

Re: SR's velocity addition -- ANY Experimental Evidence?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2004-09/1001.html>

From: Henri Wilson (H_at_..(Henri))

Date: 09/03/04

Date: Fri, 03 Sep 2004 22:48:11 GMT

On Fri, 3 Sep 2004 12:22:40 +0200, "Paul B. Andersen" <paul.b.andersen@hia.no> wrote:

>
> "Henri Wilson" <H@..> skrev i melding news:qfoff0p65orhj3eh81jbcj0lc4mpd9077h@4ax.com...
>> On Thu, 2 Sep 2004 23:31:10 +0200, "Paul B. Andersen" <paul.b.andersen@hia.no>
>> wrote:
>>
>> >
>> >> **Bull!!!**
>> >> *For mos. the periods and amplitudes hardly change over up to a hundred years.*
>> >> *You are really starting to rave uncontrolledly now!*
>> >
>> > *We are talking about long period variables, Miras, Henri.*
>> > *Here are a few lightcurves for an arbitrary collection of such:*
>> > *S Persei*
>> > <http://www.britastro.org/vss/gifl/00292.gif>
>>
>> *That is obviously a compound system.*
>>
>> > *U Orionis*
>> > <http://www.britastro.org/vss/gifm/00271a.gif>
>>
>> *The variation between maxima and mimima is obvious;y due to measurement*
>> *factors.*
>> *The curves are very typical of ballistic predictions.*
>>
>> > *R Leo:*
>> > <http://www.britastro.org/vss/gifm/00222a.gif>
>>
>> *Same thing. You only have to look at the differences between readings of*
>> *different observers at the same time to see these discrepancies are*
>> *observational.*
>>

>> >R And
>> ><http://www.britastro.org/vss/gifm/00003a.gif>
>> ><http://www.britastro.org/vss/gifl/00003.gif>
>> >Z UMa:
>> ><http://www.britastro.org/vss/gifm/00354a.gif>
>>
>> *This one is a perfect example of measurement limitations.*
>>
>> >R Tri:
>> ><http://www.britastro.org/vss/gifm/00354a.gif>
>> >R Ser:
>> ><http://www.britastro.org/vss/gifm/00315a.gif>
>>
>> *There is possibly a third body involved here.*
>>
>> >
>> >*You will find several more light curves in this article:*
>> >http://adsbit.harvard.edu/cgi-bin/nph-iarticle_query?bibcode=1997JAVSO..25...57M
>>
>> *All these curves are typical of ballistic predictions.*
>>
>> *chi Cyg is probably a ternary. you can see the little dip in the curve.*
>>
>> *Brightness curves are quite sensitive to variations in eccentricity. The
>> presence of another object might have a profound effect.*
>>
>>
>> >
>> >*I don't think I have to state who is right.*
>> >*The evidence speaks for itself.*
>>
>> *That is correct. The evidence in favour of the ballistic theory is quite
>> overwhelming.*
>
>*Don't even try, Henri.*
>*All your hand waving above only make you look pathetic.*
>*The observational evidence is indisputable.*
>
>*The light curve of Mira variables are not strictly periodic,
>and the maximum brightness varies – sometimes drastically –
>from period to period.*
>
>*Thus you were very wrong when stating:*
>*Henri Wilson wrote:*
>| *That doesn't explain why the periods of so many variable stars,
>| including T Uma, are precisely regular when the type of
>| phenomenon you are talking about should at least be
>| partly chaotic.*
>
>*The FACT is that the periods of ALL Mira type stars,
>including T UMa, are at least partly chaotic as can be expected*

sci.physics.relativity: Re: SR's velocity addition -- ANY Experimental Evidence?

>by an unstable, pulsating star.

>

>So the light curves confirm what the spectra so clearly shows.

>Miras ARE unstable, pulsating stars.

Paul, let me introduce another factor into this argument.

One LY is a quite a long way. Space is not likely to be at all homogeneous over such a large distance. There are likely to be VLP gas clouds, gravity fields, other EM, etc. present in varying degrees.

