

Re: The "GOODBYE ALBERT" Experiment.

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2004-10/4335.html>

From: Eric Gisse (*fsegg_at_uaf.edu*)

Date: 10/19/04

Date: 19 Oct 2004 00:19:54 -0700

H@..(Henri Wilson) wrote in message news:<3gn8n053v5eu5bje1hjj45jpcfmr1chm1a@4ax.com>...

> On 18 Oct 2004 13:53:04 -0700, *fsegg@uaf.edu* (Eric Gisse) wrote:

>

> >H@..(Henri Wilson) wrote in message news:<jnu5n01nirjrqs1coaqqd4d54epf9uin1d@4ax.com>...

> >> On 16 Oct 2004 17:05:25 -0700, *fsegg@uaf.edu* (Eric Gisse) wrote:

> >>

> >> >H@..(Henri Wilson) wrote in message news:<obm0n011ot369kuqvj8nns5l0kluiot9lv@4ax.com>...

> >> >> On 14 Oct 2004 16:42:20 -0700, *fsegg@uaf.edu* (Eric Gisse) wrote:

> >> >>

> >> >> >H@..(Henri Wilson) wrote in message
news:<2mqsm09u02r5p24n1n9rgrduhsdkf9g7oq@4ax.com>...

> >> >> >

> >> >> >[snip]

> >> >> >

> >> >> >> >

> >> >> >> >Why do you think I watch Uncle Al's progress with more than idle

> >> >> >> >interest?

> >> >> >> >

> >> >> >> >The only direction Al progresses is further up his arse.

> >> >> >> >

> >> >> >> >No, you goddamn fool.

> >> >> >> >

> >> >> >> >Why do you think it is that I would think Uncle Al has something

> >> >> >> >promising and you do not? There is no physicist cabal going on here,

> >> >> >> >Al is an organic chemist, im training to be a physicist. My interest

> >> >> >> >in experiments is always merit-based.

> >> >> >> >

> >> >> >> >My advice is to give up Geese. You don't have the attitude or aptitude.

> >> >> >> >

> >> >> >> >Attitude : Yes.

> >> >> >> >Aptitude : Most likely. Won't know till I get there.

> >> >> >> >

> >> >> >> >I've already been and done it so I know I have both. That is also quite evident

> >> >> >> >from my posts.. eh?

> >> >> >> >

> >> >> >> >Your posts indicate that you are stupid. I would be embarassed to have

> >> >> >> >you as a professor. I have had professors that I don't think belong in

> >> >> >> >the classroom, but I have never had a professor I was genuinely

sci.physics.relativity: Re: The "GOODBYE ALBERT" Experiment.

> >> >embarrassed to have.
> >>> >
> >> >Pick any one of my physics undergrad classmates, they are all smarter
> >> >than you.
> >>>
> >> Geese, there is nothing smart about learning what is written in a book, just to
> >> pass an exam. Any fool can do that...and plenty do. Many 'extremist 'yes men'
> >> often end up with PhDs even though they have no creative ability whatsoever.
> >>>
> >> Being smart requires an ability to reason beyond what one has been taught.
> >>
> >>There is more to math and physics to memorizing equations. Since you
> >>never completed a degree in either, im not surprised to see such an
> >>opinion voiced.
>
> Geese, I have two separate science degrees, one of which included five years of
> applied maths.

Ok, sick of you again.

Liar. You are too stupid to have a degree in any math-heavy major.

>
> >
> >>Im also not really amazed you have no single clue about what goes into
> >>a PhD. A cursory chat with any random professor shows that you are
> >>wrong.
>
> Geese, PhD student rarely fail because it reflects badly on their supervisors
> if they do.
> PhD graduates are generally useless.

Moron.

Go to a local university and check your perceptions against reality.

[snip]

> >>The stationary corner cube arrays return light on the order of a
> >>photon per second to a stationary ground target on Earth.
>
> Is that irrespective of source intensity, Geese? :)) Hahahah!

No, moron.

>
> >
>
> >> >*snicker* Have you gotten a publisher? Please don't diminish my
> >> >respect for Austrailia as a 1st world nation.
> >>>

Re: The "GOODBYE ALBERT" Experiment.

> >> *The book is on CD.*
> >
> > *Pass it out around a local universitie's physics department. Plot the*
> > *laughter on a logarthymic scale.*
>
> *It isn't written for physicists. It's for people who don't understand what*
> *physics is.*

Such as yourself.

