Re: Define a clock

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2004−10/1346.html

---

From: AllYou! (*idaman_at_conversent.net*)
Date: 10/04/04

Date: Mon, 4 Oct 2004 16:23:45 −0400

"Androcles" <androc1es@nospamblueyonder.co.uk> wrote in message
news:p2i8d.2594$xb.762@text.news.blueyonder.co.uk...
>
> "AllYou!" <idaman@conversent.net> wrote in message
> news:VfqdndqHGu44NPzcRVn−vA@conversent.net...
> |
> | "sal" <pragmatist@nospam.org> wrote in message
> | news:pan.2004.10.04.18.55.16.453817@nospam.org...
> | > On Mon, 04 Oct 2004 14:35:44 −0400, AllYou! wrote:
> | >
> | > > [...] just because Dirk and his alter−ego [...]
> | >
> | > Whoa, this is a new one!!
> | >
> | > You mean there are _two_ of him? Or has the master of sock detection
> | > supposedly been caught wearing one?
> | >
> | > Who's Dirk's alter−ego?
> |
> | Bill Hobba. Two peas in a pod. Neither is willing to provide a
> definition
> | of a clock.
>
> So? You are not willing to provide a derivation of your
> "Time on a linear clock in S' as compared to it's twin in S as both
observed
> from S:
> [T = g(T'+vL'/c^2)]"*

Where did I ever refuse to provide this derivation? You really do have anger management issues. You're so pissed over nothing that you're blinded to what's actually been posted. All you have to do is ask. Do you want me to post it for you? I'd be happy to if you ask nicely. Say please and I will. LOL!