



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

Yes,  
I  
kept  
trying  
to  
get  
dr.Jekyll  
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.

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

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 ambiguous as you keep  
making it to be.  
Here it is, one more time,  
mr. Jackasss:

-In the traincar frame  
 $\theta_{\text{car}} = \pi/2$   
-In the track frame

$$\cos(\theta_{\text{track}}) = (\cos(\theta_{\text{car}}) - v/c) / (1 - v/c * \cos(\theta_{\text{car}}))$$

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

So, can you calculate  $\cos(\theta_{\text{track}})$ ? 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

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

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 account.

Yes, I do i\*\*\*\*. 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 t\*\*\*:

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

Do you understand that in the train iFoR, the vertical beam in the light clock hits both mirrors 'dead' center, all the time, because the mirrors are aligned in the trains iFoR to be parallel?

If you see that, then you should realize that a basketball player, riding on the train, sitting in his seat, dribbling the ball in the isle, would have the ball moving vertically in the trains iFoR.

If you agree with those, then you should realize that from ANY iFoR, the

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

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

light must continue to be seen to hit the mirror in the center and the ball to hit the floor and the basketball players hand dead center.

Since the mirrors and the hand are traveling left to right, the light and the ball must travel left to right and follow the path that Jeckle keeps describing to you.

At the moment that the image of the ball [light beam] hitting the floor [mirror] reaches the trackside observer, the objects causing the images have moved even further to the right, but the track side observer sees the ball following a path that looks like a series of mmmms. The light, on the other hand, zigzags to the right. Both continue to hit the exact same spots.

Were that not true, the basketball player and the guy building the light clock would both have ways of detecting and measuring ABSOLUTE MOTION.

If you are going to argue for such an absolute motion detector, you will need to abandon quoting Einstein, because he clearly said that it could not be done, as have over a century of experiments.

Aside to Jeckle, and others: please keep your language here clean and polite. Children may read the postings here. In fact, your great great grand children WILL almost certainly read what you have written. You set a very poor example for them when you curse and call each other idiot, etc. I understand your frustration when someone 'just doesn't get it', but losing your temper just makes you look bad.

--

bz

please pardon my infinite ignorance, the set-of-things-I-do-not-know is an infinite set.

bz+spr@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx remove ch100-5 to avoid spam trap

.