

Re: An Explanation of Dayton Miller's Anomalous "Ether Drift" Result

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2006-08/msg02518.html>

- *From:* "Harry" <harald.vanlintel@xxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 30 Aug 2006 16:45:43 +0200
-

<rambus2005@xxxxxxxx> wrote in message
<news:1156946546.406267.45090@xx>

Harry wrote:

<rambus2005@xxxxxxxx> wrote in message
<news:1156865657.413616.104270@xx>

Tom Roberts wrote:

Harry wrote:

According to Munera in a
later, refined publication,
the signal

can

even

change considerably in the
time of making one turn.

Reference, please. I see no such preprint on
arXiv.org.

Are you are thinking of this:
H.Munera, "Michelson–Morley Experiments
Revisited: Systematic
Errors,
Consistency Among Different Experiments,
and Compatibility with
Absolute Space", APEIRON Vol. 5 Nr. 1–2,
January–April 1998 Page

37.

If so, he completely ignores the enormous systematic drift, and

makes

several incorrect statements about variation over time of the signal (including the claim it varies during a single turn).

As I point out in footnote 7 on page 6, the rotation of the earth introduces a negligible variation in the orientation of the

apparatus

during a run.

Munera is wrong. Munera claimed to consider "systematic errors" but ignored the systematic drift, which generates errorbars vastly

larger

than the tiny effects he considered. And he did not understand the

flaws

in Miller's analysis algorithm.

I tried to send H. Munera an email pointing out my paper, with the

hope

he would look at it and comment, but all attempts bounced.

Tom Roberts

Here is a later Munera "masterpiece"

<http://www.ensmp.fr/aflb/AFLB-272/aflb272p463.pdf>

Re: An Explanation of Dayton Miller's Anomalous "Ether Drift" Result

...a regurgitation of the earlier Apeiron publication. BTW, Apeiron is another one of the fringe journals, with a clear antirelativistic twist. It publishes mostly garbage rejected elsewhere.

Thanks for the direct reference to an article that Tom asked me for! But

I

have not seen that one published in Apeiron; instead, this was apparently an

invited paper for a special edition of AFLB (challenging mainstream, in honour of de Brogli).

Thus your diversion attempt is noticed. How would you describe the

Annales

de la Fondation Louis de Brogli?

Harald

Diversion? What the hell are you talking about? This is your "thank you" for trying to help you out?

Not me, but Tom. I already had a copy of that paper. And "Thanks" does indeed mean "thank you"!

About diversion: weirdly enough you did not comment on the journal in which it appeared, but on another journal.

Annales de la Fondation de Louis de BrogliE apparently allowed a kook thru the referee system, it happens all the time, look at the Consoli paper, it went thru Phys.Rev.Letters A, a much more reputable publication than the now defunct "Annales".

Apparently we agree that AFLB is not a kook journal.

Harald

.