Re: A little challenge for relativists.

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005−11/msg01481.html

- *From*: dubious@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx (Bilge)
- *Date*: Wed, 23 Nov 2005 02:10:36 GMT

John Kennaugh:
> wrote:
>>shevek wrote:
>>> John Kennaugh wrote:
>
>[....]
>
>>This thread has been interesting. Bilge asserts that the speed of
>>light is independent of the source as a function of geometry.
>>Space−time just works that way; there's no more reason to question it
>>than you would question why a^2+b^2=c^2 in Euclidean space.
>
>Bilge's problem is that most of his postings are intended to show how
>clever he is compared to mere mortals.

Since I am not a theorist in general relativity nor a cosmologist, what
I know in those fields is below what they know and what I post is less
than I know − mainly because I'm forced to dumb down the replies to kooks
who go out of their way to object to anything that requires broadening
their conceptual horizons. If you think Ik trying to be clever, you
are only partially correct in the sense that cleverness is required to
illustrate advanced concepts within the limititations you impose by
your refusal to learn anything new.

[...]
>
>Essentially Bilge would perhaps prefer that Einstein had never existed.

A strawman.

>What he would like to be able to say is that just as Euclid and
>Pythagoras worked out the rules of Euclidean Geometry that equally
>clever people in the 20th century worked out how to extend Euclidean
>geometry to include the dimension called 'time'.

So? Do you know of anyone having done it before the 20th century?
If not, then what's your point?

>Just as the criteria

>for acceptance of Euclidean geometry are that the rules are self
>consistent and that they hold when confronted by experience so
>Space−time geometry should be accepted on the same grounds,

So? The grounds _are_ the same, unless you can't think beyond
what you learned in high school geometry.

>and just as you do not ask for a deeper understanding, or physical
>mechanism to explain why a right angle triangle should obey Pythagoras
>theorem, or why something further away should look smaller − you
>should not ask why light is source independent or why the speed of
>light is the same in all FoR.

That is blatantly false. You are merely attempting to cover for
your inabiity to understand geoetry. I am quite interested in those
things. What I'm not interested in doing is discussing them in the
context of your self−imposed ignorance. Since you condider your
questions to be the result of deep thinking, how about trying to
explain what you think causes a right angle to be a right angle,
(or not) regardless of the frame of reference.

The reason discussions about ``deeper physics'' don't occur with
much regularity on this newsgroup, is due to kooks such as yourself
who want to equivocate semantics with physics in order to turn any
deeper questions physics into a shallow debate over semantics.

Rather than waste time trying to convince you to examine your assump−
tions, I will only justify my assumptions at the same level you do.
If you choose _any_ geometry AT ALL, I'm entitled to choose a different
one without justifying it any more than you justified your choice.
Your idea about ``cause'' is a direct result of your choice of geometry.
Trying to make me responsible for your bad choices is not deep thinking.

When you justify the pythagorean theorm with a physical cause,
I'll justify the metric in relativity with a physical cause.
If you did some of that ``deep thinking'' you talk about, you'd
discover just how shallow your argument really is.

By contrast, I've given you a specific connection between the speed of
light and conservation of charge. I can _derive_ a theory of electro−
magnetism regardless of whether or not the speed of light is constant
and show that if charge is conserved, the speed of light must be constant,
thereby satisfying your naive demand for a ``cause.'' Are you claiming
there is no evidence that charge is conserved or are you just rejecting
the cause you demanded for the reason I chose to use a 4−dimensional
spacetime for which your choice of geometry is the c −> \infty limit?

>OTOH is Space−time 'geometry' simply a useful mathematical technique

So is the pythagorean theorem. The only justification for using it
to describe the physics of anything called space, is that it works

pretty well when using it to build things which conform to out idea
of spatial extent. I realize this. The fact that you can't understand
what that means in four dimesions only indicates that you really
don't understand it in two dimensions.

>which can be used as an alternative to the more conventional maths
>Einstein produced or is it more, much more than that. Describing it as
>'geometry' gives Bilge's argument greater credibility.

