

MBR Isolation Tests (was: Ned Wright's Page on Tired Light)

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.astro/2005-01/1037.html>

From: greywolf42 (mingstb_at_marssim-ss.com)

Date: 01/05/05

Date: Wed, 05 Jan 2005 20:40:18 GMT

Bjoern Feuerbacher <feuerbac@thphys.uni-heidelberg.de> wrote in message news:crgb2m\$33c\$1@news.urz.uni-heidelberg.de...

> greywolf42 wrote:

> > George Dishman <george@briar.demon.co.uk> wrote in message

> > news:crev06\$48n\$1@news.freedom2surf.net...

>

> [snip]

{snip higher levels and sniping responses sans physics}

> [snip]

>

> >>>Not one CMBR device -- to my knowledge -- has ever attempted an

> >>>isolation test. That is, a test to determine whether the signal was

> >>>actually produced "within" the antenna -- or whether it had an

> >>>external source. For example, I know for a fact that Penzias and

> >>>Wilson did not do this test. They *did* cut out the antenna

> >>>connection. But they did not put their antenna in an isolation

> >>>chamber.

> >>>

> >>>I'd be happy to be corrected, if you know of anyone who has done this.

> >>>(And this has been discussed on the newsgroups for at least a decade.)

> >>>

> >>Well I can't imagine they would launch any craft without

> >>testing the equipment and you can't do that except in

> >>a screened room. However, you would have to contact the

> >>team that built the equipment to get confirmation, it's

> >>the sort of thing everyone does without comment, just

> >>normal engineering, so it is unlikely you will find

> >>anything published about it.

> >

> > Then why did P&W discuss the tests they ran on their systems? If it's

> > just something that one normally does?

>

> 1) This was several decades ago. Tests which are considered

> today to be totally standard obviously weren't considered

- > *all to be standard back then.*
- > *2) They made a quite surprising observation, so it's natural*
- > *to do extensive testing and report it.*

But P&W never did test their assumption that the "signal" originated outside the antenna. Even though it was "surprising". Now that it's no longer "surprising", you ask me to take on faith that this test is a "standard?"
LOL!

- > >> *Perhaps it is simpler just*
- > >> *to point out that since COBE and WMAP produce the same*
- > >> *map of the sky, the data cannot be an artefact of the*
- > >> *detector.*
- > >
- > > *No one ever said it would be an "artifact of the detector".*
- >
- > *You suggested that it arises within the antenna. Then why*
- > *do you object to calling this an artifact of the detector?*
- > *That's what one normally means with "artifact of the detector":*
- > *an effect which is produced by/within the detector instead*
- > *of having an external source.*

An artifact of the detector is a signal that results from a specific detector shape or other engineered feature. That's what "artifact" means (artificial construct). In this case, the engineering design would not affect the signal.

- > > *It would be*
- > > *what matter always sees. Regardless of it's shape.*
- >
- > *Why do the detectors see different temperatures when looking*
- > *into different directions?*

There are two answers to this one.

- 1) There is an overall bias in the signal, because the detector electrons are moving through the aether. This produces a dipole in the signal.
- 2) There are no other "different" temperatures seen (aside from the gross dipole).

- > *If you claim that these are simply*
- > *fluctuations, "noise", then please explain why COBE and WMAP*
- > *see the same temperature if they look into the same direction*
- > *(provided one takes the different resolutions into account).*

The claimed "different temperatures" in COBE (1 part in 100,000) are the results of computer "enhancing" the noise signals, below the physical resolution of the detector (1 part in 10,000). WMAP does not actually measure temperature at all.

> [snip]
>
> >>> *Including the antenna of the Penzias and Wilson
> >>> device, and all other such devices. No experimental system that I am
> >>> aware of, has ever tested to eliminate this possibility. P&W never
> >>> made this test. After P&W, everyone simply assumed it was
> >>> "cosmic" in origin (i.e. outside the mechanism) -- and never made
> >>> this test.*
> >>
> >> *How do you think they would calibrate an instrument
> >> that was picking up every microwave oven and mobile
> >> phone for miles around? All such testing and
> >> calibration has to be done in an electrically quiet
> >> environment and that means a screened room.*
> >
> > *P&W managed it. Perhaps you should read their paper.*
>
> *Reference?*

Penzias and Wilson's experiment was 1964 --- published in 1965: "EXCESS ANTENNA TEMPERATURE AT 4080 MHz".

You'll find the entire text in a post by Paul Stowe, October 8, 2001, in the thread "CMBR shielding." {I'd give a link, but I'm offline right now.}

That's the thread where Paul Andersen claimed that "the idea (of such a test) probably didn't even enter their minds" --- because it was "impossible." Which is a far cry from a "standard" test.

But no one posting in that thread knew of anyone having done such a test. Not even Tom Roberts ... dean of Relativistic apocrypha.

> >> *However,*
> >> *what would be the point? If this noise is generated
> >> by hydrogen in matter anyway, it would still fill any
> >> EMC chanber as well.*
> >
> > *Precisely!!!!*
> >
> > *If it is of cosmic origin, then you will be able to screen it out. If
> > it is of antenna matter origin, you won't.*
>
> *If it is of antenna matter origin, you have a problem explaining
> that if one and the same instrument looks nto different directions,
> different temperatures are seen, whereas when two different instruments
> look into the same direction, the same temperature is seen.*

I have no such problem, because there is no such situation in the real world.

> *Or is there an easy explanation for that which I somehow missed?*

You haven't missed it Bjoern. You simply keep ignoring it.

- > > *That's why one would do the test. To*
- > > *show that the "cosmic" MBR really is external to the detector. The test*
- > > *appears to have been ignored, because popular theory did not predict any*
- > > *such thing.*
- >
- > *As George suggested: such a test was very probably done.*

Why do you say it was "very probably done?" Just because you'd like it to have happened?

- > *Why*
- > *don't you write to the people who have designed and built*
- > *COBE and WMAP and simply ask, instead of simply claiming that*
- > *such a test appears to have been ignored?*

We have asked. We have gotten no reply. Nor has anyone else.

P&W were not the first at Bell Labs to do the experiment. But merely the first to do the experiment without getting a zero effect. I don't yet know if this "false zero" simply means that the prior researchers correctly isolated the antenna from the cosmos (hence getting an external reading of zero). While P&W explicitly did perform this calibration step.

"If Penzias's and Wilson's predecessors working on the antenna had not set their instruments to a false zero, they would have received the <1978> award. Moreover, Yakov Zel'dovich, an eminent physicist who was a colleague of André Sakharov and coinventor of the Soviet hydrogen bomb, saw only the early, 'false-zero' papers from Bell Laboratories."

"Because of the false zero, there appeared to be no background noise at all. Knowing the antenna's sensitivity, Zel'dovich, an unusually insightful theorist, concluded that the big bang theory simply had to be wrong. ... "
<page 38_Masters of Time_1992> {courtesy of AB for mdhayes}

Though Zel'dovich certainly jumped onto the bandwagon without looking back, as soon as P&W's results began to be talked about.

> [snip]

{snip tired quibble on the definition of the BB theory}

--
greywolf42
ubi dubium ibi libertas
{remove planet for return e-mail}