

sci.physics.relativity: Re: OK, I'm Ready For the Patronizing Insults From the Resident Gurus!

Re: OK, I'm Ready For the Patronizing Insults From the Resident Gurus!

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2004-09/5223.html>

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

Date: 09/19/04

Date: Sun, 19 Sep 2004 22:31:10 GMT

On Wed, 15 Sep 2004 16:00:57 GMT, The Ghost In The Machine
<ewill@aurigae.athghost7038suus.net> wrote:

>In sci.physics.relativity, Henri Wilson

><H@.>

> wrote

>on Mon, 13 Sep 2004 21:40:17 GMT

>>

>>>

>>>Best bet is to set $v = (c - d)$, where d is a smallish number,

>>>then grind it out:

>

>[snip for brevity]

>

>>>However, it turns out that for photons $m_0 = 0$, and one gets

>>>a 0/0 effect, mathematically.

>>>

>>>>

>>>> And if time as we understand it would sort of cease to exist, how

>>>> could this be given that in our frame, our conscious awareness, it

>>>> takes photons billions of years to reach us from other stellar objects

>>>> deep in space, way back in time? They're traveling through

>>>> *something,* right?

>>>

>>>I'm not sure how to characterize this very well; my strength is not

>>>in electromagnetics. However, it's clear that lightspeed in vacuum:

>>>

>>>[1] is source-invariant,

>>

>> Light moves at 'c' relative to its source.

>> What force or 'fairies' would make it do otherwise?

>

>Light moves at 'c' relative to the source, true. It also

>moves at 'c' relative to the destination.

Re: OK, I'm Ready For the Patronizing Insults From the Resident Gurus!

sci.physics.relativity: Re: OK, I'm Ready For the Patronizing Insults From the Resident Gurus!

That's straight LET.
There is NO aether.

>
>*To show otherwise invites some interesting questions regarding*
>*supernovae. It's not exactly an OWLS measurement -- but it's close.*

It's a guess ...based entirely on Einsteiniana..

>
>>
>>>*[2] is *observer*-invariant,*
>>
>> *In a medium, maybe.*
>
>*Well, we're in a medium, at that. Density about 1 atom/cm³,*
>*generally gaseous (although there is the possibility that it's*
>*just all "dark rocks"), and it may very well be defining*
>*the spacetime metric, stretching it along with everything else*
>*as the Universe expands. However, it's not an aether, at least*
>*in the classical sense (it's certainly not rigid, for starters).*

Don't quote big meaningless words to me so that you can try to win by confusion.

There is NO 'spacetime metric'.

Nothing moves in a space/time representation, anyway.
(unless, of course, more than one time dimension is included)

>
>*And AFAIK it's not dense enough to complicate OWLS-like*
>*long-range measurements.*

There are NO OWLS measurements, short or long range.
There are only guesstimates based on Einsteiniana.

>
>>
>>>*[3] is therefore constant for everybody.*
>>
>> *Bull!!! Never proven.*
>> *The ESTABLISHMENT will still not fund OWLS experiments.*
>
>*It's rather difficult to move things at $10^{-4} c$, to allow for*
>*a few parts per billion error measurement. The best*
>*example we have around here is the Earth.*

With the latest clocks and space probes, it is now possible to measure OWLS with sufficient accuracy to prove the second postulate wrong.
Nobody will be allowed to do this.

Re: OK, I'm Ready For the Patronizing Insults From the Resident Gurus!

sci.physics.relativity: Re: OK, I'm Ready For the Patronizing Insults From the Resident Gurus!

>

>>>these:

>>>

>>>Crab Nebula

>>>distance from Earth: 7,000 light-years (give or take)

>>>estimated size: 10 light-years (ditto)

>>>time of detonation: 1054 A.D. -- about 950 years ago

>>>

>>>Now, a naive computation [*] requires that the stuff from the nova

>>>during the explosion is traveling at $1/95 c$. If one makes

>>>another naive assumption, that the shock wave is spherical

>>>(which is not a given, BTW; it depends on how fast the

>>>star was rotating prior to the bang, though it's probably

>>>close enough as a first approximation), then one gets into

>>>the interesting issue of how fast light travels from the leading

>>>edge of the sphere pointing at us, versus the trailing edge.

