

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/msg00592.html>

---

- *From:* "Androcles" <Androcles@ MyPlace.org>
  - *Date:* Mon, 11 Jul 2005 04:09:41 GMT
- 

"bz" <bz+sp@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message  
[news:Xns968F92E476478WQAHBGMXSZHVspammote@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:Xns968F92E476478WQAHBGMXSZHVspammote@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)  
> "Androcles" <Androcles@ MyPlace.org> wrote in  
> [news:D29Ae.118330\\$Vo6.36396](mailto:news:D29Ae.118330$Vo6.36396)  
> @fe3.news.blueyonder.co.uk:  
>  
>>  
>> "bz" <bz+sp@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message  
>> [news:Xns968ED305F45CFWQAHBGMXSZHVspammote@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:Xns968ED305F45CFWQAHBGMXSZHVspammote@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)  
>>> Subject: Re: Will Somebody PleaseTell bz What an Inertial Frame is.  
>>> Newsgroups: LSU news server:sci.physics.relativity  
>>> To: Androcles <Androcles@ MyPlace.org>  
>>>  
>>> "Androcles" <Androcles@ MyPlace.org> wrote in  
>>> [news:esBze.107887\\$Vo6.24976@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:esBze.107887$Vo6.24976@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx):  
>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> "bz" <bz+sp@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message  
>>>> [news:Xns968D6D6178A68WQAHBGMXSZHVspammote@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:Xns968D6D6178A68WQAHBGMXSZHVspammote@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)  
>>>>> "Androcles" <Androcles@ MyPlace.org> wrote in  
>>>>> [news:ClOye.92253\\$Vo6.2345@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:ClOye.92253$Vo6.2345@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx):  
>>>>>  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> "bz" <bz+sp@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message  
>>>>>> [news:Xns968AD0D201F62WQAHBGMXSZHVspammote@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:Xns968AD0D201F62WQAHBGMXSZHVspammote@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)  
>>>>>>> "Androcles" <Androcles@ MyPlace.org> wrote in  
>>>>>>> [news:WVEye.86670\\$Vo6.66960](mailto:news:WVEye.86670$Vo6.66960)  
>>>>>>> @fe3.news.blueyonder.co.uk:  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> "bz" <bz+sp@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message  
>>>>>>>> [news:Xns968A9A198DC41WQAHBGMXSZHVspammote@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:Xns968A9A198DC41WQAHBGMXSZHVspammote@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)  
>>>>>>>>> "Androcles" <Androcles@ MyPlace.org> wrote in  
>>>>>>>>> [news:IEAye.114801\\$Vj3.65952](mailto:news:IEAye.114801$Vj3.65952)  
>>>>>>>>>> @fe2.news.blueyonder.co.uk:  
>>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>>> The velocity curve of the star

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

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

>>>>>>>>> <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.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> And your point is?  
>>>>  
>>>> Empirical data doesn't lie, people do.  
>>>>  
>>>> Figures don't lie but lires 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 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 a 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

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

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

>>> show  
>>> a phase shift, indicating there is some phase difference from your  
>>> diagram.  
>>> BTW, Einstein didn't say any thing about Algol. Astronomers did.  
>>  
>> That's the problem, circularity. Einstein takes on trust what the  
>> astronomer  
>> says, but the astronomer takes on trust what he subjectively sees.  
>> Then  
>> Einstein says the speed of light in nothing and relative to nothing  
>> is  
>> c, that newer astronomer taks that on trust and we have the circle,  
>> with  
>> people inventing facts to fit theory.  
>>  
>>  
>>>  
>>> They didn't say what they said just because Einstein said what HE  
>>> said.  
>>  
>> They do today. Goodricke saw what he thought was an eclipse, not  
>> taking  
>> into account the law of the parallogram of velocities. Einstein  
>> abandons  
>> aether but also changes the law. Now we are in vicious circle, Hulse  
>> and Taylor collect a Nobel prize for closing the circle and  
>> reinforcing  
>> it.  
>>  
>>  
>>> They said what they said because it was the most reasonable  
>>> explanation.  
>>  
>> MOST?  
>> That is preposterous, the MOST reasonable explanation is  $c+v$ .  
>> You have to deny the train comes to the station at a different speed  
>> to  
>> the station coming to the train, I don't find that in the least part  
>> "reasonable", it is nonsense. Nor do I find Einstein's definition of  
>> time reasonable.  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>>  
>>> 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.  
>>  
>> Changing facts to fit the theory isn't science.  
>> Ptolemy's epicycles had to be abandoned completely, not refined.

