laws and the court just dismissed them and doctors got lawyers. Of course stack exchange has nobody above room temperature iq and doesn't know history.

As a concrete example if I make a surgery that kills people, it's murder, but then somebody has to decide if that's assault. As long as I don't call it euthanasia I can kill anyone with this surgery as long as private regulatory agencies don't object. If the police respond I simply say I'm licensed to do the surgery therefore it is legal. AMA just makes a list of surgeries, many of which kill people, and then it's not counted as murder.

If this question is unclear you clearly struggle with reading. The question is what the difference is between surgery and assault.

Assume I run a site similar to stack exchange, namely no meaningful terms of service. In that case there is no restriction on behavior, any moderator can delete anything, up to and including running a automated script that bypasses checks and deletes the entire content on the entire site. There is nothing in the terms of service saying this can't be done.

The terms "give unlimited power", they don't take any away, hence the moderators can delete everything on the site.

Obviously this would be prosecuted under federal hacking law except it can't, because there's no policy. Again using stack exchange as a example there are no "site policies", there are only scattered questions by individual users, with conflicting answers, and one of them has a green check mark and "becomes" "the site policy". Is anything like this workable? If a mod destroyed the site is he totally free to do so as the "site policy" is nonexistent?

Note this actually has happened with real websites and is dealt with much, much harsher than on stack exchange. Facebook or its functionaries have been sued for deleting posts. The mayor of Irvine sued for deleting posts because of discriminatory and irrational behavior, not even by moderators, just even the users deleting content can be sued. If a site like stack exchange was scaled up in any way whatsoever wouldn't it be liable for completely irrational, forgive the term, \*idiotic\* behavior by moderators mass deleting arbitrary posts, especially in a litigious state like California?

Libs let me explain how mentally retarded you are. Gold is worthless.

Gold is worthless in society collapses. Nobody uses gold in Weimar. Nobody uses gold in Venezuela. Nobody "held gold" in Weimar and "got rich" after because physical gold is a scam and nobody will buy it.

Nobody uses gold in the Black Death. Nobody used gold when Rome collapsed. The gold standard does not stop wars and the largest war in history was fought in the gold standard. The gold standard died because of the trade deficit, it impairs trade and not the budget deficit.

But that's not the point. The point is the stock market simply must die. Boomers live 70 years. 2% of the stock market must be sold every year for estate taxes.

It's impossible for the stock market to exceed 50x gdp. Because taxes are half, and yearly fluctuation is half, is impossible for the stock market to exceed 3x gdp or whatever people actually spend.

30% of the economy is healthcare. 10% is finance paid by interest on other things. 10% is retail. 10% is admins. 20% is government. That leaves only 30% of the economy as actual household expenditure. It's simply impossible for the stock market to exceed what people actually spend by a large multiple because estate tax and lawyers must take it when boomers die.

Us gdp is 20 trillion. The stock market is 49 trillion and bonds are 46. Real estate is 40 trillion and commercial is 16. All these assets added together are 7x gdp.

It's simply impossible for the market to keep growing when the fed is contracting. You will die at last and gold will be worthless. You'll die of peak oil in 6mo.

Eminent domain has long been used by oil. Abner Spraberry lost all his land as it was stolen by oil companies.

In principle, renewables will use massive amounts of domain if they were ever installed on a large scale. Solar uses sunlight, it uses natural energy that exists everywhere. Interest groups can steal essentially the entire surface area of the earth and send police to attack people so they can build solar panels. Many, if not most of the time no compensation is paid.

If renewables were actually implemented rapidly, over large areas of land in a Maoist-style cultural revolution would this result in vast cases of eminent domain and adverse possession? Do we even have a choice, given imminent social collapse from peak oil?

I am writing about poincares objection to lesage theory, which is well known.

Poincare says the energy present would he huge therefore it's impossible. It's all lost in internal collisions. It's like saying a swimming pool has the energy of a nuclear bomb.

As you see, Poincare a objection is poorly worded and hard to explain but it amounts to something along the lines of "if lesage theory was correct, it would require a enormous number of corpuscles, therefore it's impossible".

The other objections to lesage theory on Wikipedia are also extremely poor. Does anyone here have a physics degree and care to correct them? Given this board instantly deletes any question requiring reading comprehension probably not.

I own one share of Walmart, I am a capitalist and can sleep in their parking lot. Of course security will attack me but even so I'm a legal owner.

Now one objection is I have to be a majority owner, to be a owner. This doesn't make sense but I've seen people make this stupid response.

The problem is I can buy a million dollar company. I can put 100k down and 5x leverage and be a majority owner of a pink sheets company.

Now I go into the parking lot, sleep, security attacks me and says I'm not the owner. Why?

Given homes cost millions of dollars it seems like eventually somebody will just spend 100k, or even less, to buy a company because the leverage and cost of doing this is far less than a residential mortgage. If you can live everywhere on 100k then would the concept of property collapse because you can just buy a undervalued company, take partial ownership, then call the cops when security attacks and show them your share certificate?

For other wars we have ready statistics. 10,000 LGB were used in the gulf war, in Serbia and so forth. How about Ww2 by all sides?

Wikipedia has a list of ships sunk but there is no really available list of their use against ground targets.

Obvious examples are the Fritz, 1,4000 produced, and the German V weapons, which were arguably sometimes used as precision weapons. If the V1 is counted as a cruise missile there was truly enormous use of precisions weapons, the gulf war was technologically regressive over Nazis.

There are a significant number of American glide bombs used in Ww2 as well. The GB-1 is listed as a thousand used. The ASM-N-2 Bat is listed as thousands made. Given these are big missiles I wouldn't be surprised if more precision tonnage was used in Ww2 than the gulf war and wars which supposedly "introduced" them. Consider also the large number of, for example, VB-3 and other weapons that entered service days before the war ended.

Was Ww2 comparable (or even larger) than the gulf war in precision weapons use?

States are based on resource depletion.

The first state we have record of was Egypt, and England ran out of surface tin and the Bronze Age collapsed. There was no tin mentioned between then and modern times.

Medieval England was based on the wool trade which automated. Rome was based on population growth, Muhammad created a religion from trade and Arabs had growth. Even when resources created the state population drove it. Rome captured England early and got all its iron.

Han China used iron until climate forced it south. Spain was irrelevant before colonialism. Many smaller states like Germany and Italy were the result of external threats from the real states. Prussia used Swedish iron. Many small states, Venice, crusader kingdoms, teutons formed from trade as they couldn't do anything themselves.

Colonialism was run on British iron and created most of the states in the world. Britain ran out of iron in the 19th century and Sweden had a bit left, which supported Germany in the world wars. At that point states weren't even existing for mercantilism, but in opposition to the remaining states with resources.

Sweden also ran out of iron. Ww2 itself was just a Malthusian check when all this stuff started collapsing, which was temporarily corrected and now is back. Ww1 was due to the decline of imperialism and those wars coming back to Europe.

Ford ran the soviet car industry and communism is a market economy. Soviet oil ran their state.

You'll die of peak oil in 6mo. Ww2 was the end of states and everything since then is just riding down the confused infrastructure they created.

Home ownership doesn't mean anything. Everything is owned by a HOA or something, the way castle doctrine is applied is whoever is residing in the house, not the legal owner.

In that case what counts as a home. A cop enters a homeless tent, is a trespasser, I apply castle doctrine and shoot them. Is my tent a home? Is castle doctrine about "legal ownership" or actual residence?

This will be deleted immediately but it will be used one day to physically annihilate police.

It would depend entirely on the age of the missile, the same missile model at different times is obviously going to give different results.

A brand new fitter could outmaneuver the missile flat out. Given perfect skill and maintenance the missile would never win. Hits occur because of old airframes and mistakes.

A su 22 has a comparable turn rate to a phantom, based on wing loading. Thats around 30 degrees a second. A AMRAAM turns 17 and a sparrow probably less. Even if the missile is twice as fast it can't out turn the fitter. Even a fitter can evade a slow amraam, rather easily, a amraam has a lower turn rate than a b-52.

The reason missiles hit is the plane doesn't evade or just is a old airframe. It's easy to see a new airplane will easily evade any missile, of course this will get troll replies from bob but it's trivial math I can cite easily.

The real math is more like

17 degrees/second amraam turn rate (less for sparrow)

Mach 4 missile

Mach .7 fitter

4/.7= the missile is 6x faster

17\*6= 102 degrees per second turn rate needed to evade.

If the missile slows to under mach 1 then it will be less than the 30 degrees per second needed. The sparrow reaches mach 2.5 normally while the amraam would slow down in a lot of cases (eg a 20% course correction losses a fifth of the speed, and a similar amount of energy to correct the error). So a fitter could rather easily defeat a sparrow as the missile has a lower turn rate than a b-52.

We can also calculate the missile turn rate from G. The maximum G of a amraam is around 50g. For a 4 meter missile with 2 meter radius that's a angular momentum calculation. Gravity is 10m/s or 1g is 100 watts. That's 5kw for 50g at 1 meter or 10kw at 2 meters. For a kilogram mass that's 100 m/s, or 25 m/s (2 meters squared divided). That's a tenth of a second to turn 90 degrees or 900 degrees per second.

If the missile is going 1000 m/s then the energy needed is 100 times faster than 10m/s, so we end up with a nine degrees per second turn rate for the amraam. In reality the missile goes slower for most of its flight which gives the higher turn rate.

As for the 50g number, it comes from energy density. If the missile weighs a few hundred kg and goes a few mach the energy density of fuel limits acceleration to that range.

The theory that cfc destroys ozone is a perpetual motion machine. It requires ozone to die faster than cfc. Otherwise cfc breaks apart and forms HF, which does nothing.

Obviously diesel inventory is collapsing, price is over $6 a gallon. Ghawar has had no projects since 2005 and has run out of reserves. Shale oil is condensate, it’s not usable as a fuel. Global oil production is falling rapidly. Chinese propaganda claims they are raising coal production despite steel production falling at double digit rates and major blackouts.

Great post ovi. Obviously production will never recover to what it was, and is following the curve perfectly.

It's amusing dennis never mentions volumetric reserves, or even knows what that word means. Permian has a quadrillion barrels of dirt, 10% rock, 10% TOC, 10% soluble and 5% light. Obviously permian reserves are low.

As Dennis is mentally retarded he is too lazy to google any of these terms, but trivial math shows his reserve estimate is physically impossible and any toddler capable of adding numbers can show there's not enough space for the oil. Dennis cited 10 trillion barrels of oil in permian which was obviously kerogen and refused to read the email by the author. Dennis doesn't cite sources, he directly says stuff the source disagrees with.

Delete this question if you are so lacking in knowledge you have any difficulty answering it.

Obviously, there were no evictions in the Roman Empire when it collapsed. So there was some time between the start of civilization and today when evictions started.

Cops didn't exist until the 20th century. Major cities, like Los Angeles had no police until the 1890s. In Europe the police are unarmed and can't evict.

In the 1920s, there was a rent strike in New York, and the police were physically defeated. In Berlin squatters were not evicted until 2020 because the police are unarmed.

This narrows the time period further. Evictions never existed in Europe, in America they started after Ww2, or something then.

Evictions are done in small claims court. There were none of these before the sixties and thus evictions were impossible. Filing a lawsuit costs thousands of dollars and vastly exceeds any rent. Small claims allowed a "fake" court in which evictions could happen.

Did evictions exist before 1960? Can you prove it?

Exerpt from dickens.

‘And how was he found out at last?’ inquired Mr. Pickwick.

‘The benchers determined to have his door broken open, as he hadn’t paid any rent for two years. So they did. Forced the lock; and a very dusty skeleton in a blue coat, black knee-shorts, and silks, fell forward in the arms of the porter who opened the door. Queer, that. Rather, perhaps; rather, eh?’ The little old man put his head more on one side, and rubbed his hands with unspeakable glee.

Jushi fiberglass makes 25% its money on wind power. It has 10,000 employees. Vestas has 25,000. Humans emit 2 tons of co2 per year.

Vestas makes roughly 4,000 1 mw turbines. At 20% capacity and depreciation that's 10 gwh per turbine or 40 twh per year of green energy. Oil is 10mwh per ton so that's 4,000,000 tons of oil displaced.

According to the wind interest group GWEC, there are 100gw of turbines installed globally per year or about 100,000 of these turbines. That's 1 pwh of wind generation or 100 million tons of oil.

According to the same interest group, there are 20 person years per megawatt per year of labor. This is a lot more labor, around 3 million jobs. Air is .1% carbon and humans breath 6 kg per minute. 6 grams per minute is 3 tons per year. These workers also have 4 people in their family. That's 40 million tons per year just breathing. Notice that these employment numbers are consistent with a five year depreciation of wind turbines, not twenty.

Note that these breathing numbers are at a resting rate. During work respiration can be 100 L per minute, and breathing rate correlates .91 with carbon dioxide emission (Blackie et al, 1991, Normal values and ranges for ventilation and breathing pattern at maximal exercise). Thus it's plausible these workers are breathing 100 million tons of co2 if they work all the time.

Do wind energy workers and their families emit more co2 when breathing than the carbon emissions the turbine offsets?

Airframe life is the sole factor in air combat. Nesher got all the kills in 73. Vietnam got migs in 65 and the navy kill ratio improved later as it got new airframes.

A new missile will fail against a new airframe. A sparrow is 100kg with 90% oxidizer and hydrazine. That's 2gj or 200mj with oxidizer. A 2 meter radius is angular momentum of 1mj per meter or 1000 m/s acceleration. At 10 m/s gravity and half reaction thats 50g.

A missile going at Mach 2 for ten seconds against gravity is 40g plus 10g gravity. The missile only has about 10g of turn even if launches point blank and any plane can out turn it. A amraam turns 17 degrees a second at mach 2 which is lower than a b52. Missiles only kill old airframes. It's physically impossible for a amraam to reach mach 4 in level flight.

Dennis,

Thank you for the reply. Volumetric reserves are not based on discoveries. They are based on physical reality and the volume of oil that can fit.

If you give USGS recovery as 100 billion for permian (they are not) while using the given assumptions for kerogen, that results in a physically impossible amount. If you disagree then please give your generation fraction.

Your reserves at 10% recovery are 1 trillion. At even generation that’s 20 trillion products. You didn’t give a soluble fraction, but it is normally 10%. The TOC is less than 10% as known from experiment.

That gives 2 quadrillion barrels source rock or twice the size of the entire permian. Therefore your estimate is physically impossible.

Obviously this will be deleted as people are too dumb to do math. But airplane size is a function of airframe life. The previous duplicate was deleted as well, not marked as duplicate.

An 225 is rebuilt after every flight. It has a airframe life of an hour or so.

Normal jets (747 etc) can fly for thousands of hours. 747 is 35k hours. There were about five versions so that's 5,000 hours per actual plane.

Airports like LAX only fly three actual flights per day. You can see it with a quick search, like today they have LV, SF and NY. The entire country has only about one hundred flights per day. 36,500 hours a year on 10,000 planes for 50 years is 15 hours per plane or three hours per rebuild. Based on publicly available flight data, and common sense, the amount of time airliners spend in the air is truly negligible.

On radarbox you can see approximately 100 planes over america. However this comes out to a truly negligible number, the actual airframe will only fly a few hours in its entire existence.

