Re: SR time dilation on remote objects ?

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.astro/2004−07/2186.html

---

From: vonroach (*hadrainc_at_earthlink.net*)
Date: 07/20/04

Date: Tue, 20 Jul 2004 23:35:43 GMT

On Tue, 20 Jul 2004 09:54:46 +0200, Bjoern Feuerbacher
<feuerbac@thphys.uni−heidelberg.de> wrote:

>vonroach wrote:
>> On Mon, 19 Jul 2004 11:43:04 +0200, Bjoern Feuerbacher
>> <feuerbac@thphys.uni−heidelberg.de> wrote:
>>
>>
>>>vonroach wrote:
>>>
>
>[snip]
>
>
>>>>>I didn't say they are. I asked you if you think that, based on your
>>>>>strange, incomprehensible comment
>>>>>"Yes, I know what it (the BBT] says, and I also know it is a theory and
>>>>>inappropriate to transfer theory to a little bang (supernova)."
>>>>>which you chose to snip (oh, content is not important, right?).
>>>>>
*>>>>>What *did* you mean there?*
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>I mean that the study of supernova has hardly progressed beyond the
>>>>stage of initial observations.
>>>
*>>>Why on earth do you think so??? SNs have been studied for *decades**
>>>now.
>
>Care to answer that?
>
>
>>>But what has this to do with "transfering the BBT to SNs"?????
>>
>>
>> I was hoping you would elaborate on that since you choose to describe
>> a supernova as an `explosion'.
>

>I explained that in detail now.
>
>
>> Most describe a stellar implosion with
>> an `exploding' supernova remnant of extruded particles, radiation, and
>> `dust'.
>
*>The implosion is the *cause* of the supernova. It is not the supernova*
*>itself! The supernova itself *is* the "ejection" of all this debris*
>and radiation! In supernovae type I, there even is no star left after
>the supernova!
>
>
>> When a building is imploded by explosive charges, a large
>> cloud of dust and particles is extruded with considerable energy,
>> resulting from the imploding building, not the explosive charges.
>
>In a supernova explosion, there is only a quite tiny remainder (type
>II), or no remainder at all (type I) − most or even all of the matter of
>the original star is blown away. In contrast, most the building is still
>in place after the cloud of dust has been blown away. So this is a false
>analogy.

No, you are incorrect. Your `explanation' is ludicrous. An active star consumes almost all its fuel to the point that it cannot generate enough energy to support its own outer layers. And with this severe absence of fuel, you hypothesize that it `explodes'. ROFLMAO. It implodes and the implosion can only be halted by neutrons, otherwise it becomes a black hole − whatever that may ultimately turn out to be. And the bright supernova remanent expands and fades into the interstellar medium.

>
>> Now,
>> in the case of a `supernova', does a star implode or explode?
>
*>First an implosion, and due to that implosion, a *huge* amount of*
*>energy is released. And *that* energy release is called the supernova*
*>− not the implosion which causes it! And that energy release *obviously**
*>is an *explosion*!*

Yes the supernova (unstable giant star) IMPLODES. Now you can discuss the fate of the extruded remanent, thereafter called a supernova remanent.

>
>> Is the
>> sudden brightness that is observed due to an `explosion' or a
>> supernova remnant that persists and slowly dims?
>
>Err, the energy which makes the remnant glow comes from the explosion.

Wrong again, it is the remanent of implosion of a giant unstable star.
If the star had material left to `explode' it would continue to exist
and support its own structure.
>
>> If you choose to call
>> it an explosion, how do you explain the neutron star or black hole
>> that may be observed to follow?
>
>First, it follows only in supernova type II, not in type I. Second,
>as I said above, even in type II, most of the matter of the original
>star is ejected, blown away.
>
>
>
>> With regard to the `big bang' theory, it appears that there was a
>> mysterious explosion, if the theory is correct.
>
>Calling the Big Bang an explosion suggest that you either use the
>term quite loosely, or that you don't know what the theory really
>says.
>
Now you seek to explain the `Big Bang' be my guest. Start with the out
of nothing came everything part. Then continue with what was before
plasma. talk about plasma a bit, then explain the formation of nuclei
and later atoms, little photons ...all with uncertainty. Explain the
formation of stars and galaxies and the coming of light. A chaos of
creation that you should be able to master in a few crisp sentences.
And is it still expanding or does it just appear to be so. Plumb the
tiny dimensions of matter and the gigantic collections of matter
beyond our knowledge. Of course what you will be basing this fiction
on, is not the `big bang' but the big bang remanent that we observe at
present. I will excuse any confusion between events and remnants of
events.
Ta ta
>> There is nothing to suggest an implosion.
>
>Agreed.
>
>
>
>[snip]
>
>
>>>>There are plenty guesses. What is one to conclude if there is still
>>>>disagreement on a `red shift'.
>>>
>>>Disagreement? What do you mean, specifically?
>>
>>
>> Disagreement on the `meaning' of a red shift. You can dispute that
>> with others.

>
>*Who* disagrees on the meaning of red shift? Do you mean people like*
>*Tifft and Arp, or some of the crackpots here in the newsgroup?*

No, do you recognize even two possible causes for a `red shift'?
Expanding spacetime? Gravitational? Both associated with `time
dilatation.
>
>*Bye,*
>*Bjoern*