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

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

>>  
>> The original theories predate Einstein, so he can't be  
>>> blamed for them.  
>>  
>> Not totally, I agree. However, he IS responsible for defining the  
>> time  
>> for light to travel from A to B is the time for light to travel from  
>> B  
>> to A, and I don't accept  $16 = 4$  as I demonstrated with Sam, Joe, a  
>> mosquito and a ladder. His "Lorentz transformation" is pure nonsense.  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>> 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.  
>>  
>> It doesn't take a genius to figure out the law of the parallelogram  
>> of  
>> velocities is a LAW of Nature, not to be violated by mere man.  
>>  
>>  
>>>  
>>>> My point 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.  
>>  
>> Look at Algol. The ONLY data you have is the velocity curve and the  
>> eclipse.  
>> Using the law of the parallelogram of velocities and dispensing with  
>> aether, the light arrives at  $c+v$ .  
>> But you have a theory that it arrives at  $c$ , so you change the facts  
>> of  
>> what is happening to Algol to fit the theory.  
>> Einstein may have been attempting a little dry humour, but the irony  
>> of  
>> it is, it is what he did. He created his own definition of time.  
>>>  
>>> 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  
>>  
>> Yes, so what does that say of his changing the LAW of the  
>> parallelogram  
>> of velocities? How does the station come to the train at a different

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

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

>> speed to the train coming to the station?  
>>  
>>>  
>>>> 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.  
>>  
>> That's right, and the c+v model predicts the same luminosity curve.  
>> Two competing models, same data.  
>> We've been there before, Ptolemy had epicycles and Copernicus had  
>> heliocentricity.  
>> St Wm of Ockham says heliocentricity is simpler than epicycles.  
>> St Wm of Ockham says c+v is simpler than c, c needs aether or time  
>> dilation.  
>> St Wm of Ockman says Algol isn't eclipsing at all.  
>> St Wm of Ockman says cepheids are not expanding stars.  
>> St Wm of Ockman says novae don't blow themselves apart and settle  
>> back  
>> to normal.  
>> Algol cares not whether you model it as two stars or a star and  
>> planet.  
>> Only WE care, and the simpler model is the correct one.  
>>>  
>>> Our model should be exactly as stable as Algol / Beta Pers.  
>>  
>> I agree, but your model CLAIMS to be unstable and it is puzzling you.  
>> You've evented instability for it, to fit your theory.  
>> It should merge any day now, keep looking up.  
>  
> The law of the parallelogram does NOT explain all the data.

Of course it doesn't, anymore than  $1+1 = 2$  explains why apples fall in autumn, but you won't get far by saying  $1+1 = 1$ .

> It doesn't  
> explain the doppler data. It doesn't explain the xray data. It doesn't  
> explain the microwave data from just algol. It doesn't explain the  
> LACK of  
> multiple images due to the variation in travel time of about +/- seven  
> days.  
> The law of the parallelogram doesn't explain the lack of c+/-v photon  
> observations in laboratory testing. It doesn't explain the lack of  
> c+/-v  
> photons from solar flares.

The composition of velocities,  $c = (c+v)/(1+v/c)$

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

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

DOESN'T EXPLAIN

the doppler data. It doesn't explain the xray data. It doesn't explain the microwave data from just algol. It doesn't explain the LACK of multiple images due to the variation in travel time of about +/- seven days.

AND IT DOESN'T EXPLAIN THIS:

<http://antwrp.gsfc.nasa.gov/apod/ap981011.html>,

Mr. Multiple Images not explained.

When you are done with your list of what is not explained, can we revert to LOGICAL debate?

- > The law of the parallelogram doesn't explain the lack of variation in
- > brightness of known, non eclipsing binary stars.

When you are done with your list of what is not explained, can we revert to LOGICAL debate?

- > The law of the parallelogram fails so many tests that in the horse
- > race
- > between AE's theory and BaT, BaT doesn't even leave the starting gate.

When you are done with your list of what is not explained, can we revert to LOGICAL debate, or have you given up?

You haven't responded to many of my points, I'm WAY ahead on points you have no answer too, and I find it quit illogical that BaT should attempt to answer why oranges grow on trees but apples fall off trees or any other of your irrelevancies as to what it cannot do. If we are having a horse race between BaT and Einstein's theory, then Einstein's theory didn't qualify to enter the starting gate and its a one-horse race.

>>>>>>>>> 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"

>>>>>

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

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

>>> That model won't let us vary the values as finely as we need to do.  
>>  
>> I know, so why did you show me such a simple model?  
>  
> read my next sentence:  
>>> 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.  
>>  
>> But you can't fit the 10 hours in 70 of eclipse to it.  
>> Therefore your model is wrong.  
>  
> With the right omega, I can. You and I both know that the 10 hours  
> isn't a  
> problem.  
The problem is manifold: the proximity of the two stars and fitting the  
velocity  
curve to the luminosity curve, the stability of the system.  
Show me how two stars can even come together 9.8 Megayears ago, and  
settle into a circular (or nearly so) orbit. The composition of  
velocities doesn't explain that, so the composition of velocities  
doesn't even leave the starting gate. (Bz logic)

The starlight project.exe program covers the 10 hours just fine for  
> the algo system. None of these little programs is a complete model.  
>  
> You may be, but I don't have it at hand.

