

Re: Define a clock

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2004-10/4370.html>

From: jem (*xxx_at_xxx.xxx*)

Date: 10/19/04

Date: Tue, 19 Oct 2004 09:27:38 -0400

AllYou! wrote:

> "jem" <xxx@xxx.xxx> wrote in message
> news:7J7dd.105934\$a85.94589@fed1read04...
>
>>AllYou! wrote:
>>
>>>I'll try this one again:
>>>
>>>"jem" <xxx@xxx.xxx> wrote in message
>
> news:FoYbd.28493\$UA.2860@lakeread08...
>
>>>>What you're observing when you watch the blinking light or listen to the
>>>>ticking clock is "change" – light/no light, sound/no sound. "Change" is
>>>>the essence of these observations, and the details concerning how the
>>>>change is being produced aren't relevant to that. In your terms,
>>>>"change" is a fundamental aspect of Nature – not change in velocity,
>>>>change in displacement, or change in anything in particular, just
>
> change.
>
>>>
>>>>To assert that the details of what makes a clock operate is irrelevant
>
> is to
>
>>>>dismiss my theory out of hand. My whole point is that time is a
>
> derivative
>
>>>>of the very real properties of distance and velocity. It's a concept
>
> only
>
>>>>and it's measurement is fully dependent upon motion. IOW, all clocks
>
> depend

sci.physics.relativity: Re: Define a clock

>

>>>*upon motion to produce events. And so to say that the very property*

>

> *which*

>

>>>*is the underpinning of my proposition is irrelevant to the discussion is*

>