

Re: Letter to oriel36 – continued

Source: <http://sci.tech–archive.net/Archive/sci.astro.amateur/2008–10/msg00666.html>

- *From:* oriel36 <kelleher.gerald@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 23 Oct 2008 12:32:44 –0700 (PDT)
-

On Oct 23, 8:10 pm, chris1...@xxxxxxxx wrote:

On Oct 23, 12:33 pm, oriel36 <kelleher.ger...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

If all Martin can manage is 'axial tilt' then he is in good company as it remains the explanation Copernicus used for the seasonal variations in daylight/darkness. It is when the global variations in the natural noon cycles require an explanation that 'axial tilt' runs into trouble and that is why the original thread by Martin and the reply from me are basically insult free –

"Natural noon cycles", as you would put it,

Do you want to hear it from Huygens –

"Here take notice, that the Sun or the Earth passeth the 12. Signes, or makes an entire revolution in the Ecliptick in 365 days, 5 hours 49 min. or there about, and that those days, reckon'd from noon to noon, are of different lengths; as is known to all that are vers'd in Astronomy."

<http://www.xs4all.nl/~adcs/Huygens/06/kort–E.html>

have been known for

centuries now. You don't have an explanation, just some gibberish which makes no sense.

There are two 360 degree motions with respect to the central Sun that all planets have, daily rotation is one motion, the 360 degree orbital change to the central Sun is another. You can check it out using modern imaging –

Re: Letter to oriel36 – continued

<http://hubblesite.org/newscenter/archive/releases/1999/11/video/b>

You are playing us for fools, which we are not.

Your use of the english language, basically your misuse of grammar, prevents you from making any kind of a clear argument.

Go ahead, explain why the natural noon cycles vary using that very poor sub-geocentric interpretation –

<http://www.analemma.com/Pages/framesPage.html>

Brush up on the rules of grammar. Stop using run-on sentences to beat around the bush. State clearly what you want to say, and people will then be able to interpret it correctly. Otherwise you are just blathering (like a politician).

Rolando

My turn.

Look, it is a 100% geometric certainty that the explanation for the variations in the natural noon cycle is also the same one which causes the seasonal variations in daylight/darkness and it involves a 360 degree orbital component. If all you can manage is blurt out 'tilt' then I do not fault you, the initial encounter with the specific way the Earth orbits the Sun is a little disconcerting but just follow the reasoning where, in the absence of daily rotation, all locations would experience a single daylight/darkness cycle over the course of an annual orbit. It is just a matter of adding daily rotation as a separate motion into the mix.

Now, I am certain that you are on a review board hence the fixation on grammar, for my part, this is the usenet and I never complain about typos and what have you and anybody who does is a numbskull. There are far too many exciting possibilities out there in the celestial arena and one of them happens to be a more productive explanation for the astronomical experience of the seasons in its barest form – the variations in daylight/darkness over and above seasonal weather patterns.

Again, if you want to discuss grammar then I am sure there are many nice forums dedicated to your concerns but unless you have an astronomical idea to discuss then be content with your personal gripes

Re: Letter to oriel36 – continued

Re: Letter to oriel36 – continued

but I do not take these things into consideration.