

Re: McCullough is caught with his pants down.

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2005-02/4034.html>

From: Androcles (*Androcles_at_*)

Date: 02/08/05

Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 23:14:41 GMT

"Daryl McCullough" <stevendaryl3016@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:cubbjh011d@drn.newsguy.com...

> *Androcles says...*

>

>> "Daryl McCullough" <stevendaryl3016@yahoo.com> wrote

>

>>> *Androcles says...*

>>>>

>>>>> *Einstein defines it as $(16+4)/2 = 16$*

>>>>

>>>> *No, he does not.*

>>>

>>> *Yes, I've got it now.*

>

> *No, you don't.*

Yes, I don't.

No, you do.

No, I do.

Yes, you don't.

>

>> *He didn't say*

>> "we establish by definition that the ``time" required by light to

>> travel from A to B equals the ``time" it requires to travel from B to

>> A. " when he said "we establish by definition that the ``time"

>> required

>> by light to travel from A to B equals the ``time" it requires to

>> travel

>> from B to A. "

>

> *Where in the above did he say that he was defining time so that*

> *$(16+4)/2 = 16$? He didn't.*

Well, see, the time for the mosquito (or light) to travel 80 units from A (Sam) to

B (Joe) is 16 seconds, and the time for the mosquito to travel 20 units

sci.physics: Re: McCullough is caught with his pants down.

from

B (Joe) to Sam (A) is 4 seconds, so we establish by definition that the "time"

16 seconds equals the "time" 4 seconds.

Then he puts that in an equation, $(\tau_0 + \tau_2) = \tau_1$, or $(16 + 4)/4 = 16$.

So I asked you why he did that, but now that I don't get it, you say he didn't, which means he did. Or didn't, as the case may be.

Have you made that appointment with the psychiatrist yet?

- > *What he said was that as measured in the *moving* frame, the time*
- > *required to travel from A to B is equal to the time required to*
- > *travel from B to A. He didn't say that these times were equal*
- > *as measured in the *stationary**