Mine isn't complete. I only have one point of light in Keplerian orbit  
with a very limited spectrum of a few fictitious emission lines, but it  
does model the velocity curve superimposed on the light curve, and it is  
18 years old, and it can duplicate the curve of V1493 Aql found 6 years  
ago, 12 years AFTER the program was created.  
<http://www.britastro.org/vss/gifc/00918-ck.gif>  
None of your programs can model that, so the composition of velocities  
loses the race to BaT, it never entered the starting gate.

Here's deSitter's pathetic little paper, BTW, I've just located it.  
<http://www.ebicom.net/~rsf1/desit-1e.htm>

>  
> Henri's certainly isn't a complete model. It has many flaws built into  
> it. He  
> is improving it, but it has a long way to go.  
>  
> I would love to have a program that puts in all the factors and allows

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

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

- > me to
- > compare, in one program, SR/GR/EEP compliant light curves, velocity
- > curves,
- > doppler shift predictions, etc., with BaT/PoR  $c'=c+v$  compliant curves.

It takes time to write programs, even more time to debug them, and time is money. Either do it yourself or pay someone to do it for you. I can't, I'm past it. Even the program I have now has the colours reversed, red should be blue and blue should be red. Its a minor bug, but still a bug. I'll live with it.

Throw

- > in a few other theories too, like local aether. Throw in cosmological
- > constant effects, BB effects. Include some weird universes also, like
- > Poyat's, Yoon, tj, the falling light and the dual universes.
- >
- > No such program seems to exist.

So write one. I did mine to be as simple as possible, but not simpler. It doesn't model light from the other orbiting body and was not intended to.

You can have my source code and build on that if you like.

- >>>> Closest approach is the major axis of the smaller orbit.
- >>>
- >>> Depending on phase. It could be furthest distance.
- >>
- >> Periastron is by definition the point of closest approach and
- >> is by simple inspection (of your model, even) the major axis
- >> of the smaller orbit, privileged view. Phase has nothing to do with
- >> it.
- >> You are inventing facts to fit your theory.
- >
- > The major axis of an elliptical orbit is along a line that passes
- > through
- > both the point of closest and the point of furthest approach.

Right, so "Closest approach is the major axis of the smaller orbit." which is what I said, and it doesn't depend on phase. Engage brain before opening mouth, not after.

- >
- > The shape of the light curve we see depends on how that axis is
- > oriented wrt
- > the earth.

Correct, both inclination and longitude of periastron. I happen to disagree with your assessment of both. Well, not YOURS, you don't have one, you only have the assessment of web pages.

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

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

>  
>>>> 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.  
>>  
>> It isn't probably correct, it IS correct.  
>  
> It would be correct if light moves at c.  
> I am not at all sure it is true when we add  $c'=c+v$  photons into the  
> mix.  
> Are you sure?

I modelled it. I'm sure. I've even rotated the major axis through 90 degrees. That changes the shape of the curve, but not the phase of the supposed "eclipse", a dip in luminosity I get when the orbit is seen 85 degrees tilted from edge on.

>  
>>>> That java model doesn't show light intensity, it  
>>>> shows velocity curves and how doppler is used to determine binaries.  
>>>>  
>>>> 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].  
>>>  
>>> I'm not interested. I want the Julian dates of the velocity curve  
>>> (not  
>>> the phase)  
>>> superimposed on the Julian dates of the luminosity curve. I don't  
>>> want  
>>> your java model,  
>>>  
>>> They are not MY java models.  
>>> Ok.  
>>>  
>>> I want REAL data.

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

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

>  
> Go for it. There is quite a bit of it published on the web and you can  
> probably get the raw data from some of the other published articles by  
> contacting the authors.

I've tried. :-)

> ....  
>>>>> 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.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Either the x-ray data coincides with the optical data or there is  
>>>>> something wrong with your model.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> I predict that the xray data won't coincide with the optical data  
>>>>> because the  
>>>>> source of the xrays does not coincide with the entire photosphere of  
>>>>> the  
>>>>> star. [unless the xrays are all really  $c+v$  photons, not due to  
>>>>> infalling mass  
>>>>> from the other star].

How do the x-rays get through the darker star, then, which is eclipsing  
the lower optical frequencies of the brighter, more energetic star?  
Maybe x-rays don't travel in straight lines in your model but curl  
around the star before coming direct to earth...

>  
>> x-radiation doesn't go through stars.  
>> You might get

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

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

>> a neutrino to go right through, but not an x-photon.  
>  
> I agree. So, there is a test for your c+v photons.  
>  
> dig into the data and see which model it fits better.  
>  
>>>> 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.  
>>  
>> You've already blown your argument when you said it eclipses "only at  
>> times".  
>  
> No. I made safe statement. Think. Nothing eclipses all the time or we  
> would  
> never see it.

lol, ok.

>  
> I am willing to give you some helpful suggestions of where  $c'=c+v$   
> photons  
> might be found, but I am not gonna do your homework for you. I don't  
> have any  
> emotional stake on either side of the question.  
>  
>>> I suggest you examine the data and see if it might be consistent

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

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

>>> 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.  
>>  
>> Can't get the data.  
>  
> Have you tried? Have you looked up the referenced articles and  
> contacted the  
> authors, asked for their data? Most authors will be happy to help.

