

Re: Magnetic field and relative motion

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2004-06/5061.html>

From: Cozmo Man (*cozmologist_at_scientist.com*)

Date: 06/26/04

Date: Sat, 26 Jun 2004 10:27:07 -0700

xxein wrote:

> "Cozmo Man" <cozmologist@scientist.com> wrote in message
> news:<20040624002246.521\$HZ@news.newsreader.com>...
>> xxein wrote:
>>> I developed a theory based on (what turns out to be) a LET-type.
>>> It has a gravity that is functionally simple and agrees with all
>>> observation.
>>
>> I assume by "LET-type" you mean a Lorentzian ether type of theory.
>> I also assume by "theory" you mean a theory you developed on first
>> principles from your Lorentzian-type ether rather than just
>> fiddling with the existing theory. If so, and if you claim
>> agreement with "all observation" then that is a remarkable
>> achievement. Where does one find this remarkable theory?
>
> xxein: There is hardly anything there that has not been thought of
> and 'published' before. That's the mystery. I started from scratch
> so that not even a photon's 'intrinsic frequency' (there goes
> Einstein's Nobel) is inviolate. But I didn't learn of the
> 'published'
> material until later.
>

What published material do you mean? I don't know of anything anyone ever did that is like what you describe.

> When I say 'from scratch', I mean that I took measurement by
> observation (raw measurement) without a pre-supplied interpretation.
>
> Look. This becomes boring, even to me, to have to repeat this. ---
> (you can google 'xxein + ugly duck').

I did that search and looked at a few of the posts and all I found was the same sort of vague things you say here. You said you had a LET-type theory that incorporates gravity and agrees with all experiments. But all you seem to have is your "ugly duck" which seems to duck being a theory. :-)