

Re: answer to YBM's bell problem

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2008-09/msg00671.html>

- *From:* YBM <ybmess@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 10 Sep 2008 22:43:27 +0200
-

rbwinn a écrit :

Just apply the equations of your "theory", it leads to this contradiction.

No contradiction at all. The transformation equations are

$$\begin{aligned}x' &= x - vt \\ y' &= y \\ z' &= z \\ t' &= t\end{aligned}$$

What is there about these equations that you do not understand?

This is the equations of the Galilean Transformations, not of your "theory", as usual you deliberately "forget" the meaningless $n' = t(1 - v/w)$ you add.

I already said you what GT predict : of course the bell ring in both frame... *but* with GT the speeds of the light rays are not c in *both* frames.

Well, you said $n' = t(1 - v/w)$. I could not have said it better myself.

Listen, disgusting bastard : in order to prove that any theory is absurd, one have to play with it, to write down its formulas, to make some logical deduction from them. The fact that I wrote some of you stupid equations does not mean that I accept them. As a matter of fact, I've proven them to be absurd.

So, next time you'll pretend I've proven something, please don't lie and write that I've proven Robert Winn's modified "Galilean Transformation" to be absurd.

You can even provide the link :

<http://groups.google.com/group/sci.physics.relativity/msg/a39fe2523de79ced>

Re: answer to YBM's bell problem

Robert Winn's best fumble :

> The time n' in B is saying that the two light rays meet at the origin
> of B

so... the ring bell in B but not in A (the bell is not at the origin
of B whenever the light rays meet !)

.