>
> >
>
> >> >> *I cannot do it Geese. Not enough money. I'll have to ask the Chinese.*
> >> >
> >> > *Do let us know if your proposal isn't laughed at.*
> >>
> >> *You don't even understand the experiment or its significance, so don't comment*
> >> *Geese. It is Androcles experiment anyway. It is perfectly sound and practical*
> >> *right now.*
> >
> > *Androcles doesn't do experiments, so I was assuming it was under your*
> > *control.*
> >
> > *In any event, I won't be holding my breath for a paper – published or*
> > *otherwise.*
> >
>
> >> >> *GR is plainly an exercise in sheer stupidity.*
> >> >> *.....all it ever does is make a lot of pseudo scientists feel very smug.*
> >> >
> >> > *OOooh. I think I see your problem with GR – you couldn't understand*
> >> > *the math.*
> >>
> >> *I probably could not understand the maths of Earth centrism either, when it*
> >> *tries to describe the motion of Jupiter's moons wrt Pluto.*
> >>
> >> *.....but why should I bother?*
> >
> > *Intellectual curiosity. To understand why people thought it would*
> > *work.*
> >
> >>
> >> >
> >> > *Tell me Henri, how long ago was it when you last tried to understand*
> >> > *GR? Did you ever read the little box about "ict" in Misner, Thorne,*
> >> > *and Wheeler that I pointed out to you?*
> >>
> >> *Geese, when I see stupidiy in the first paragraph, I dont bother to read any*
> >> *further. Life is too short to waste time on nonsense.*
> >

sci.physics.relativity: Re: The "GOODBYE ALBERT" Experiment.

> > *In other words, you think you already know the answer so there is no
> > reason to see what other people say.*
> >
> >>
> >> *I accept that light increases speed when falling down a gravity field just like
> >> anything else. The maths is very simple then. no 'curved space' is required.
> >> (curved in what, geese?)*
> >
> > *Light doesn't increase speed while falling. You agree that the
> > universe isn't Newtonian, yet you think it is also NOT Lorentzian.
> > What is it? The c+v viewpoint is a Newtonian perspective, yet
> > Newtonian mechanics are empirically wrong.*
>
> *There is overwhelming evidence that in a complete vacuum, the speed of light
> is source and observer dependent.*

Nope, sorry.

Liar once again. Stop lying.

>
> >
> >> *Do you disagree with the equivlance principle, Henri? The frequency
> > shifts are derived *directly* from the equivlance principle –
> > acceleration and gravity are locally indistinguishable.*
>
> *Yes, geese. Go sit on the moon and watch the Earth expanding at g!*

No, moron.

You don't understand any aspect of GR.

>
> *posting.google.com*
> >> >
> >> > *You are unable to distinguish between the understanding of an idea and
> >> > belief in an idea. I understand the idea, but I do not believe in it.
> >> > Is this another case of you being unable to distinguish between
> >> > fantasy and reality?*
> >>
> >> *Geese, why would anyone want to spend a lifetime to studying a stupid theory
> >> that turns a simple geometric concept into one in which light speed always
> >> remained constant at c?*
> >
> > *What makes you think it takes a lifetime? Can I interpet it to mean
> > you have been attempting to study it your whole life and you still
> > have no fucking clue as to what GR is?*
> >
> >> *....Far easier to stick with Euclidean geometry and the truth.*
> >
> > *Euclidian geometry is wrong. Ask a surveyor.*

Re: The "GOODBYE ALBERT" Experiment.

>

> *Surveying uses TWLS.*

Euclidian geometry is still wrong. Euclid's 5th postulate does NOT HOLD.

>

> >

> > >

> > > *I once proposed a geometry that would make the density of matter constant*

> > > *throughout the universe. It is quite possible.... and it leads to astonishing*

> > > *results. Why don't you devote your life to worshipping 'Wilson's constant*

> > > *density theory' rather than Einsteiniana?*

> >

> > *For the simple reason that your theory is wrong. Furthermore, what I*

> > *devote my life to is not going to be influenced by a crackpot aussie.*

>

> *It's as good a theory as GR.*

Is the matter density of the universe the same at the surface of the earth as at a lagrange point? Or any other point?

Disproven.

>

> >

> > >

> > > >

> > > > >

> > > > > >

> > > > > *Einstein concocted a geometry that would make light speed always equal c. Do*

> > > > > *you think that is (1) easy?, (2) an indication that he was insane?*

> > > > >

> > > > > *>1) No. Math is hard, especially differential geometry. Do you know how*

> > > > > *>hard differential geometry is? No, you don't. I suspect you have never*

> > > > > *>even taken a 300 level math class [read: linear algebra and up].*

> > > > >

> > > > > *I always came top in geometry. It's my speciality.*

> > > >

> > > *>Im talking about things like manifolds and vector spaces, not*

> > > *>highschool geometry.*

> > >

> > > *Manifolds are not necessary if one accepts that light speed is not constant.*

> > >

> > > *Why try to make the univerese hareder to understand than it is already?*

> >

> > *Geometry has uses outside of GR. Too bad you are too shortsighted to*

> > *understand why. I would point you to a few books, but since you don't*

> > *read, I won't bother.*

>

> *'Curved space', my arse!*

Nowhere were the words 'curved space' used. Since you don't read, there is no point in explaining.