Previous answers said "the largest airplane possible is a function of time" or something idiotic. Obviously the airframe life of current large airplanes is negligible and goes to nothing as they get larger. Regardless of idiotic statements like "a 747 lasts 35,000 hours" it's obvious from flight plans and plane trackers that their actual flying time is 0.1% of that.

This is not to say small airplanes last longer, just that the current ones are already impossible.

So basically what's the question?

Here's two graphs on reserve requirements. First one is with vault cash. There's negligible cash in bank vaults.

The second one is just m2 over monetary base, minus currency in circulation. The money multiplier is increasing by a full unit in a year. By 2023 it will hit 7.5 which is the 13% capital buffer at chase bank. By summer 2023 it will be 10 which is the Bank of America buffer.

Renewables people want a one for one buffer for fossil fuels. This would crush reserves. Banks will stop lending and there will be no cash to pay interest, capitalism is zero sum and positive interest is impossible.

All the major banks will die. Credit cards will stop working. Government spending will collapse and layoff.

Non-cash home purchases will disappear. Structures are worth 100k while the home is 500k. Home values will fall to that and after taxes and commissions it will be worthless.

Car purchases won't exist. Everything strained will fail

I am asking if there is a difference between an ideology and it's symbolism. For example, the left doesn't support abortion. It supports the bureaucracy and salaries behind abortion not the actual act. If there was a way to make money without doing abortion, they would do it, it's just a coincidence that their interest group and its chosen symbolism or stance align.

Likewise with trans. The left doesn't care if they kill themselves, they're not concerned with anything trans do or their actual survival or physical existence. They just support pride, the symbolism and bureaucracy behind the movement. So it seems like ideology and symbolism are separate.

Likewise racists support cops or whatever, and purely symbolic positions. Despite cries of "cops are niggers" they basically support the exact institution which is causing blacks to exist, while opposing blacks. So I am asking if the symbolism of a movement can differ from its actual outcome.

Capitalism is nonconstructive. It specifies a property capitalism must have (private property) but not a means to define it. With the moratorium property will be meaningless and you'll kill each other. It's wonderful.

Property is just a bunch of technicalities and arbitrary decisions by a judge. Even if property is listed on a title libs argue it's in trust or whatever. Anyone can evict anyone, which is called "title fraud", and capitalism only exists at all because libs were too dumb to develop it.

Let's discuss Dennis most hated subject, eroi.

Like I said earlier recycled steel is 50mwh a ton. A oil wells is one ton per bpd and the oil is 10mwh a ton. In a year a shake well makes 500mwh of oil per ton.

30% is diesel and shale is worse as it's condensate. So the eroi of shale is 1 just for the well and that's why diesel production is falling. Gasoline is such a ineffective fuel stations have been caught adding 40% water to gasoline.

Brain size is environmental. A 50 year old white has a smaller brain than a 20 year old black. This is why rushton is retarded. You're taking a obviously environmental reason, that varies in the same person, and saying genetics. Genetics is obviously fake and pseudoscience, but that doesn't even matter.

Africa has the most temperature variance of any continent. It's mountains are colder than anywhere. Asians are obviously the bug race. R strategy works but it's the exact opposite of rushton. Asians have the smallest body size, blacks vary, and whites are consistently the moderate retards.

Europe and America are the easiest continents to live in, with the most genetic disorders and least endogenous diseases. White Americans are the dumbest race to ever exist and have the highest wars and murder rate of anyone. Racism is a dishonest argument, you defend obviously worthless races like Americans while pretending to be superior. White inventions were funded by Jews and white Americans produced the most worthless products ever devised, like iPhones.

His is a retard board.

Here's a quick takedown of the smallpox crap. South America had 50 million people in 1900. Viruses prefer cold climates. America had malaria, tick diseases and more animals. The only advantage europe had was density but that just means Europeans were a mindless horde.

There's no gene for any specific disease immunity. Immune cells die after a few months, the only reason chickenpox is that you have the actual virus residing in your cells. The point of vax is immunity isn't heritable. The entire smallpox crap directly contradicts vaccination.

Natives were already in Greenland. Even if they weren't america has buffalo pox and other zoonoses that would have the same effect. Smallpox didn't exist until 1600. We have physical evidence of battles thousands of years ago but not the battle of Stalingrad or the smallpox crap. In fact, they found some remains for salmonella, a fish disease that was already there. Malaria is carried by birds as are everything but libs two gay diseases, smallpox and measles, only because those are specifically defined as human diseases.

Jared barely mentioned smallpox, he wrote a brief sentence on it one time. His "Germs" argument was about healthcare and had barely any relation to the immune system. Immunity develops within a few hours and doesn't matter, libs pretend it's this really important life changing thing. The entire argument is backwards because smallpox disappeared because immune systems got weaker.

There were five white people in Congo and thousands of Arab slave traders. You'll die of peak oil in 6mo.

Libs, turn rates follow a simple rule.

Exlude the planes with fuselage lift or thrust vectoring. F 16, 35, and delta wings. For conventional planes weight makes then more maneuverable. The f 15 has a mechanical fly by wire system and controls go to a black box. For planes that configuration the f 18, f 15 and su 27 get more maneuverable with more weight. The weight goes in the back as the pilot is in front and they become more unstable.

Then for delta wings it's the opposite as the weight is already there. Delta wings can't climb while turning

1789 copper shortage

1792 gold shortage

1796-1823 French Revolution and British Invasion

1825 gold shortage

1828 embargo

1836 gold shortage

1847 iron/rail shortage

1853 fake recession

1857-1870 civil war and food shortage

1873 specie shortage

1890 South American land shortage

1893 gold shortage

1900s market manipulation

1914-20 ww1 food and material shortages

1929 copper and anthracite peak

1937 Kilgore TX oil production peak

Korea and demobilization

1958 suez crisis aftermath

1960 peak of eastern coal

1967 copper shortage and Vietnam

1970 peak oil

1973 Arab embargo

1975 soviet peak iron

1980 Iranian peak

1990 soviet collapse from peak oil

1997 Indonesian peak

2008 coal peak and global conventional oil

2015 Chinese peak oil, truck deliveries to bypass condensate and peak vertical drilling. US shale "dumbbell effect" of producing fake oil in heavy or light grades and shortage of middle distillates.

2018 peak oil and rapid social collapse

Just wanted to point out that the accepted answer goes against the so called "jared diamond smallpox crap".

According to [diamond smallpox killed 99% of natives.]( https://www.pbs.org/gunsgermssteel/variables/smallpox.html#:~:text=They%20had%20never%20experienced%20smallpox,by%20an%20infected%20African%20slave.). Therefore there is some immune reason (obviously fictional but still believed without evidence).

If the virus was merely VARV, not smallpox itself, then the "jared diamond smallpox crap" is impossible. If as given in the source,

>The root of VARV circulating in the XX century was estimated to be about 700 years ago, corresponding to about 1300 AD. The divergence between West African and South American VARV went back about 500 years ago (falling approximately in the XVI century)

Then the divergence happened too late for the "smallpox crap" to work and it couldn't be responsible for the genocide of natives. The fact the virus didn't diverge until then shows [genetic transfer](https://www.ox.ac.uk/news/science-blog/rodents-crossed-south-atlantic) between continents.

So the entire idea of the Colombian change, smallpox genociding the natives and so forth is anti scientific and physically impossible. Even if it was "another disease like smallpox" that is unscientific and there is no reason it would work.

Speed matters for subsonic aircraft. Above that it becomes a matter of conventional versus delta wings.

The conventional planes get more turn rate with more weight. F 18 has lower instantaneous than a eagle than a sukhoi. Excluding the planes with fuselage lift (f16) or thrust vectoring, this rule holds. If something adds weight, like thrust vectoring, this is a double benefit. The su 35 turns 90 degrees in two seconds in air shows. Likely the most maneuverable non experimental jet fighter ever created.

The f 15 has a clipped delta wing. With increasing size there's a tendency to put more weight in the back or move the wings back. Although center of gravity is not published you can use RC models to understand it, and they confirm the f 15 is more unstable than a hornet and has a cog farther aft of the wing edge. The hornet LERX compensated for its smaller engine and does not help lift versus the eagle. The sustained turn rate of the eagle is worse as it's a big plane and a partial delta wing. The f 15 has a black box and is mechanical fly by wire, as it is unstable.

For delta wings it's the opposite. Smaller delta wings turn more. Besides the su 35 the most maneuverable plane is the gripen. Delta wings have more speed. Otherwise they have worse low speed handling, more material, can't climb while turning, and have every disadvantage except the only factor that matters in dogfights, instantaneous turn.

As you can see the combination of technology (delta wing, thrust vectoring, relaxed stability) decide turn rate. The f 15 is a big partial delta wing, the gripen is a small one, and the su 35 is a big conventional plane with thrust vectoring.

Planet formation is fake. The universe is e30 meters to a side. The density of the universe is 1 atom per cubic meter. There are e30 atom diameters per square meter.

On average an atom will travel the entire universe without hitting anything. It needs gravity to overcome the distance. At a distance of a meter the electromagnetic force of an atom is about e-20 newton or a coloumb.

The mass of a atom in grams is similar. It comes out to around e-50 newtons of a single atom. You need around e30 atoms to close the gap or a ton.

Quite simply there isn't enough gravity to form a planet for objects smaller than a ton, if planets formed from stardust the dust would just scatter everywhere and never form a planet, or would get smaller over time until planet formation became impossible. Planets would never form spontaneously.

Now pol will act retarded and disagree, and the thread will die.

What I'm asking is if aircraft follow the inverse cube law.

So a f 14 for example has a 3m wing length from front to back. It has a 1m diameter. The rivets are a cm and are spaced to cover about 10% of the plane. So a 3 m wing with 2 sides with rivets every 10 cm is 30 rivets. That's 300 grams of steel or 300 mpa of tensile strength.

A plane turning 1000 m/s with ten tons is 100 gigawatts which will easily destroy these rivets. The actual aircraft has a 10 meter radius so this would be about 20 turns a second or 7,000 degrees. The stress needs to be 3000 times less or 50 times slower. That's 140 degrees a second. With weaker steel and smaller rivets you get the actual turn rate of 30 degrees a second.

As you can see as the plane gets bigger all these values get worse and an an225 cannot complete a standard rate turn.

So obviously stack exchange will be too dumb to understand but physical limits exist.

Obviously this will be deleted immediately but the quality of answers on this site has nosedived over approximately the past year, especially on hot button topics dominated by interest groups. Usually the quality questions are deleted immediately so this is 100% a moderation problem.

https://politics.stackexchange.com/questions/66285/why-is-the-us-asking-opec-about-prices/66306#66306

Not a single real question on the entire board about why gas is $6. This is a obvious issue that affects people in real life and stack exchange has nothing on it.

The question states

>That's surprising. From what I remember, in 2019, U.S. energy production exceeded U.S. energy consumption on an annual basis for the first time since 1957.

The fact this wasn't immediately deleted shows this site is basically mentally retarded. As is well known [the type](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-refiners-trucks-analysis/u-s-refiners-turn-to-tanker-trucks-to-avoid-dumbbell-crudes-idUSKBN0MJ09520150323) of oil America produces is condensate and 100% useless yet stack exchange is dumb enough to think it is real.

>The blends tend to produce a higher proportion of fuel at two ends of the spectrum: light ends like gasoline, demand for which has dimmed in recent years, and lower-value heavy products like fuel oil and asphalt. What’s missing are middle distillates like diesel, where growing demand and profitability lies.

Another question, utterly ridiculous statement.

https://politics.stackexchange.com/questions/19356/why-is-the-u-s-still-dependent-on-fossil-fuels/19375#19375

>The United States has plenty of coal.

Obviously not.

Also very odd discussion of renewables.

>There are also some problems related to managing the grid. The grid isn't really ready to handle green alternatives, as most of them are variable.

This ignores the current rapid decline in renewables due to rare earths depletion.

These are just three examples of stack exchange being completely wrong and falling for midwit level statements. Even if you cite these statements they are obviously categorically wrong. There were also better answers mods deleted (see internet archive).

Why are the mods so aggressive in reducing the quality of this site and deleting any correct answers?

Just as a example, the Charles dickens novels talk about being evicted for two years after not paying rent. It's not even a eviction, it's just allowing criminals to enter or something else. There was also a eviction protest in New York in 1920 and police were physically defeated.

Is there any evidence evictions existed in any meaningful way before the modern period?

As shown in previous threads, a new aircraft will evade a missile easily. In Vietnam the sparrow launched and locked 45% of the time, same as the gulf war. The hit rate was 8% after evasive action. Technology didn't improve, what happened was the airframes got older and couldn't evade the missile.

Again, with math given earlier, the energy density of a amraam and it's angular moment gives it 50g of turning ability, about 20g left at the target. A b52 turns 17 degrees a second at 300mph. A missile is seven times faster. A 3g turn for a plane is 20g for a missile. Given the missile is faster it will spend basically all its G and fail to hit a b52. A new b 52 can easily evade a amraam, anything can.

The only reason missiles work is that airframes are old. A new mig 15 from 1950 would easily defeat a modern raptor which is 10-20 years old. If you watch blue angel shows their aircraft struggle to do anything.

Airframe life is the sole factor in air combat. Nesher were a new airframe in 73 and got all the kills. If israel only had phantoms it would lose it's wars, and in all wars the new airframe gets all the kills. The only exception is the Ogaden war because the primary sources say those were crashes but Wikipedia lists them as kills.

Missiles became effective because airframes are old. This isn't modeled in the game. If you do the math on G limits it's obvious a new airframe will easily evade any missile. It's only when the airframe is old and missiles are new they work at all. There's no difference between a Vietnam sparrow and amraam, it's the airframes got worse.

[quote=boogabooga post\_id=5017084 time=1658099991 user\_id=142666]

Your claim that "Technology didn't improve" is citation needed. As is the premise that AIM-7 performance didn't improve between Vietnam and the Gulf War.

Also, I think that there is a very, very important point that is getting missed about the new missile fly-out model. Don't think of it that missiles are much easier to dodge- think of it that [b]practical[/b] missile engagement ranges have decreased by about 60%.

[/quote]

Correct it didn't improve.

https://nationalinterest.org/blog/reboot/you-can-still-find-f-4-phantoms-haunting-skies-192512

[quote]Studies showed that 45 percent of Vietnam-era AIM-7s and 37 percent of AIM-9s failed to either launch or lock on, and after evasive maneuvers, the probability of achieving a kill fell to eight percent and 15 percent for the two types, [/quote]

Amraam:

Dec 27 1992 mig kill

January 1993 mig 23 kill

February 28 1994 1 kill out of 3 planes. Possible amraam failure (10-25% accuracy).

1998-1999 unknown amraam fired on Iraq, 100% failure.

1999 six amraam fired on foxbats, 100% failure.

1999 allied force, five or six hits.

March 24 1999 2200 hrs, 3 shots 1 kill.

March 26 1999, 3 shots 2 kills.

Total for allied force at least 12 shots with 5 kills.

2015 two su 24 shoot down.

2017 su 22.

2019 Pakistan (4 missiles 1 kill).

Total at least 29 amraam fired. At most 13 kills. 40% accuracy.

If you limit it to actual data then the 1992, 1999 Iraq, three of the allied force kills have accounts with one sa 7 incident, then 2017/19.

1992 1 kill

1998 at least 1 shot over Iraq.

1999 6 shots 0 kills Iraq

1999 March 24 1 kill and at 2200 3 shots 1 kill.

March 24 Dutch f 16 kill.

