

Re: An astronomer's view of mechanics

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.astro.amateur/2007-10/msg00180.html>

- *From:* oriel36 <geraldkelleher@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 07 Oct 2007 06:52:02 -0700
-

On Oct 7, 1:21 pm, Quadibloc <jsav...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

oriel36 wrote:

All you are doing now is trying to justify axial and orbital motion using the calendar system via the return of a star to a location and that is little more than a mixture of creationism and astrology, again, it really is that bad.

You say this, but I cannot see it.

I know you cannot see it even though you are trying. When I showed you the text of Huygens and how 24 hour clock noon is derived from the natural unequal noon cycles you still cannot see what is wrong with the fictional difference between a solar/sidereal day in terms of the Earth's motions –

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Image:Tiempo_sid%C3%A9reio.en.png

and I do not believe anyone who opposes the faith of people, be it simple or more elaborate can ever really be a productive astronomer.

The faith that human consciousness is a real, meaningful phenomenon, not some sort of illusion (were it an illusion, who is there to be deceived by it?), that our fellow human beings matter, and that right and wrong are as real as the truths of logic and mathematics – this much faith I have. It is not much, but there are atheists who would feel that this is enough faith to make me one who has capitulated to superstition.

Re: An astronomer's view of mechanics

Sounds great when you stand on a stable foundation but as I always point out, the basis of your celestial beliefs is astrological and not astronomical and your problems with the daily cycle reach even lower than the level of the creationists. At least they believe in something greater than themselves.

Some forms of revealed religion have led people to feel justified in violating natural law; we see this in those who persecuted Galileo, and we see this today in terrorism. But that is indeed no reason to oppose the faith of people of good will.

Galileo believed what Copernicus proposed as the solution for retrogrades seen from an orbitally moving Earth I but you do not believe it, preferring an alternative and false Newtonian view of retrogrades and their resolution via a hypothetical observer –

'Here Salviati explains Jupiter's motion, then follows with'

" Now what is said here of Jupiter is to be understood of Saturn and Mars also. In Saturn these retrogressions are somewhat more frequent than in Jupiter, because its motion is slower than Jupiter's, so that the Earth overtakes it in a shorter time. In Mars they are rarer, its motion being faster than that of Jupiter, so that the Earth spends more time in catching up with it. Next, as to Venus and Mercury, whose circles are included within that of the Earth, stoppings and retrograde motions appear in them also, due not to any motion that really exists in them, but to the annual motion of the Earth. This is acutely demonstrated by Copernicus . . .

You see, gentlemen, with what ease and simplicity the annual motion — if made by the Earth — lends itself to supplying reasons for the apparent anomalies which are observed in the movements of the five planets. . . . It removes them all and reduces these movements to equable and regular motions; and it was Nicholas Copernicus who first clarified for us the reasons for this marvelous effect." 1632, Dialogue Concerning the Two Chief World Systems Galileo

Galileo tried to put words in the Pope's mouth and the Pope threw him to the curia who cared nothing of astronomy or much else. The persecution was a political response and there is far too much of the same thing in this era insofar as it is only politics upholding the dumb view of Newton as opposed to the correct interpretation by people like Copernicus, Galileo and Kepler.

Re: An astronomer's view of mechanics

I have sufficient understanding of the technical matters at issue here to know that you have stumbled; that the remarks of Newton and Flamsteed to which you object change nothing of what Kepler and Copernicus had already said, and that Newton led the way in a proper fashion to further build upon what Kepler had achieved.

You are mistaken, Flamsteed led the way and Newton followed him down a very astrological path, a path so bad that I basically have to wreck myself trying to point in the direction of correct astronomical working methods.

However important intuition may be, it does not serve as an argument for faith for you to, lacking the proper mathematical knowledge, stumble in those matters, and make of yourself an object of ridicule. To do this prevents you from being properly heard as an advocate for faith.

I will tell you what, I would gladly suffer any ridicule than see another generation indoctrinated in astrological beliefs and the empirical cult. If you want to know what faith actually is, I will direct you to St Francis who correctly points out that challenging yourself requires more faith than listening to any ideology –

<http://www.feastofsaints.com/perfectjoy.htm>

My reward is the ridicule of you and your dull and dismal kind but it would be nice to see some productive people finally put a stop to the contrived nonsense which has hijacked genuine astronomical methods and insights, if not as a Christian then as a genuine good person.

I believe that with greater understanding, you will find that the conventional understanding of the motions of the heavens is not in fact objectionable in some of the ways you object to it, and in the others, the objections are not really valid.

John Savard

Re: An astronomer's view of mechanics

I think the participants of sci.astro.amateur deserve to have you as their authority now, you are the only one openly supporting the false correlation and conclusion of Flamsteed and I admire that, even if it is astrological. Go ahead and speak about the astronomical achievements of relativity and Newton's work and see how they respond.