

Re: An astronomer's view of mechanics

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.astro.amateur/2007-10/msg00148.html>

- *From:* oriel36 <geraldkelleher@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sat, 06 Oct 2007 03:58:40 -0700
-

On Oct 6, 3:10 am, Quadibloc <jsav...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

oriel36 wrote:

The bottleneck which was created in the late 17th century by Flamsteed first and Newton later spun itself off into a vocabulary all of its own and still used today –

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Inertial_frame_of_reference

The created bottleneck where no new data can pass productively exists as a consequence of the work of two individuals yet it can be presented in terms of absolute space and absolute time of Newton.

Absolute/relative time is simply the false perception that the 'fixed stars' provide a means to determine axial and orbital motion and is the basis for Newton's treatment of Keplerian geometries.

Absolute/relative space is the false approach and resolution of retrogrades and opposed to Copernican reasoning, an idiosyncratic version by Newton which is counter-productive on all counts and has no precedence in pre-Copernican and heliocentric astronomies.

Many attempts were made to deal with time and space conceptions and especially by the Germans such as Mach –

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mach's_principle

Re: An astronomer's view of mechanics

For an astronomer with the necessary intuitive intelligence it is possible to identify the double errors which eluded many people for centuries and for the most part show how it is possible to re-align most of the astronomical principles back to 'safe mode'.

I thank you for attempting here to explain in more detail what it is you find troubling about the current understanding of Solar System motions.

The dominance of astrologers in astronomy can be problematic, I will admit this, however this can change as genuine people who have self respect can now easily comprehend the dual errors which led to outlandish concepts which emerged last century, as the outward symptoms of an internal intellectual disease. They can actually understand the absurdity of absolute/relative time and space that was denied others in the preceding centuries but this time against the work of Copernicus and Kepler .

http://antwrp.gsfc.nasa.gov/apod/image/0112/JuSa2000_tezel.gif

The Earth seen overtaking the outer planets affirms our own orbital motion and that is all, no hypothetical observer on the Sun and no absolute/relative space which is tagged on to that false way to approach and resolve apparent retrogrades –

" For to the earth planetary motions appear sometimes direct, sometimes stationary, nay, and sometimes retrograde. But from the sun they are always seen direct," Newton

If indeed, though, no one has yet come up with "true" principles of time and space – Mach's principle being an unsuccessful attempt – and what we have to do is discard Newton and limit ourselves only to what Copernicus and Kepler knew, thus being in a more limited world – like going into "safe mode" in the Microsoft Windows operating system – people will be understandably reluctant to do that without a good reason.

Re: An astronomer's view of mechanics

It is all highly focused, the bottleneck created by Flamsteed contains the difference between the correct major astronomical achievements and the later ones which followed from Newton and extend into the last century. Nobody has expressed surprise that it can all be condensed into two fundamental errors, one created by Flamsteed and the other by Newton but that is the way it stands.

And given the impressive success of computations based on Newton in guiding space probes to the distant planets, or predicting the complicated motions of the Moon to a high accuracy, it would seem that this would be avoiding things that are *known* to work and *proven* by experience – simply because they are somehow inaeesthetic. At least from your point of view.

Technically impossible, trying to fit the axial and orbital motion cycles into a constellational system of 3 years of 365 days and 1 year of 366 days is impossible, that it has all the traits of a 'predictive' clockwork system would normally have somebody wide-eyed with disbelief but I have yet to see one person grasp the easy to follow reasoning. If a star returns constantly to a location and it requires an additional leap day every 4th year it should follow that you are not dealing with a concept of 365 days 5 hours 49 minutes but rather the calendrical convenience of 365/366 days.

As an example of one point that baffles me is that even if one doesn't want to use the fixed stars as a reference, if one admits Venus moves faster, the Earth more slowly, and Mars more slowly yet, in the same direction around the Sun, then isn't one also admitting that a year is approximately the period of the Earth's revolution around the Sun?

And, of course, _that_ admission leads directly to $1/\text{day} + 1/\text{year} = 1/$ (23 hours, 56 minutes, 4 seconds) which you find particularly problematic, as well as indicating that the fixed stars really are approximately fixed. This is why you seem to us to be contradicting yourself.

Re: An astronomer's view of mechanics

I do not have a problem with 23 hours 56 minutes 04 seconds, it merely shows how a star returns in that time within a 24 hour period based on a 1461 day cycle of 3 years of 365 days and 1 year of 366 days. Any person who wishes to tie axial and orbital motion to that value and builds concepts on them is no better or worse than astrologers or creationists who will happily build their concepts on similar foundations.

Of course, I know you may feel that we are so indoctrinated with empiricism that the intuition has just been beaten out of us – and if that weren't true, you wouldn't need to explain further, we would see what is obvious to you.

John Savard– Hide quoted text –

– Show quoted text –

The images and texts which support correct astronomical principles as opposed to the awful alternative concepts which emerged in the late 17th century is obvious to many people, they have already taken a wider view whereas you remain stuck in that narrow view which is causing enormous problems in matters such as climate studies and how the motions of the Earth condition climate and weather patterns.

"When we wish to correct with advantage and to show another that he errs, we must notice from what side he views the matter, for on that side it is usually true, and admit that truth to him, but reveal to him the side on which it is false. He is satisfied with that, for he sees that he was not mistaken and that he only failed to see all sides. Now, no one is offended at not seeing everything; but one does not like to be mistaken, and that perhaps arises from the fact that man naturally cannot see everything, and that naturally he cannot err in the side he looks at, since the perceptions of our senses are always true.

People are generally better persuaded by the reasons which they have themselves discovered than by those which have come into the mind of others." Pascal

Re: An astronomer's view of mechanics