

Re: Will Somebody PleaseTell bz What an Inertial Frame is.

Re: Will Somebody PleaseTell bz What an Inertial Frame is.

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-07/msg00523.html>

- *From:* bz <bz+sp@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 10 Jul 2005 01:44:01 +0000 (UTC)
-

Subject: Re: Will Somebody PleaseTell bz What an Inertial Frame is.
Newsgroups: LSU news server:sci.physics.relativity
To: Androcles <Androcles@ MyPlace.org>

"Androcles" <Androcles@ MyPlace.org> wrote in
[news:esBze.107887\\$Vo6.24976@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:esBze.107887$Vo6.24976@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx):

>
> "bz" <bz+sp@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
> news:Xns968D6D6178A68WQAHBGMXSZHVspammote@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
>> "Androcles" <Androcles@ MyPlace.org> wrote in
>> [news:ClOye.92253\\$Vo6.2345@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:ClOye.92253$Vo6.2345@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx):
>>
>>>
>>> "bz" <bz+sp@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
>>> news:Xns968AD0D201F62WQAHBGMXSZHVspammote@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
>>>> "Androcles" <Androcles@ MyPlace.org> wrote in
>>>> [news:WVEye.86670\\$Vo6.66960](mailto:news:WVEye.86670$Vo6.66960)
>>>> @fe3.news.blueyonder.co.uk:
>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> "bz" <bz+sp@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
>>>>> news:Xns968A9A198DC41WQAHBGMXSZHVspammote@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
>>>>>> "Androcles" <Androcles@ MyPlace.org> wrote in
>>>>>> [news:IEAye.114801\\$Vj3.65952](mailto:news:IEAye.114801$Vj3.65952)
>>>>>> @fe2.news.blueyonder.co.uk:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> The velocity curve of the star
>>>>>>> <http://homepage.mac.com/antallan/images/algol/hilla.jpg>
>>>>>>> shows max and min velocities at phases 0.06 and 0.7, or 144
>>>>>>> degrees apart, not 180 degrees, so it would not be possible to
>>>>>>> claim
>>>>>>> a circular orbit with a c-constant model, meaning that the orbit
>>>>>>> would have to be elliptical and periastron considerably closer
>>>>>>> than
>>>>>>> 4.56 times the radius of the larger star, making the system even
>>>>>>> more unstable.
>>

Re: Will Somebody PleaseTell bz What an Inertial Frame is.

Re: Will Somebody Please Tell us What an Inertial Frame is.

>> And your point is?

> Empirical data doesn't lie, people do.

Figures don't lie but liars can get out of tune.

>>>>> You are assuming spherical and symmetrical stars.

>>>>>

>>>>> No I am not, I'm assuming NOTHING except empirical data and

>>>>> simple trigonometry. I don't give a hoot if your stars are

>>>>> tetrahedrons

>>>>> or cubes, the MAXIMUM separation, centre to centre, is 2.28 times

>>>>> the width of the larger star.

>>

>> What is YOUR data and how do YOU determine this. And what is your

>> point?

>

> I accept the data, but not the explanation.

> Algol is in near circular orbit, ABCD around O.

> A

> D O B

> C

>

> Your INTERPRETATION of the data, based on your faith that Einstein

> who was not an astronomer insists the speed of light is a universal

> constant, means you see an orbit that is more like this:

> A

> D O B-----> observer

> C

> You've got 70 hours to get from A back to A again, and you have to spend

> 10 of them hiding behind O at D for the eclipse. That kinda forces the

> major axis along our line of sight.

Not exactly, otherwise the velocity curves would be sine waves. They show a phase shift, indicating there is some phase difference from your diagram.

BTW, Einstein didn't say anything about Algol. Astronomers did.

They didn't say what they said just because Einstein said what HE said.

They said what they said because it was the most reasonable explanation.

If you look at how the picture of Algol has changed over the years, you can see that our view has changed from time to time as more data has become available. The original theories predate Einstein, so he can't be blamed for them. He shouldn't be blamed for astronomers adopting his theories either. They didn't do it to please him, they did it because it gives answers that fit better with everything else known.

> My point is:

Re: Will Somebody Please Tell us What an Inertial Frame is.

Re: Will Somebody Please Tell bz What an Inertial Frame is.

> "If the facts don't fit the theory, change the facts." —Albert Einstein
> <http://www.humboldt1.com/~gralsto/einstein/quotes.html>

It would be interesting to see the above quotation in context.

Here is another AE quote:

"Only two things are infinite, the universe and human stupidity, and I'm not sure about the former." —Albert Einstein

>> Algol is apparently NOT a stable system.
>> <http://homepage.mac.com/antallan/algol3.html>
> It is far more stable if it's a circle.

It is exactly as stable as it is.
It cares not whether we model it as a circle or an ellipse.

Our model should be exactly as stable as Algol / Beta Pers.

