

## Re: The "GOODBYE ALBERT" Experiment.

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2004-10/4527.html>

---

**From:** Henri Wilson (H\_at\_..(Henri))

**Date:** 10/20/04

Date: Wed, 20 Oct 2004 01:37:02 GMT

On 19 Oct 2004 00:19:54 -0700, fsegg@uaf.edu (Eric Gisse) wrote:

>H@..(Henri Wilson) wrote in message news:<3gn8n053v5eu5bje1hjj45jpcfmrlchm1a@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

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

>> >> >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  
>> >> >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.

Hahahaha! You don't even understand the basics... Hahahahahah!

>  
>>

Re: The "GOODBYE ALBERT" Experiment.

>>>

>> >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.

tell me about any experiment that refutes my claim.

>

>>

>>>

>> >Do you disagree with the equivalence principle, Henri? The frequency  
>> >shifts are derived \*directly\* from the equivalence 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.

You should hop into bed with Seto, you two would make a lovely couple.

>>>

>> >> ....Far easier to stick with Euclidean geometry and the truth.

>>>

>> >Euclidian geometry is wrong. Ask a surveyor.

>>

>> Surveying uses TWLS.

>

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

Postulates have a habit of not holding... particularly Albert's

>

>>

>>>

>>>>

>> >> 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?*

You don't get it Geese. Density of matter is constant everywhere, space changes to make it so. There are lots of discontinuities.

It is probably a lot easier to construct this theory than to fabricate one that makes light speed always constant.

>

>*Disproven.*

It could explain refractive index.

>>>

>>> *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.*

I realise the truth hurts you, Geese.

>>>>

>>>> *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.*

good idea.

>  
>>  
>> >  
>> >*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.*

You probably wont learn about those thing till second year.

>  
>*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.*

ever heard of Heaveside?  
Newton didn't know electricity existed.

>  
>>  
>>  
>> >> *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\**  
>> >

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

>> >...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. Energy and 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.

That's one of the first things we learn in atomic physics.

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

try applying relativity to neutral particles instead of charged ones.

>  
>>  
>> 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.

SR degenerates back to its 'aether version', you mean.

>  
>>  
>>  
>> >>  
>> >> 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...

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

Not all modern physics is infected with Einsteiniana, Geese.

>

>[*snip*]

HW.

[www.users.bigpond.com/hewn/index.htm](http://www.users.bigpond.com/hewn/index.htm)