

Re: FAREWELL TO PHYSICS

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2006-08/msg01350.html>

- *From:* The Ghost In The Machine <ewill@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 13 Aug 2006 20:00:04 GMT
-

In sci.physics.relativity, Sorcerer
<Headmaster@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote
on Sun, 13 Aug 2006 18:38:46 GMT
<[WkKDg.89739\\$F8.43099@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:WkKDg.89739$F8.43099@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>:

"The Ghost In The Machine" <ewill@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:skv3r3-6h4.ln1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

| In sci.physics.relativity, Sorcerer
| <Headmaster@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
| wrote
| on Sun, 13 Aug 2006 13:30:03 GMT
| <[vPFDg.40627\\$Ca.26252@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:vPFDg.40627$Ca.26252@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>:
| >

| > "The Ghost In The Machine" <ewill@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in
| message

| > news:ap82r3-vcn.ln1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

| > | In sci.physics.relativity, Sorcerer
| > | <Headmaster@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
| > | wrote
| > | on Sat, 12 Aug 2006 16:42:52 GMT
| > | <[gynDg.82039\\$9d4.41886@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:gynDg.82039$9d4.41886@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>:
| > | >

| > | > "The Ghost In The Machine" <ewill@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in
| > message

| > | > news:g391r3-nln.ln1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

| > | > | In sci.physics.relativity, Sorcerer
| > | > | <Headmaster@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
| > | > | wrote
| > | > | on Sat, 12 Aug 2006 09:42:40 GMT
| > | > | <[kohDg.81167\\$9d4.40226@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:kohDg.81167$9d4.40226@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>:
| > | > | >

| > | > | > "Dirk Van de moortel"
<dirkvandemoortel@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

| > | > | > wrote
| > | > | > in message [news:jugDg.17433\\$i64.421939@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:jugDg.17433$i64.421939@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

| > | > | > >
| > | > | > [anip]

Re: FAREWELL TO PHYSICS

|> |> |>
|> |> |> x' versus xi?
|> |> |> Androcles
|> |> |
|> |> | Since $c = 0$, most of the rest of Einstein's logic is moot. We'll
just
|> |> | have to go back to caveman physics.
|> |>
|> |> You have that wrong, troglodyte, $c = 0/0$,
|> |
|> | Wrong. $c = 0$. $c = (AB+BA)/(t'-t)$; since $t'-t$ is nonzero and $AB+BA$ is
|> | zero, $c = 0$.
|> |
|> | Or hadn't *that* occurred to you?
|>
|> | It takes no time to travel from A to A, why do you say it is nonzero?
|
| If it takes 0 time to travel from A to A why do they consistently
| measure nonzero? There are a fair number of instruments which
| use lasers to measure distances. There's even a patent:
|
| <http://www.freepatentsonline.com/5054911.html>
|

We are not discussing reality here, we are discussing a math model
that is flawed.

Not a math model, a physics model. But it is flawed, yes, by your
logic.

There is no connection between the speed of light
and Einstein's 'c'. They are completely unrelated.

"We have not defined a common ``time" for A and B, for the latter
cannot be defined at all unless we establish by definition that the
``time" required by a TURTLE to travel from A to B equals the
``time" it requires to travel from B to A, BECAUSE I SAY SO.

|>
|> |> If you want to be pedantic as I know you do, be consistently pedantic.
|>
|>
|>
|>
|> |> Einstein had no logic and neither do you. The dynamics of a variable
|> |> speed
|> |> of light is far more interesting than Einstein's fairy tales or

Re: FAREWELL TO PHYSICS

Dork's

|> |> misconceptions about the before and after length of a "Lorentz"
 |> contracted cuckoo's egg.
 |> |
 |> | True enough. So...what is the distance of Algol, and the orbital
 |> | periods of its components? Bear in mind SR gives the *wrong* answer
 |> | to this question (since SR is obviously wrong).
 |>
 |>
 |> I wish I knew, but unfortunately I can't solve two simultaneous equations
 in
 |> three variables.
 |> $ax+by +cz = 0$
 |> $dx + ey + fz = 0$
 |
 | One can solve it up to a parameterization variable, in
 | the general case.
 |
 | $ax+by+cz=0$
 | $dx+ey+fz=0$
 |
 | yields
 |
 | $(af-dc)x+(bf-ec)y=0$
 | $y = (af-dc)x/(ec-bf)$
 | $(ae-db)x+(cd-fb)z=0$
 | $z = (ae-db)x/(fb-cd)$
 |
 | so, given a value for x, one can find y and z.

You don't have a value for x.

So pick one. I did say "given a value for x". If one picks $x = 0$, one gets $y=0$ and $z=0$. If one picks $x = 1$, one gets $y=(af-dc)/(ec-bf)$ and $z=(ae-db)/(fb-cd)$. If one picks $x = 2$, well, you figure it out.

|>
 |> Here's the problem:
 |> Imagine light from apastron reaches us at the same instant as light from
 |> peristrion with the orbit edge-on at distance d.
 |>
 |> Now we move the system to a distance 2d and tilt it 60 degrees.
 |> Light will now travel toward us at $c+ v.\cos(60) = c+ v/2$, and light from
 |> apastron still reaches us at the same instant as light from peristrion.
 |>
 |> Same again for 4d and a tilt of 75.5 degrees, $\cos 75.5 = 0.25$.
 |
 | In this case the parameterization variable appears to be the tilt of the

Re: FAREWELL TO PHYSICS

| orbit relative to Earth.