The bottom line is that Einstein has no evidence for his second postulate, and it is pretty clear that Algol's data isn't going to convince anyone to even consider  $c+v$  as a simpler solution, except perhaps Henri.

>  
>> I want the luminosity curve superimposed on the  
>> velocity curve.  
>  
> You will probably have to collect the data from various sources and  
> plot it  
> yourself.  
>  
>> All you have is some useless java models for kids to  
>> learn YOUR model.  
>  
> Not my java, not my model. Just something I found interesting and  
> thought you  
> might too.

Nah... I've already built a more realistic model 18 years ago.

I can change :

distance

period

eccentricity

major axis

longitude of periastron

inclination.

What else is there?

>  
> Speaking of interesting, I just downloaded the Jad java decompiler and  
> ran it  
> on all the java .class files that I found in my "Start  
> Menu\Application Data  
> \Sun\Java\Deployment\cache\javapi\v1.0\file" directory. And I am now  
> looking  
> over the code for those limited java applets.

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

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

>

> They appear be very easy to modify. You might wanna download Jad and  
> play.

The bottom line is still to punch holes in Einstein's hoax.

We need apostles of St. Wm of Ockham; you at first seemed a likely candidate, but since you've argued what  $c+v$  CANNOT do I'm no longer as optimistic. Henri was my first convert, but he still goes overboard now and then with his  $h$ -aether.

Sue still tries to make everything fit to web pages she's read on moving charges and magnetism, taking it as the gospel according to St. James Clerk Maxwell.

>

>>>>>> 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  
>>>>>> 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.

>>>> Alogol is apparently  $p=0.039''$  or  $\sim 40$  parsec away, 130.5 ly,

>>>>  $1.23 \times 10^{15}$  km.

>>>> and we apparently (by doppler shift) have about  $\pm 44$  km/s

>>>>

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

>>>>

>>>> According to

>>>> <http://www.solstation.com/stars2/algol3.htm>,

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

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

>> 92.8 ly away.

>> You can't even agree on the distance to 40%.

>

> Pick a figure. The actual distance isn't the point I was trying to

> make.

Then don't claim 7 days. :-)

I pick

Distance 30 parsecs.

Period 3 days

eccentricity 0.6

Semi major axis 0.015 AU

Longitude of periastron 180 degrees

inclination 85 degrees !!!!! NOTE !!!!! Face on orbit,

cannot be an eclipse, too far from edge on.

Calculated: Semi minor axis 0.012 AU

Result:

Luminosity curve, dip 1/7 th of phase.

Yes, I can fake data and get what I want.

Distance 3 parsecs.

Period 0.3 days... huh?

eccentricity 0.6

Semi major axis 0.0015 AU

Same curve.

There is a triangle with sides

Distance, Period and Major axis that is a similar triangle,

it produces the same shape curve.

The period gives the distance to the star if you use it.

(Does Henrietta Leavitt ring a bell?)

> I also used a lower radial velocity than 'Ghost' did. He came up with

> over 8

> days, I came up with 7. Flip a coin or average the figures. It don't

> matter!!

Ah, but it does matter. You can both be wrong by a factor of 10 quite

easily. Only the nearest stars can be measured using parallax,

and even then it is difficult. As to the velocity, you can only get

that from the shift, and the shift says  $c+v$  in vacuum or  $c$  in a medium.

No medium allowed,  $c+v$  photons are found.

Here's code fragment I used, you that wanted a program to examine other universes.

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

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

if(Androcles) Doppler = (c-v)/c;  
else if(Einstein) Doppler = sqrt((1.0+v/c)/(1.0-v/c));  
else Doppler = (c)/(c-v); //Lorentz aether;

They ALL give the velocity curve.

> Point is that we should almost a secondary aberation of almost 10% of  
> the  
> primary aberation, due to BaT photons.

Ya mean ya found Algol C?  
See if you can find a nova.

>  
>>> c' photons should arrive 7 days early or late. That is a two week  
>>> swing.  
>>  
>> "Should" means you don't know the distance.  
>  
> The exact distance isn't the point, the secondary aberation effects  
> with a  
> magnitude of almost 10% of the primary aberation is the point.  
>  
> The secondary aberation should vary with the velocity curve's period.  
>  
> If that secondary aberation exists, BaT has strong support.  
>  
> If that secondary aberation is absent, it is another nail in the BaT  
> coffin.

What, matching the empirical data is a nail in the coffin?

Some logic, that is.

I've got to find a secondary aberation that isn't there to get strong support. I think you need a chat with St. Wm of Ockham, you are inventing facts to fit your theory. I CANNOT change the empirical data. I can change the reduced data to anything I like that is reasonable.

>>> Parallax is measured over 1/2 orbital period, or 26 weeks. Two weeks  
>>> out  
>>> of 26 should represent a 10 percent variation in parallax, occuring  
>>> over 1  
>>> orbital period. It should be synchronized with the times of max red  
>>> and  
>>> blue shift.  
>>  
>> Parallax! Now you are blowing a smokescreen if you think you can  
>> measure

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

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

- >> the distance to Algol using parallax.
- >
- > The distance to Algol has been measured using parallax.
- > That is the origin of the 0.039" figure that I quoted from that site
- > that
- > covers historical data on Algol.

