

Re: SR, frames, light and spatial separation

Re: SR, frames, light and spatial separation

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2009-02/msg00098.html>

- *From:* PD <TheDraperFamily@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 3 Feb 2009 07:02:11 -0800 (PST)
-

On Feb 3, 8:51 am, "Strich.9" <strich.9...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Feb 2, 5:29 pm, PD <TheDraperFam...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Feb 2, 3:27 pm, "Strich.9" <strich.9...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Feb 2, 12:43 pm, PD <TheDraperFam...@xxxxxxxxxx>
wrote:

On Feb 2, 9:56 am, "Strich.9"
<strich.9...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Feb 2, 10:51 am, PD
<TheDraperFam...@xxxxxxxxxx>
wrote:

On Feb 2,
9:39 am,
"Strich.9"
<strich.9...@xxxxxxxxxx>
wrote:

On
Feb
2,
10:36 am,

Re: SR, frames, light and spatial separation

PD
<TheDraperFam...@xxxxxxxx>
wrote:

On
Feb
2,
9:35 am,
"Strich.9"
<strich.9...@xxxxxxxx>
wrote:

On
Jan
27,
9:55 pm,
PD
<TheDraperFam...@xxxxxxxx>
wrote:

On
Jan
27,
8:06 pm,
jonas.thornv...@xxxxxxxx
wrote:

On
Jan
27,
7:47
pm,
Jim
Newman
<j...@xxxxxxxx>
wrote:

jonas.thornv...@xxx
wrote:

Re: SR, frames, light and spatial separation

On
26
Jan,
16:12,
Eric
Gisse
<jowr...@xx...>
wrote:

On
Jan
26,
6:01
am,
jona
wrot

*CA
they
Sure
The
who
plan
Eart
can
be
cons
a

Re: SR, frames, light and spatial separation

fram
if
you
so
choo

I
always
thought
it
did
travel
in
an
elliptic
path
around
the
sun
and
thus
was
accelerated.
Apparently
i
was
wrong
muhahaahah

A
frame
can
be
non-inertial
and
still
be
a
frame.
I
thought
you
knew
that.

Re: SR, frames, light and spatial separation

Well
according
to
PD
a
frame
could
be
the
Aether
too,

I
didn't
say
the
Aether,
either.
It
doesn't
have
to
be
EITHER
an
object
OR
the
aether.
Why
do
you
think
a
frame
has
to
be
one
or
the
other?

no
need
for
object

Re: SR, frames, light and spatial separation

or
observer
you
just
imagine
a
point
that
need
no
place
since
there
is
no
absolute
space
and
this
point
is
free
to
be
moved
anywhere
at
once,
to
adjust
the
speed
of
light
to
c.

Go
figure
on
that
one
for
a
while.....
And
come
back
with

Re: SR, frames, light and spatial separation

a
coherent
definition
for
inertial
frame.

None
of
you
have
any
clue
about
what
an
inertial
frame
is,
you
only
keep
on
guessing
from
the
dreamwork
of
Einstein.

A
none
inertial
frame
is
quite
useless
for
measuring
the
speed
of
light,
time
dilation
and
length

Re: SR, frames, light and spatial separation

contraction,
*****;
thought
you
knew
that.*****

Because
SRians
always
been
invalidating
accelerated
frames
for
comparisson
of
time
dilation.
That
is
the
SRIANs
main
argument
dealing
with
anyone
who
asking
them
why
objects
orbiting
around
sun
with
higher
velocity
than
others
do
not
experience
any
relative
time
dilation
to

Re: SR, frames, light and spatial separation

objects
orbiting
with
lower
velocities.

AND
also
you
have
the
fact
that
an
object
at
the
earthpoles
have
a
relative
lower
speed
than
an
object
at
the
equator,
and
that
clock
there
should
experience
relative
time
dilation
compared
with
clocks
at
the
poles.

But
i

Re: SR, frames, light and spatial separation

thought
you
new
that,
or
do
you
want
to
change
your
position
so
we
also
can
use
accelerated
frames
to
disprove
SR
fairy
stories?

JT-
Hide
quoted
text
-

-
Show
quoted
text
--
Hide
quoted
text
-

-
Show
quoted
text

—

But
you
need
an
ether
for
light
(the
wave)
to
travel
through.
Unless
you
again
invoke
an
exception
to
the
rule...

What
rule
are
you
thinking
of?

What rule
are you
thinking of?

Is
this
similar
to
the
rule
that
mammals

Re: SR, frames, light and spatial separation

all
give
live
birth
to
their
young?–
Hide
quoted
text
–

–
Show
quoted
text
–

First
you
diagnose
your
own
condition,
now
you
extend
your
BS
into
biology?
You
are
on
a
flight
of
ideas,
Schizo–boy.–
Hide
quoted
text
–

Re: SR, frames, light and spatial separation

– Show
quoted text
– Hide
quoted text
–

– Show
quoted text
–

Schizo, do you need
everything spelled out for
you? You want me to
feed you everything in a
rubber coated spoon? You
need to get up from
your chair and do some real
work!

You want me to read your mind to determine
what rule you're thinking
of?– Hide quoted text –

– Show quoted text –

You asked the question so I presume you were on to
something. It is
obvious you are clueless about your own line of inquiry...

You made a statement: "But you need an ether for light (the wave) to
travel through. Unless you again invoke an exception to the rule..."

So I asked you what rule you had in mind. You've not answered what
rule you had in mind.

Re: SR, frames, light and spatial separation

So from the information we have from you so far about your claim, either

- 1) You don't have a rule in mind, but you just said "exception to *the* rule" for the hell of it.
- 2) You had a rule in mind, but you've forgotten what it was.
- 3) You have a rule in mind, but you are keeping it secret.
- 4) You don't have the foggiest recollection ever making that statement.

Which of these is right?– Hide quoted text –

– Show quoted text –

Now that you seem to be holding on to reality, here is the rule. By definition, a wave requires a medium.

What definition are you referring to?

There is no physical definition of a wave that requires the presence of a medium, other than one you just made up.

Water waves require water.

Bats are born with wings. Bats are mammals. Therefore mammals are born with wings.

The water molecules do not travel. Only the water wave does. Sound requires air. The air molecules do not travel. Thus both water waves and sound waves travel at velocities INDEPENDENT of the source.

Yes.

Light had been postulated to travel at velocities INDEPENDENT of the source. What is its medium?

There isn't any.

Balloons travel upward. They do this because they are lighter than

Re: SR, frames, light and spatial separation

Re: SR, frames, light and spatial separation

air.

Rockets travel upward. This must mean that rockets are lighter than air.

The ether was postulated, and then debunked. To maintain the isotropy of lightspeed, a medium must be found.

At this point, you are ready to depart from reality again, so I am merely reminding you to try to keep on the course.

For someone with an IQ of 200, you have a few problems with logic.

PD

.