

Re: An astronomer's view of mechanics

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.astro.amateur/2007-10/msg00340.html>

- *From:* oriel36 <geraldkelleher@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 11 Oct 2007 10:11:33 -0700
-

On 11 Oct, 13:54, Quadibloc <jsav...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

oriel36 wrote:

When I said I was tired it only was due to poor sentence structure and spelling errors,there is nothing whatsoever beyond that .

I am aware that German, rather than English, is your first language. And, thus, occasionally there will be an un-idiomatic choice of words, such as "contrapuntal opposite" when, I presume, you meant the absolute opposite – as far from the other as the nadir is from the zenith. That, idiomatically in English, is the "diametric opposite".

A Christian tenet is that you cannot serve two masters and my poor sentence and spelling is the result of busy external circumstance Plus the weighty load of doing astronomy in a world that no longer recognises atronomical methods and insights.It is not your ability to dance around Newton's false view and resolution of retrogrades like an idiot,it is the sheer silence behind not affirming the only explanation that Copernicus,Kepler and Galileo knew,that we see orbital motion of ourselves and the other planets from an orbitally moving Earth –

<http://antwrp.gsfc.nasa.gov/apod/ap011220.html>

This nonsense of a hypothetical observer on the Sun should be swiftly expunged from civilisation,instead there is a bunch of astrologers behaving as if nothing is wrong.

I have wondered if it is a language issue that has led you to see something in Flamsteed and Newton that contradicts Galileo and

Re: An astronomer's view of mechanics

Copernicus; as I have often noted, it appears from the general viewpoint that Newton only affirmed Copernicus and Kepler – adding what Kepler sought, but failed to obtain, an explanation of the observed celestial motions as a consequence of underlying physical laws. Which was exactly what was needed for the unchallenged triumph of Copernicanism. And the mechanical laws of Newton rest upon, and do not at all contradict, the discoveries of Galileo.

These guys here claim inheritance from Galileo but that is bringing shame on Galileo and on the entire human race. To stay silent while you try to attach the agenda of Newton and Flamsteed to the great astronomer surpasses any attempt by creationists to impose their agenda on natural phenomena. Your astrological framework on which you hang your concepts is really that bad.

I might also note in this connection that in my childhood, the first book about astronomy that I read, which led me to an interest in these matters, was translated from the German – it was the history of astronomy "And There was Light" by Rudolf Thiel.

Of course, I somewhat disagree with his strong words for Ptolemy's use of the equant! That was a very good approximation to Kepler's Laws for low eccentricity, and it is unreasonable to expect better from the ancients. Or, once they have found an accurate correspondence from simple circular elements, to reject it merely because of the off-center point. Thus, denouncing it as a "wretched capitulation" seemed hyperbolic.

John Savard

I am proud of my astronomical heritage, even that part where Galileo can explicitly discern that people who have established false correlations will become ill if you present conclusive evidence that they are in error.

What the other guys here are proud of I do not know, they can't claim to represent the heritage of Copernicus and Galileo insofar as I have yet to see a single objection to the stupid approach of Newton to retrogrades and their resolution –

"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

Re: An astronomer's view of mechanics

Go pine for you telescopic equipment, many people in this era are starving due to an imbalance in the climate affecting their crops or where they are living due to severe meteorological events. I have explicitly stated that the direction is not concerned about the junk of Newton but the necessary modification based on orbital orientation change for the seasons and from there into climate.

The problem is not global climate, the problem, at present, is the shocking level at which the 'experts' approach the topic. In one stunning sequence of images, the application of lessons learned from Uranus can be applied to the Earth, instead I have to argue over basic astronomical principles with a guy who has severe astrological convictions. Fair play to you John, at least you are openly protective of Flamsteed/Newton even if these pair almost wrecked astronomical methods and insights.