March 26 3 shots 2 kills.

Additional f 16c kill which Wikipedia claims was serb friendly fire. Incident was may 4 and no information at all.

2017 fitter.

2019 4 shots 1 kill.

Total 22 shots and 8 kills or 36%.

AIM 7D was just as bad as the amraam. The base functionality of the missile, being able to fire and track at all was 45% for sparrow and 40% for amraam. The sparrow hit 15% with 8% kills whereas 100% of amraam hits were kills (again old airframes). 75% of sparrow were fired out of parameters.

The fact missiles got better means airframes got worse. Missile technology didn't improve at all its simply airframes getting worse. If you disagree then which specific incident are you disputing?

Obviously you'll just insist the amraam improved but if you use the actual accounts of its use it's just as bad at functioning, then the high hit rate is because technology is inferior to the 1960s and the airframes are old. You'll insist airframes are better but it's mathematically impossible for a new airframe to be hit by a missile while evading, and no aircraft have been built for about forty years.

Fighter aircraft take 20 years to design. The moon landing from Kennedys speech to the landing was about 7 years.

Normally larger projects take longer to do. So for example, it takes about two years to design a prototype of a car, about a decade to design a fighter jet (which costs a thousand times more), etc. Yet Apollo cost way more than all of these and the prototype took five years and testing was a mere two years.

The mercury program was actually based almost directly on nazi rockets and the redstone. It was "easy". After that the Gemini program was "essentially a enlarged mercury capsule". Yet Apollo was a completely new design and completed in less time. I would have expected it to take decades or centuries and they didn't even have real ICBMs before the Saturn V was done. Why was Apollo so much easier than expected?

Let's discuss crime=density ideology.

Blacks are urban because they're not evolved for the climate. Whites die of malaria so blacks are always density. Blacks have more disabilities which cause drug use and density.

Jews have disabilities but are white. They network with whites and get rich. Cities have more total wealth, it's just they have overpopulation and drugs. If you can live in a city but network with other people who have money you can have high density and status.

Now his will give an idiot reply and the thread will die.

Assume a proton never decays. At least that claim is made.

Over infinite time the vacuum creates a anti particle. Then it collided and destroyed the proton.

Doesn't everything decay? Is there any meaningful difference between decay and vacuum energy destroying it?

Capitalism is literally retards. It's zero sum, a pays b 100, b pays a 99, a pays b 98 etc.

There's no way lend lease could have mattered. America gave Soviets ten percent of their explosives. America did not give a single firearm or artillery. They gave planes, tanks and other useless things.

There's no way lend lease could have mattered because america did not send a single artillery piece or anything that could have fired the ammunition given.

His is literally retards and will disagree. All replies will be ignored.

The smallpox crap is fake.

Anyway this is a trash book and I will spend no time on it.

Aspects of the Roman Empire are fake. Most Roman history focuses on two things: taxation and warfare. However the idea that taxes existed in Rome is a myth. Roman citizenship was enforced by exclusion. There were no cops, no real debt collectors or anything. The government was a pyramid scheme that you paid into, it wasn't coercive direct taxation.

As for the Roman army it never existed as a standing force. There are a handful of major battles which are recorded. However the iron production of the entire empire was 100,000 tons. If 1% of that went to armor that's 1,000 tons or 50,000 suits. Over a decade they could armor approximately a million soldiers. Equipping the army that existed in the late Roman Empire would be barely physically possible.

Just today a police officer was physically annihilated. They have died at least once a day for a four day streak, and hundreds died this year.

For every death there are hundreds of wounded. A normal military casualty ratio is 10/1. Just assuming this ratio that's 4,000 officer casualties per year.

The nypd has 10,000 patrol officers and 3% of the population. That comes out to around 300,000 officers in america that die 1% a year.

Assuming 2% annual attrition they need 6,000 officers every year. Furthermore half of police shootings are reported so the actual casualties could be 8,000.

How did police survive if they die faster than recruited?

America builds 400,000 acres of road a year. The country has a billion acres. Furthermore usually about a mile from a road is seized for sound barriers and other services which puts the total at 15 million acres.

In other words 2% of the land area of America is eminent domained every year. There are no buildings in New York older than 1800 because literally all the land has been seized.

If eminent domain paid just compensation would the payouts be trillions?

Obviously this will be deleted immediately but the accepted answer is incorrect.

The "adiabatic burn temperature" is the temperature at equilibrium at constant volume. [here](https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Adiabatic\_flame\_temperature)

>The constant volume adiabatic flame temperature is the temperature that results from a complete combustion process that occurs without any work, heat transfer or changes in kinetic or potential energy. Its temperature is higher than in the constant pressure process because no energy is utilized to change the volume of the system (i.e., generate work).

This is obviously not relevant to wtc as there was nothing containing the fire.

This is ignoring the quantity of jet fuel at wtc was too small also. A thousand square meters of 1 meter flooring is thousands of tons [at the density of concrete](https://www.google.com/search?q=fensity+of.concrete&rlz=1CDGOYI\_enUS944US944&oq=fensity+of.concrete&aqs=chrome..69i57j69i177j69i60l4.2262j0j7&hl=en-US&sourceid=chrome-mobile&ie=UTF-8). The total amount of jet fuel was less than 10% the weight of the flooring. To make an analogy it's like a cars gas tank destroying the car.

As for the question being asked, "maximum burning temperature "- in open air, which is the only sense in which this question has meaning- can be given. The Wikipedia claim is also incorrect and has no academic studies.

[Here](https://web.mit.edu/16.unified/www/FALL/thermodynamics/notes/node84.html) is a graph of engine temperature.

[![enter image description here][1]][1]

Even a jet engine struggles to reach 600 Celsius and it needs compressors to do so. Claiming the burning temperature of jet fuel is 2000C leads to physically impossible conclusions like you can fly a plane without engines or some absurdity. As stack exchange is a midwit site it believes such obvious physical impossibilities.

So in all cases the "jet fuel crap" is impossible and the "Jews did wtc" position is not disputed.

[1]: <https://i.stack.imgur.com/rBQjA.jpg>

Renormizalization is a obvious one, gravity becomes infinite at short distances. The Wikipedia level objections are here.

https://web.archive.org/web/20220510043531/https://physics.stackexchange.com/questions/707843/bad-explanation-by-poincare

The correct theory is obviously lesage theory. Everything is trivial, just bouncy balls. It does not require any extra dimensions. Gravity is just a pressure difference. No matter how much ether flows into a point, it will always be lower pressure than the surrounding, and the relative values will be the same.

Gravity is just pressure differences in the ether, electromagentism is just cyclones. It's just whatever causes gravity, spinning. The plum pudding model is correct except for orbitals, which are just a byproduct of the planck constant or whatever the elasticity of the ether is. Everything in physics can be explained by fluid dynamics. String theories themselves are simply waves in the ether.

[![enter image description here][1]][1]

[1]: https://i.stack.imgur.com/RzdbR.jpg

The number of rental assistance applications is growing rapidly (note the data change in April artificially reducing the number as local programs were delegated).

Now, in some cities, like SF it is currently illegal to evict. In Los Angeles it's entirety possible the moratorium will be resumed, or the homeless encampments will destroy the property value rendering the rent moot.

If these trends continue do landlords have any recourse? If the government fails to pay landlords assistance and allows rent to go unpaid what will happen legally?

This will be deleted immediately but I just want to mention scaling laws of aircraft. Larger planes have a higher turn rate.

[![enter image description here][1]][1]

[1]: https://i.stack.imgur.com/CKHCf.jpg

This holds for conventional wings. Up to the point of the tomcat structural limits reduce the turn rate. Thereafter planes get bigger by reducing turn rates.

The tomcat is a 6g plane and 20 tons. A phantom is 9g and 15 tons. The turn rate goes down proportional to size. A 40 ton aircraft has essentially nothing.

The an 225 is 300 tons. Titanium is half the weight of steel and 4x the aircraft size. This is the limit on how big a plane can get.

Small planes are made of wood. Then aluminum, steel, then titanium. Once the turn rate is low and titanium is used it's physically impossible to build a larger aircraft. The an225 wing droop is because of gravity, like how the b52 does the same when fueled.

It's physically impossible to build larger airplanes than already exist. The c 5 was designed as the largest possible airplane without titanium and still had cracks and problems. The xb 49 broke apart.

I know that Citi will fail first, the mediocre banks will die first.

After Citi I'm less sure but I give the order of collapse as

Citigroup Inc.

BOFA

BNP Paribas USA, Inc.†

JPMorgan Chase & Co.

Credit Suisse Holdings (USA), Inc.

UBS Americas Holding LLC

DWS USA Corporation

HSBC North America Holdings Inc.

Morgan Stanley/Wells Fargo

The Goldman Sachs Group, Inc.

With Goldman hiding assets as it's credit card.

>>13740042

>>13740040

>>13740029

I will answer this after I answer the engine question.

The drag coefficient of a ship is .05. That means if it's moving through water with a mass density 1, at 10 m/s, that's 100 watts per square meter of drag. Cargo ship is 50mx100m or 5,000 m2. That's 500kw of energy or 25kw after drag.

If I punch jidf at 30 m/s with 100kg, that's 100kw. Entire ship can be propelled by one person on the basis of drag.

Now let's assume there's no ocean current and water is moving against you. 5 m/s water over 5,000 m2 is 25,000 tons of water every second at 625,000 watts.

If the ship is also moving 10m/s that's now three times as much water at three times the speed, or 30x the kinetic energy to move it. That's 30 mw.

The largest ship engine is 100mw at 30% efficiency. Oil is 36 gj a ton. That's one ton every six minutes or 240 tons a day, again at 10 m/s or about 1000 km a day. This is a short trip.

There are 50,000 ships so that's 4 billion tons a year. Expressed as barrels a day, that's 84 million barrels, more than world oil production.

Ships are physically impossible.

The entire thread is of course liberalism, this post will be ignored but nukes are fake.

Soviets were vastly stronger than anything the west had after the 70s, they are still stronger today but don't try. No physical evidence for battle of Stalingrad.

Any "who would win" scenario is obviously Soviets would win, that is easy, no question. In reality nothing would happen but in a purely military sense they would win.

There was never enough plutonium for nukes to work. Only about 100 tons of plutonium were ever made. Of the few million tons of uranium ever consumed reactors breed plutonium for the first years. There was only ever enough plutonium for a few nukes and all of them were used in nuclear tests or are old by now.

An atomic weapon has approximately the power of a battleship or tank company, it's not a big factor, it wouldn't affect a war.

Tank brigades are physically impossible. The amount of fuel needed to operate tanks is such there has never been 100 operating at one time. Ww3 would go nowhere, but to the extent anything happened, the Soviets win. Only a few dozen b 52s were ever made yet his will cite Wikipedia.

The a 10 is a slower and smaller plane than the frog foot. America has more fighters but Alamo has better range, and the flogger has a better gun than phantom.

Torpedoes are useless and Belgrano was a 1920s torpedo. The navies on both sides would be useless but otherwise Soviets had Kirovs and their naval guns were superior. After ww2 america had no real surface fleet before the Spruance while Kotlin destroyers were strong.

Afghanistan was the air war of ww3, Soviets won, Pakistan was never effectively able to use their planes. Airframe life is the sole factor in air combat and Israel would die without the Nesher. The American planes israel used did poorly.

Tanks are the one area america was better, besides naval sams, but america lost the gulf war and ran out of fuel in 4 days. Soviets had a more realistic chance of using tanks, nato would only win on infantry and urban warfare. In any technological sense Soviets would win.

There are interiors of countries where gdp=tourism applies also.

North vs south Germany

North vs south Italy

Interiors of cities (tourism areas better)

Catalonia vs Spain

Tokyo vs Hokkaido

Seoul vs northern provinces (the southern provinces have ports)

New South Wales vs queensland

Kerala vs interior

American states are different and due to hydropower.

Montreal or Vancouver vs interior.

In almost all cases the income differences inside countries and cities are due to tourism.

Capitalism was never profitable. Capitalism is zero sum- a pays b 100, b pays a 99, a pays b 98 etc. Capitalism is literally retards. The trpf is resource depletion (mining is better and declines more).

If you invested in anything in 1980 you would lose money. Land (or whatever the base resource is) outperforms capital because capitalism must lose money as it's zero sum.

Any losses within capitalism, like taxes, make it negative sum. Because the spending side goes to healthcare, which is tax exempt, this leads to growth in healthcare as a share of gdp and the real economy becomes negligible over time.

It never reaches that point because rent grows with taxes, and because taxes grow faster than a zero sum economy there is a permanent deficit which causes everything to collapse when rent and healthcare costs exceed income. Thus the moratorium and capitalism collapses rapidly. Currently in the Bay Area several percent of people aren't paying rent and this doubles every few months. Capitalism collapses rapidly when rent exceeds income as it is zero sum and it's impossible for profit to be positive. This is the opposite of Marxism, Marxism said wages would fall. It is healthcare wages increasing that pushes income negative and you die at last.

It appears exactly one, wpns answered. His answer is incorrect because 60nm nw Kuwait City, is Iraq.

Was there any more than one single a 10 sortie, in Kuwait, in the entire gulf war? Even this single sortie doesn't mention anything, or give any information.

Obviously this question will be deleted immediately as stack exchange is defending the answer.

It is possible the number was low to zero, for the following reasons.

1. Most of the Iraqi equipment was abandoned or ineffective.

https://www.google.com/amp/s/www.tampabay.com/archive/1991/09/15/experts-look-again-at-wartime-satellite-photos/%3FoutputType%3Damp

>But at the same time, it seems clear now that the Iraqi force in Kuwait \_ whatever the numbers \_ probably did pose a threat to Saudi Arabia and American interests in that country.

>This is what could be concluded from the Soviet satellite pictures:

>The Iraqi army hadn't sent its tanks sweeping across the Kuwaiti desert; the signs of movement of such a force would have been easy to see in the Soviet photos. Even in satellite pictures with resolutions of 33 feet \_ many times poorer than those the Soviets provided \_ analysts could read the story of armored battles of the Iran-Iraq war in tracks left in the sand.

2. Iraq set the oil fires in January. By then it had probably left because there was nothing to do in Kuwait.

3. This photo was photoshopped in 2002.

[![enter image description here][1]][1]

Although a famous photo of the gulf war, one of the earliest mentions of it was the Wikimedia page created in 2007, and the defense department ID is 020926-O-9999G-908.JPG, with the first two digits implying a creation date of 2002. Although not directly relevant to warthogs it does show the need to check primary sources.

4. Of the single warthog sortie we have an account of, it mentions seven tanks destroyed. What does this mean? Were they abandoned? Destroyed by ground forces? The army made no effort to catalog and document Iraqi losses. If there was a sortie it has barely any trace in the record.

[1]: <https://i.stack.imgur.com/1PvXb.jpg>

I want to know when evictions started. Charles Dickens talked about how he didn't pay rent in two years and the landlord complained. Evidently, evictions didn't exist.

Sometime between then and now people decided to use police to force people to do things. I don't know when exactly that started. Obviously stack exchange will act like this is an easy question or delete it.

