

Re: Principle of equivalence

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2008-04/msg01498.html>

- *From:* rbwinn <rbwinn3@xxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 18 Apr 2008 23:31:20 -0700 (PDT)
-

On Apr 18, 10:29ýpm, Eric Gisse <jowr...@xxxxxxx> wrote:

On Apr 18, 9:14ýpm, Bryan Olson <fakeaddr...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

rbwinn wrote:

Well, in the first place, Bryan, there is no way to know for certain what the Lorentz equations say with regard to where a clock thrown from a moving frame of reference will hit just by saying it was thrown from the frame of reference.

"In the first place" you posted wrong or nonsensical statements on what the Lorentz transform predicts. In the second place, I did the math you challenged me to do, and showed the result for which you asked. We're not in the first place anymore, nor the second. Now you are changing the question because the theory you do not like turned out to work in the first place, contrary to your reporting.

So if I say that a clock is thrown from the moving frame of reference in the opposite direction to the motion of the frame of reference at half the velocity of the frame of reference, then does that clock hit in S at $x=0$?

What a mess. I assume y