

Re: New improved facts part 1v02

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-03/6396.html>

From: Dr *** (paulpsremove_at_freeuk.com)

Date: 03/29/05

Date: Tue, 29 Mar 2005 18:44:25 +0100

"Sue..." <susyshow@yahoo.com.au> wrote in message
news:1112102750.876599.194530@g14g2000cwa.googlegroups.com...

|
| "Dr ***" <paulpsremove@freeuk.com> wrote in message
| news:1112082624.32462.0@sabbath.news.uk.clara.net...

|>
|> "jahn" <susyshow@yahoo.com.au> wrote in message
|> news:3argoeF6c4c07U1@individual.net...

|> |
|> | "Dr ***" <paulpsremove@freeuk.com> wrote in message
|> news:1112048541.13959.0@eunomia.uk.clara.net...

|> |>
|> |> "jahn" <susyshow@yahoo.com.au> wrote in message
|> |> news:3arav9F65pqobU1@individual.net...

|> |> |
|> |> | "Dr ***" <paulpsremove@freeuk.com> wrote in message
|> |> news:1112041655.16840.2@lotis.uk.clara.net...

|> |> |>
|> |> |> [snip /n]

|> |> |> |>
|> |> |> |> THE zero ring experiment ?

|> |> |> |
|> |> |> | No
|> |> |> | <http://hyperphysics.phy-astr.gsu.edu/hbase/relativ/muonex.html>

|> |> |> | Ya mean :
|> |> |> | <http://www.phy.bris.ac.uk/research/theory/jfachapter.ps.gz>
|> |> |> | ?

|> |> |> | I'm not likely to reload my ghostscript reader for something
|> |> |> | that gets only one google hit. Is it really earth shaking ?

|> |> |> |>
|> |> |> |> With other back up, yes when you think about it and have time to
|> |> |> |> integrate.

|> |> |> |> OK ... I'll give it a look.

|> |> |> |> |
|> |> |> |> | (I picked a bad day for that metaphor) ;-)

|> |> |> |> |>
|> |> |> |> |> Yes just heard did it rattle your cups ?

|> | It knocked the energy pea down 5 positions.
|> |
|> |>
|> |> |
|> |> | [snip /n]
|> |> |> |> the decay rates of short half life things.:~)
|> |> |> |> The bell example was means.....
|> |> |> |
|> |> |> | Oh! Ya wanna play that way?
|> |> |> | Put a clock on Jupiter have both twins view it over CCTV
| with
|> equal
|> |> |> | lengths of cable. The cable properties don't depend on any
| region
|> of
|> |> |> | space. The twins will eat, sleep and watch Dr. Who on 16mm
| film
|> |> |> | according to the same clock.
|> |> |>
|> |> |> | If you could do what you say then each twin would view the
| same
|> things
|> |> but
|> |> |> | one would age faster than the other due to the effects I
| described
|> and
|> |> the
|> |> |> | moving twin would experience the data run more slowly and any
| clock
|> he
|> |> had
|> |> |> | would show a delay against the other. For example say the DR
| Who
|> film
|> |> was
|> |> |> | 2hrs long by the clock of the non moving twin. The moving
| twin would
|> |> |> | experience the same data over for example over 1 hr because
| the
|> cosmos
|> |> has
|> |> |> | speeded up for him from his pov
|> |> |
|> |> | What proof can you offer that the cosmos is speeding up ?
|> |>
|> |> | This is just from the pov of a moving body relative to a less
| moving
|> body so
|> |> | if I see the cosmos as speeding up its the same as me saying I'm
| slowing
|> |> |> | down. See experiments on the links you posted although I have not

| had a
|> |> chance to look yet I'm fairly sure they will confirm what I
| write? Also
|> I
|> |> gave it a few turns on the clockwork the other day and that
| always
|> speeds
|> |> things up :-)
|> |
|> | I am not familiar with the term "less moving body".
|> | Particles have relative motion or they don't.
|> | If I measure your speed at 30km/hr then you will
|> | measure my speed at 30km/hr.
|> |
|> |
|> Against the vacuum background and it depend how you measure it.
|> Mind you we might be moving into the realm and confusion of dodgy
| light
|> clocks with the latter.
|
| If the combined fields of local charges is what you consider to be
| "vacuum background" then there will exist an object which you can
| use as a point of reference. Lets call it REF.
| So your bicycle might be moving 20km/hr wrt REF and
| my bicycle might be moving 10 km/hr wrt REF.
| We will both age less because cycling is good for your
| health...

Very true :-) but I will be growing older slower than you because I'm a
faster cyclist wrt to REF and the faster I cycle wrt to ref and you the
younger I will be, wrt to you.

| Not because we consider the local bulk matter's
| contribution to the dielectric when flashing light signals
| to each other.