Small claims courts started in the 1940s so it was physically impossible to evict before then. Furthermore the rent was very low. In 1930 you paid $50 on a $500 monthly income for a Manhattan apartment. Rent just wasn't significant enough for evictions to matter, or at least a rent strike at that time was physically defeated by Jews and police failed to evict. https://news.mit.edu/2013/the-great-rent-wars-of-new-york-1021

So I just want to know at what point evictions happened or became possible. Most courts do not have records that go back that far. New York has no buildings made before 1800 because everything was eminent domained. In terms of evictions Nevada had no police until 1924 so that is a starting point. HUD did not factor income into rental decisions until the Brooke Ammendment. This means evictions just didn't exist at all until the 70s or 80s.

Most states did not actually enforce property taxes until the 1930s which is why all the conservation land is some discrete block that was unowned before that date. The park services grew around that time by claiming all the tax liens. National parks were founded in 1916.

There's a sample of cases here

[![enter image description here][1]][1]

Which shows even then a concept of "partial eviction" existed, or merely harassing the tenant is an eviction. In fact it basically says evictions are illegal, and only mentions them as a justification to not pay rent if the landlord evicts you.

Note the genocide of the Irish is called a eviction in textbooks, although it's not really a eviction, just ethnic cleansing. This is usually how the term eviction is used in older works.

This gem from 1994 talks about evictions like they are a impossible thing that never happens.

[![enter image description here][2]][2]

Surely this is not a website full of 12 year olds, some of you should have enough life experience and self awareness to know when the threat of eviction became a normal concept.

https://m.sfgate.com/bayarea/article/97-year-old-evicted-tenant-in-a-tough-spot-but-6847769.php

This guy rented on a verbal agreement, made in 1950, and they are trying to evict now. I want to know when libs decided to write the lease and force an eviction.

And with ngram viewer you see that the concept of evictions started around the 80s. The decline thereafter is due to changes in terms, and the use of notices.

[![enter image description here][3]][3]

[![enter image description here][4]][4]

[1]: https://i.stack.imgur.com/jfIk0.jpg

[2]: https://i.stack.imgur.com/lpeNV.png

[3]: https://i.stack.imgur.com/rXXF8.png

[4]: <https://i.stack.imgur.com/0OJGF.png>

So it's clear that of anything of the form x ^ 1/2, you can take the logarithm of both sides.

So log sqrt (x) is the same as 1/2 log x. This is the power rule of logarithms.

Of course you can't take the logarithm of imaginary numbers, so if the exponent is imaginary it doesn't work. The zeta function is basically 1/ sqrt (n). Because n has a imaginary exponent you can't solve using the power rule.

So what I'm asking is, is this all the Riemann hypothesis is? If I just take the logarithm rule and apply it ignoring the imaginary number, does that solve the reimann hypothesis?

The zeta function is a sum of

1/n^s

, where it has a root at s = 1/2 + it. This case is

1/n^(1/2+it)

If you were to take one iteration of this summation and invert the denominator on both sides, it simplifies to

n^(1/2+it)

We can do this by treating the summation as a limit then differentiating both sides, making the left side 1/z(s).

The rest is equivalent to

N^(1/2) \* n ^ it

Taking the log of both sides this becomes

Log (sqrt (n)) + log (n^it)

Then the important part, using the power rule we can move the exponent around.

1/2 log (n) + it log (n)

Which simplifies to, multiplying by two

Log (n) + 2it log (n)

Which further simplifies to

2It log (n2)

Again using the power rule

4it log(n)

And dividing both sides by 4it gives

Log(n) = log(z(s)) / 2it (equation 1)

As differentiation removes the log and inverts both sides, this becomes

1/n = 1/(z(s) \* 2it)

Squaring both sides,

0 = z(s) \* 2it

Z(s) = 0

Going back to (1),

Log (n) = log (0) / 2it

= 1/2it

Squaring both sides,

2log (n) = 1/4 (-1) t2 (equation 2)

Diving by 2

Log(n) = -1/8 t2

Differentiating

1/n = -8 t

T = -1/8n

Going back to (2),

2log (n) = -1/8 (-1/8n) ^2

Differentiating

1/2n = 64n

Fully evaluating this leads to 1 = 128, a clearly wrong result as we took the log of an imaginary number which is illegal.

Note that any choice of the real part will give this result, by the constant multiple rule. The only difference is that 1/2 is the only value that will always give this 1=128 result, without invoking the rule. This constant multiple relies on us using the power rule to move the exponent to become a multiple. Therefore the "least broken" proof is that the real part is always 1/2.

This 2^7, or 128 result is because in order to solve the equation you need to solve for 3 terms (the left side, the real term and the imaginary term) and square and differentiate them one time, then a final step to remove the exponent. Any proof using the power rule will get this result.

The question I'm asking is simple, tell me if the Riemann hypothesis is ill posed because it could be solved by taking the log of a imaginary number. If this illegal operation was allowed then it would have an eigenvalue at a real part of 1/2 that all other proofs would converge on, but only 1/2 gives the most direct proof. Again, this is not a proof of the reimann hypothesis, it is proof it requires an illegal operation to solve and is ill posed.

Obviously this question will be deleted immediately because, although it is written in fifth grade language stack exchange is too dumb to read. All the above is fake and it's unsolvable because more unknowns than equations.

>>390474878

The majority of American fields were already declining or almost before 2020. It's impossible to stop oil coming out of the ground. The fact that the entire discussion is in America, and also only on leases, shows how braindead American politics is and how irrelevant all of it is.

American refineries consume 15 m bpd. The imports are half that. Domestic production is 11m with 4m exports. 7m left for consumption.

The stripper wells are useless and are about 2 million BPD. 80% of the wells in America are stripper wells. A truck moving water at a water cut of 10 at 50 miles per ton gallon is .2 gallons per trip, or .5 with return trip, for a ton of water. One ton of water per barrel.

That's 1 million gallons or 20,000 barrels per day of gas to move water. The actual water cut could be 100 so 200,000 barrels made from 500k of crude. If these trucks are less than full load that's 1 million barrels per day to sustain these stripper wells.

The oilfield chemicals industry is $30 billion, about $10 billion in America. At 100k per worker that's 100,000 workers. Those are all the water trucks.

Of that basically all of it is filler. The global chemical industry is 3 billion tons per year and about 500m in America. That's 10 million barrels per day. All of the oil America produces outside GOM and stripper wells is bad.

Let's do some quick math here. Arab D in Ghawar is 800 billion tons of rock. At 10% organic carbon, 25% soluble, that's 150 billion barrels of volume. This is (unsurprisingly) the oil reserves of the reservoir.

The majority of oil in the world is split between different API in the range of 20 to 50, with 5% in the aromatic range of 39-41 API. It also has lower porosity (about 15% vs 25%).

Oil only forms on fault lines, within a distance of about ten miles. The world has 30,000 miles of fault zones with 300,000 mi2 of this area. This means 1.2 trillion barrels of reserves. Because condensate is included as reserves the number is slightly higher (1.4 trillion).

In 1980 the world had 1.4 trillion barrels of inferred oil reserves. No oil has been discovered since that time. The world consumed 75 million barrels a day since 1980 which is a consumption of 1.2 trillion barrels. This means 200 billion barrels exist to be consumed and it is logically impossible for more to exist. There is no space in the world for more oil.

Is oil consumption historically accurate? Are there 200 billion barrels left?

Let's try to provoke jidf a little bit more.

America had 275,000 miles of rail in 1920. A lot of this was imported from England which peaked in 1850.

Rail is 40kg/m or 100kg for two rails. That comes out to 55 million tons for the entire system. Buildings and pipelines extend this. 10kg per square foot of steel, 1,000 square feet per person is 1-3 billion tons of steel buildings. 3% depreciation which is the annual steel production.

The rail steel is of high quality and that's why it is made less. 1084 steel is 820 MPA. A36 is half that. There is maybe ten times more structural steel so 100 million tons of quality steel. In other words, basically all the steel is in rail.

The uk had 15,000 miles of rail in 1900. Its iron production grew from 0 to 10mt 1700-1900. It had by that point produced a billion tons of iron. Given its own rail network was tiny, and america is most of the 500,000 miles of rail in the world, this was enough to build the entire world rail network ten times over.

Given the statistics confuse recycling and production, and the production grew linearly from 1700 to 1900, it's reasonable to assume that around 1800 to 1850 the actual iron production peaked.

>immigrants lower wages

To what extent does this actually happen?

For one thing, after COVID the boomer population is actually declining, so that doesn't work. Just like when Marx wrote, the capital stock was already declining and the industrial base was dead. Even if your argument is correct it would work in reverse.

One argument is immigrants raise population. But then you're opposing population, it's not a actual argument. And it's fertility=density so you're literally mustang.

The argument is that businesses chose to lower wages. But the entire increase in inequality is in the stock market, which is not labor. If boomers sell a stock to each other at ever inflated values this will cause wealth to grown without affecting wages. It does make housing unaffordable and so on, but it does nothing else.

Wages fell because healthcare spending increased and because all the money creation went to the stock market. Not because the profit margin of corporations increased or the non-stock compensation of executives increasing. The entire increase in executive compensation was stock as their salary is capped at a million dollars (like it already was). The entire cause of inequality is in the stock market and the profit margin or executive base salary has not changed.

So it's not even logically possible. If Hispanics make 10% less, then them being half the workforce would lower wages 5%, ignoring that they would just raise white wages to cancel it out.

So the only real argument against immigration is that you'll die of peak oil in 6mo. The wage argument makes zero sense mathematically.

>>13817266

>Tech still was and still is miniscule in comparison to the housing market for example.

Tech is half the stock market, it's overwhelming. Much of the housing market is tech driven anyway. California and New York are the majority of the housing market and are completely tech or healthcare.

In terms of physical value the tech industry is nothing and always will be. But capitalism only cares about asset values and tech is dominant there.

Capitalism is a very specific pyramid scheme that started in the 1930s with xerox, which patent trolled some trivial inventions, got apple to do the same, then apple ran its own pyramid scheme for a variety of reasons and came to dominate the stock market. From the perspective of capitalism, tech industry is and always was capitalism. In the 19th century there were railroads that serves the same purpose. Not a single major company from 1900 is relevant today because there was a period between railroads being destroyed in the depression to the start of the tech industry where there was nothing.

But modern capitalism is entirely based on the tech industry, at least in financial terms. Capitalism doesn't value anything you need to survive or exist, like food. It does value housing but the value of housing is determined by savings and other assets, which end up being the tech industry.

Housing wasn't worth anything until the 1950s. The concept of "buying a house" didn't exist and there were no mortgages or any way to do that. Mortgages created housing and the mortgages themselves came from the military- which was the tech industry at the time- and grew from there. IBM sold to the military and was later surpassed by apple and others. IBM made the space program and the other aspects of military-industrial capitalism possible.

At a trivial level capitalism is cops, but at a higher order level it has a very specific and clear meaning- the tech industry, apple, and the pyramid scheme around that.

It is unclear. We don't have enough information to prove there were no elections and it is implied there were.

The Nazis stated

>Popular assemblies [Volksvertretungen] of the "Laender" shall be abolished. [\_law.yale.edu\_][1]

These are state elections.

There are about ten other [types](https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Municipalities\_of\_Germany) of local governments within Germany, and these aren't mentioned. If not specifically prohibited from having elections it's possible they continued to do so. In fact, de jure, they would do so unless there is a separate law not available on the internet.

[Also](https://de-m-wikipedia-org.translate.goog/wiki/Deutsche\_Gemeindeordnung?\_x\_tr\_sl=auto&\_x\_tr\_tl=en&\_x\_tr\_hl=en&\_x\_tr\_pto=wapp), there was a law on municipal government, abolishing municipal councils. Again, no mention of town councils elections, and no mention of how they changed. It does however indicate they existed. There are multiple levels of government and its not clear how far down elections are abolished.

[![enter image description here][2]][2]

Oh, and are towns and municipalities the same? [No.](https://germanlawarchive.iuscomp.org/?p=380)

>The local autonomy of towns, municipalities and districts is a key element of modern constitutional states.

[1]: https://avalon.law.yale.edu/imt/2006-ps.asp

[2]: <https://i.stack.imgur.com/CZ5c7.png>

https://www.sci.news/astronomy/universe-getting-hotter-09037.html

It is known for example that the universe is getting hotter due to friction in the ether.

This is the objection Poincare gave to lesage theory. Because empirical results show the universe is in fact heating the standard model is now lesage theory.

So aren't you back to square one?

Mods have joined faggotry. The mods support white supremacy, which is dishonest as they are mutts and actually not white at all. But let's discuss cold winters theory.

The average annual temperature in the Mediterranean is closer to room temperature than anywhere else. Africa has the most temperature variance of any continent. White 50 year olds have smaller brains than black 20 year olds. Africa doesn't have any resources- his is a retard board and will disagree.

There is a racial difference in skull size, but it's a fraction of a percent or something pathetic which is why pol infographics never mention it. Racists are leftists and defend cops.

Europe has the easiest climate and the dumbest people. Africa has lower drug use than Europe and the iq of Africans is probably significantly higher than modern Europeans. The idea that better climate makes dumber people has two assumptions.

One is economics, or rational choice theory. If people have rational goals then ability to meet those goals will increase reproductive success.

In reality everyone is mentally retarded, inventing computers is easy and the fact it took thousands of years shows retardation. The underlying value system of rushton subhumanity is based on the idea that peoples underlying goals that intelligence is applied to are constructive.

The other assumption behind climate affecting intelligence is that, if the underlying value system is rational, then the rational behavior will actually be adaptive or rewarded by other people. Considering europe spent forever suppressing science and intentionally destroying its own knowledge, at least according to racists and other leftists, then it leads to the opposite result. Because the actual value system that europe applied was that knowledge is bad, the fact that it failed to suppress knowledge is a failure of its own intelligence. Suppressing knowledge is easy and only a severely retarded society would fail at that.

RK strategy is based on body size, it has nothing to do with intelligence. Furthermore climate is a independent factor in body size, the body size caused only by climate is orthogonal to RK strategy. Racists constantly talk about iq and genetics despite knowing nothing about either. Of course rushton presented iq studies which are obviously fake. There is no question that Chinese PISA results, for example, are fake.

Now mods will delete the thread. Or racists, all of them being mentally retarded, will give a midwit reply because they are dumb enough to think Asians are white.

Private property did not exist before 1950.

In the book Evicted, during the GFC, it mentions utility shut offs and faggotry. Cops did not do evictions, you cannot find any example of evictions happening before 2017.

Capitalism is literally retards and has only existed ten years. Credit scores did not exist. Money did not exist, you would go to a store and open a line of credit. Cops had no body armor and did not do stupid things.

Nobody paid for anything and boomers lived in niggertopia. Since the failaids pandemic began the nonwhite population is falling because capitalism is collapsing now that it started happening at all.

Sun. Moon. Earth. Man. Hair. Ear. Hand. Arm.

Summer. Winter. Spring. Fall. Land. Water. Dirt. Food. Drink.

>sun

Solis/soul

>earth

Terra - erra - earth

>man

Virile

>hair

Coma/comb

>ear

Auris

>hand

Manual

>summer

Estivate

>winter

Frigid/frigus

>spring

Fons- fountain

>drink

Bibere imbibe

>water

Russians were alcoholic and called it vodka

>food

Morsus - morsel

They are all some version of Latin, lib. German is the retard words. German is an addition to English not the core language. German is the beginning of the cancer of language based on cliches and indefinite articles.

Five year olds are smarter than the top phd historians. All the basic confusion and illogical stances are never resolved with an answer, they just go nowhere.

