

Re: Tom Van Flandern and Newtonian Gravity

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2004-09/7317.html>

From: Dennis McCarthy (*djmenck_at_aol.com*)

Date: 09/29/04

Date: 28 Sep 2004 19:36:56 -0700

>
> and "Vern" <vthodge@bealenet.com> writes:
>
> > [Vern]: I'm going to try another quote to explain my position:
>
> I assume this was from the same faulty source as the
> previous source because it has elementary errors too. I mention some
> examples:
>
> > [Vern (quoting)]: "It was originally Galileo's discovery, that the
> > trajectory of a falling body can be separated into two or more
> > entirely independent components of motion, caused by separate and
> > independent forces.

TVF:

> The horizontal component of motion is a velocity, not an
> acceleration, and therefore has no associated ?force?. There is only one
> force of gravity, and it is purely radial (which is downward for falling
> bodies).
>
>
> > [Vern (quoting)]: Take the case of an apple, dropped from the top of a
> > two story building. During the first second it falls radially toward
> > the center of the earth 9.8 meters.
>
> Uh, no, it falls 4.9 meters in the first second. But its
> speed becomes 9.8 meters per second. (Getting these mixed up is not a
> good sign.)
>
> > [Vern (quoting)]: Neither is there an acceptable theory to explain why
> > the moon should share the angular momentum of the earth, like the
> > apple or the cannon ball, nor is there any imaginable parallel for the
> > force of the gunpowder.

TFV:

> This is wrong on both counts. All four theories of lunar
> origin get the Moon into its present orbit with its present angular