

Re: SR time dilation on remote objects ?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.astro/2004-07/1596.html>

From: vonroach (*hadrainc_at_earthlink.net*)

Date: 07/16/04

Date: Fri, 16 Jul 2004 23:55:58 GMT

On Fri, 16 Jul 2004 15:21:31 +0200, Bjoern Feuerbacher
<feuerbac@thphys.uni-heidelberg.de> wrote:

>vonroach wrote:

>> On Thu, 15 Jul 2004 20:50:10 -0700, "N:dlzc D:aol T:com \(\dlzc\)" <N:

>> dlzc1 D:cox T:net@nospam.com> wrote:

>>

>>

>>>Dear vonroach:

>>>

>>>"vonroach" <hadrainc@earthlink.net> wrote in message

>>>news:q85df053uaf33gda7sghotgpou4jpi50lt@4ax.com...

>>>

>>>>On Wed, 14 Jul 2004 20:59:27 -0700, "N:dlzc D:aol T:com \(\dlzc\)" <N:

>>>>dlzc1 D:cox T:net@nospam.com> wrote:

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>>Dear vonroach:

>>>>>

>>>>>"vonroach" <hadrainc@earthlink.net> wrote in message

>>>>>news:gicbf01ouf5m6dk73t1e5l3gcq248l3cl2@4ax.com...

>>>>>

>>>>>>On Tue, 13 Jul 2004 16:45:21 -0700, "N:dlzc D:aol T:com \(\dlzc\)" <N:

>>>>>>dlzc1 D:cox T:net@nospam.com> wrote:

>>>>>>

>>>>>>

>>>>>>>Neglecting other observations, the red shift could be due to kinetic

>>>>>>>velocity, yes. Including the proportional "dilation" of the duration

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>of

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>a

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>Type I supernova.

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>Davy, seriously, are you nuts?

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>No. Are you deaf?

sci.astro: Re: SR time dilation on remote objects ?

>>>
>>>>Davy, I may be. What is `potential velocity' or perhaps `static
>>>>velocity'.
>>>
>>>I don't recall saying either of those. The term I used was "kinetic
>>>velocity" (SR or Newton), as opposed to "apparent velocity" (GR).
>>>
>>>
>>>> And what is the `proportional dilation of the duration of
>>>>a supernova?
>>>
>>>>A "local" Type I supernova takes a certain number of days to go from
>>>>maximum intensity, to some proportion of that intensity. As Type I
>>>>supernovae are observed that are more remote, we find that the amount of
>>>>time between maximum, and that arbitrary "ending threshold" is increased.
>>>>The increase in the duration between maximum and cutoff intensities, is
>>>>proportional to the redshift of identified spectra from these sources. Is
>>>>that marginally more clear?
>>>
>>>>David A. Smith
>>
>>
>> Yes, the type I are more remote,
>
>He did not say that. He only said that the type I supernova which *are
>observed* (in cosmology) are more remote.

What are we discussing? I hope we aren't talking about imagination.

>
>> introducing more potential
>> complications into the observation.
>
>Obviously, yes. Care to explain why the results from the analysis
>of the supernova are not only internally consistent, but also consistent
>with other types of observations?

Care to cite some reference to this beyond a general statement. As I had often said, I'm a skeptic.

>
>> Kinetic is usually opposed to
>> potential. Now apparent is added. One might guess that real or
>> relative velocity would be better.
>
>>So a relative velocity is not "real", or what?
>
>
>Bye,
>Bjoern

Re: SR time dilation on remote objects ?