Why were there 1000 slaves that didn't rebel against 1 owner? Whole period 1943-45 no battles? Why can't I take over the world as Zimbabwe like my video game? Why do cops even exist, and when do they start? How was building things even possible if the energy to make them is the same as they use? Why does a photon touch every atom in a gram in a second? How do libs oppose the government then worship the functionaries through which they have power at all? How does evolution work if it's obliterated by mutations? Why does Africa have no resources and europe all the iron? How do wars even happen if everything is within the underlying architecture of libs and liberalism? How do airplanes fly 250,000 hours but actually fly 10? Why has nobody bothered to optimize anything or calculate how long before peak oil? Why is all the effort into transporting rather than building things? How is everything flinstone cars and gasoline is a fake fuel? How does society exactly consume all the electricity it produces? How do ships exist if ocean currents are nearly always stronger than engines? How does language exist besides being a hierarchy of concepts starting with absence? If ww2 was real why were chemical weapons not used?

All these problems are answered with it's all fake and you'll die of peak oil. But libs in the meantime invested immense resources in trying to prove them all for naught.

Yang spam is my favorite memetic ideology. It's something only the internet could create, based on autism and first order logic.

Capitalism was never profitable. Capitalism doesn't exist for profit, profit exists because the IRS excludes capital leases as COGS and Wikipedia declares profit exists. The TRPF is resource depletion.

Capitalism exists as a mindless behavior where libs increase a numeric value. If there is more income, they take that too.

Private property didn't exist before 1950. Everything before that is subsistence agriculture. After 1950 rent was just a utility payment. The rental yield was income versus m2, and m2 grew at some arbitrary rate after the federal reserve was created.

In 1870 money velocity was about 4 because there was less gold than gdp. Then gold didn't matter and they created more reserves. Then velocity halved by the 20th century as the world was mining 1,000 tons of gold. The Roman Empire had 250 tons of gold and the global gold stock remained around that until the Calif gold rush, which more or less created the concept of inflation and gold became a major part of gdp. 20 years later the money supply was growing 5% and that became the inflation rate.

Rent in 1930 was 11% of your income. Rent was $18 in 1930 on $1970 salary. Because of healthcare salary began to diverge. Falling wages actually have nothing to do with rich people, it's because healthcare grows faster than wages and creates a gap between gdp and wages. Even if rich did nothing then wages would grow slower than gdp.

Inflation is due to the metals supply hundreds of years ago. When metals take over gdp they determine inflation then it grows at some arbitrary rate.

The median rent is now 1900 or 5.25% growth. Income is now $67521. That's 4% growth. This 1% wedge between wages and rent over 91 years means rent is 34% of income. The 23% difference is due to healthcare which went from 4% to 20%, and the rich income that went from 10% to 25%. In 1930 healthcare was 4% of gdp and the amount of disabled and old people grew, and seniors went to 5% of the population to 15%. Disabled workers were 2% in 1970 and 10% now.

Because healthcare creates gdp, which is taxed and causes more healthcare, it's a infinite cycle. It's not even landlords fault. If there are 10 million mortgages per year on 143 million homes, the stock of mortgages has to grow that amount. There are 1.6 million built. This would have limited inflation to 1%, but they chose to inflate anyway based on the California gold rush number.

The banks determine house prices by how many mortgages they make. If they don't issue the mortgage the seller backs down and because capitalism was never profitable it doesn't matter. They instead chose to issue the mortgage at some arbitrary growth rate and that's what inflation is.

If the bank doesn't issue then the property does abandoned and it doesn't matter anyway. So the home prices are completely arbitrary and set by the bank accepting a mortgage at whatever growth rate. The bank could never charge more than wages and would never recoup the cost.

Capitalism is zero sum and it's obvious. The only growth is accounting errors or external inputs like monetary growth. So the only variable is this growth rate which was set 170 years ago in the California gold rush and determines all financial variables.

Money supply is a path variable. The state variables like resources go back in history and set a bunch of factors that result in the m2/gdp. Capitalism is literally retards and you'll die of peak oil in 1mo. Libs call this the Cambridge capital controversy but the point is capitalism is arbitrary. Libs assume there are time preferences, like the rent is 2% because people accept 2% of their income in a year. In reality is all accidental and caused by the metals supply 170 years ago.

This can go on forever until it causes a problem, and that problem is capital requirements. In 2019 you almost died because they made the Basel requirement 10% and banks failed. But failaids killed m2 and delayed it. Now m2 recovered and all the banks will fail.

Because capitalism is zero sum any loss pushes it negative and causes income to fall below rent. This loss is healthcare, which is counted as income despite it not being money you have access to. As a result rent increases as a share of wages and because everything is in elastic nobody pays rent.

And the deeper problem which doesn't relate to any of this is that the monetary base is collapsing. Coin shortage causes hyperinflation and the fed ran out of treasuries to buy, and stopped caring about Keynesianism. MMT failed because nobody cared about it, and the fed will contract and multiplier will hit ten by June. Then all the banks will fail as they realize they built a system that has no way to create base money, and even if they did then it would run out of coins.

Yang ideology is bureaucratic accelerationism. It seeks to use the technicalities of capitalism. If you give $1000 they just raise the rent. Yang is a coin clipper, but in reverse. If the landlord wants $1000 you make that worth less and keep $1000 and give him $1000, but then he just takes all of it. If you have national rent control then they just attack tenants and find Karen reasons. Capitalism will collapse, as it is retards, and all of you will die. Capitalism is leftwing and defends cops.

In conclusion Yang is a moron, he's not even efficient at slowing the collapse at capitalism because his argument is so childish. If you raise wages they raise rent. The solution is to destroy oil inventory and accelerate your death. Even if yangs goal is to delay the collapse of capitalism the solution would be some green stupidity to directly limit resource use. Yang doesn't oppose that he just doesn't know you'll die from peak oil in 1mo.

Remember that his is mentally retarded and will give incoherent babbling replies. The above is hard to understand but also obvious anyway.

Obviously this will be deleted immediately. But I'm just asking for the meaning of this famous phrase.

So, primes are random. But the specific meaning of this is that the difficulty of finding the nth prime through sieving is constant or follows a constant rule. Primes are less constant for larger numbers at a constant rate. If this number is violated two outcomes would happen. One, the primes become less common with size. This would mean that everything becomes a multiple of everything else and no further mathematics is possible because it suffers from reduction to a constant multiple.

Two, primes become more common with size. In that case nothing could be multiplied and mathematics would become impossible.

So I'm just asking what primes being random means, because it obviously means that they are constant in distribution. There's the same odds of finding a prime for larger N, or the odds go down linearly.

There doesn't seem to be any evidence that america actually conducted those sorties. There is one video of the attack on the att building.

Otherwise nothing in Baghdad seems to be hit. Did Iraq make a extensive effort to conceal damage? Or did the sorties fail?

There's a few specific things that should have happened. The civilian casualties were only 1,000, all due to a single strike on an air raid shelter. If they really were bombing all these installations, that have 24/7 operations, the casualties would be higher.

They bombed the ministry of intelligence which is basically a prison. Why didn't the hundreds of Iraqi prisoners die? They also bombed the ministry of defense. Most buildings like that have dozens or hundreds of security guards. Given that they bombed about 20 major government buildings, at night, when they were staffed by guards, why were the casualties so low? Plus, why were there no fires or damage to other structures?

You cannot go to Iraq and see the tanks that were destroyed, there's no physical evidence for that either. There is evidence for battles thousands of years ago but not Iraq.

Basically why was the air war so ineffectual? Why is there no evidence that any casualties or damage occurred?

>>13876066

Excellent work jidf.

Anyway private property didn't exist before 1950. There was a wave of tax foreclosures in the 30s as they started enforcing taxes. Before then property didn't exist or mean anything, it was just "if you buy my land I'll do something", and the property registry was just a ad board for who owned the land.

The park service was founded in 1916 and that's when they began caring because the tax foreclosures became national parks. This was a lot of logging land and stuff nobody cared about.

Then they tried foreclosures in 30s but gave up and there was national rent control until the 60s.

Evictions still didn't exist and the 2008 book evicted mentions no police. Even in 2008 a book specifically about evictions proved evictions didn't exist.

Capitalism began with mortgages and paperwork beginning in the 50s. This inflated the price of homes. Before then the stock market was rail companies and stuff that didn't matter. No company alive in 1900 exists today.

All the modern companies started with ibm and xerox that started in the 30s or so. Xerox created apple as a patent troll shell. IBM dominated the stock market and it didn't own any "private property", it was just military.

Then police obtained automatics and body armor and got more aggressive. In the 2010s community courts and other fake courts began and this created evictions. Capitalism didn't exist before 2015.

Let's do a quick refutation if jidfs claim the south grew food.

The south is 250 million acres, 10% arable. Corn yields 5 tons per acre today or .5 tons then.

The entire south could grow corn for 10 million people. But the yield is lower and they had 30 million population. The south could not even feed itself let alone slaves.

Finally an effort post, thank you.

I don't actually have access to cite 1 and it seems to be out of stock. However I will reproduce your g limit graph here in the attachments.

It clearly says a 7.5g limit and I don't see the 9g claim supported anywhere, in any documentation. In fact the information you cited directly refuted your own claim.

Your Snort citation clearly says that he lost an engine (you didn't mention that) and it was a hard turn for the aircraft. Nothing like a "routine" event. Your other sources are either brief or give similar comments. Again you are directly refuting your own point and proving a 10g turn will destroy the aircraft.

You also didn't mention the error in the G gauges. If you wish I can cite error ranges on modern gauges, and the tomcat error would be worse. The Grumman number of 7.5 G is the actual number and anything else can be considered erroneous. Why would you trust YouTube over technical documentation, especially when these are casual interviews that say the plane was destroyed anyway?

You also avoided the central point, which is the amount of time. In video games the turn rate is a fixed amount and you pull it forever. In reality these are obviously brief episodes and none of your examples were more than a second. So using your 8.5 mention and a 10% error that's actually what Grumman gave, and your remaining citations all destroyed the aircraft in less than a second.

So everything you cited directly proves my point and refutes your own. The tomcat is a 6g plane and can pull more for a fraction of a second, and snodgrass and other tomcat pilots confirm the plane is destroyed beyond that. This is all in your own citations, and directly refuted your own point, you just did not read your citations.

First off, it depends entirely on materials. The tomcat that existed on the drawing board was much more capable than the one that actually existed. So if you are going for technicalities any turn rate is possible and this discussion doesn't mean anything. If you are winning on technicalities the debate is over. If you are going by reality then saying stuff like "the tomcat can turn 7g for a full minute" is impossible.

So a f 14 for example has a 3m wing length from front to back. It has a 1m diameter. The rivets are a cm and are spaced to cover about 10% of the plane. So a 3 m wing with 2 sides with rivets every 10 cm is 30 rivets. That's 300 grams of steel or 300 mpa of tensile strength.

A plane turning 1000 m/s with ten tons is 100 gigawatts which will easily destroy these rivets. The actual aircraft has a 10 meter radius so this would be about 20 turns a second or 7,000 degrees. The stress needs to be 3000 times less or 50 times slower. That's 140 degrees a second. With weaker steel and smaller rivets you get the actual turn rate of 30 degrees a second. Note that the turn rates already given above are in this range.

As you can see as the plane gets bigger all these values get worse and an an225 cannot complete a standard rate turn and do an air show. Adding weight reduces the turn rate.

What I am saying is that turn rate is a cumulative function. Pulling infinite G for an instant is always possible, the only meaningful model is where the stress on the airframe accumulates rather than "you can always turn X g" like in a video game. In reality even a 2g turn is impossible for more than a few minutes.

The FAA on its website says it handles 5000 flights per hour, this is a lie. Flight trackers show far less. Planes do not fly 200,000 hours. They fly about ten hours and turn a few seconds before being destroyed. It's not "lifecycle preservation", planes are a throwaway expendable equipment unlike the car you drive.

There is no objection possible to this post because it just frames the problem. This is a conclusive end to the discussion, if you have any objection to specific parameters those are their own thread.

If you say something like "the plane can sustain a 7g turn for a full minute" or can sustain repeated turns that add up to that, then you are wrong. That is categorically false given the rivet strength. Anything below that gets uncertain and "YouTube says this".

G limit is not a fixed value per time, it's a damage function that accumulates. Not over a long time but within a single flight. The exact way this happens requires a extremely advanced engineering simulation that will never happen but something like "50% destruction odds after 1 minute of 7g" is totally accurate and extremely generous.

Battles are fake. People wearing steel armor aren't actually able to kill each other. Also tank brigades are physically impossible, there's not enough fuel to run more than a certain number of tanks.

In a premodern society the land could only support about one person per square mile. Assembling thousands of men at a single point wouldn't be possible. Even cities didn't have apartments and high density structures until the 20th century. There were almost no cities over 100,000 people and those had infrastructure and groundwater.

Going to do a quick page ten run.

The Reddit explanation of why europe is rich is technology, iq or whatever. This is wrong. The actual reason is geography, and gdp=tourism.

Northern latitudes have higher winter wheat yields. Spring wheat yields are less affected. Crop breeding helps starch more than protein. Europe had much more population than Asia and the stats showing otherwise are false. Today, europe and Asia have a similar density.

Iron is a reason, but it's not that important. This crop yield reason is important. Europe has a higher density than everywhere except India, and India has terrible harbors.

So density and crop yields are the fundamental reason why countries are rich, and ocean currents and harbors are a additional reason. The Southern Hemisphere has no useful currents because the warm, fast currents flow north and the cold currents flow south. So even if they had everything else they wouldn't even be able to move goods.

Iron is only important for winning wars. There's countries that are strong militarily that are poor otherwise, like iran or Russia. Iron is a function of British foreign aid and railroads. It's a separate topic.

But GDP and food are just density, which are largely a function of crop yields.

Because europe started with higher yields it still has a higher per capita food supply. Wheat in Europe is still yielding twice as much as rice in India or China, even though rice in Europe is ten times more.

Note that even though rice has a higher yield it produces less animal feed, so when you add in meat and get total food consumption europe would have more food even if India fully adopted the best seeds. Furthermore meat is less dependent on soil erosion and in the future india will get even worse.

Nobody plans anything. When somebody builds a fighter jet, they don't draw a blue print and plan it. They just screw around and through trial and error figure it out.

Cars are powered by manual effort. This is why cars are 20% efficient and 80% filler. It's all stupidity that happens in accident, it's just a trial and error process with no plan.

People don't even design fighter jets. That's why nobody designs societies or systems. Everything emerges accidentally through trial and error. That's how government was formed. Capitalism is cops, but it's also the paperwork the government uses to collect taxes.

Taxation is the most generic activity ever. The government does not collect taxes to fund revenue. There is no reason for taxes. They happen to fund spending, but there was no plan to do that. Taxes exist because somebody wanted to do something, with a resource, and took it. Nobody budgets anything, nobody intends taxes to pay for anything, it's just a coincidence spending and taxes are the same amount.

Jews came from Sumerians or whoever was first, and Rome used Jews as tax collectors. Jews created government, and the concept of taxes. Even China has Jews from the Roman revolt. The question of why government exists is mostly irrelevant but it's a chain of historical factors starting from Jews collecting taxes.

Education is a generic activity. Healthcare is a generic activity. Whoever is ill or non threatening gets some sort of healthcare. Healthcare is libs doing things to each other. It's a completely generic activity, like taxes, that means anything. basically what the government does is cops- teachers are cops, cops are cops, etc. So this cop behavior is politics.

