

Re: Bending of light not well authenticated

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-05/msg01722.html>

- *From:* "Dirk Van de moortel" <dirkvandemoortel@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 23 May 2005 09:15:04 GMT
-

"Gene McGraw" <emcgraw@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message news:42917d84.47908468@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

> On Sun, 22 May 2005 "Koobee Wublee" wrote:

>> Since you do not even know what R is which again R is not the
>> radius of the sun, your integration of dH/dr from infinity to R is totally
>> bogus. To do the integration properly, you have to know what R is ...

>

> Indeed you do. As stated above, R is the radial coordinate of the
> light path at the perihelion (the point of closest approach to the
> gravitating mass M).

>

>> See. Your understanding of GR is not complete. In every spacetime
>> equation, there are always...

>

> It's quite obvious that you know nothing at all about general
> relativity, so there's really no point in you pretending to instruct
> anyone in that subject. The question is, do you want to learn how
> general relativity predicts the deflection of light, or don't you?

>

>> What I have been trying to tell you is that your concept is wrong because
>> if the mass of the sun were to be any larger, the photon cannot escape
>> from the sun. There would be no deflection because the photon is
>> captured by the sun.

>

> Stop and think for just one minute. The distant star is sending out
> rays of light in all directions, passing at all distances from the
> Sun, some close, some far. If the mass of the Sun was suddenly
> increased, the ray that had previously just grazed the Sun would now
> slam into the sun, BUT... a ray that previously passed further from
> the Sun would now be pulled in so it now just grazed the sun, and
> that's the ray we would see. No matter how massive the Sun is, as we
> look at the distant star in the sky, with the Sun getting closer and
> closer, there will be a point when the star is just visible at the
> edge of the Sun. And at that moment the path of light has a perihelion
> distance of R, and it has a certain amount of deflection, and that's
> what I showed you how to determine from the field equations of general
> relativity. You're welcome.

>

>> You are totally lost... Maybe after you have understood what I am talking

Re: Bending of light not well authenticated

- > >about we can continue with our discussion.
- >
- > I understand exactly what you're talking about. That's how I know
- > you're an ignorant self-deluded moron.

Apart from being a self-deluded moron, Koobee Wublee is a well known troll with a well known and very specific agenda. He has been around for years. Professionally he is a retired aerospace engineer.

His previous name was Australopithecus Afarensis.

Before that he was Scholarly Fungi and Time Traveler.

When he stopped posting as Australopithecus he admitted also having been Lordly Amoeba, Ibn Battuta and Marco Polo.

For a little overview of his statements:

<http://groups-beta.google.com/group/sci.physics/msg/2885701549101903>

Dirk Vdm

• **References:**

- ◆ **Re: Bending of light not well authenticated**
◇ From: Randy M. Dumse
- ◆ **Re: Bending of light not well authenticated**
◇ From: Koobee Wublee
- ◆ **Re: Bending of light not well authenticated**
◇ From: Randy M. Dumse
- ◆ **Re: Bending of light not well authenticated**
◇ From: Koobee Wublee
- ◆ **Re: Bending of light not well authenticated**
◇ From: Randy M. Dumse
- ◆ **Re: Bending of light not well authenticated**
◇ From: Koobee Wublee
- ◆ **Re: Bending of light not well authenticated**
◇ From: Randy M. Dumse
- ◆ **Re: Bending of light not well authenticated**
◇ From: Koobee Wublee
- ◆ **Re: Bending of light not well authenticated**
◇ From: Randy M. Dumse
- ◆ **Re: Bending of light not well authenticated**
◇ From: ande452
- ◆ **Re: Bending of light not well authenticated**
◇ From: Koobee Wublee
- ◆ **Re: Bending of light not well authenticated**
◇ From: Gene McGraw
- ◆ **Re: Bending of light not well authenticated**
◇ From: Koobee Wublee

Re: Bending of light not well authenticated

- ◆ **Re: Bending of light not well authenticated**
◇ From: Gene McGraw
- ◆ **Re: Bending of light not well authenticated**
◇ From: Koobee Wublee
- ◆ **Re: Bending of light not well authenticated**
◇ From: Gene McGraw
- ◆ **Re: Bending of light not well authenticated**
◇ From: Koobee Wublee
- ◆ **Re: Bending of light not well authenticated**
◇ From: Gene McGraw
- ◆ **Re: Bending of light not well authenticated**
◇ From: Koobee Wublee
- ◆ **Re: Bending of light not well authenticated**
◇ From: Gene McGraw

- Prev by Date: **Re: Lorentz contraction.**
- Next by Date: **Re: relative motion and aging**
- Previous by thread: **Re: Bending of light not well authenticated**
- Next by thread: **Re: Bending of light not well authenticated**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **Date**
 - ◆ **Thread**