Re: McCullough is caught with his pants down.

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005−02/2012.html

---

From: Daryl McCullough (*stevendaryl3016_at_yahoo.com*)
Date: 02/08/05

Date: 8 Feb 2005 13:40:01 −0800

Androcles says...

>"Daryl McCullough" <stevendaryl3016@yahoo.com> wrote

>> Androcles says...
>>
>>>Einstein defines it as (16+4)/2 = 16
>>
>> No, he does not.
>
>Yes, I've got it now.

No, you don't.

>He didn't say
>"we establish by definition that the ``time'' required by light to
>travel from A to B equals the ``time'' it requires to travel from B to
>A. " when he said "we establish by definition that the ``time'' required
>by light to travel from A to B equals the ``time'' it requires to travel
>from B to A. "

Where in the above did he say that he was defining time so that
(16+4)/2 = 16? He didn't.

What he said was that as measured in the *moving* frame, the time
required to travel from A to B is equal to the time required to
travel from B to A. He didn't say that these times were equal
as measured in the *stationary* frame.

As I said before, if t_1 is the time at which the light signal
leaves Sam, t_2 is the time at which it reaches Joe, and t_3
the time in which the reflected signal reaches Sam, then we
have for our example

t_1 = 0
t_2 = 16
t_3 = 20

If t_1', t_2', and t_3' are the times of the same events, as
measured in the moving frame, then for our example we have

t_1' = 0
t_2' = 8
t_3' = 16

Einstein's equation is about times in the moving frame. He's saying
that

t_2' = 1/2 (t_1' + t_3')

which is true:

8 = 1/2 (0 + 16)

--
Daryl McCullough
Ithaca, NY