Cops didn't exist til the 20th century. New York passed a alcohol law because cops- who were recent Irish immigrants or whatever- wanted drugs. And they assumed poor people have drugs, and this created vagrancy laws and capitalism.

Capitalism is completely accidental. If things happened in a slightly different way it would collapse at the start. If cops assumed some other group had drugs, they wouldn't attack homeless people. Nobody would pay rent, nobody would pay taxes and cops would collapse. Cops also steal cars but those also come from financing that comes from rent, and is the same.

Capitalism exists based on two technicalities. One, cops are fat. Otherwise everyone would ignore them, theyd attack homeless people and lose and wouldn't survive. Two, cops assume poor people have drugs. If they assumed rich have drugs then they'd attack their own taxes and collapse.

This is why questions like "why did Rome collapse" are amusing. Things exist in precise conditions, and any change destroys them. Everything fails all at once because any change destroys the entire system. Capitalism relies on cops, and this one factor changing destroys everything, even if everyone else is fine. Capitalism exists in precise conditions, that exist only by coincidence, and cops only have power because they are fat and do drugs. Capitalism is the most asinine ideology ever devised, and we live in a joke world that is the most pathetic that could ever exist. It has logic, but its almost like the universe was simulated to be pathetic, but even without the simulation it would happen anyway.

Property has nothing to do with private property. Property is a tax rule. What libs call property is whoever is in the local property registry as the tax payer of the property. The mises.org definition of property does not correlate to the property people use in real life. Real property has nothing to do with natural law, or morality or anything. It's something somebody wrote down as the tax payer on a area of land. That's all. Private property never existed. The idea of actually paying taxes and property mattering started in the 30s when there was a bunch of tax resistance and they started enforcing taxes. Everything before that was a donation. The park service began in 1916 to seize the easy swathes of taxed logging land.

Evictions didn't exist until 2015. The 2008 novel Evicted mentions no police. The word evicted means ex-vincere, or "out conquest". It came into use during the genocide of Irish by England. It was never used to refer to a court order to remove people from property. Before 2015 you could just never pay rent and never be evicted. The idea of owning property was a boomer concept of "somebody told me to do this". People paid taxes as a formality and capitalism didn't exist.

Adam smith was about resource depletion. Capitalism as a theory came from Ricardo, but actually Keynes. There were no economics programs in colleges until 1900. The concept of exchanging goods for money in a meaningful way didnt exist because land was abundant and it didn't mean anything. Theft was more of a abnormal behavior, or rudeness, not a actual offense or something that people needed to survive. If people exchanged goods it was a formality, and if you couldn't afford something you could open a line of credit.

There were a handful of evictions in the 30s to harass ethnicities or silly reasons. The entire country was under price controls until the Korean War. If "economics" meant anything it was just the government directly setting prices. The concept of buying things with money existed in academia but it wasn't this large scale social experiment like today.

Even when price controls were lifted it took years for healthcare costs to take over salaries and unemployment to rise as the military was cut.

The 1980s recessions was when the average person started to notice having to pay for things and this being an issue. Apple sold computers that were utterly useless but schools bought it and created the tech industry. The tech industry existed before then but the idea of a utterly worthless product having value was new. Apple was useless as a company but it's innovation in creating pointless products for money was central to the idea of capitalism. This is a second meaning of capitalism that ties into cops later.

By the 80s as well, healthcare was beginning to cut wages and in addition to that, there were no defense jobs holding up the market. People committed suicide out of confusion from layoffs. Those that survived formed the modern version of capitalism, based on healthcare, the tech industry, and real estate.

Cops gained access to automatic weapons and body armor. By the 2000s they were willing to start attacking aggressively. In addition, the newly created industries based on pure rent, Indians, and female jobs had destroyed any sanity in the system. This is where cops relate to apple, in that if apple was able to create jobs and be sensible it would have maintained the system. Instead it just took over the market through patent trolling and marketing, and morons bought their slow phones made to work at the pace of boomers. Thus the collapse of manufacturing jobs combined with healthcare being taken over by drug spending destroyed all the jobs. Libs spend money to buy drugs for other drugs, it becomes pure monetary exchange and liberalism.

In the 2010s cops and bureacracy had advanced to the point where community courts were created to do evictions. His is too dumb to know that evictions didn't exist before 2015 and even 2008 books specifically about evictions don't mention evictions.

Starting from 2015 you can find various news stories of evictions and that's when capitalism began. Within five years capitalism already collapsed from moratorium and the rest is history. Capitalism won't even exist as a word soon and nobody is paying rent or doing anything.

>>13905243

The answer, op, which will be drowned in spam is that the KPD called all other parties fascist regardless of their affiliation. Just like historical communist parties called each other "social fascism", it's just a generic insult.

The Nazis never disputed this designation and fascism came to be their name.

Germany was the most urbanized country in the world at the time, except England, where fascism lost from internal politics. National Socialism is just social democracy, in the past socialism referred to non-violent communists. His may give a differing definition if this is a retard board.

So the name national socialism simply means nationalist social democracy, it doesnt tie in with fascism in any particular way besides being a welfare state.

Fascism is corporatism, not business corporation. It happened in the mediocre welfare states where unions became part of the government.

So national socialism is simply a normal NATO welfare state like exists today. Fascism is a paperwork change to put unions in the legislature.

I propose a reclassification of historical periods. The Marxist classification is something like

10000 bc - 1000 ad: primitive accumulation

1000 ad - 1800 ad feudalism

1800 ad - ? Capitalism

I believe this is a bad classification for obvious reasons. Agriculture didn't overtake manufacturing as a share of healthy male workers until the fifties. Nobody can find a eviction before 2015. Cops were physically annihilated and had no body armor until the 90s.

The period called late capitalism was in fact the entirety of capitalism. Neoliberalism was labeled in 1945 yet his is a retard board and thinks it's Reagan. The idea of exchanging things for money in an economy didn't exist before Keynes. As late as 1930 everything was built with convict labor. Even today a third of people are on parole or some kind of primitive accumulation.

Private property didn't exist before 1950. In 1949 Florida required the "open range" interpretation and owners had to define their property by fencing it.

So given all this Id say

10000 bc-1950ad subsistence agriculture

1950ad-2015ad boomerism

2015- capitalism and rapid social collapse.

The planck constant says that as a object gets colder, it emits photons, and these photons bump into each other and as they get larger they bump less. The less bumping means heat escapes faster and a higher planck constant means faster heat transfer per frequency of photon emission.

The expression for the amount of energy a object emits per volume in terms of frequency V and temperature T was given by planck. The function represents the energy per volume as kj / (m3 \* nm). The nanometer term is because the energy is measured on a flat surface so you're actually taking the volume that the detector can fit.

The first term is 2hv3. 2h is a arbitrary parameter and v3 is the wavelength cubed. The wavelength is scaled relative to the speed of light, c. Because photons bump into each other, the energy will go up as they get faster, like ke = mv2. This is why c is squared and because v is scaled to c, it is also squared. Because h itself is in units of inverse frequency, v needs to be multiplied again.

Then you multiply this entire term by a second term. The term is the inverse of the growth rate of the effect of the photons bumping into each other. The left term already expressed that higher frequency has more energy, the right term relates the surrounding losses. The term is a inverse of how fast the bumping behavior grows; more bumping reduces the part of the energy that is released.

The dividend is the Euler number to hv/kbt, minus one. The Euler number represents a growth rate. One is subtracted because only the fraction of temperature caused by photos is measured.

The hv term represents the wavelength increasing the energy again. The kbt term divides it and represents the temperature caused by bumping and the energy it contains. As photos contain more energy the term will increase.

The Euler number to the power of this number is subtracted by 1, because the other term is expressed as how much energy is contained in the photons divided by the energy in the zero sum bumping. The matter part has a energy of 1 and is subtracted.

Then this entire result is inverted as we are measuring the energy released to be measured and not lost in internal collisions (bumping).

These internal collisions were calculated in the denominator as a share of the total energy and because higher frequencies bump into each other more there are more losses from internal collisions. As a result being able to emit energy at a high frequency despite many internal collisions means the total energy in the space is high.

The left term, the number of photons released at a given time period, is divided by the right term, the share of energy lost to bumping. The temperature is the key parameter which represents this lost energy and this divides the simple energy due to releasing photons at a given frequency, if the simple energy is a larger share of the total energy then the right term is less.

Let's rile jidf.

America lost the gulf war. Less than 1% of Iraqi forces were engaged. America reported no missing in the ground war and pows were released without ever being mentioned.

Iraq did not lose a single t 72 in the entire war. 70% of air sorties never happened. Iraq lost approximately a dozen tanks and all of them were t55 which were old.

America had no anti tank weapons. Tf 1 41 retreated at 73 easting. At medina ridge the entire force retreated to safwan, lost to mines and ran away after an Iraqi general talked to a us army capitan. The captain acted tough and spat, and Iraq left. Then america staged a photo of tanks pointing at each other and ran away. The ceasefire to end the gulf war doesn't exist.

The picture of planes over oilfields was photoshopped in 2002. Capitalism is literally retards and nobody can find a eviction before 2015. Private property didn't exist before 1950.

America lost the gulf war. Wikipedia kill ratios are fake. There is no evidence combat even happened so this documentary will use generic footage of Kuwait being obliterated after the war. You will get to hear Schwarzkopf talking about his proto Wikipedian worldview and the kill ratio information that was used by future generations to present the gulf war as a victory.

The story of Iraq begins in the 1940s when kurdish axis partisans rebelled against British rule. Kurds are ancestrally Jews and probably leftovers of the khazar people who created European, ashkenazi Jews. Israel and the west have historically supported Kurds to keep Iraq unstable. As Iraq became independent there were repeated Kurdish rebellions sponsored by states like Israel and iran.

Around 1975 Iranian oil production began to collapse due to the hubbert curve. This resulted in the rural religious poor, who had already been migrating to cities, support a Islamist regime. This Islamist regime created great confusion in the west and they had no idea how to respond.

Iran received substantial British infrastructure during ww2 and other wars. The entire world was built by British foreign aid, like Britain building up Ukraine in the Crimean war and the Anglo-Japanese alliance giving japan a stronger fleet than Britain itself. Vietnam is another country with disproportionate capital relative to its size due to its history of foreign aid and wars. Iran and Iraq both received substantial foreign aid in the 19th century and later and by 1980 were serious military powers.

Iraq retaliated against the Iranian Kurdish proxy insurgency and began the iran-Iraq war- better referred to as the Khuzestan war, a poor part of iran where it was isolated.

The mountainous areas of iran and Iraq have historically been impoverished and unstable, in addition to Kurdish rebels. Iraq advanced into khuzestan, ran out of fuel and retreated. Theoretically, major armor battles occurred, and Iraqi t 72s were highly effective. Iraq received these t 72s in kit form from the Soviets, suggesting very low quality.

Iraq has a small number of metalworking and tank upgrading sites where the work to assemble these commenced. Information on these activities are hard to find and none of these exist today. Iraq upgraded its Type 69s to respectable modern tanks with heavy armor and laser range finders. Even during the iran Iraq war, Iraq possessed fully modern type 69QM upgraded MBTs, probably superior to the awful early model Abrams and definitely a threat to the obsolete Iranian Pattons and Sherman's.

In the air, iran claimed a enormous number of BVR kills with Phoenix. Either these kills are mathematically impossible or China delivered a hundred f7s in secret to replace losses.

As a dogfighter the tomcat did poorly and besides the sidra incident, the tomcat has never won a dogfight. Other than mentioned little happened in the air war over khuzestan. Iraq was supposedly able to fire scuds at Tehran although the information on these strikes is extremely hard to find. Iraq also possessed the powerful but delicate tu 22 blinder strategic bombers. It never used these in a effective capacity.

Iraq received fulcrums at the very end of the war and never used them in combat. It's losses were in bomber model floggers and obsolete fishbeds. On the ground, the t 72 was fearsome, but little information exists about the supposedly several hundred vehicle major tank battles in the war. Human wave attacks on the Al faw peninsula by child soldier basij charging into toxic gas seem the most memorable part of the war.

Iran decided the cost of defeating Iraq was excessive and ended the war. The war was a tactical draw but a strategic defeat for Iraq, burdened with western debt and losing its best equipment. Even after the war, Iraq still had the fourth largest land army in the world and had more airfields and military infrastructure than Germany or France.

Iraq attempted to develop nuclear weapons at the tuwaitha facility. It even constructed a large berm to contain the explosion, although only on one side, implying the researchers would be fried. The tuwaitha facility is just outside Baghdad and quite a risky place for a nuclear test.

Israel bombed the facility while mossad told the guards to go on lunch break. This was the end of Iraq's nuclear program, and their chemical program was incomplete. Multiple nerve gas sites were scattered around the country and required alcohol to mix with precursors to active the gas. Its apparent Iraq never actually used these weapons correctly and they were of low effectiveness in most cases. The sites were pilfered by Mahdist commandoes and Iranian intelligence in 2003 in the organized looting before the American occupation, without ever being put to effective use.

Kuwait had a large Palestinian refugee population which had gained some social status. Native Kuwaitis resented their presence and planned to expel them. In 1990 the Palestinians staged a coup supported by Iraqi commandoes delivered by helicopter. From iraqs perspective, it was making a humanitarian intervention in Kuwait. Small Iraqi forces entered Kuwait and began committing war crimes. Kuwait was a nation of two million which produced five million refugees, proving how silly Wikipedia is and excluding foreign workers.

By January 1990 Kuwait had only 200,000 people left. It's impossible Iraqi forces could have been significant given all the infrastructure and workers were gone. There are claims the initial coup involved tanks, and the "battle of the bridges", but if there were any Iraqi tanks they did not remain long.

Mideast envoy Rumsfield had greenlit the Iraqi invasion, hoping to start a pointless war to defend Israel. The gamble paid off and world opinion, even the Soviets, all sided with america. Iraq had not been resupplied during most of the iran Iraq war and its primary weapons were mines and infantry weapons. The entire Iraqi navy was three patrol boats and 100 "swary" class, a fake name derived from the Arabic word for "small" and probably representing a nonexistent class of small ships.

The Iraqi Air Force was relatively capable, although it had no tankers to fly in a offensive role. Iraqs strategic missiles were superior and were able to deny airfields as far as Dharan.

America sent the 82nd airborne in a rush to stop Sadaam from taking over Saudi Arabia. America had spent 30 years building up King Khalid military city and it was time to use its infrastructure built for a nonspecific war it somehow knew would happen.

American forces had a Wikipedia strength of 2000 Abrams, which probably includes the great number of fake tanks produced in Egypt. 90% of tanks are lost in breakdowns and it is plausible that america had about 50 Abrams at all useful.

2000 Bradley's were sent but the 1st infantry division did nothing and got a citation for a attachment, TF 1-41. Using the same math it's plausible that only a few dozen Bradleys were actually there.

Airframe life is the sole factor in air combat. Iraq had only 30 modern, Mig 29 fighter aircraft. Coalition forces were around a thousand fighters. Iraq did have quite good bombers like the su 24 and blinder, but they were never operational. Even it's floggers, however, were capable of bomber interception. Iraq used r 24T IR variant Apexes. These had continuous rod warheads, where half the weight was a metal ring that would devastate large aircraft. The sparrow and later missiles artificially increased in range by removing the continuous rod warhead and using a small HE charge.