Yes, 40% difference between you and Ghost.  
However, I took 30 parsecs as a round figure, so close enough.

- >> Even if you could, you are
- >> assuming that we see the orbit of Algol edge-on.
- >
- > No, I was using the numbers on that radial velocity curve that was on
- > the
- > same Algol site. You gave that curve back to me, several times.
- >
- > We apparently see the orbit pretty close to edge on, otherwise we
- > wouldn't be
- > seeing that radial velocity.

I'm glad you said "apparently".

You are looking at reduced data; the speed of the Earth is 30 km/sec around the sun at a distance of 1 AU.

If you were looking at the Earth (and it was emitting light) from the celestial pole, what would you CALCULATE its speed to be? Would it be  $2\pi * 1\text{AU}$  per year, 30 km/sec?

I would hope so, since that is what it is, but how would you measure shift and convert that to 30 km/sec?

You have to KNOW the angle of inclination, right?

You do not know the angle of inclination of Algol, do you?

What was that speed again? 1 orbit in 70 hours, I think.

How far did it travel?  $2\pi * \text{what fraction of an AU?}$

- > So, I was using the apparent radial velocity, as seen from earth, and
- > it
- > doesn't matter what the orbits inclination is.

Are you sure?

- >
- >>> 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  $c' = c +/ - v$  photons.
- >>
- >> Huh? Of COURSE we can measure Earth's velocity from the shift
- >> seen by the light of ANY other star.
- >

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

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

> Not the earth's velocity. The velocity of the photons from Algol.

All velocities are relative, old son.

When you've seen blue or red shift, you've seen light that doesn't move at c, relative to Earth.

>

>> If that's all you want,  $c'=c+/-u$  is

>> already confirmed, where u is the velocity of the Earth relative to

>> the

>> aether.

>

> MMX and hundreds of other tests say you are wrong.

Nonsense. MMX says I'm right. Ask St Wm of Ockham.

MMX is moving through the aether, and there is no aether.

The relative velocity of the source and the fringes at the detector is zero.

$c+v$

$$f' = f \frac{c}{c+v}$$

$c$

$$= f (c+0)/c$$

$$= f * c/c$$

$$= f * 1$$

$$= f.$$

NO FRINGE SHIFT.

The Earth is moving through empty space carrying MMX with it.

$c+v$

$$f' = f \frac{c}{c+v}$$

$c+u$

$u = v$ , detector and source are relatively at rest and both are moving through the empty space at  $0.0001c$

$$1 + 0.0001c$$

$$f' = f \frac{c}{1.0001c}$$

$$1.0001c$$

$$= f.$$

NO FRINGE SHIFT.

the velocity of light in the empty space is  $1.0001c$ , or it is

$1c$  in empty space and  $0.9999c$  relative to the source and detector.

The MMX light source, seen from Mars, will be shifted.

MMX says I'm RIGHT.

>> Stand in a bridge, take a look at ripples on a moving river when you

>> drop a rock in. They are concentric circles moving downstream.

>> The evidence for the LAW of the parallelogram of velocities is all

>> around

>> you.

>

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

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

> Air, water, aether, vacuum, sound, light. Not the same.

The PRINCIPLE of relativity IS the same.

>

>> Why do you imagine you can violate a law of Nature by defining time

>> of

>> flight for light from A to B equals time from B to A?

>

> I imagined that I could demonstrate the derivation of the Lorentz

> transform

> by doing that. I did so. The laws of nature don't care what our math

> says.

> We care whether or not our math matches what we see.

Your math doesn't. You don't even understand MMX or how simple St. Wm of Ockham told you it was.

>

>>> The xray peaks should coincide with the max blue shifts

>>> The microwave peaks should coincide with max red shift.

>>

>> You must think there is only one frequency emitted!

>

> Not at all. But IF  $c'=c+v$  photons exist and if they look like doppler

> shifted

> photons by the time we observe them here on earth, then the max blue

> shift

> part of the orbit would give us the best chance to observe strongly

> blue

> shifted photon. If they were shifted far enough to the blue, they

> could show

> up as x-rays. Same reasoning for the opposite effect  $c'=c-v$  photons.

> Max red

> shift might give us microwave photons.

>

> We know Algol has been seen to emit xrays and microwave photons.

> Those were explained by those using SR/GR/EEP as due to mass falling

> into one

> star from the other.

>

> I proposed that you might find your  $c'=c+/-v$  photons by reexamining

> the data

> to see if it could provide the evidence.

>

> If you hadn't noticed, I was trying to help you.

ANY shift is evidence that the light isn't c relative to the observer.

I'm trying to help YOU understand REAL physics, and you are

stuck in a quagmire of relativity nonsense.