Naturally. I can actually obtain physics that corresponds to
experimental data as well explain the physics represented by the
mathematics. Your refusal to understand what the math means
is not an argument that no one else does does.

>If you refer to
>the same technique as 4 vector analysis then his argument downgrades to
>"It is so because the maths sez so" which is hardly helpful as the maths
>were based upon the assumption that light is source dependent and the
>speed of light is constant in every FoR in the first place.

Your understanding degrades into ``It's because the maths sez so."
What would be helpful would be to upgragde your understanding, rather
than perpetuate your blatantly false claim about that upon which the
math is based. I've explained to repeatedly that the math is the same
math upon which geometry − any geometry is based. Your decision to
impose restrictions on the math and call the result a physical concept,
despite the fact that the physical data doesn't agree with you, is proof
that YOU cannot separate the math from the physics. If you stop treating
math as physics, your problems would go away. Unfortunately, you would
have to understand geometry rather than just some small piece of euclidean
geometry to realize the small piece you understand is just math, not
self−evident physics.

>One has to be careful of circular arguments.

Yes, you should, but unfortunately, you go to a great deal of
effort, play word games and make blatantly false statements
in order to maintain the circularity of your arguments under the
delusion that your idea of what is self−evident is really the truth.

[...]
>Bilge says history is irrelevant and doesn't accept my argument because
>I can't dig Einstein up and ask him,

I dont accept any arguments based upon what a dead person thought about
an argument the person was too dead to know about. Did einstein listen to
your argument? No? Well then, he obviously could not have given you his
opinion about it. Trying to create the impression that your arguments are
the same as those supported by famous people is nothing but an appeal to
authority based upon your misconception that you're dealing with

sycophants who might be persuaded by such an appeal. My replies to such arguments are rude because only an idiot would accept them. If you really expect me to accept such an argument, then either you're an idiot or you're being rude by expecting me be an idiot.

>I have tried to present a balanced view.

That's what fox news says about their reporting of the news, but the only people who agree with that assessment are those whose preconceptions agree with the bias fox news presents under the guise of a balanced view.

>I believe above I have actually
>presented Bilge's case more clearly than he himself has ever done and

How by actually lying about what I said? How does that clarify my point?

.

- ***References***:
  - ♦ ***Re: A little challenge for relativists.***
    - ◊ *From:* shuba
  - ♦ ***Re: A little challenge for relativists.***
    - ◊ *From:* Harry
  - ♦ ***Re: A little challenge for relativists.***
    - ◊ *From:* shuba
  - ♦ ***Re: A little challenge for relativists.***
    - ◊ *From:* John Kennaugh
  - ♦ ***Re: A little challenge for relativists.***
    - ◊ *From:* shuba
  - ♦ ***Re: A little challenge for relativists.***
    - ◊ *From:* John Kennaugh
  - ♦ ***Re: A little challenge for relativists.***
    - ◊ *From:* shuba
  - ♦ ***Re: A little challenge for relativists.***
    - ◊ *From:* John Kennaugh
  - ♦ ***Re: A little challenge for relativists.***
    - ◊ *From:* Harry
  - ♦ ***Re: A little challenge for relativists.***
    - ◊ *From:* shuba
  - ♦ ***Re: A little challenge for relativists.***
    - ◊ *From:* Harry
  - ♦ ***Re: A little challenge for relativists.***
    - ◊ *From:* John Kennaugh
  - ♦ ***Re: A little challenge for relativists.***
    - ◊ *From:* John Kennaugh
  - ♦ ***Re: A little challenge for relativists.***
    - ◊ *From:* shevek

- ***Re: A little challenge for relativists.***
  - ◊ *From:* vern
- ***Re: A little challenge for relativists.***
  - ◊ *From:* John Kennaugh

- Prev by Date: ***Re: Simple Question About GR And Uniform Acceleration***
- Next by Date: ***Re: Simple Question About GR And Uniform Acceleration***
- Previous by thread: ***Re: A little challenge for relativists.***
- Next by thread: ***Re: A little challenge for relativists.***
- Index(es):
  - ***Date***
  - ***Thread***