America technically had better missiles, but Iraqi Foxbats had Acrids, the largest missile ever made. Because the Phoenix had less weight in the warhead, it had more range, but the acrid would tear apart anything it hit. The only practical consequence is whoever hit it would be KIA no body recovered as there is no way to survive this thing.

The Iraqi Air Force at this point was equipped for a mission that didn't exist, of strategic interception and nuclear war. Intercepting light attack aircraft and tank plinking were something that it was greatly overkill in capability for. The warthog lacked the range to engage strategic targets with a useful payload, so Iraq had no real use for its capabilties. Had America gotten anywhere near Iraqi airbases with large forces it would go badly for the warthogs and humvees. America had no cheap, mass produced APC like the BTR or MTLB and its infantry were unprotected.

The foxbats were based at Sadaam airbase in Kurdistan, as it was strategically important and had oil. There were additional planes at Talil, near the ziggurat. It's unclear if america ever encountered these planes when they supposedly occupied the base, and in 2003 they were found buried at a airbase around Baghdad.

Even though American forces were numerically superior, the f 16 was never actually capable of proper BVR engagements in the early models. In terms of fully capable aircraft, America would rely on its 300 Eagles while Iraq had approximately 100 fulcrums and foxbats and significant air defenses. America never had any effective SAM systems and would be sitting ducks if Iraq had some tankers to extend the range of its frogfoots. Iraqi attack helicopters are hard to find information on, but were used in the cia backed Basrah uprising after the war.

America spent months building up while Iraq put no effort into the war, destroyed oil fields and pulled out of Kuwait. After the refugee exodus Kuwait was simply irrelevant, but America still demanded it back. Iraq never annexed Kuwait or set up a meaningful government, and the nine person occupation government was arrested years later on vacation in Norway and other places. There is no specific point where the Iraqi occupation ended, just like the nazi occupation of Poland ended randomly when one person was captured by Americans while on a business trip. Kuwait did expel the Palestinians, but they came back and are still there. The failure of America to genocide Palestinian expats is a strategic defeat of the coalition forces.

On the military level, america began the war on January 17th with a nighthawk strike on a telecom building. By this point in history telecom exchanges had been obsolete for about a decade and america was effectively bombing an antique museum.

The sources for when planes took off are clown world. The sources claim the strikes launched at midnight but nothing happened until 3am. Iraq is a small country to bomb and the strikes could not have launched much earlier than 2:30. 70% of sorties in the gulf war never happened and Reddit is comically innaccurate on everything. A sortie is a administrative concept not a physical aircraft in the air.

Besides the telecom building and a bridge, there is no evidence that anything of consequence was bombed in Baghdad. The scuds were from fixed, undefended launch sites and america completely failed to hit them. Some sorties were made against airfields which seem like the most significant result, besides some power plants and civilian targets. Iraqs refinery capacity was little affected, and it had unnecessary plans to build refineries under mountains to stop air attacks.

The r 24T is a IR missile and therefore provides no RWR warning. It's unclear if this is intentional or not, but Iraq successfully snuck up on some aircraft and shot them down. There are suspicious kills attributed to mechanical failure over the sea. A b 52, a f 18 (not speicher, an additional one), and a 6 were lost in this way. The navy claimed to mine a water way on the Kuwait-Saudi border yet there's no evidence this happened.

You can view various threads on f 16.net with Iraqi pilots and accounts. I will not bother to link as they will be deleted soon. Most of the information I give is either trivially findable on Wikipedia or from these threads. Additional information is on gulf war veteran websites and the excellent DOD report on gulf war syndrome and depleted uranium, specifically Tab H.

One Iraqi patrol boat escaped to iran. The us navy panicked at the uselessness of its weapons and a British destroyer sent a helicopter to engage a shitty Iraqi boat which scuttled itself. Because missiles are useless even against motorboats, Canadians fired sparrows at these boats and failed to sink them. No evidence exists any Iraqi ships were sunk, but just like Wikipedia had a edit war to hide the Yamato sinking itself, the Iraqi navy died in a fake battle with zero evidence and comical encounters. If you have hornets and tomahawks why are you sending helicopters? They boarded the iran ajr because they were unable to sink it. America is incapable of sinking a little barge.

Fulcrums only engaged eagles twice. The kelk kill opened the war. Another engagement is claimed as a kill, but f16.net claims they were damaged and landed. In January 19th a pair of fulcrums killed a falcon over Baghdad falsely recorded as a Sam kill.

An Iraqi friendly fire incident occurred at some point. Pilots were trained to hold the trigger on auto target and kill the first thing they saw. An Iraqi fulcrum killed its wingmen on takeoff and then crashed itself. Iraq put zero effort into the war in general.

The Rodriguez engagement occurred when two fulcrums almost reached the awacs. One was hit by a sparrow and died. The other flew unarmed, in a straight line, hoping for the incompetent American pilot to kill it. This never happened so the pilot crashed and bailed out. All of these incidents are clear American victories on Wikipedia. No non-absurd claims of killing foxbats occurred.

On January 19 at 0255Z, the "rjlee.org" blog claimed a phantom died from AAA 1nm north of KKMC deep in Saudi Arabia. This is a bizarre kill with no support or explanation. A RSAF f5 was lost near "wadi Al Kirk" (al Karak in Jordan?) in another incident to AAA. These inexplicable losses could be a typo, or else Iraqi victories. The last kill of the war on 2/27 was a hornet damaged by rifles, incidentally proving rifles are perfectly capable of killing jets. Try finding French losses in the indochina war.

The Iraqi t55s that weren't upgraded to the type 69QM standard were apparently abandoned and counted as the inflated kill ratio of warthogs. Warthogs were restricted to 25 miles of the border and 70 of them took damage, by photos on the internet. 2951-clss.gulwar.com has details but it lists about half.

Usually the better coalition forces were deployed forward. Kuwait and French forces were stuck in dharan while king Fahd had the most active bases. After their weak performance over Baghdad, not even killing that many civilians, america focused on the ground war. The Iraqi government buildings have dozens or hundreds of night security guards yet none of those died, and america supposedly bombed the intelligence building were its own pows were.

When Wikipedia says there's 700 warthogs that's massive double counting due to upgrades. 157 warthogs ever existed and the gulf war killed most of them. For every kill there's 10 damaged. This is why the low casualties on Wikipedia are misleading for everything. The Iraqi losses are the paper unit strength 100% assumed KIA while the American losses are just a handful of recorded word of mouth casualties. The army reported no missing despite prisoners being released after the war from khafji. The GAO claimed 21 abram losses while wikipedia found 20 scattered around in random websites.

Iraqs assault on khafji was more significant than anything America accomplished in the gulf war. Iraq captured a actual economically relevant minor port for a few days then left when saudis told them it was mean.

1% of the US army was infantry, and the 1st armored and specifically TF 1-37 and 1-41 were the only units that did anything. A few casualties is really complete destruction of everything america sent but Wikipedia gives the lib explanation. Wikipedia applies the casualties=KIA meme to make libs look better.

Finally after all this america decides to do a ground war. The western and eastern wings of the advance did nothing, besides marines killing a bunch of surrendering people in the reveille engagement. T 72 guns elevate when loading the autoloader, showing Iraq was unarmed.

The only actions of any consequence on the ground were 73 easting and medina ridge, and the "safwan stupidity" which is too embarassing to mark as a battle. America attacked from the west and destroyed a bunch of abandoned equipment and Wikipedia hallucinations in empty, unpopulated desert.

At 73 easting some American tanks came over a ridge while Iraqis were hanging around naked outside their tanks drying clothes. This is considered a huge victory where Wikipedia claims 10000 tanks died. In reality there's no evidence Iraq lost any t 72s, besides some gifted trophies, and the t 55 were abandoned. The t 55 itself is just a patched IS 2 chassis.

Cars last a decade and libs expect tanks to last 40 years. In any case the Americans destroyed some rusted equipment before Iraq put their clothes on. The tawakalna division showed up to see what was happening and accidentally hit a Bradley with an RPG, sending america into total confusion with a bunch of friendly fire as they thought Bradley's were BMPs. Tf 1-41 retreated and then fought in the fictional Battle of Norfolk, invented to make it look like Britain did something even though there are zero British photos from the war or any evidence of them doing anything. The photo of jets flying over oil fields was photoshopped in 2002, using the image name. The battle of Norfolk is largely a Wikipedia creation and no British books or websites reference the gulf war ground campaign. The book "Challenger Squadron" by Richard Dunston, 64 pages, is the origin of the battle and this book is impossible to find. Very few or no British soldiers received any medals or official recognition that the battle was real. The battle of Norfolk is almost entirely contemporaneous with 73 easting and is effectively meaningless.

The battle of medina ridge is relatively meaningless but there was a combined RPG engagement and friendly fire incident where multiple vehicles were lost. Because the army focuses on DU they call everything friendly fire, but many hostile losses are acknowledged.

The typical cope is the lost Abrams "returned to battle". Car companies take cars out the junk yard and repaint them. "Losses" in this sense cannot be a perpetual motion machine and Capt Pope, silver star recipient who was on the edge of the advance says everything was lost to mines in his army website citation.

Safwan was the most absurd incident of the war. Pope met an Iraqi general who asked him to leave. Pope sent a bunch of apaches- which otherwise were crippled by sand most of the war- and acted dramatic, spat, and Iraq assumed they were dealing with an idiot and walked away. Wikipedia shows a dramatic image of a tank standoff at safwan airfield. I personally emailed the national archives asking for the gulf war ceasefire and it doesn't exist.

Whatever happened at safwan, america stole fuel from local gas stations to get its tanks out. It came back after the war to pick up its abandoned equipment, commit war crimes at Rumaylah, and then leave. The Iraqi pows were handed to saudis after the war but there is zero evidence a significant number of iraqis surrendered or any significant part of their forces were engaged. Those 400 "artillery pieces" at medina ridge could be an RPG or some trash and there is no evidence america killed or captured more than about a dozen tanks or vehicles.

The highway of death is the aforementioned refugee exodus combined with war crimes on all sides. A typical cope is Iraq was using civilian vehicles, which is odd if it's own equipment was virtually all abandoned and post war satellite photos given in obscure local papers confirm no dust clouds showing tank movement into Kuwait. Soviet satellites had higher resolution than American ones and saw the iran Iraq war tanks but nothing for the gulf war.

Another problem is MLRS. 700,000 MLRS rounds were made yet only 5,000 were ever fired. Again wikipedia double counts upgrades and it's plausible 100,000 were made, a third were operational, and most were expired. Whatever America did in the gulf war was all cluster MLRS ever used. Because MLRS is small bomblets easily stopped with body armor, it's a effectively useless weapon, and expensive.

PL Bullet was the only real battle in the entire war not dominated by incompetence and it was a disaster. An American officer made a secret agreement with Iraqis to kill another officer, and their cavalry unit was destroyed in a ambush. Bradley's are supposed to be stronger than t 34s yet they died easily from non penetrating dashikas.

In another incident a Bradley door was stuck by enemy fire and a Abrams blasted it open, killing crew. In yet another incident 20 Iraqis surrounded a Bradley to "surrender" and an Abrams killed everyone. Some of the "surrenders" on Wikipedia are more like iraq harassing or trying to capture American equipment. In yet another incident Tab H lists it as friendly fire but the soldier interview in the report insists it was enemy fire.

Chobham armor is useless and ceramics. Depleted uranium is a desperate measure that offers not only zero advantages but poisons the crew. No real steel has been produced anywhere in the world since 1900 so they need these stupid changes. The Abrams has rarely or never survived an enemy round that was fired at it. Depleted uranium is both weaker than steel per volume and weight, and useless as a penetrator except it's toxicity. In 2003 there are anecdotes an upgraded Iraq t 72, the asaad Babyl, survived multiple 120mm hits.

It's not "the gulf war never happened". Besides possibly the awfully documented PL Norfolk battle, which might be fake, it was a clear defeat of all 20 American tanks by vastly superior Iraqi forces. The Package Q air strike was almost slaughtered by eight fulcrums and america failed to effectively bomb Baghdad or the static, obvious scud sites. The gulf war did happen; america lost decisively and had no missiles able to outrange the Acrid, no anti tank weapons, and no numbers to fight the war plausibly. Iraq completely destroyed Kuwait and left behind a empty husk which America declared as victory- which was a victory because Rumsfeld told Iraq to do it anyway.

Tell me the odds of there not being physical evidence for battle of Stalingrad.

Let's say a house is built once a generation, and excavated half the artifacts on the property. It takes 10,000 bullets per casualty.

At that rate, it would take 13 generations for the evidence to disappear. Furthermore the dirt would build faster than the houses build.

A house only has a meter foundation. The earth has 1 kw of soil per m2 with a less than 100kpa tensile strength. A ton of dirt to a depth of a meter is 100kpa of gravity.

That's 100mpa per m2. It takes a day to erode a meter of dirt, squared because some of the dirt ends up in the pile. This comes out to about a 200k years per meter, which matches oil from 100 million years ago being 500 meters from where it formed. Usually oil forms at 5,000 meters and has some migration.

So if it takes 1,300 years for a single casualty to leave a record, the fossilized evidence of the battle, if there are a million casualties and the odds fall logarithmically, would last 1.3 million years. If only 1% the area is built per generation the battle would become older than dinosaurs.

>>13963009

Africa has the same gold reserve as every other continent, only because the others already used theirs. The copper reserve is the only thing that's decent.

Otherwise there is no oil, iron, or anything despite Wikipedia.

Copper forms in low sulphuric environments. The world is a fractal pattern where the northern hemisphere has more mountains and volcanoes. Small, incomplete volcanoes tend to spew magma longer which favors the formation of copper, as sulphur evaporates and reacts to form copper ores in pooled brines. Because Africa has weak volcanoes that burn longer it has copper and low sulphur. The conditions that cause copper and cobalt in Africa prevent it from having sulphur and normal metallurgy. In other words the reason it has cobalt is that it has nothing.

Africa's gold reserves are mediocre and are only significant because the rest of the world already used theirs.

Let's imagine what the trpf would look like.

Marx used accounting profit. Capital expense is not a COGS. It would show up later as depreciation or something. So let's pretend that happens. The depreciation is hidden by inflation and doesn't show up either but let's pretend prices are constant.

Company makes $10, $5 COGS, $5 profit. Now it buys $1 of capital. This capital creates $1 of revenue.

Profit is now $4, plus $1. Revenue is $11 so profit fell from 50% to 45%. The marginal profit would be zero in this case.

But usually people just use the average profit because they're dumb. So as we add capital all profit ratios go down.

Problem is, wages are the same the entire time. Only if capitalists want to increase the profit margin would they care about trpf, not the absolute level of profit. Marxism doesn't have any concept of diminishing returns, it's just supposed to work.

So if we buy $10 of capital so revenue is $20, profit is still $5, COGS (wages) is still $5, then this depreciation expense is $10 and that would go to COGS at another company. So no matter how much capital you buy wages would stay the same and the profit margin would go down.

But let's assume this is a problem and the falling margin is enough to destroy capitalism. In that case we would need there to be zero margin on capital. If $1 of capital produced $1.5 of revenue, then the trpf would happen, but only up to the point where profit fell to 33%. It would never hit zero, it would asymptomatically approach whatever the margin on capital is. So the way Marx described the trpf it would never reach zero, it would hit some arbitrary value and not go lower.