>>>>> I will just assert that we have yet to observe any photons

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

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

>>>>> 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  
>>>>  $c+v$   
>>>>  $f' = f \frac{c+v}{c}$   
>>>>  $c+u$   
>>>> 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.  
>>>>  $c+v$   
>>>>  $f' = f \frac{c+v}{c}$   
>>>> c  
>>>>  
>>> so, it is aether one or the other? I gave you what you need, above,  
>>> already.  
>>>  
>>> algol 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.  
>>>  
>> I'm trying to reason with u, and u, having no logical answer, are  
>> trying  
>> to be facetious. We've seen  $c+v$ . Admit it.  
>  
> You might have. I haven't. I have not seen ghosts or flying saucers  
> either.  
> I have shown you a place that  $c+/-v$  should show up -- photons from  
> algol.

We've seen shift.

>  
> There may be 'water there', I have shown you where it might be found.  
> If you  
> like, you may drink of it.

It's raining. I don't need to search for water.

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

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



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

You can use Einstein's doppler if you wish.

$$f' = f * \sqrt{ \{1 + v/c\} / \{1 - v/c\} } \\ = f * 1.0001466774237998772521198122506$$

There is a minor difference, I'll accept either.  
Maybe I'll even accept 45 km/sec or 43 km/sec  
if you can prove it from shift evidence.  
Go on, punch a hole in c+v. Your bluff is called.  
Put your cards on the table.

> There is one possible way to save c'=c+v that I can think of.

Not interested. I'm calling your bluff. Show me shift evidence  
of 44 km/sec.  
Let's see your 1.00014667 accuracy to either model and how you get 7  
days from 44 km/sec.  
I don't want one of your "lots of scientists" arguments, either.  
Show me the real data.

You can  
> introduce that 'k' that you disliked so much. Perhaps there IS a small  
> value  
> of k that would allow us to explain why no one has seen photon  
> arriving days  
> early.

Nope. I'll echo Isaac Asimov.  
Present the evidence.

Isaac Asimov wrote in "Quasar, Quasar, Burning Bright" ,  
ISBN 0-380-44610-3  
(concerning life after death)  
If you want to argue the point, present the evidence.  
I must warn you, though, that there are some arguments I will not  
accept.  
I won't accept any argument from authority. ("The Bible says so")  
I won't accept any argument from internal conviction ("I have faith it  
is so")  
I won't accept any argument from personal abuse ("What are you, an  
atheist?")  
I won't accept any argument from irrelevance ("Do you think you have  
been put on this Earth just to exist for a moment of time?")  
I won't accept any argument from anecdote ("My cousin has a friend who  
went to a medium and talked to her dead husband")  
And when all that, and other varieties of non-evidence are eliminated,

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

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

there turns out to be nothing.

>  
>>>> 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.  
>>  
>> "I'm innocent, your honour. I plead not guilty to murdering anyone  
>> and  
>> the jury agrees, so I couldn't have." – O.J. Simpson.  
>> I don't believe O J Simpson was telling the truth, and don't believe  
>> your simple denial either.  
>> Einstein's second postulate is an aether model.  
>> There is no "empty space" for the speed of light to be relative to,  
>> so  
>> he must mean aether.  
>  
> Unsubstantiated accusations of the prosecuting attorney are not  
> admissible as  
> evidence.

Good. Show me your  
f \* 1.0001466774237998772521198122506  
or it is unsubstantiated and inadmissible,  
as is your 44 km/sec you claim to have derived from it.  
"Objection", your honour, "hearsay".

>  
> "Einstein was lying when he said "The introduction of a "luminiferous  
> ether"  
> will prove to be superfluous inasmuch as the view here to be developed  
> will  
> not require an "absolutely stationary space" provided with special  
> properties, nor assign a velocity–vector to a point of the empty space  
> in  
> which electromagnetic processes take place.", says the prosecutor"  
>  
> "Objection, unsupported allegation!", says the defense attorney.  
>  
> "Sustained.", says the judge.

"If I may be permitted to continue, your honour, I'll prove to this  
court the allegation isn't unsupported. I can't accept your ruling until

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

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

I've had an opportunity to respond to my learned colleague's objection at the defense table, it is for the jury to decide whether the allegation is or is not unsupported."

"Very well, Dr Androcles, I'll suspend my ruling until the evidence is heard, but let me warn you that I will not tolerate outbursts in my courtroom."

"Thank you, your honour. I have asked my learned colleague to present his evidence of the 44 km/sec and ask the court to invite him to do so, using Einstein's doppler if he wishes"

"What have you to say to that, Mr Bz?" says the judge.

>>>>> 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.  
>>>>  
>>>> THEY haven't been invalidated.  
>  
> [sniped, some totally unrelated allegations]

>> The law of the parallelogram of velocities and the PoR are laws.  
>> The station does not come to the train with a different speed to the  
>> train coming to the station, and the distance from the train to the  
>> station is equal to the distance from the station to the train.  
>> Length  
>> contraction is changing the facts to fit theory. Time dilation is  
>> changing the facts to fit the theory.  
>  
> A theory can only work if the actual data matches the theory.

Of course, I absolutely agree.

