

Re: The velocity of light going pass a moving train.

Re: The velocity of light going pass a moving train.

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2007-06/msg02276.html>

- *From:* Dono <sa_ge@xxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 18 Jun 2007 19:43:37 -0700
-

On Jun 18, 4:36 pm, "Jeckyl" <n...@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

"Dono" <s...@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message

news:1182173841.643429.130030@xx

You didn't really do a very good job of defining it at all. You also didn't say in which direction the laser was pointing .. we had to assume you meant in the x axis (direction of travel of the train).

You need to learn how to read.

I can .. you need to learn how to write .. you said something that was COMPLETELY wrong,

No, idiot, you are still unable to understand it, too complicated for your brain.

I understood what you wrote .. you were simply incomplete and unclear .. and wrong

If you understood as you claim you will not have any trouble explaining (with math) the following :

1. Why can light be aberrated towards the rear of the car in Einstein's experimen.

Re: The velocity of light going pass a moving train.

Re: The velocity of light going pass a moving train.

2. What is the aberration angle in the problem at point 1?
3. How do the equations at point 1 change if the "light clock" is turned 90 degrees (horizontally)

and then had another example that was porroly explained.

It was a much simpler problem, you couldn't get that one either.

No .. YOU got it wrong, , dumb ass

Now, now, now little idiot, I explain a few simple things to you and you call me names. Look in the mirror, you'll find the dumb ass there.

Next time, before you shoot your mouth, ask questions, I will explain to you.

Next time .. keep your mouth shut to avoid embarrassing yourself.

You are still an idiot after all the mathematical explanations. Too bad.

You wrote a couple of trig formulas .. that doesn't make you right.

It does, since the formulas and the explanation are correct. If you had any formal education you would have recognised them and you would have shut up. In case you don't know, it is quite clear that you are trying to learn physics (and relativity in specific) from the different posters. So, be thankful when you get a free lesson and shut the fuck up when you have been proven wrong.

If a beam of light is vertical in the frame of reference in the train ,it does NOT seen going backwards (in the opposite direction to the train) from the FoR of the track

Re: The velocity of light going pass a moving train.

Re: The velocity of light going pass a moving train.

At least you are persistent in terms of repeating the same idiocy, the main trademark of crackpots. Of course, it is seen backwards from the FoR of the track:

– try writing the math,

– try thinking about how "separation speed" works when the trajectories of the two elements involved (light beam and the mirror attached the the roof) are perpendicular to each other

Both approaches should give you the same result, backwards aberration. I.e. if you stop being a crank and you learn some physics.