

Re: Time for a photon.

Re: Time for a photon.

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2006-04/msg00266.html>

- *From:* "N:dlzc D:aol T:com \(\dlzc\)" <N: dlzc1 D:cox T:net@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 4 Apr 2006 17:51:41 -0700
-

Dear Henry Haapalainen:

"Henry Haapalainen" <kirppu@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message [news:e0uoh0\\$3b5\\$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:e0uoh0$3b5$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

"N:dlzc D:aol T:com (dlzc)" <N: dlzc1 D:cox T:net@xxxxxxxxxx>
kirjoitti
viestissd [news:1w1Yf.12610\\$kT4.8861@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:1w1Yf.12610$kT4.8861@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

Dear Henry Haapalainen:

I don't think that I am or even want to be dear to you.

You don't have to like me. You don't have to respond to me. If you can't handle positive criticism, you shouldn't be posting to a public newsgroup.

But you have a problem, which makes it impossible to discuss with you: You cannot write. When I write something, there is my name below showing the other readers what I have said.

I supply your post to which I replied:

<QUOTE>

"N:dlzc D:aol T:com (dlzc)" <N: dlzc1 D:cox T:net@xxxxxxxxxx>
kirjoitti
viestissd [news:Dv_Xf.12404\\$kT4.2648@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:Dv_Xf.12404$kT4.2648@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

Dear DaveL:

"DaveL" <Top Poster Extraordinaire> wrote in message news:afCdncS-h4vTva3ZRVn-uA@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Re: Time for a photon.

Re: Time for a photon.

Time dilation is only good for one thing. Sci-fi.

SciFi or not, "reality" or not, it agrees with experiment.
Nothing else attempted in the last 100 years does.

David A. Smith

All

In relativity theory, time has been made a varying quantity like weight and distance. This assumption is still unsupported by any research result.

Relativity theory's most enthusiastic supporters believe that there should be a mass of evidence – but there is none. There are only misunderstandings of how an atomic clock operates (the effect of acceleration), and misunderstandings of what objective research demands. In many cases, attempts have been made to use the theory to prove itself.

<http://www.wakkanet.fi/~fields/>

Henry Haapalainen
<END QUOTE>

See how your newsreader added the symbol ">" in front of what I wrote? This is what differentiates what you write, from what was previously written. Now your ignorance is cured. I also signed my reply with my name.

I don't want anybody to think that I have written something that is yours.

Fine. It is now even clear to you.

So let me add the material back in that you decided not to reply to (using your odd requirement to put your name *after* the quote, rather than before):

All

In relativity theory, time has been made a varying quantity like weight and distance.

[Henry Haapalainen]

Yes. One can measure time/duration, and it is clearly

Re: Time for a photon.

Re: Time for a photon.

independent of both space and mass, being limited (in the laboratory) by neither.

[David A. Smith]

This assumption is still unsupported by any research result.

[Henry Haapalainen]

Just several hundred years worth of experimental results. What problems are you seeing with measuring the duration of a day, a lunar eclipse, or anything else?

[David A. Smith]

Relativity theory's most enthusiastic supporters believe that there should be a mass of evidence – but there is none.

[Henry Haapalainen]

Empty words. And canned at that.

[David A. Smith]

There are only misunderstandings of how an atomic clock operates (the effect of acceleration),

[Henry Haapalainen]

Like stationary at the top and bottom of a tower? Newton doesn't have it accelerating if its velocity isn't changing... are you worrying about the very 24 rotation of the clock?

[David A. Smith]

and misunderstandings of what objective research demands.

[Henry Haapalainen]

I think you are looking into a mirror here.

[David A. Smith]

In many cases, attempts have been made to use the theory to prove itself.

Re: Time for a photon.

Re: Time for a photon.

[Henry Haapalainen]

Or in your case, to use only words, appeals to "common sense", and no facts at all to disprove anything you personally find uncomfortable? How original...

I found a new word today:

"mumpsimus," – a person who persists in a mistaken expression or belief

Science is about testing one's theories. You haven't supplied any facts, any testable predictions. Are you proposing science, or "a mistaken expression or belief"?

David A. Smith

.

Re: Time for a photon.