

Re: Light Clock Nonsense

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2004-12/3289.html>

From: Paul B. Anderersen (paul.b.andersen_at_deletethishia.no)

Date: 12/07/04

Date: Tue, 07 Dec 2004 15:41:38 +0100

jahn wrote:

> "Paul B. Anderersen" <paul.b.andersen@deletethishia.no> wrote in message
news:cp1mjc\$3g9\$I@dolly.uninett.no...

>

>>jahn wrote:

>>

>>>It suddenly occurs to me that Paul will see a vertical
>>>pipe, unless told a light beam is moving inside, in which
>>>case he will see whatever is necessary to parrot the
>>>SR delusions. Abandon all hope. That kind of faith
>>>won't be matched even among the snake handling
>>>religions.

>>>Sue...

>>

>>Assuming that you are not making up your
>>allegations, but are referring to the only
>>statement I have made about pipes in this thread:
>>"A stationary tube in the observers frame
>>will obviously have to lean over to keep
>>the short light pulse within the tube."
>>I will interpret your statement to mean
>>that you do not agree with this.

>>

>>I have a simple question for you.
>>Two observers are looking at the same star
>>through their respective telescopes.
>>The observers are moving at v relative to
>>each other along a line perpendicular
>>to the line of sight to the star.
>>At the time they are passing each other,
>>are their telescopes then parallel?

>>

>>You don't have to invoke SR to arrive
>>at the correct answer, which is "no".
>>(Which is why your confusion puzzles
>>me a little. You object to matters which
>>no sane person dispute, even if said person
>>don't "believe" in SR.)

>>
>>*The angle between the telescopes is:*
>>*According to*
>>.. *the Galilean transform: $\arctan(v/c)$*
>>.. *the Lorentz transform: $\arcsin(v/c)$*
>>
>>*The difference is minute unless v is very high.*
>>
>>*Disagree, or admit that I am right.*
>>*You will make my day either way.*
>>
>>*(Experience tells me that you rather will*
>>*flee the discussion, though.)*
>>
>>*Paul*
>
>
> *Stars don't shoot bullets so your wasting your own time.*

I take that to mean that you disagree.
Thanks. You made my day. :-)

The English astronomer Bradley measured
the angle you think is zero in 1728.
He used it to measure the speed of light,
and found it to be 301000 km/s.
The phenomenon I described above has been
well known ever since.

So you have a few centuries of physics to catch up. :-)

> ... *not mine*
> *Do ya think these for devices*
> *are for comparing rifling marks?*
> <<*The VLTI Delay Line retroreflector carriage on its rails in the*
> *Interferometric Tunnel, as seen from the front with the openings*
> *through which the light beams from the telescopes will enter and*
> *exit. (This digital photo was obtained on September 24, 2000).*
>
> <http://www.eso.org/outreach/press-rel/pr-2000/phot-26-00.html>
>
> *Sue...*

Your ability to give irrelevant references is really impressive.

Here is a relevant one:

<<Annual Aberration

The annual motion of the Earth around the Sun causes a periodic
aberration in the position of an object. This is due to the fact
that the velocity of light is not infinite; the angular size of

sci.physics.relativity: Re: Light Clock Nonsense

the correction is of order V/C . The aberration constant k is 20.496 arcsec.
Over a year, the star traces an ellipse with semimajor axes k .
At the ecliptic pole this reduces to a circle; on the ecliptic this is a line.>>

<http://www.ess.sunysb.edu/fwalter/AST443/astrometry.html>

And please, do not make an even bigger fool by yourself
by confusing this with parallax.

Paul