

Re: Another Rotating Cylinder Problem – explain from moving frame view

Source: <http://sci.tech–archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2006–04/msg01231.html>

- *From:* sal <pragmatist@xxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 17 Apr 2006 13:26:28 –0400
-

On Sat, 15 Apr 2006 07:52:09 +0000, David wrote:

On Fri, 14 Apr 2006 18:29:50 +0100, "Martin Hogbin" <goatREMOVETHIS123@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

"David" <dseppala@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message news:5e5v32hhd167p57ikjfcvnm82o1thjecu@xxxxxxxxxxx

Can anyone explain this rotating disk problem from the point of view of a moving observer?

Davis Seppala is one of the mysteries of this group. Unlike Spaceman, for example, he is smart enough to dream up endless SR puzzles, many of them involving accelerating reference frames, yet by his own admission he has practically no understanding of SR.

Is he really an expert on the subject testing posters' understanding?

Is he a bunch of psychology students performing some kind of experiment on us all?

Is he just a troll who delights in stirring up discussion and argument?

Any suggestions?

He is none of the above. David's understanding of Einstein's notions so far is much like David's comprehension of E. M. Escher's drawings. He gets to points in problems where there seems to be contradictory results as in his posting on 4/10/2006 where a moving rigid rod is always parallel to the x-axis and loops about the x-axis in a circular pattern at a 10 meter diameter circle yet no forces are applied to the rod to make it continue in this circular pattern. Or in this posting where as tension on a straight wire increases the center of the wire moves away from a straight line.

Re: Another Rotating Cylinder Problem – explain from moving frame view

This is opposite to typical experiences – wires form straight lines when stretched from two points with nothing in between them to interfere with the straight line. This does not make sense to David.

David is accustomed to more educated people pointing out the errors in his understanding. David really doesn't care whether others think he's a troll, a moron, a psychologist perform tests, fat, skinny, ugly or anything else for that matter. David simply finds relativity interesting but seeks out the help of others in resolving things that don't make sense to him. He finds it interesting that posters spend time speculating about his motives but he doesn't find it helpful to himself or others who may not understand the answers. If the problems are so uninteresting as one person has posted here why does he read David's postings?

Two reasons, really, or perhaps three.

First, once in a while David posts a problem which I hadn't thought about, and which I find interesting. Quite some time back (last year, I think) David posted a contorted question about moving ammeters, and thinking about it led to some issues I found very interesting. Among other things, it was in the pursuit of that in which I learned that a resistor's value, as measured by a "stationary" observer, changes when the resistor is in motion.

Second, David doesn't get abusive, so one can read and respond to his posts without getting showered with s*** in payment.

Third, David constantly gives the (possibly deceptive) impression that he's about to actually learn something from the responses. That is hard to resist...

As to finding some of David's posts very "ho hum", as I think I've put it in the past, that's because David has shown a tendency to post the same thing over again, apparently without having made any progress at all in delving into the particular issue raised by the problem. The moving ammeter problems, while they were interesting to start with, have been hashed out pretty thoroughly in this NG in the past, partly as a result of David posting them. But David does not seem to have learned anything about them from those earlier discussions, and seems to want to start over at the beginning again every time. If, as has been suggested repeatedly, he tried harder to work things out for himself and to take replies to his posts and carry them forward by adding his own calculations and deductions rather than stopping at the first difficult spot, he might get farther.

If the answers are so obvious why not simply post the correct interpretation and help everyone? Why do you care about David's motives?

Re: Another Rotating Cylinder Problem – explain from moving frame view

After a while, observing David's apparently self-defeating behavior, and observing his lack of any apparent progress in understanding the issues, one must start to wonder about his motives.

And besides, guessing motives is part of politics and "politics" among primitive primate groups, it has been suggested, is what led to the runaway evolution of the enormously overdeveloped human brain. So, guessing motives is among the most important traits which distinguishes human beings from the lower animals. If you expect people to interact with you without guessing at your motives you will consistently be disappointed.

David

Martin Hogbin

—
Nospam becomes physicsinsights to fix the email

.