

## Re: GPS 'GR Correction' Myth.

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-08/msg01054.html>

---

- *From:* "Androcles" <Androcles@ MyPlace.org>
  - *Date:* Fri, 12 Aug 2005 00:59:26 GMT
- 

: just testing.  
: Did this reach you?

Sure did.

"Henri Wilson" <H@..> wrote in message  
<news:bgqnf1h03hrtq9l6in9jpef4qqs7rl6kpo@xxxxxxxxxxx>  
| On Thu, 11 Aug 2005 11:50:45 GMT, "Androcles" <Androcles@ MyPlace.org>  
wrote:  
|  
|>  
|>"Henri Wilson" <H@..> wrote in message  
|><news:k57mf19b9k2n3hk117aiaur0idm4efgavc@xxxxxxxxxxx>  
|>| On Wed, 10 Aug 2005 23:52:15 GMT, "Androcles" <Androcles@  
MyPlace.org>  
|>wrote:  
|>|  
|>| I dont know how to program  $E = M - e \cdot \sin(E)$ .  
|>| It doesn't make much sense. Nor does it produce an ellipse.  
|>  
|>I posted it. You didn't read it.  
|>So that you understand it, go to the diagram at  
|>  
|><http://www.akiti.ca/KeplerEquation.html>  
|>  
|>Now, see the angles at E and M (badly hand-written), E at the centre  
and  
|>M at the focus, f.  
|>They are very different, right? M is greater than a right angle, E is  
|>less.  
|>The interval of TIME for the angle E is the same interval of TIME  
|>for the angle M.  
|>  
|>Because we want equal times, we compute E from M and  
|>that will give us the x-coordinate of P as semi-major-axis \* cos(E)

Re: GPS 'GR Correction' Myth.

```
|>and the y-coordinate as semi-minor-axis * sin(E) (near as makes
|>no difference, it isn't quite exact.)
|>
|>Private Sub Form_Kepler(M)
|>
|>R=0
|>E= M
|>While (abs(R-E) > 0.0001)
|> E=R
|> R = M - ecc*sin(E)
|> Wend
|>RETURN E.
|>End Sub
|
| Yes OK I get it.
|
| ....but my method is much better.
|
| It gives both peripheral speed and peripheral angle at each point.
These are
| both stored in 70000 element arrays. The whole process takes less than
a
| second.
|
| That makes it a lot easier to calculate radial velocity and to
incorporate yaw
| angle.
|
|>
|>
|>|>| Tha's is why he cannot understand that the two stars that make
up
|>the
|>|>binary
|>|>| HD87105 (or whatever) also almost cancel each other's brightness
|>|>variation
|>|>| curves.
|>|>
|>|>|>I know... That's why I programmed a single light source.
|>|>|>I could easily have programmed two sources but I wanted an
|>|>|>educational aid, not a simulation of a real system.
|>|>|>That's up to you and other students to do and get accolades for.
|>|>|>You might even win a Nobel prize. Hulse and Taylor did by
|>|>|>using GR and a pulsar, but you have no chance without Kepler's
|>|>|>equation, so program the ellipse correctly.
|>|>|> Do your fucking homework, quit teaching morons like bz
|>|>|>how to think and boasting how you proved Einstein wrong,
|>|>|>you did not.
|>|>|>I did.
|>|>
```

|> I did many times.... see my programs.  
|>  
|> >My work is all this newsgroup and has been since before you  
|> >arrived on the scene.  
|>  
|> have a beer A.  
|>  
|>  
|> >  
|> >You don't have to be, I'll help, as I'll help anyone.  
|> >  
|> >| The most useful thing I have ever done is prove Einstein wrong.  
|> >  
|> >You didn't.  
|> >Sagnac did, in 1913. I interpreted the data in 2005.  
|>  
|> Tell George Dishman about it then.  
|>  
|> >  
|> >There are others before me  
|> >[1] R.B. Driscoll, "Sagnac's Experiment Misdescribed," Galilean  
|> >Electrodynamics ..  
|> >  
|> >[2] Fox, J.G., Am J Phys, "Evidence Against Emission Theories,"  
33,  
|> >1-17, (1965)  
|> >  
|> >[3] J.P. Wesley, "The Sagnac Effect: Renshaw vs. Driscoll,"  
Galilean  
|> >Electrodynamics 8, 86 (1997)  
|> >  
|> >Not all want to claim accolades.  
|> >Some are interested in physics for it's own sake.  
|> >Quit messing with bz, he can't teach you anything, and do your  
|> >fucking  
|> >homework.  
|>  
|> Bob likes wasting our time. It is OK for him, he is at  
work....getting  
|> >paid.  
|>  
|> I produce beautiful ellipses A. You cannot deny that.  
|>  
|> >They are not ellipses, they are half spirals.  
|> A, you forgot that the force goes to zero at zero displacement then  
becomes  
|> >negative.

I don't have to worry about it.  $E = M - e \cdot \sin(E)$ . I don't need to use  
force.

My ellipses are centred at (0,0), have a fixed 1,000,000 pts, fill an

array

of 1000 to fit the screen, I could easily go to 100,000,000 pts if I wanted too, yours is only fast because you have a paltry 70k pts and you can't get the eccentricity as high as I can. I've got V1493Aql, you do not, It's my Rolls–Royce against your Ford, no contest.

| You let the object move from + displacement to – without integrating over very

| small time intervals so as to include the force changes.

| If you did, your computer would crash because you get a division by zero.

Not me. I don't have to worry about an angle being zero.

$$E = M - e \cdot \sin(E)$$

at 0,

$$0 = 0 - e \cdot \sin(0) = 0$$

at pi,

$$\pi = \pi - e \cdot \sin(\pi) = \pi - 0 = \pi$$

Right on the money!

Androcles

.

---

• **References:**

◆ **[Re: GPS 'GR Correction' Myth.](#)**

◇ *From:* Paul B. Andersen

◆ **[Re: GPS 'GR Correction' Myth.](#)**

◇ *From:* Androcles

◆ **[Re: GPS 'GR Correction' Myth.](#)**

◇ *From:* Androcles

◆ **[Re: GPS 'GR Correction' Myth.](#)**

◇ *From:* Androcles

- Prev by Date: **[Re: OWLS is not equal to c](#)**
- Next by Date: **[Teaching relativity simply](#)**
- Previous by thread: **[Re: GPS 'GR Correction' Myth.](#)**
- Next by thread: **[Re: GPS 'GR Correction' Myth.](#)**
- Index(es):
  - ◆ **[Date](#)**
  - ◆ **[Thread](#)**