No. I never said that it was that's the other posters on this group I don't
agree with them. I thought that was pretty obvious:-)
But having said that the local dielectric will effect EMR travelling within
its domain and although if measured within any domain the SOL will be c the
measurement if compared against a REF. may very well be different. Blasphemy
will I be struck by lightning? still here:-)

|
|
|>
|> |
|> |>
|> |> |
|> |> | and so when they compered clocks the moving
|> |> |> clock would show -1 hr against the relatively stationary
| clock

|> assuming
|> |> they
|> |> |> had been in sync at the start. This is assuming that they
| were at
|> all
|> |> times
|> |> |> in the same region of influence of the same dielectric
| properties .
|> |> |
|> |> |
|> |> |>
|> |> |> | The universe can then do what it pleases with it's
| ?metabolism?
|> and
|> |> |> | they don't have to be bothered by it.
|> |> |>
|> |> |> | 'Metabolism ' in this context means the particular process
| rate for
|> a
|> |> given
|> |> |> region of space
|> |> |> | But they do because they started off being part of that same
|> metabolic
|> |> rate
|> |> |> | of that region, if they had been in sync to start with.
|> |> |> | Cosmic metabolism is the base rate of this system and is
| equal to
|> ????
|> |> |> | working.....
|> |> |>
|> |> |> | I can hardly wait for you analysis of the Insulin and
| Kuiper
|> belts.
|> |> ;-)
|> |> |>
|> |> |> | Hit me with the data baby.:--)
|> |> |>
|> |> |> | BTW most space ships carry an on-board dielectric for the
|> aspiratory
|> |> |> | aspirations of the inhabitants.
|> |> |>
|> |> |> | Yes and you wrote it 'the dielectric properties of the region
|'
|> define
|> |> the
|> |> |> | metabolic rate of that region in relation to other regions
| although
|> |> *within*
|> |> |> | a region c will still be c.
|> |> |
|> |> | Ahhhhem... You are the first to refer to dielectrics as

| *metabolism* .
|> |> | I don't think my metabolism changes when the barometer drops
| but
|> |> | the speed of light changes measurably..
|> |>
|> |> Check your metabolism next time it happens :-) perhaps I can be
| clearer,
|> the
|> |> process rate for any event set will be dependant on its
| relationship
|> with
|> |> any given dielectric condition.? process rate any better ?
|> |
|> | I have heard some pretty desperate attempts to preserve Dr. Who's
|> | Tardis but you might just win an award with that one. ;-)
|> | <http://scienceworld.wolfram.com/physics/Dielectric.html>
|> |
|>
|> I don't feel at all desperate to defend my transport as you cant get
| more
|> real than a cop box :-) I have not yet looked at your links yet but
| will.
|> There seems to be three of four main groups within this group. Theirs
| your
|> group, the practalists who've got a grip on the vacuum but have some
|> difficulty with real time shift. Theirs the SRists who have become
| lost in
|> dodgy clocks and math. Theirs the aetherists who have been ridiculed
| into
|> confusion and some where but hiding are the don't knows, perhaps.
|
| They are all *aetherists* unless they can make a light path work with
| fewer than two charges. ;-)

But will they admit it ? :-)

|
|>
|> |>
|> |> |
|> |> |> That's why you need three regions to describe
|> |> |> the actions of stars from planets. Star region/frame, vacuum
|> |> |> region/frame
|> |> |> and planet region/frame. You can get away with experiment on
| planet
|> that
|> |> |> have only two region/frames with some loss of data.
| Spaceships can
|> take
|> |> the
|> |> |> place of planets with the atmosphere striped of and in the

| case of
|> |> |> spaceships equipment outside the hull if you like.
|> |> |
|> |> | Actually critical path calculations are sometimes broken into 3
| or
|> |> sometimes
|> |> | even 5 regions so near-field effects can be better modeled.
|> |> | regions
|> |> Good O! I thought because this group seemed unable to count above
| two
|> frames
|> |> that the rest of physics had the same handicap but if your saying
| the
|> |> majority of phisists can count above two frames then this is a
| great
|> relief
|> |> to me. But why am I finding book by establishment profs. full of
|> confused
|> |> inaccurate stuff on relativity ?
|> |
|> | A wagon can get purdy fer off the trail if ya keep it moving the
| wrong
|> | way for a 100 years.
|>
|> Wrong way? This is just the more scenic and humours route :-)
|
| Oh ya mean:
|
| $x' +/- \tau$ ----> jump frame to accelerated counter-twin's FoR
| excluding space-like null co-ordinates on odd numbered birthdays.
| Then slow syncing and E-syncing apparent clocks 'till lightning
| kills observer. ;-)

Sounds good any ice cream breaks ?

|
|>
|> |
|> | Eh! Who said anything about physicists? I saw that in a protocol
| for
|> | testing weather radars that *have* to work whether the book says
| they
|> | should or not.
|>
|> O, all right then this species then :-)
|>
|> |
|> |>
|> |>
|> |> | Star - ether - planet
|> |> | equals

|> |> | near – far – near
|> |> |
|> |> | Yep!
|> |> |
|> |> | How about near far far far near?
|> | Actually I saw:
|> | nearest near far near nearest
|> | To accommodate elaborate structures.
|> |
|> | Yes but this is local and I lost my cyclotron some years back in the
| jungle
|> | so am a bit dated on nearest data although I think that individual
| electron
|> | are collapsed negative far field half cycles with just a touch of
| positive
|> | to keep them vaguely stable and the opposite for positrons.
|
| Well... I can't offer argument against that PoV. It sounds as good as
| the rest I have heard.