>>>>> These aren't.
>>>>> That skews the brightness curve.
>>>>>
>>>>> You've been to Algol and looked, have you?
>>
>>>> Neither of us have.
>>
>> <http://instruct1.cit.cornell.edu/courses/astro101/java/binary/binary.htm>
>> $w = -75$
>
> There's no way you can eclipse for 10 hours in 70 with $w = -75$. Just
> look at "earth view"

That model won't let us vary the values as finely as we need to do. I just wanted to show you that the velocity curve could look much like the actual velocity curve IF you have the right omega value for the orbit phase.

> Closest approach is the major axis of the smaller orbit.

Depending on phase. It could be furthest distance.

> Max v in the direction of Earth is NOT the tangential velocity at
> closest approach, that is going to be zero for us, the star is moving
> across our light of sight.

I agree.

> Eclipse has to be when shift is minimal, i.e when blue
> and red velocities cross.

That is probably correct. That java model doesn't show light intensity, it shows velocity curves and how doppler is used to determine binaries.

Re: Will Somebody Please Tell bz What an Inertial Frame is.

Re: Will Somebody Please Tell bz What an Inertial Frame is.

Go to

<http://instruct1.cit.cornell.edu/courses/astro101/java/eclipse/eclipse.htm>

if you want to see the light curves and how the star's classification can effect the light curves [because they effect the density/size].

.....

>>> Einstein tells us that the law of the parallelogram of velocities is
>>> only a first approximation. Newton and Galileo would disagree, as do
>>> I.

>>> Einstein then USES the law of the parallelogram of velocities to
>>> state

>>> $t = x/(c-v)$ and derive his "Lorentz transforms", thereby propagating
>>> his approximation.

>>>

>>> We have data from Algol. albeit incomplete, but what we do have
>>> doesn't

>>> fit the complete model.

>>

>> Don't forget the xray and microwave data. Maybe your super/sub luminal
>> photons are hiding there.

>

> Are they eclipsed?

Only at times.

>> but extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence. The xray and
>> microwave data LOOK like it is showing matter falling into one star
>> from another.

> That's an extraordinary claim, far more so than saying $c+v$, which is the
> intuitive and axiomatic vector addition of velocities, as every child at
> school knows.

Well, it is kind of difficult to generat the observed levels of RF and
xrays with any ordinary stellar process.

> Saying the speed of light is c in all frames of reference is also an
> extraordinary claim, and you can't find evidence of it from Algol yet
> you mould the model of Algol to fit your faith, and you are still
> struggling with the model.

On the contrary, I suggested you might be able to find your sub/super
luminal photons in the xray and microwave data.

I suggest you examine the dat and see if it might be consistent with your
model and show the [here-too-fore unobserved] timing and levels and
frequencies were consistent with the arrival of sub/super luminal photons.

>>> The solution I propose is that the light from the star travels at

>>> $c+v$,

>>> v being the speed of the source of light in our direction, and v is

Re: Will Somebody Please Tell bz What an Inertial Frame is.

Re: Will Somebody Please Tell bz What an Inertial Frame is.

>>> approximately $V \cdot \cos(\omega \cdot t / P)$, P the period of 70 hours, V the
>>> tangential velocity of an orbit, the approximation to be corrected
>>> by
>>> the laws of Kepler.
>>> What solution do you offer?
>>> I'm willing to examine it with an open mind, but I'll not accept
>>> your assertion that the speed of light is c for every body having
>>> mass,
>>> I consider that to be preposterous nonsense and a mere approximation.
>>
>> I will not assert that the speed of light is c for every body having
>> mass.
>
> Good.
> So the light leaves Algol at c,
> Algol approaches Earth at v,
> the light arrives at c+v.
> The orbit is less elliptical than ALL your web pages think it is.

Perhaps. That remains to be seen.

Algol is apparently $p=0.039''$ or ~ 40 parsec away, 130.5 ly, 1.23×10^{15} km.
and we apparently (by doppler shift) have about ± 44 km/s

so $44 \text{ km/s} * 130.5 \text{ yr} = 7 \text{ days}$.

c' photons should arrive 7 days early or late. That is a two week swing.
Parallax is measured over 1/2 orbital period, or 26 weeks. Two weeks out
of 26 should represent a 10 percent variation in parallax, occurring over 1
orbital period. It should be synchronized with the times of max red and
blue shift.

Now all you have to do is get someone to search the data for such an
effect. If it is confirmed, then you have captured $c'=c\pm v$ photons.

The xray peaks should coincide with the max blue shifts
The microwave peaks should coincide with max red shift.

>> I will just assert that we have yet to observe any photons traveling
>> at a
>> velocity that we can definitively say is different from c.
>
> The velocity curve of Algol is a calculation from the Doppler shift
> Doppler's equation (for aether) would be
> $c+v$
> $f' = f \frac{c}{c+v}$
> $c+u$
> Where v is the motion of the star through the aether and u is
> the motion of the Earth through to aether. MMX says there is no u.
> $c+v$
> $f' = f \frac{c}{c+v}$
> c

Re: Will Somebody Please Tell bz What an Inertial Frame is.

