

Re: Nearby stars—why do they start at 4LY?

Re: Nearby stars—why do they start at 4LY?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.astro/2008-07/msg00300.html>

- *From:* "Landy" <noone@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 21 Jul 2008 20:15:58 +1000
-

"Androcles" <Headmaster@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message [news:vlOgk.26498\\$gU4.6266@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:vlOgk.26498$gU4.6266@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

"John C. Polasek" <jpolasek@xxxxxxxx> wrote in message news:5b9784dng0s0hkgu94con8409ur7kiatqg@xxxxxxxx
| Wiki et al show tables of the first 20 or 50 stars nearest the earth.
| The distances for the first few are
| 4.3 6.0 7.7 8.4 8.6 9.4 10.4 LY
| 1.7 1.7 .7 .2 1.2 1 the differences
| Why are there no stars from 0 to 4.3 LY? From the difference list
| there should be at least 2 closer than 4.3.
| These are probably the few that can be measured using the parallaxic
| effect. It just doesn't seem likely that such a void exists.
| John Polasek

Why are you a cretin? There should be at least 55 morons writing to sci.astro ahead of you and you the closest. The next poster is at least an hour away from you, it just doesn't seem likely that such a void exists.
Look, imbecile, that's the way it IS, there is no "why" to it.

And why are you such an asshole?

The poster was simply asking an innocent question.

If you can't be constructive, why don't you just shut the fuck up?