

## Re: Cahill on the speed of light (& Einstein)

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2006-06/msg00328.html>

---

- *From:* "Mike" <eleatis@xxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* 4 Jun 2006 17:26:32 -0700
- 

Tom Roberts wrote:

Mike wrote:

Tom Roberts wrote:

the "signal" in just about all of these experiments is proportional to their resolution or errorbars. So the older ones have bigger "signals". He simply does not understand that a statistically insignificant "signal" is useless and a figment of his imagination.

If that is the case, the older ones have lower signals.

Not true. Older experiments with resolutions about 7 km/s are ascribed a "signal" about 7 km/s; later experiments with better resolutions are ascribed smaller signals. And he dismisses modern experiments with resolutions well under 1 m/s. Modern repetitions of the MMX show no significant variation with orientation at the few parts in  $10^{17}$  level.

Can you give a reference to "modern repetitions" of the MMX? The LIGO dipole detected a definite absolute motion speed of about 365 Km/s. This is not modern?

Once the importance of errorbars is recognized and their value computed, ALL of these experiments are seen to be consistent with the null result predicted by SR.

Tell me something. let's say a car is moving at 30 Km/hr. You try to measure the speed by marking two lines on the road pavement 8.3333 m

Re: Cahill on the speed of light (& Einstein)

apart and you have a clock that counts only seconds, not less. Your resolution is  $8.333 \text{ m/s} = 30 \text{ Km/hr}$ .

Does that mean the car is not moving if you measure it's speed to be 30 Km/s?

No, it means that it may be going slower or faster. Not that it is not moving.

Drawing the conclusion that something does not move just because it's speed falls within the range of the resolution of the measuring device is the biggest blunder one can make.

Then, in this example, the measuring device was calibrated in advance. What is the calibration fa