"Thence we conclude that a balance-clock at the equator must go more slowly, by a very small amount, than a precisely similar clock situated at one of the poles under otherwise identical conditions."— Albert Einstein.

"Your witness, Dr Androcles", says the judge.

Androcles:

"Please present to the court the actual data of the time of day you obtained from Scott base, Antarctica and from Hawaii; you may use more the accurate caesium clocks if you wish. They WERE kept at the same

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

altitude, sea level, I trust?"

Dr Einstein:

"Err.. err.. well, they gave the same reading, but its GR, I tell you!

That was my first theory, I was younger then and I have a better theory now!"

Androcles:

" So you were in fact lying, Dr Einstein?"

Dr Einstein:

" No, no, The GR effect exactly balances the SR effect at the pole!"

Androcles:

(muttering under his breath, "a likely story")

" I believe my accusation to be substantiated, your honour, the witness is impeached, his original theory proved false and it was that theory I referred to."

Judge:

" I'm overruling your objection, Mr Bz, counsel for the prosecution may call Dr Einstein a liar."

"Ladies and Gentlemen of the Jury, you have heard defense counsel state "A theory can only work if the actual data matches the theory." I submit to you that the data of clocks at the pole and the equator do not match the theory Dr Einstein presented, and hence his theory does not work."

>

>> The mosquito flies 40 feet in 8 seconds, 40 feet back again in 8 seconds, along the moving ladder, so it flies at 5 fps in the frame of the ladder.

>

> ok. 80 feet in 16 seconds = 5 fps.

>

>> The mosquito flies 80 feet in 16 seconds, 20 feet back again in 4 seconds, so it flies at 5 fps in the frame of the road.

>

> ok. 100 ft in 20 seconds = 5 fps.

>

> OK, 20 seconds in the road FoR = 16 seconds in the ladder FoR.

Sure, you've got it.

>

>> The EVENTS of mosquito meeting Joe and meeting Sam are the same.

>

> agreed.

>

>> That cannot be invalidated, it is what you believe. Logic cannot overcome faith, it cannot overcome the excrement of the male bovine. Nevertheless, Einstein's relativity is bullshit, illogical claptrap suitable only for

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

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

>> having a good laugh at.

>

> Enjoy your mirth.

Oh, I am, I am. Relativity is the best joke of the last century. :-)

Expensive, though. Tax payers are still forking out, paying to teach it.

>

>>>> 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 live in the real world, not einstein's.

>

> We don't get to pick our universe. We must live within the data we

> actually

> observe.

That's right. Got that

f \* 1.0001466774237998772521198122506

shift for me yet? I want to actually observe it.

>

>> In Einstein's world, the mosquito flies at 5 fps in all frames of  
>> reference.

>> It travels 40 feet in 8 seconds along the ladder.  $40/8 = 5$  fps.

>> It travels 80 feet in 16 seconds along the ground.  $80/16 = 5$  fps

>> Whoopee, it travels at 5 fps in all frames of reference, proven.

>> In the real world, the mosquito travels 32 feet along the ladder

>> at  $5-3 = 2$  fps, and takes 16 seconds.

>>  $t(16) = \tau(16)$  in the real world.

>>  $\tau(8) = t(16)$  in Einstein's world.

>>>>

>>>> "In the first place it is clear that the equations must be linear on

>>>> account of the properties of homogeneity which we attribute to space

>>>> and

>>>> time."

>>>>

>>>> Flying back, the mosquito takes 8 seconds to travel 40 feet,

>>>> and 4 seconds to fly 20 feet along the ground.

>>>>  $\tau(8) = t(4)$

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

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

>  
>> In the second place Einstein's equations are NOT linear, we have  
>>  $\tau(8) = t(4) = t(16)$   
>> What happened to gamma, I thought it was supposed to "linear"?  
>  
> The equations  
>  
>  $x = \gamma(x' + ut')$   
> and  
>  $x' = \gamma(x - ut)$   
>  
> are linear equations.

They don't work one way, old son.  
Let's see.

$$\begin{aligned} 80 &= (40 + 3 * 8) / 0.8 \\ &= (40 + 24) / 0.8 \\ &= 64 / 0.8 \\ &= 80 \end{aligned}$$

Yeah, that looks linear.

Now for the time.

Oh, you didn't mention that. Maybe you snipped it when you realized it wasn't linear.

I wonder what happened to synchronizing all those clocks along the ladder...

"Would the court please ask the defense counsel not to snip the record?"

Judge:

"Defense counsel is ordered not to snip one-day-old testimony, it spoils the fun. The jury is entitled to have a good laugh. You can snip when a subject point is exhausted or agreed upon, Mr. Bz".

>  
> That is what we mean when we said '[assuming a linear relationship]'.

Yeah, I guess I'll have to rub it in if you want to protest.

Time for Albert to fly from Sam to Joe, 16 seconds ground frame and 8 seconds ladder frame, 5 fps in either frame.