That's what we don't know, but for ALL cepheids it will be more than 85 degrees and for most it will be more than 89 degrees.

| >
| > the SHAPE of the light curve is unchanged, so we have to fall back
| > on the inverse square law and estimate distance from magnitude.
| > So when Henrietta Swan Leavitt discovered empirically that cepheids
| > were "standard candles" for distance, she was absolutely correct.
| > However, we CAN find the tilt if we know the tangential velocity v.
| > To get that, we need the period and the orbital path length, and
| > to find that we need the semi major axis. We know the period, we even
| > know $v \cdot \cos(\phi)$ the velocity from doppler, but not much else.
| > Period, major axis and distance form the sides of a similar triangle.
| > That's Androcles's law.
| > <http://tinyurl.com/rv9z4>
|
| Interesting. What about the frequency and/or wavelength shift?

$f' = f \cdot [c + v \cdot \cos(\phi)] / c$
If we knew phi we would know v.

And how does one figure out phi? Any ideas?

I've got one but it requires measurement of the spectra of the stars involved, and an assumption of constant light speed. This obviously won't work for you.

Mercury orbits the sun in 88 days, Venus in 225 days, Earth in 365 days.
Mercury zips along at 47 km/s, Earth at 18.5 km/sec.
The closer you are to the sun, the faster you go.

Whatever is in orbit around Algol gets around it in 3 days, so it has to be close and DAMNED fast.
If it is a ball of gas, a star, even a dark star, it will be ripped apart by tides.

And it is. The one star is ripping the other one apart, swallowing its gas, according to conventional cosmology. (In H. Wilson's theory a WCH object, which is apparently generally transparent to infrared, is orbiting a single star. The only one who takes this particular variant seriously is Henri, of course.)

Re: FAREWELL TO PHYSICS

Fluids go easily.

<http://www.asterism.org/tutorials/tut25-1.htm>

So whatever it is, it is solid. Now, the only dispute between the classical model and the $c+v$ model is the tilt of the orbit.

I say it is almost face on, Goodricke says it is edge on.

<http://www.surveyor.in-berlin.de/himmel/Bios/Goodricke-e.html>

We agree on the period.

Goodricke wants the orbit edge-on and eclipsing but the eclipse lasts for 10 hours out of the 70, or for 52 degrees of the 360, so the pair MUST be closer than shown.

Now, it is NOT eccentric.

<http://www.androcles01.pwp.blueyonder.co.uk/Eccentric.gif>

because the timing is wrong between primary and secondary minima.

So it is a circular orbit.

<http://www.androcles01.pwp.blueyonder.co.uk/AlgolOrbit.gif>

If the orbit is close, there should be an ENORMOUS shift from a high velocity, in the 100s of km/sec, but we don't see that.

So the conclusion is that the orbit is seen face on, and the 10 hours in 70 hours CANNOT be an eclipse.

So all that is left is the speed of light in space is source dependent and arrives at $c+v$. This I modeled, and I agree with the data.

Low velocity in out direction, low shift, 52 degrees of "Eclipse" that isn't an eclipse. Goodricke guessed wrong.

Einstein believed him, deSitter believed him, I do not, it jibes with the data.

The Tusselad, a pig ignorant relativist, says this:

"But the two stars of Algol have different mass, radius and density, and the B8 is well outside of the Roche limit of the K2, while the K2 is just at the Roche limit of the B8. That is, the K2 fills its Roche lobe completely, and mass is transferred to the B8. So the K2 IS torn apart and there is an accretion disk around the B8 akin to the rings of Saturn. (This accretion disk is not stable, though. It is a transient disk; the mass transferred from the K2 bounces off the surface of the B8 and eventually falls back to the surface.) "

That, my friend, is a line of contradictory bullshit, Algol has been

observed for thousands of years. I'm sure you've seen just how

close Saturns rings are to Saturn, they are not about to clump together to become

a moon again.

I've named my planet "Androcles". I found it, I can do that.

Re: FAREWELL TO PHYSICS

That you can, once the data's been reviewed properly. Is it transparent in the infrared as well?

| > The shape of the triangle doesn't change, so distances can be found
| > from period and the shape of light curves. This is a considerable
| > amount of work which I have not undertaken, I felt it more important
| > to enlist aid and to convince at least one other person that Einstein
| > was a fraud and a crock of shit, impeding progress in astronomy
| > and particle physics to the detriment of science, to promote his own
| > personal gain.
| > I say enlist aid... I don't need the aid of shitheads, I seek genuine
| > philosophers interested in Nature that I can debate reasonably with.
| > Baez and Roberts are most definitely shitheads.
| > Androcles.
|
|
| --
| #191, ewill3@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx
| Windows Vista. Because it's time to refresh your hardware. Trust us.

--
#191, ewill3@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx
Windows Vista. Because it's time to refresh your hardware. Trust us.