

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/msg02311.html>

- *From:* "Jeckyl" <noone@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 20 Jun 2007 00:05:58 +1000
-

"Dono" <sa_ge@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
<news:1182221017.977985.141520@xx>

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

"Dono" <s...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> 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,

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

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.

Which experiement? We were talking about a light beam that was pointing vertically in the frame of the train .. and you said it would be pointing backward in the opposite direction to the way the train is moving from the frame of the track .. that is clearly nonsense.

2. What is the aberration angle in the problem at point 1?

What problem?

3. How do the equations at point 1 change if the "light clock" is turned 90 degrees (horizontally)

What light clock?

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.

I can see you fine already

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

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

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

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.

No .. its not. You're misapplying it. Or there is a massive failure in how
you're explaining the thought experiement and the result you are predicting.

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.

Why should I .. you certainly don't .. and you're so clearly wrong it is
staggering that you persist with this nonsense.

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

At least you are persistent in terms of repeating the same idiocy, the
main trademark of crackpots.

You're the crackpot here .. have you even thought about this problem at all?
... or did you just wildly shove in the latest formula you read without
realising how to apply it?

Of course, it is seen backwards 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.

You're a complete fool .. A light shining vertically upward in the train would be seen shining diagonally forward in the direction of travel from the FoR of the track. It has to be, if the track saw it going backward, then the beam would be out the back door of the train before it got anywhere near the roof of the train.

- 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)

What mirror?

are perpendicular to each other

Have you actually tried thinking about this problem? From the ridiculous answer you give .. that the light would be angled backward in the FoR of the track, you obviously have not .. you've applied a formula without thinking when and how it should be applied.

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

Talk about the pot calling the kettle black. Try using a little common sense.

.