You brighten my day, no joke.

|
|>
|> |>
|> |> |
|> |> |>
|> |> |> <snip>
|> |> |> |> | Any two points can be synchronized with two equal
| length
|> cables.
|> |> No
|> |> |> |> | room for independent time Eh?
|> |> |>
|> |> |> See above and what you say is a very local view.
|> |> |
|> |> | I have a rich uncle in the coax cable business. ;-)
|> |> |
|> |> | Take the case of one twin
|> |> | Carry your own case.
|> |>
|> |> | It was full of rich pickings and you left it behind. What a waste
| I
|> think
|> |> you should go and find it:-)
|> |>
|> |> |> on ground with pulse gen set to produce 1 sec on pulse
| followed by
|> 1
|> |> sec
|> |> |> off pulse from pov of ground based twin with counters to
| count own

|> |> pulses
|> |> |> and those from twin same for other twin cable up to other
| twin
|> whipping
|> |> |> round earth at 1 sec per rotation per pov ground based twin.
| Start
|> run
|> |> |> stationary sync counters first rotation. Orbital twin running
| slow
|> due to
|> |> |> motion
|> |> |
|> |> | Who says it runs slow ?
|> |> See your experimental links above.
|> | No warranty on the links I post. Caviar Escargo!
|>
|> Don't use warranties as they are usually not worth the paper they are
|> printed on but do use Occams and logic which seem to work a lot
| better so
|> reread the second link and be convinced or its another smack on bum
| :-)
|>
|> |> |
|> |> | so one sec from his pov will be two secs on ground so will see
|> |> |> pulses coming faster and will transmit pulses more slowly. So
| from
|> the
|> |> pov
|> |> |> of the orbit twin the pulses from the ground are coming
| faster so
|> from
|> |> his
|> |> |> pov the ground based twin has speeded up. From the pov of the
| ground
|> |> twin
|> |> |> the pulses from the orbit twin are coming slower as the orbit
| twin
|> is
|> |> going
|> |> |> slow from the ground pov because the orbiting twin has been
| slowed
|> down.
|> |> So
|> |> |> after two rotations from the ground twin pov he has output
| one on
|> pulses
|> |> and
|> |> |> one off pulses and received from orbit one on and no off
| pulse.
|> From
|> |> the

|> |> |> orbit twin pov he has done two rotations and received one on
| pulse
|> and
|> |> one
|> |> |> off pulse and has output one on pulse and no off pulse. So
| the
|> counter
|> |> in
|> |> |> orbit records output as on, for input as on off. The ground
| base
|> counter
|> |> |> records as output on off for input as on.
|> |> |> So the counter in orbit has counted itself as slower than the
| earth
|> |> counter
|> |> |> and the counter on ground as faster than the orbit counter.
| No
|> tricks
|> |> just
|> |> |> simple
|> |> |> fact. This result is qualified by the experiment being
| performed in
|> a
|> |> |> uniform common dielectric.
|> |> |
|> |> | Sorry... I can't even identify your paths in all that.
|> |> |
|> |> Your not trying because you dont want to lose your cable orders
| :-)
|> there
|> |> are two paths that why it can be confusing.
|> | Well... "see your links" is not adequate explanation why something
| other
|> | than a light-clock should behave like a light-clock. I'll try to
|> | find the paths if you can iron out that detail.
|> |
|> See the second link to be convinced of real slowed ageing at the
| micro micro
|> micro fine level and then the above should seem pretty clear but can
| be as
|> slippery as frequency and wavelength are to some. There may be a
| postscript
|> converter in word, have to check. No. Will try and find in more
| digestable
|> format but cant remember where I read it as it was a while back.
|
| Can I put you on the clock and invoice for this? ;-)

Will anti grav be enough ?

| I have a reader. I just didn't reload it after my last bout with
| the CWS trojan 'cause it slows the virus scanner down a lot.

Ye I try to keep a slim system too, will have to download the reader. 9 meg
20 mins that will cost me all of GBP 0.60p ye gods, the expense, my hairs
gone grey, is the world worth it? :-)

|

| Sue...

| BTW I started new thread "Alice slays Mad Hatter"

Be with you, just get me hat.:-)

Ardvark.