

Re: An astronomer's view of mechanics

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.astro.amateur/2007-10/msg00244.html>

- *From:* oriel36 <geraldkelleher@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 08 Oct 2007 10:01:01 -0700
-

On Oct 8, 1:24 am, Quadibloc <jsav...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

oriel36 wrote:

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

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

Re: An astronomer's view of mechanics

" 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

In what you quote, the Earth moves. It moves more quickly than Mars, Jupiter, and Saturn do – and it moves around the Sun.

There is no precedence for creating a fictional or hypothetical observer on the Sun to account for 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

Because the Sun takes 220,000 years to orbit the center of the galaxy, in describing the motions of the Solar System, we neglect the motions of the Sun just as we would neglect the motions of the Earth when describing a game of billiards. We are not asserting, in a geocentric, astrological, or creationist fashion that the Sun and stars do not move.

Once recognised that we see heliocentric orbital motion directly from a moving Earth in an orbit between Venus and Mars it is intellectually impossible, approaching the level of insanity, to ever believe the Sun around the Earth is a valid conception. –

"PHÆNOMENON IV.

That the fixed stars being at rest, the periodic times of the five primary planets, and (whether of the sun about the earth, or) of the earth about the sun, are in the sesquuplicate proportion of their mean distances from the sun." Newton

I have walked you through the entire setup where Newton misinterprets the data arising from the diagram on page 86 by believing if you place the Sun at the center, the retrograde loops disappear –

http://mitpress.mit.edu/journals/pdf/POSC_13_1_74_0.pdf

There is the horror of your absolute/relative space, the idiosyncratic vandalism of a genuine Keplerian insight which uses orbital comparisons between the Earth and Mars –

"Copernicus, by attributing a single annual motion to the earth, entirely rids the planets of these extremely intricate coils [spirals], leading the individual planets into their respective orbits [orbits], quite bare and very nearly circular. In the period of time shown in the diagram, Mars traverses one and the same orbit as many times as the 'garlands' [corollas] you see looped towards the centre, with one extra, making nine times, while at the same time the Earth repeats its circle sixteen times " Kepler

Given the Earth moving around the Sun, what is more natural – once people are accustomed to the idea that, yes, the Earth does move – than to begin one's explanation with that which does not move, the surroundings in which the movements of the Earth, Mars, and the other planets take place? And so we begin with the Sun at the center – and the stars, which cannot move around the Sun appreciably in the course of a year, as they would need, at their vast distances, to move at an impossible rate to do so?

These astrological traitors here know now there is no precedence whatsoever for an idiosyncratic approach to and resolution of retrogrades by Newton and let them be cursed for it. Building concepts by introducing a zodiacal framework into heliocentric reasoning is the complete antithesis of astronomy, its methods and its insights extending to all facets of civilisation. Any society which allows its

Re: An astronomer's view of mechanics

own achievements to be destroyed for worthless conceptual junk is hardly civilised but savage.

I told these magnification guys here they can keep their Ra/Dec system as long as they do not use it to qualify axial and orbital motion of the Earth or structural heliocentric reasoning but they seem intent in casting their lot in with the astrological concepts of Flamsteed/Newton.

One car overtakes another on a circular racetrack. Does that disprove that the pavement stands still? Or, at least, since the pavement *does* rest on a moving Earth, that it is simplest to understand the moving cars by looking at both of them from a seemingly still vantage point, as cars turn their wheels to move themselves in relation to the ground beneath them, than from the viewpoint of someone within one of the cars?

I look what you did with the analogy I have used for years and see you throw it back at me as an assertion –

"A car moving on a traffic roundabout sees cars moving slowly on the outer lanes ,as we are in the car travelling faster in an inner lane,as we overtake the cars moving in the outer lanes,it appears that the cars go backwards and then forwards again.This is just a common judgement based on the fact that we are sharing a common axis on the roundabout. "

<http://groups.google.com/group/sci.space.policy/msg/7b2117cbf109c167>

The ground is the proper starting point from which to isolate the motion of each car; from one car, or from the Sun, or from Mars, other motions are brought in and the problem becomes more complicated. All Newton did was start his explanation of retrogrades from the right place to isolate the motions in the Solar System – in this, he changed nothing from Kepler or Copernicus, he just made it plainer for people who no longer disputed Copernicus.

Newton's statement is corrupt and silly and has no basis in astronomical reasoning.The orbital motion of the Earth accounts for the observed behavior of the outer planets leaving axial rotation to

Re: An astronomer's view of mechanics

explain the daily cycle. There is no other way –

" 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

http://antwrp.gsfc.nasa.gov/apod/image/0112/JuSa2000_teze1.gif

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.

I hope I am having some success in explaining to you why what you say is hard for us to understand. Perhaps that can make your task easier.

John Savard– Hide quoted text –

– Show quoted text –

You have all the success in the world in turning people off appreciating the astronomical tradition of Copernicus and Kepler and especially in this era when it is so important to move astronomy into climatological and geological disciplines. Even when there is a new motion to work with, replacing the pseudo–dynamic of variable axial tilt with a change of orbital orientation, there is still this horrible silence.

http://astro.berkeley.edu/~imke/Infrared/UranusAo/ur_time_2001_2005.jpg

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nwTrYVBcx9s>

All it takes is a little effort to adjust for the orbital path of the Earth to keep the solar radiation/orbital shadow boundary from pivoting off the Equator and allowing the images from Uranus to demonstrate what is actually changing on Earth.

Your 'sidereal time' justification for axial and orbital motion keeps the Earth orbital face holding the same face to the Sun over an annual orbit –

<http://calgary.rasc.ca/radecl.htm>

Re: An astronomer's view of mechanics

The modification for the explanation of the seasons far exceeds the Keplerian modification for orbital geometries but unlike the Keplerian era there appears to be no men of repute to handle the matter, there are only semi-astrologers defending guys who created a contrived mess in the late 17th century.

I have given a clear direction to my efforts in terms of the necessary modification which accurately brings astronomy in line with climatological studies. I hold nobody accountable for the astrological errors they inherited through indoctrination and I certainly do not care who uses my analogies or my concepts to promote astronomy ,

That I admire your astrological conviction does not mean I have any intention of dwelling with that vacuous intellectual level. It is a means to keep the astronomical platform front and center and to keep the Ra/Dec system as a mere convenience.