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

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2007−06/msg02539.html

- *From*: Dono <sa_ge@xxxxxxxxxxx>
- *Date*: Wed, 20 Jun 2007 23:33:28 −0700

On Jun 20, 10:26 pm, "Jeckyl" <n...@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

> "Dono" <s...@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
>
> news:1182387866.761051.23130@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

> > On Jun 20, 5:27 pm, "papar...@xxxxxxxxx" <papar...@xxxxxxxxx> wrote:
> >
> > On 20 jun, 18:29, Dono <s...@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
> >
> > > On Jun 19, 11:05 pm, "Jeckyl"
> > > <n...@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
> > >
> > > > "Dono"
> > > > <s...@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote
> > > > in message
> > > >
> > > > news:1182303768.824683.175520@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
> > > >
> > > > > Yes, I kept
> > > > > trying to get
> > > > > dr.Jeckyll to
> > > > > understand
> > > > > it I
> > > > > already
> > > > > showed him
> > > > > the formula,
> > > > > to no avail

(at least, so
far).

You were simply
misunderstanding the
problem and so coming up
with
the wrong
solution.

No, idiot. You simply don't understand
aberration, that is all.
If you stopped talking and you started using
math you would
understand. But since you avoid using math
like the plague, you keep
repeating the same errors.

It helps when you are
actually talking about the
same problem as
everyone else (G, Harry,
myself). As I said .. you
were using the
right
formulas but misapplying it
(as far as the problem the
rest of us
were
talking about).

Again, no, idiot. The description of the
problem in math terms is not
as ambigous as you keep making it to be.
Here it is, one more time, mr. Jackasss:

−In the traincar frame theta_car=pi/2
−In the track frame

cos(theta_track)=(cos(theta_car)−v/c)/(1−v/c*cos(theta_car))

So, can you calculate cos(theta_track)? I asked you 5 times, why are you so shy about using a little math?

Since you don't get the math and you didn't get the "separation speed" explanation, I will give you a third explanation: since in relativity all frames are equivalent, instead of having the train moving Left to Right with respect to the tracks, imagine that the tracks move Right to Left while the light bounces vertically in the car frame. How is the light inclined in the track frame? If you still don't get it, look at these pictures:

http://www.fourmilab.ch/cship/aberration.html

But in those pictures, the observer is in the train frame and he sees through the window as if the ground is moving from left to right and, obviously the rain is falling with an angle that clearly is inclined into the direction of the movement of the ground, again as seen from the train frame. So those pictures actually contradict what you are saying.

Miguel Rios

In both cases the light is inclined from right to left,

> No .. if the traing goes left to right in the FoR of the tracks, then the light that is vertical in the train goes left to right in the FoR of the tracks.
>
> You are using the correct formula .. but applying it incorrectly. BTW: Do you even understand relativistic aberration works, and why you get a great difference in angle when you take relativity into accout.

Yes, I do idiot. Now check with the guy who was the first to derive the formula:

http://www.fourmilab.ch/etexts/einstein/specrel/www/

> > i.e. it makes an angle greater than 90 degrees with the semipositive x−axis.
> > Try understanding the relativistic aberration formula, would you?
>
> How about you try it .. you seem to think the light goes the wrong way

Check with Einstein, you ignorant twit:

http://www.fourmilab.ch/etexts/einstein/specrel/www/

.