Time for Albert to fly from Joe to Sam, 4 seconds ground frame and 8 seconds ladder frame, 5 fps in either frame.

$$\text{function}(8) = 16$$

$$\text{function}(8) = 4$$

This function is called "linear" and is

$$8 * \gamma = 16$$

$$8 * \gamma = 4$$

because

$$(8 + 8) * \gamma = 16 + 4, \text{ or}$$

$16 / 0.8 = 20$  (whoopie!), which makes clocks at the pole run slower than

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

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

clocks at the equator because the speed of mosquitoes is 5 fps in all frames of reference.

Well, you did want me to show you Einstein's math, right?

Did we do the twin paradox yet, with one larva going from Sam to Joe at 4 fps or 0.8c, the other staying home?

That's another good joke. Maybe some other time.

Hmm... tell you what, you tell it to me instead.

>

> Later, when we solve for gamma, we find that the VALUE of gamma is not

> linear

> in v or c, but our starting equation  $x = \gamma(\dots)$ , using gamma, IS a

> linear

> equation.

Later? what later?

gamma is solved, old son.  $\gamma = 1/0.8$  or 1.25.

> When one is working with differential equations [and at many other

> times] it

> is often useful to make a substitution of variable. When one can

> linearize an

> equation by a substitution, one can solve it much easier than if one

> were

> trying to solve an equation in a higher degree.

I think I already have a higher degree in math...

"Hence, if x' be chosen infinitesimally small,"

.... da-de-da ...

$$\frac{\partial \tau}{\partial x'} + \frac{\partial \tau}{\partial t} * [v/(c^2 - v^2)] = 0$$

Didn't you say x' was zero? Never mind, that joke's been stricken from the record.... oops, nope, only snipped. Google still has it.

So what IS  $\frac{\partial \tau}{\partial x'}$  in our ladder system?

Why, it looks like an upside-down velocity!

I wonder why we even NEED to take a partial derivative here, surely 5 fps is 40 feet in 8 seconds? Do we need the instantaneous upside-down velocity at all points along the ladder?

Aren't they all the same value, by definition of "constant velocity"?

Sure looks impressive, though.

Tell us the twin paradox joke, I like that one better. :-)

>

> Check with some mathematicians. You will find that what was done was

> legal.

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

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

See some of my older students, do you mean? :-)

>> Of course that doesn't invalidate SR, you cannot overcome bullsh\*t  
>> with  
>> logic.  
>  
> On the contrary. Logic is the best way to overcome BS. But that  
> assumes that  
> you are dealing with people who understand logic.

There aren't any relativists that do.  
If they did, they wouldn't be relativists.  
They sure can BS, though. :-)

>  
>>>>> 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.  
>>  
>> Henri and myself, perhaps. We can't include you.  
>  
> I see no profit in exchanging insults with you.

Fair enough, but it wasn't an insult, I was stating fact.  
"MMX and hundreds of other tests say you are wrong." – Bz.  
That is not the remark of a scientist, and it's an insult if I take it  
that way. It is certainly inflammatory. Still, we can drop the matter,  
I gain nothing from a bitter exchange either. Nor am I upset if you  
state facts, as long as they are facts.

>>> Science just requires proper evidence.  
>>  
>> Tell it to Einstein, he thinks he can define time and his "theory"  
>> cannot be invalidated.  
>  
> One[reproducible] experiment which demonstrates  $c' = c + v$  photons in a  
> vacuum,  
> in a laboratory, would be enough to invalidate Einsteins theory.

There isn't the room in a lab. Shoot the moon from the ISS. That's how  
to duplicate his "postulate" and his "definition" of time. MEASURE it in  
the environment he's referring to. The world will then sit up and take  
notice. It's not an expensive experiment, as experiments go. Most of  
what is needed is in place anyway.  
But I think it fails on its math, really I do.

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

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

I haven't gone into GR much, I've seen enough skulduggery in SR to brand the guy a charlatan, a huckster. The alternative is to say he's crazy, but he's much too smart for that. Criminals are often quite intelligent. Those little catch-phrases he uses, "it is clear" and "in agreement with experience" or "We see that". Those I like, they are a dead giveaway. He really wants to be convincing.

And he got away with it all his life. What a performer!

Crime pays.

>

>>>> They are all relativists, playing

>>>> games with particle accelerators and making statements like  $c' =$

>>>>  $c+vk$ .

>>>

>>> That is how science works.

>>

>> Bullshit.

>> The most recent accusations of forgery made against Ptolemy came from

>> Newton in [12]. He begins this book by stating clearly his views:-

>>

>> This is the story of a scientific crime. ... I mean a crime committed

>> by

>> a scientist against fellow scientists and scholars, a betrayal of the

>> ethics and integrity of his profession that has forever deprived

>> mankind

>> of fundamental information about an important area of astronomy and

>> history.

>>

>> Towards the end Newton, having claimed to prove every observation

>> claimed by Ptolemy in the Almagest was fabricated, writes [12]:-

>>

>> [Ptol

- *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*

- Prev by Date: ***Re: Question about light clock and derivation of time dilation***
- Next by Date: ***Re: Question about light clock and derivation of time dilation***
- 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***