Light emitted by a star during one part of its orbit will not traverse the same path through space as light emitted some time later. It is easy to imagine the consequences of this. The brightness curves will vary considerably from those predicted for perfectly empty space.

After this has been taken into consideration, it is quite obvious that all these brightness curves are a result of the fact that light speed is source dependent.

What do you say its speed depends on, Paul?

>

>

>[..]

>

>> >You are pretending not to get the point, aren't you? :-)

>> >

>> >As you know very well does the ballistic theory

>> >predict that just about all close binaries should be

>> >variables – but few of them are.

>>

>> The ballistic theory DOES NOT say any particular group should be more variable

>> than any other. They are all very distance dependent.

>

>The important parameter is – as you well know –

>the radial acceleration multiplied by the distance.

It isn't that simple.

>Since the former is high in all CLOSE binaries,

>the ballistic theory WILL predict that just about all

>close binaries are variables, unless the distance is very small.

Wait, you are assuming binaries are close if their periods are short.

I agree there is a fair correlation but with broad exceptions.

The surfaces of binaries can be physically close but the periods long, if one is a giant.

>But you know this.

I apparently know a lot more than you do.

After all, my program accommodates 12 variables and presents the results in a relatively simple 5D representation...all in a few seconds.
How long will it take you to do the same with YOUR equations?

>
>> >*In one of your desperate attempts to "explain" why*
>> >*the ballistic theory gets this wrong, you invented*
>> >*the temperature fluctuations in close binaries.*
>>
>> *.and one of your own DHR colleagues agreed with me.*
>>
>> >*Do I have to say more?*
>>
>> *you don't ...but you probably will...because your faith is collapsing.*
>>
>> >
>> >*Hilarious! :-)*
>>
>> *Like Einsteiniana.*
>
>*Henry:*
>> >> >*Will you please explain how the alleged temperature variations*
>> >> >*which you say cancels out anyway can make the ballistic*
>> >> >*theory predict that they should NOT be variables?*
>
>*This IS hard to explain, isn't it? :-)*

Please draw a distinction between the two effects, Paul.

If two binary are close enough to affect each other's surface temperature, can you not see what will happen to the combined spectra?
Hint: From a distant observer's point of view, one will become warmer as the other gets cooler.

>
>> >> >*This is hilarious, Henry.*
>> >> >*This "explanation" was another great blunder, wasn't it? :-)*
>
>*Well, wasn't it? :-)*

When one speaks only the truth, it is difficult to blunder.

>
>> >> >*Sure. The faint giants, right? :-)*
>> >>
>> >> *Have you gone completely mad?*
>> >
>> >*I see you have snipped your faint giants. :-)*
>> >*I can understand why.*

>>>

>>>Henry wrote:

>>>| *The large companion is -> a red giant.*

>>>| *It is much the same mass as ever but it is very large.*

>>>| *It is also dull red so doesn't contribute much to the brightness curve.*

>>>

>>>| *I think "completely mad" is an appropriate description. :-)*

>>>

>>> *You are showing complete ignorance.*

>>> *I think Androcles is right about you.*

>

>*Out of words, Henry? :-)*

>

>*I can understand why.*

>*Having to defend the invention of a red giant which is dull*

>*compared the red giant T UMa so that the former doesn't*

>*contribute to the light curve of the latter, but still is*

>*so warm that it is able to heat T UMa by 500K on*

>*one side compared to the other, is no easy task.*

What is wrong with that?

A giant at 700C could easily cause a 500C difference in night and day temps on a closely orbiting planet or star.

But you wouldn't see the giant, would you Paul?

>

>*It is however incredible funny! :-)*

>

>*Henri can answer everything I throw at him!*

>*Gaaasp. :-)*

And a lot more.

>

>*Paul*

>

Henri Wilson.

www.users.bigpond.com/hewn/index.htm

See proof that light speed is source dependent.

www.users.bigpond.com/hewn/variablestars.exe