

Re: Stupid Einstein question.

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2004-09/1294.html>

From: suzysewnshow (suzysewnshow_at_yahoo.com.au)

Date: 09/05/04

Date: 4 Sep 2004 17:24:53 -0700

rbwinn3@juno.com (Robert B. Winn) wrote in message
news:<a17e5e0e.0409040900.f3a91c2@posting.google.com>...
> suzysewnshow@yahoo.com.au (suzysewnshow) wrote in message
news:<e0a23188.0409040111.16e5012b@posting.google.com>...
>> rbwinn3@juno.com (Robert B. Winn) wrote in message
news:<a17e5e0e.0409031543.729c6369@posting.google.com>...
>>> suzysewnshow@yahoo.com.au (suzysewnshow) wrote in message
news:<e0a23188.0409020017.1e3ee9c7@posting.google.com>...
>>>> rbwinn3@juno.com (Robert B. Winn) wrote in message
news:<a17e5e0e.0409011551.5dae80@posting.google.com>...
>>>>> suzysewnshow@yahoo.com.au (suzysewnshow) wrote in message
news:<e0a23188.0408312338.6b0792c5@posting.google.com>...
>>>>>> Round trip is the same all days. An airplane flying through a medium
>>>>>> of air, with or without wind, is not the same thing as a photon.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>> Not I nor any other readers of this group want your *OPINION* of what
>>>>>> photons do if you can't solve a simple vector addition problem. Most
>>>>>> high school physics students and any 15 year old student pilot can
>>>>>> solve this for 2 axes. I set x equal to zero to save ya the trig.
>>>>>> A typo I made should have made your illogic even easier to find. I
>>>>>> expressed the wind speeds as km/s. They should have been km/hr.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>> Grade schoolers sometimes need a Thursday flight and since you applied
>>>>>> the wrong solution, I added that and few more descriptive words to
>>>>>> make it easier to read.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>> ----With hints, sans typos----
>>>>>> Mail pilot flies a daily round trip 100km N drops mail pouch and
>>>>>> returns 100km S.
>>>>>> Airspeed is always 100km/hr
>>>>>> On Monday there is no wind
>>>>>> On Tuesday wind is from N @ 10km/hr
>>>>>> On Wednesday wind is from S @ 10km/hr
>>>>>> On Thursday wind is from S @ 100km/hr
>>>>>> Which day is longest RT time?
>>>>>> -----
>>>>>> Mail carrier drives a daily round trip 100km N drops mail pouch and
>>>>>> returns 100km S.

sci.physics.relativity: Re: Stupid Einstein question.

>>>>> > *Roadspeed is always 100km/hr*
>>>>> > *On Monday there is no wind.*
>>>>> > *On Tuesday wind is from N @ 10km/hr*
>>>>> > *On Wednesday wind is from S @ 10km/hr*
>>>>> > *On Thursday wind is from S @ 100km/hr*
>>>>> > *Which day is longest RT time?*
>>>>> > -----
>>>>> > *Extra credit*
>>>>> > *Which one is solved by simple algebra?*
>>>>> > *Which one is solved by simple logic?*
>>>>> > *Which one is an example of the effect of an ether?*
>>>>> > -----
>>>>> > *If ya got the extra credits right then you'll see how the first*
>>>>> > *postulate dictates whether "simple algebra" is used. Personal tastes*
>>>>> > *has nothing to do with it.*
>>>>> > -----
>>>>> > *If you come back with the same answer, I gotta be honest with you: You*
>>>>> > *are wasting your time and everybody's else time trying to use your*
>>>>> > *math skills to study relativity. You seem really good with the rules*
>>>>> > *and notation so I would guess you're one who dreaded the dreaded "word*
>>>>> > *problem". I think that is called "applied math".*
>>>>> >
>>>>> > *Take two of these and call Uncle Al in the morning.*
>>>>> > *Rx <http://www.glenbrook.k12.il.us/gbssci/phys/Class/vectors/u311b.html>*
>>>>> >
>>>>> > *Kind regards,*
>>>>> > *Sue...*
>>>>> >
>>>>> > *I solved it. If you want two axis, then the wind has to be from the*
>>>>> > *east or the west. All Thursday did was make a round trip impossible.*
>>>>> > *The airplane will have to stay N until the wind dies down.*
>>>>> > *Robert B. winn*
>>>>> >
>>>>> > *Take two of these and call Uncle Al in the morning.*
>>>>> > *Rx <http://www.glenbrook.k12.il.us/gbssci/phys/Class/vectors/u311b.html>*
>>>>> >
>>>>> > *Well, I was more than half right with the answer I gave. All of the*
>>>>> > *car problems and one airplane problem were answered by the answer I*
>>>>> > *gave.*
>>>>> > *Robert B. winn*
>>>>> >
>>>>> > *Fortunatey for you, the dog ate your report card but that sounds about*
>>>>> > *right. So now you can see that for the airplane, any constant wind*
>>>>> > *will increase the round trip time. When the wind speed => air speed RT*
>>>>> > *time goes to infinity. If the air is like an ether, the aircraft is*
>>>>> > *like commutating light and the airports are like mirrors, then we can*
>>>>> > *see why a light clock slows with motion in any direction. The "ether*
>>>>> > *wind" is blowing the light off course.*
>>>>> >
>>>>> > *Back to the example, you can now see the airplane case (ether) is*
>>>>> > *misinterpreted if "logic" is applied and you think falsly, the*

Re: Stupid Einstein question.

sci.physics.relativity: Re: Stupid Einstein question.

> > *headwind cancels the tailwind. Likewise the automobile case (no ether,
> > PoR) is misinterpreted if you apply "simple algebra" have some result
> > which "dilates" the period according to wind speed.*

> >

> > *This is the problem when you try to analyze the train gedanken in
> > greater depth than the writer did. For an analyst to be fair with his
> > readers, the worst case, not the best case must be considered. That
> > gets real ugly. Ionized air is instantly sucked out of the experiment
> > so the train can instantly accelerate to a significant fraction of the
> > speed of light and you are supposed to follow some contorted logic
> > about how light is propagating through the air which you just sucked
> > out.*

> >

> > *Of course... the gedanken experiment can be salvaged, but in so doing
> > the goal should be to add clarity, not preservation of the writer's
> > ambiguities. When you put the four instantaneous emitters where the
> > writer's own statement of the principle of relativity dictates they
> > must be, his logical errors become apparent.*

> >

> > *As a further test, replace the light flashes with two projectiles in
> > uniform motion. No amount of clock fiddling will preserve the
> > principle of relativity for both frames of reference. Use of four
> > projectiles clearly makes the writer's fundamental point:*

> >

> > *"If, relative to K, K' is a uniformly moving co-ordinate system devoid
> > of rotation, then natural phenomena run their course with respect to
> > K' according to exactly the same general laws as with respect to K."*
> > --Albert Einstein

> >

> > *Kind regards, Sue...*

>

> *Well, I never included ether in any way from the beginning. I just
> noticed that something was amiss with regard to simultaneity. I
> resolved this by having the lightning leave marks on the railroad
> track, which seems impossible for the Lorentz equations to resolve.
> Then, again without ether, I figured the problem using velocity of
> light rather than speed of light. I did what Einstein said he was
> doing. So if there is some proof that ether exists, go ahead and give
> it. Other than that, I just correct the mistakes of scientists.
> Robert B. Winn*

I took a peek at at your argument in the other thread and it looks valid to me. I haven't seen it before so maybe you have an original. I'll pass on the ether challenge. You only need that to make light-clocks work. You just proved that we don't need light clocks. Kind regards, Sue...