

Re: transformation equations

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2008-09/msg01367.html>

- *From:* PD <TheDraperFamily@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 19 Sep 2008 04:40:44 -0700 (PDT)
-

On Sep 18, 6:10 pm, rbwinn <rbwi...@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Sep 18, 12:10 pm, PD <TheDraperFam...@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Sep 18, 12:19 pm, rbwinn <rbwi...@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

I did not say I do not understand relativity, you did.

And this is not a matter of opinion. If you want to assess whether you understand physics, you ask a physicist. I would not claim to understand dentistry on my own assessment without checking with a dentist; doing otherwise would be foolish.

So I said,
just post what you think I do not understand about it.

I did. Did you not understand what I said?

It is not my
job to do anything with regard to this. I do not work for the
government. Scientists are the ones who benefit from
socialism. All
I do is pay taxes.
But from what you have said so far, scientists regard
relativity as a
top secret item of government information, and if a taxpayer

Re: transformation equations

tries to
write something about relativity, scientists are obligated to
say that
what was said was wrong because there is an unauthorized
person
attempting to discuss something that is top secret and should
be known
only to scientists.

Oh, far from it. On the other hand, the fact that it is publicly
funded and supported does not mean that you are entitled to an
education for free. State universities are supported by public funds
— this does not entitle you to take classes for free. EMS services
and ambulances are supported by public funds, but this does not
entitle you to free services on a 911 call.

So while it is certainly not secret, the onus is on you to avail
yourself of it. This means effort and time at the very least, and it
may mean financial commitment as well, even for things that are
publicly supported.

But it is not really all that difficult. You have a set of
Cartesian coordinates representing one frame of reference,
you have
another set of Cartesian coordinates representing another
frame of
reference. One set of Cartesian coordinates moves relative to
the
other. Where do coordinates x,y,z in one set of Cartesian
coordinates
appear as x',y',z' in the other set of Cartesian coordinates?

Ah, but see, this is what I'm talking about. You have the impression
that relativity is based on transformation equations from one set of
Cartesian coordinates to another. That couldn't be further from the
truth. Relativity is based on invariance of physical laws with
inertial reference frame. Your equations that transform one set of
Cartesian coordinates to another set of Cartesian coordinates don't
address physical laws and their invariance at all. You are barking up
the wrong tree.

Re: transformation equations

OK, PD, give us the official government answer.

You may need to purchase some transportation to get under the right tree.

Robert B. Winn– Hide quoted text –

– Show quoted text –

There are no trees here in Arizona, PD. A government fire fighter started a fire several years ago that burned all the trees in the state. The United States Forest Service kept everyone, including firefighters, back away from the fire until it ran out of trees to burn. But when the fire reached Show Low, Arizona, some former loggers took matters into their own hands and took some heavy equipment and made a fireline between the town and the fire, so the fire stopped in that area when the fire reached the fireline. This was entirely unauthorized, and everyone feels guilty about the town of Show Low being there today.

Every time I ask you about whether some group of workers should be paid out of public funds, you bring up a criminal case out of that group of workers. I'm not sure what your point is, Bobby. Is it your point that if there is anyone in a class of workers that is a criminal, then that whole class of workers should not be supported by public funds? Do you think that if there is a teacher that hits a kid, then this means that teachers should not be paid from taxes?

So let's talk about invariance of physical laws. The claim of scientists today is that electromagnetic waves, which are a form of energy, change frames of reference, which Einstein said could be represented by sets of Cartesian coordinates, by causing any frame of reference which moves to be contracted in the direction of motion, just so that the ideas that scientists have about invariance of the laws of physics can remain unchanged.

On the other hand, a mathematician could insist that the Cartesian coordinates remain unchanged, and physicists would have to do more than just tell everyone else what to believe.

Ah, I suppose that gets down to it. Aside from the fact that mathematicians are also supported by public funds, so I'm not sure why

Re: transformation equations

Re: transformation equations

you should want to believe anything that they say.

What more do you think physicists should have to do, than just tell everyone else what to believe?

We can see that is not going to work because scientists all depend on the government for their livelihood, so scientists are enforcing their model of reality. I personally have to side with what mathematicians have said about the Galilean transformation equations.

Why? They are also tax-supported. There was a fairly famous mathematician whose fame was partly due to the fact that he sent bombs in the mail and killed people.

So, as I see it, we are about where Faraday was when the eminent scientists he worked for as a laboratory technician were trying to figure out why a magnetic compass would point to a wire through which an electrical current was running. Faraday tried to tell them that there had to be a magnetic field around the wire, and the scientists all said that anyone knew that the electrical current had to remain inside the wire. The same scientists all later opposed Faraday's admission into the Royal society of scientists, etc.

So we can see that science has not changed much from that day to this. Scientists just have more information to be narrow minded about.

Anyway, I like my concept of light a lot better than the one that scientists have.

Of course you do. Now the question is, by what metric do you determine whether the concept you like is also the one that is right?

Robert B. Winn