>>>

>>>Light from the leading edge, according to Newtonian theory, is

>>>traveling at $c + 1/95 c$, for a transit time of 6927 years.

>>>The trailing edge emits light that, from our vantage-point,

>>>is traveling at $c - 1/95 c$, for a transit time of 7074.5 years.

>>>Therefore, the ancients would first see a dim blue dot, which

>>>would slowly brighten as it turns greener/whiter, then the

>>>intensity would dim again as it turns redder, in the space

>>>of about 147.5 years.

>>>

>>>That's the theory.

>>

>>Crap!

>

>Did you have an alternate explanation for the phenomenon?

You don't know the blue green would become less prominent over that time span.

The parameters are all estimates...

In theory, I agree a colour change would be expected.... but over what time span.

>

>>

>>>

>>>The actual observations, however, indicate that the star was

>>>observed one day to be stunningly bright -- to be seen in

>>>daytime for a few weeks, in fact! -- and lasted for about

>>>a year before fading into relative obscurity. (It wasn't

>>>until the telescope was invented that anyone could see the

>>>glowing remnants, which are interesting in their own right.)

>>>

>>>This indicates something seriously wrong with Newtonian light theory. :-)

>>

>>Crap!!!

Re: OK, I'm Ready For the Patronizing Insults From the Resident Gurus!

sci.physics.relativity: Re: OK, I'm Ready For the Patronizing Insults From the Resident Gurus!

>> *If you start with Einsteiniana, you can easily prove Einsteiniana*
>> *is right. That's called circularity*
>
>*True enough. But am I starting with "Einsteiniana"?*

There are plenty of approaches one might consider to explain, on ballistic grounds, why the nebula might have done what it did. For instance, as the explosion progressed, the outer layers would slow down at a faster rate than the inner ones. Light from faster inner regions would catch the slower light. This could easily give rise to a 'focussing of information' and a very bright flash over a short period of time.

The phenomenon certainly doesn't rule out the ballistic theory. Rather, I would say it fully supports it.

>
>>
>>>
>>>*There are other confirmations -- Mercury's orbital perturbations*
>>>*is a classic one, and an observation regarding sensitized*
>
>*[snip for brevity]*
>
>>>*I could if you wish derive the Lorentz Transformation*
>>>*from the requirement that light has a constant speed in*
>>>*all inertial reference frames. It's a bit tricky, and*
>>>*mostly theoretical, but it turns out the Universe is happy*
>>>*to oblige SR and GR in this case, though Gravity Probe B's*
>>>*results will be interesting, as one other prediction of GR*
>>>*is that the Earth's mass is twisting the local spacetime*
>>>*metric by an extremely tiny amount -- so tiny that the*
>>>*experiment will have to go on for about 2 years to make*
>>>*sufficiently accurate measurements to verify it.*
>>>
>>>*Either way, science advances.*
>>
>> *Crap, Ghost.*
>>
>> *Science has stagnated for 100 years because of Einsteiniana.*
>
>*You're right; we should all go back to Newton and forego*
>*such modern amenities such as particle accelerators.*
>*After all, the Accelerator Adjusters has been suppressing*
>*proof that $c' = c+v$ for generations. There's also the*
>*Muon Madmen, who are of course frantically swapping muons*
>*(with a modern supersonic fighter and a Leyden jar it's*
>*actually fairly simple) over scientific installations*
>*attempting to measure them.*

Yes Ghost, we have explained the fallacies in all these so called 'proofs of relativity'.

Re: OK, I'm Ready For the Patronizing Insults From the Resident Gurus!

sci.physics.relativity: Re: OK, I'm Ready For the Patronizing Insults From the Resident Gurus!

>

HW.

www.users.bigpond.com