>
>
>>>
>>>All big words from a little boy who obviously ain't goin' nowhere fast.
>>
>> Explain them using the $c+v$ theory of light instead of whining about my
>> supposed non-progress.
>
> Everything matches the ballistic theory.

Liar.

This has been covered in depth in other threads. Just because you do not understand the arguments does not mean they are not valid.

>
>>
>>>
>>>>
>>>> This is why you are not a scientist. Your set view of the world
>>>> diverges from how it actually happens to be when it is put against
>>>> experiment.
>>>>
>>>> No Geese. Experiment and theory show that light speed is c relative to its
>>>> source.
>>
>> Liar.
>>
>>> The task now its to burn the last 100 years of physics books and start all over
>>> again.
>>
>> Idiot.
>>
> m
>>>>
>>>> So what if it "explains" nothing? It is a good enough model. Everyone
>>>> with some education in modern physics knows that Relativity isn't the
>>>> theory of everything, we have some way to go. But until there is an
>>>> empirical contradiction within the theory or a contradiction with
>>>> experiment it will stand.
>>>>
>>>> The theory is not used anywhere. It is completely unimportant. It is an
>>>> exercise in self-delusion, like any religion.
>>
>> Liar.
>
> Bad language will not get you anywhere Geese.

Oh noes!

Im going nowhere EVEN FASTER THAN BEFORE. I guess ill change my major to business administration.

>
> >
> > *The work that is done at UAF includes auroral research. The motion*
> > *electrons exhibit is relativistic. Would you like to argue the point*
> > *with any of the researchers here? I would be greatly amused to be*
> > *privy to the exchange.*
>
> *No Geese, I know that 'gamma' comes into charged particle movement.*
> *That ws known before SR.*

No, idiot.

$1/\sqrt{1-(v/c)^2}$ was a relation that was obtained by Lorentz right before the turn of the century. Nothing to do with charged particle interactions. Cyclotrons did NOT work with Newtonian kinematics, nor will they ever.

Your picking–and–choosing of experimental evidence is the hallmark of intellectual dishonesty. None of SR's predictions, including the gamma factor, can be derived through Newtonian mechanics.

>
>
> > > *Mossbauer effect, Compton effect. Go ahead, explain them using your*
> > > *"c+v" theory of light.*
> > >
> > > *The doppler shift is almost the same in ballistic theory, NM and SR, for small*
> > > *velocites. The Mossbaeur effect works exactly as it should. The Pound–Rebka*
> > > *experiment agrees perfectly well with the ballistic theory.*
> >
> > **snicker**
> >
> > *...and the Compton effect? You are yet to address the Compton effect.*
> > *You don't know what it is, and will never know since you don't read.*
>
> *I know what the Compton effect is Geese. Enery anbd momentum balance after a*
> *particle/particle collision.*
> *I cannot see how it violates the BT.*

You can not see because you will not open a book. RIGHT IN FRONT OF ME is the derivation for the wavelength of the incoming and outgoing photon, along with the angle they make.

Since the ballistic theory is essentially Newtonian by your own goddamn admission, there is no way to recoincile the need for the relativistic assumptions involved.

>
> >
> >>
> >> >
>
> >
> > *In other words, nothing.*
> >
> > *You haven't the motivation to prove any of us wrong, you just like to*
> > *sit and say that you are right by misinterpreting experimental*
> > *evidence.*
>
> *Geese, why should light from differently moving stars ever end up traveling at*
> *the same speed across space?*
>
> *When you discover the answer, please inform Andersen.*

Hey, idiot with reading comprehension issues:

I have said it at least 3 times now. SR does not answer that question,
SO STOP ASKING ME.

>
>
> >>
> >> *Since relativity breaks down completely when it tries to describe how light*
> >> *travels through space, I don't see why I have to consider it at all.*
> >
> > *That is what E&M is for, shit for brains. You know the difference*
> > *between modern E&M and SR, right?*
>
> *Give up Geese.*

In other words: "no".

You have no education in modern physics, and you have no wish to receive one. So sad...

[snip]