The only way it would work is with diminishing returns, but in that case Marx's explanation is irrelevant, you can just call it diminishing returns.

Capitalism was never profitable because it's zero sum. But otherwise this thread gets zero replies anyway, except from jidf.

In reality the trpf is taxes. Introduction of various local taxes took down profit. The 1920 Japanese tax reform obliterated it.

Assuming one acre lots, and 2 billion acres in America that are 10% valuable, america could have 10 million miles of rail. Usually there's a 200 foot right of way or 3 acres around the track. However the government gave them the entire square mile around the track and this ended up being 5% of the entire country.

Because railroads owned basically all the land that mattered, they paid taxes. $5 was a acre price in 1850. Improved land might be $50 at 1% tax rate. National gdp was around $10b at dollar a day wages for half the population and $1b was industrial with $200m profit.

The 100 million rail acres were worth $5b with $50m taxes. As they started actually enforcing property taxes the profit went down.

By the 30s property taxes were pretty much established. At that point the trpf was resource depletion. Enron alone was a lot of the utilities loss. The collapse of the steel industry was the rest.

Profit exists because the irs ignores capital leases in COGS. It never existed, it's just a accounting concept. Agriculture and healthcare get money from government and don't count it being spent on acquisitions and farm equipment. Otherwise resource depletion increases profit in energy, even if it's fake, and the trpf is a technicality.

Also, the goldbach conjecture. If the Riemann hypothesis was "wrong" then two things would happen. Either it would be impossible to add numbers to create a prime, at large values. Or it would change the behavior of primes at large values. Both of these outcomes are empirically absurd and impossible, but there is no proof within mathematics that the Goldbach Conjecture is correct independently of RH.

Imagine the universe runs for infinite time, and there is a clock tracking it. There is another clock an abitrary time ahead. Is there a point where adding the time can never be a prime number? Obviously not, but nobody has proven it.

So given the prime gap behavior predicted by RH empirically has to be true for the universe to exist, are there empirical proofs of it that are outside current mathematics?

150mpa bone

1kg takes 1w heat

1 year

30 million seconds

30mpa

1/1000 of body is dna

20% damaged per generation, 1000 squared or 1 millionth damage, 30 million coding base pairs

5 mutations per generation

20 of these generations per lifetime.

Mutation rate is tensile strength.

There was a falcon lost over Baghdad on January 19th, 1991 to a pair of fulcrums falsely recorded as a Sam kill. Whether you believe this is immaterial; the details are easy to find and the actual combat record is unknown. Obviously this will be deleted immediately.

Disclosure, I am a family member.

Note the contradictory reports

https://www.f-16.net/aircraft-database/F-16/mishaps-and-accidents/year/1991/

>Pilot, Major Jeffrey Scott Tice ejected safely after travelling 150 miles inside Iraq, but became a POW as the ejection took place over Ir

https://valor.militarytimes.com/hero/29813

https://www.f-16.net/articles\_article8.html

>The other pilots came back and said that the F-16 was split in half, the cockpit pitched down and that they didn't see any parachute.

Lost immediately vs 150 miles in.

Baghdad is 400 miles from the border. So losing a plane 150 miles means it was obviously a mig kill because Iraq has no sams there.

Temperature is sunspot lagged fifty years. Solar insolation is 173 petawatts. Ocean is e18 kg. 4e24 joules to raise temperature 1 degree or 4e23 to .1 degree. 2e17 per second so 2e6 seconds to do that or 2e9 for a .1% change. That's 63 years.

Why is the way the reimann hypothesis is taught so dumb? The function has two inputs, t and s, not one. It also has nothing to do with primes, it just happened to be the maximum count of primes below a number. It also doesn't use imaginary numbers, it just uses them in radian notation.

Hi, did the blackbird actually have three or four crew including the pilot and wso? It consumed "in excess of 100,000 pounds of fuel" in a 1 hour flight of its unrefueled range of 2,000 NM. Yet it only carried 80,000 pounds of fuel and most of that was for heat absorption. Were there extra crew powering the plane?

https://www.beale.af.mil/News/Article-Display/Article/667324/beale-removes-fuel-storage-tanks-that-kept-blackbird-soaring/#:~:text=This%20fuel%20was%20developed%20by,fuel%20per%20hour%20of%20flight.

>The fuel was then pumped through a 4.5 mile-long pipeline to the flight line where the Blackbird consumed approximately 36,000 to 44,000 pounds of fuel per hour of flight.

At max speed that's 2000 knots.

https://theaviationgeekclub.com/former-sr-71-driver-explains-why-the-blackbird-had-to-refuel-after-takeoff/

>The Yo-Yo procedure had the crew chief completely refuel the plane to full tanks of 80,000 pounds of fuel. Then, with the nitrogen pressurization system working, they de-fueled 15,000 pounds of JP-7, ending up with a 65,000 pound fuel load and a plane that was capable of going immediately to Mach 3+.”

So 1.5 hours of fuel maximum or 3,000 miles.

https://www.operationblackbird2022.org/sr71-fun-facts

>Fuel consumed: 8,000 gallons per hour at maximum speed.

That's 56,000 lb or 1.2 hours of flight- 2,400 mile range.

https://www.sr-71.org/blackbird/sr-71/

>Range: 3,200 nautical miles (without refueling)

That's 30% more range, even without any fuel being used for takeoff, climbing and acceleration which are another third of the flight.

Aircraft aren't actually capable of using all their fuel.

https://theaviationgeekclub.com/heres-why-the-sr-71-blackbird-airframe-was-designed-to-leak-fuel/

The sr 71 leaked fuel and had to fly fast to seal the tanks. Hence this discussion only makes sense at high speed.

Furthermore something has to absorb the heat on the aircraft, so the fuel tanks would have to stay mostly full the majority of the flight, which again reduces range.

So a sr 71 having 2000 mile range is absolutely absurd, it might do 1000 miles. It's longest unrefueled flights were about that distance.

<https://www.13newsnow.com/amp/article/news/history/sr-71-fastest-coast-to-coast-flight-ever-recorded/291-682988d5-ac7e-4978-9ce8-b71ec14d50ed>

Idea to help wind power.

A 1 mw turbine requires 10 m/s wind. Air is 1 kg per m3 so this is moving 10 kg per m2 per second. That's 1 kw per square meter and the turbine is 5x50m or 250m2 per blade or 750m2 total.

These are all official statistics from vestas.

So 750m2 of blade receiving 1 kw per square meter is imputing 750 kw of energy. So if the turbine is 1 mw and running at 100% capacity with 750kw of incoming wind, you can run a 750kw wind fan from your 1 mw turbine to power a 1mw turbine, and repeat infinitely for infinite energy.

Wind turbines generate more energy than the force of the wind they receive, therefore you should be able to power a fan that powers another turbine.

Sum of the zeta function is equal to the product of the reciprocal of one minus the reciprocal of primes to the power s.

The square root of any prime is irrational, and the 1/2 in the reimann hypothesis is a square root. All zeta zeroes are irrational.

Therefore any result has to be a square root because it has to be irrational, or the other side has to be rational, therefore the riemann hypothesis is correct.

Here's the seven layer, osi model of global neoliberalism.

Physical layer: rentacops.

Data link layer: cops, defines the behavior of the physical layer

Network layer: lawyers, determines the physical path of cops

Transport layer: mobility chairs

Session layer: cop leadership, maintains connections and is responsible for controlling cops and lawyers

Presentation layer: government, laws. Ensures data is in a usable format and is where incarceration occurs

Application layer: Jewish elites. Jews access network services.

I saw some comical answer that evictions existed in 1900. When was the actual date it became possible to evict tenants?

In New York there was a wave of tenant harassment in 2015 and it seems there were no evictions before then. A casual Google search shows literally zero evictions existing before 2015.

In the modern new york state code you can search online, there are literally zero hits for the word "eviction", the evictions are done by the sheriff outside the legal system. Sheriffs did no community policing before 2015.

>312600 lend-lease trucks amounting to 150% of Soviet production

They sent trucks with no fuel so it's fake.

>18200 aircraft, 30% of Soviet production

Western aircraft were never used.

>8000 tractors and construction vehicles

Insignificant

>13000 battle tanks.

Western tanks were almost never used.

>57.8 per cent of aviation fuel requirements

Soviet airforce was inactive a lot of the war so this is a tiny number.

>53 per cent of all explosives

Fake statistic, no ammo at all was sent.

>56.6 per cent of all the rails used during the war

Irrelevant

>1900 locomotives to supplement the meagre Soviet output of just 92

>11075 railway cars to add to the 1087 produced domestically

Soviets destroyed their own railway cars.

>half the supplies, by weight, came in the form of food, enough to provide an estimated half-pound of concentrated nourishment for every Soviet soldier, every day of the war.

>canned meat, 17.9% of meat production.

Jews stole all the food.

>82.5% of copper production.

Copper is a consumer good.

>deliveries of aluminum, essential for production of aircraft and tank engines, exceeded Soviet wartime production by 1.25 times.

Aluminum is useless

>956700 miles of field telephone wire

>2100 miles of sea cable

>35800 radio stations

>5899 radio receivers

>348 radars

>rolling stock exceeding production by 10 times

Irrelevant.

>tires, 43.1% of Soviet production.

Tires are the easiest to substitute.

Market theory is wrong for these reasons.

Capitalism is zero sum. But besides that products are segmented. The way the segmentation happens determines demand and there's not actual preferences.

For example if I go to the store there's organic butter and poor people butter. Whether one brand wins doesn't reflect consumer surplus or anything like that, it's just the demographics of the market. Capitalism can size demand between different segments of the market, but this isn't "creative destruction", it's just a mechanical process of making more of something that is used more. There's no reason to use prices over just making things people use or some trivial signal.

Then there's the issue of allocating resources between alternatives. This isn't an actual separate issue, it's just a reframing of the segmentation issue. If you make more of things people use then more resources go there, it's not a result of prices. There's no situation where prices would provide additional information over just making things people use. At best prices provide math to demonstrate this process, but then prices are also flawed because they abstract the physical values to monetary ones. Producing more of a $2 butter obscures the difference between people who want the $2.001 and $2.002 one, money just obfuscated the underlying information provided by the physical outcome.

If there is any price difference between identical products then it's purely due to rent. If two products are the same and differ in price, then neither is profitable because capitalism is zero sum, and also any extra cost is just determined by rent or some nonmarket process. Rent is nonmarket by definition because it's just a natural resource that has arbitrary ownership, the ownership has to happen for free and isn't a market because of the prime mover problem. There's no market for base resources that create the system, any market is for the secondary results of that ownership. Those base resources accrue rent which is not a market, the only market is defining what the resource is, not the value of it once the resource is defined.

If I have a acre of land and you have two acres, you get twice the rent. That isn't a market, it's just a mechanical function of the quantity of goods owned. That's why rent isn't a market, it's just resource accounting.

If you make something with the land it's not a market either but you can at least pretend it is because it's something more advanced than primary production and can have unclear value that needs to be decided in a market. But as above simply making things people use has the same result.

In fact the fact something is sold at all is proof it has negative value to the owner. If you produce something and don't consume it that means it's value to you is negative, and the consumer is doing a service by stealing it. Hence prices can't actually exist in the real world, everything has to be done at negative rates because the fact anything exists is a negative value. Consumption beyond satiety is negative utility, other people reducing your consumption is a service and there is no reason to sell anything for money or obstruct any consumption. Trade doesn't exist, it is caused artificially by taxes and forced expenses that cause prices, the actual transaction of trade is meaningless. The consumer is double paying by both taking the good and paying money, and if that money causes more undesired production then they are harming both parties. Hence prices are never pareto efficient and exist solely due to bureaucracy.

I'm not expecting a real reply here, just the usual fast deletion.

The planck constant is actually just a hack to prevent the electron falling into the nucleus. Humans measure the oscillations of a quartz atom then base all the units on this time measurement. The second is the fundamental unit, along with light speed. A photon hits every atom in a gram in a second.

These oscillations are just the random motion of the atom, caused by the planck behavior. When something falls into the nucleus, gravity becomes infinite at short distance which leads to stupidity. Instead lesage physics wins and there's a minimum distance where the ether thins out and stops creating more force. This is the planck scale.

It's like rolling a ball down a ramp, and it goes up the other ramp. The planck constant is the minimum velocity it comes out. If the electron is going as slow as possible, it will barely enter the atom and then speed up from attraction, then speed out the other side.

In another way its like the world boundaries in a video game. If you get too close to the boundary you bounce back to prevent the game breaking. The planck constant works the same way, there has to be a push to prevent the electron falling into the nucleus and leading to stupid outcomes. The planck constant is in units of temperature times the boltzmann constant, so it's actually a temperature unit, which is an entirely empirical and subjective concept. It abstracts away what's actually happening as "random motion".

The planck constant is also the minimum energy humans can measure at before this "stupidity prevention" behavior takes over. As you reduce the energy level the constant goes down- because it's just temperature, and less motion in the system allows smaller motions to matter. Hence the planck units are entirely circular in definition because they're just a minimum scale at which humans can measure things. If temperature falls these quartz oscillations take longer and all the units get smaller. Oscillation is caused by temperature by definition so all the units based on that are circular.

The Wikipedia objections to lesage theory are embarrassingly bad, it's hard to talk about "mainstream physics" when the effort you put into defining that on Wikipedia is zero.

Sci is a retard board and all objections will be ignored.

Lesage theory is correct. Everything is bouncy balls, physics is very simple and obvious.

The planck scale is based on temperature, if you make a nitrogen atom smaller it transfers energy better and cools more. Boltzmanns constant is the basis of other constants because lower temperature reduces the motion of atoms- which gives a hertz unit of time- then time implies length, then length implies a wavelength and mass. Everything is based on time, and time is based on temperature; its the speed things happen. It's the base disturbance that creates the universe.

When an event happens, it carves a path through the ether. This has no meaning as the path is already set. It's just that the universe is in eternal return, and you are all retards that repeat your life endlessly.

Thermodynamics doesn't apply to a container. Any structure in the universe disperses to create a wall. As an example, the ratio between the planck mass and constant is e24. Each impulse of information creates cascading disturbances until countered by its own gravity, at a e24 larger ratio.

If expansion is faster than gravity then this just becomes another ratio. The cosmological constant as a wavelength is e-27. This comes out to about 100 joules.

A visible photon hits an area equal to its own wavelength every second. The average gravity of the universe is around e-30 m/s, so the given cosmological constant is enough to disperse the 1 atom per meter dust, and at the scale of a planet is able to cancel gravity at the scale of the universe.

If the universe is created by 1 planck unit of information multiplying itself by its ratio with the planck mass, and this occurs once per scale defined by the expansion, then the universe will keep repeating and dying until it forms a wall. Because the cosmological constant is scaled to exactly cancel the average gravity in the universe, and maximal universes exist, these failed universes enclose the working one and create a wall. Basically, whatever created the universe keeps creating it elsewhere, and the failed universes simply become a container for the real universe.

Thermodynamics doesn't apply to a container. The universe undergoes eternal recurrence and reaches a favored state because of the path carved through the ether. The path gets clogged and particles flow back and forth, resulting in eternal recurrence on the path.

Libs assume heat death. In reality there's a boundary condition caused by failed universes that results in a container and eternal recurrence, and ether gets stuck on clogged paths to recurrence more.

Capitalism is literally retards. You'll die of peak oil.