Re: Will Somebody Please Tell bz What an Inertial Frame is.

so, it is aether one or the other? I gave you what you need, above, already.

algor is about

- > Rearranging,
- > $f'c = f(c+v)$
- > $f'c/f = c+v$
- > $v = f'/f c - c$
- > $= c(f'/f - 1)$
- >
- > If we've seen blue shift, we've seen $c+v$.
- > If you want to make c constant through the aether, you'll
- > have to put u back in.

You do it, if u want.

>>> Take the philosophy of our Lord, St. Wm of Ockham, and reason with
>>> me.

>>

>> Until we have evidence that $c'=c+vk$ photons exist somewhere [and k is
>> close to 1, rather than less than 10^{-9}], we should

>>

>> 1) continue to look at our data carefully, just in case we can catchi
>> phast photons.

>

> Look at the shift, it's right under your nose. You need aether to squish
> up the wavelength and raise the frequency. Without aether the light
> arrives early, pushing up the frequency.

It arrives DAYS early. That oughtta push the frequency up, way up.

- > Kick out N cycles in 2
- > seconds, N cycles arrive in 1 second, the source is coming at us at c ,
- > the light at $2c$.
- > We HAVE the evidence, it's in the shift.
- > Einstein's second postulate is an aether model.

No, it is a NO aether model.

>>

>> 2) make our 'best' models using the 'established' [not yet
>> invalidated]

>> theories which include SR/GR/EEP.

>

> Now you are back to "assert that the speed of light is c for every body
> having mass." to which you have just said "Will not"

I said "our 'best' models using the 'established' [not yet invalidated]
theories which INCLUDE SR/GR/EEP.

Re: Will Somebody Please Tell bz What an Inertial Frame is.

They haven't been invalidated.

>

>> I have no objection to you or Henri putting together well written
>> papers proposing models based upon other theories.

>

> The vector addition of velocities (or the law of the parallelogram of
> velocities as Einstein called it in his schoolboy idiom), isn't a
> theory, nor is it an approximation. It's an axiom, and it applies
> equally well to light as it does any other entity.

In a Newtonian universe, it is an axiom.

In an einsteinian universe, it is an approximation that breaks down at
high velocities.

>> I suggest you do. Write them and submit them for publication so that
>> some 'real scientists' can review them.

>

> There are no real scientists left.

Real scientist exist.

Science just requires proper evidence.

> They are all relativists, playing
> games with particle accelerators and making statements like $c' = c + vk$.

That is how science works.

> We don't need any k to confuse the issue, $k = 1$.

That would need to be justified.

> Ockham's Razor just
> shaved your superfluous k off.

Afraid that can't be justified. The experiments that have shown k is a
small number must be either falsified or justification for sidestepping
them must be developed.

.....

--
bz

please pardon my infinite ignorance, the set-of-things-I-do-not-know is an
infinite set.

bz+sp@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx remove ch100-5 to avoid spam trap

Re: Will Somebody Please Tell bz What an Inertial Frame is.

- *Follow-Ups:*

- ◆ *Re: Will Somebody PleaseTell bz What an Inertial Frame is.*
◇ *From:* Androcles

- *References:*

- ◆ *Re: Will Somebody PleaseTell bz What an Inertial Frame is.*
◇ *From:* Aristotle
- ◆ *Re: Will Somebody PleaseTell bz What an Inertial Frame is.*
◇ *From:* Aristotle
- ◆ *Re: Will Somebody PleaseTell bz What an Inertial Frame is.*
◇ *From:* The Ghost In The Machine
- ◆ *Re: Will Somebody PleaseTell bz What an Inertial Frame is.*
◇ *From:* Aristotle
- ◆ *Re: Will Somebody PleaseTell bz What an Inertial Frame is.*
◇ *From:* Androcles
- ◆ *Re: Will Somebody PleaseTell bz What an Inertial Frame is.*
◇ *From:* bz
- ◆ *Re: Will Somebody PleaseTell bz What an Inertial Frame is.*
◇ *From:* Androcles
- ◆ *Re: Will Somebody PleaseTell bz What an Inertial Frame is.*
◇ *From:* bz
- ◆ *Re: Will Somebody PleaseTell bz What an Inertial Frame is.*
◇ *From:* Androcles
- ◆ *Re: Will Somebody PleaseTell bz What an Inertial Frame is.*
◇ *From:* bz
- ◆ *Re: Will Somebody PleaseTell bz What an Inertial Frame is.*
◇ *From:* Androcles

- Prev by Date: *Re: relativity of simultaneity – real or perceived?*

- Next by Date: *Re: Question about light clock – Part II*

- Previous by thread: *Re: Will Somebody PleaseTell bz What an Inertial Frame is.*

- Next by thread: *Re: Will Somebody PleaseTell bz What an Inertial Frame is.*

- Index(es):

- ◆ *Date*

- ◆ *Thread*