Re: OWLS Without Absolute Synchronization

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2006−09/msg00018.html

- *From*: "Sorcerer" <Headmaster@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
- *Date*: Thu, 31 Aug 2006 22:49:56 GMT

"Henri Wilson" <HW@..> wrote in message
news:tdkef2db6oa59jdtr3baj3rnl4s0phm37v@xxxxxxxxxx
| On Thu, 31 Aug 2006 08:10:12 GMT, "Sorcerer"
<Headmaster@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
| wrote:
|
| >
| >"Henri Wilson" <HW@..> wrote in message
| >news:v34cf218cgjsmh7hlhpllg38mnmhini0gt@xxxxxxxxxx
|
| >| >| >| Why go to all this trouble? You are bound to get the answer: OWLS
=
| >| >'c'.
| >| >| >
| >| >| >Nah... TWLS = c, OWLS = speed of light.
| >| >|
| >| >| I know that...you silly old pom...
| >| >
| >| >You confuse 'speed of light' with 'c', daft old wabo.
| >|
| >| Neither the 'speed of light' nor the 'speed of anything' exists in
| >physics.
| >| Speed exists only relative to another object.
| >
| >
| >Yep.
| >
| >|
| >| There is every indication that 'c' is the speed of light wrt its source
| >| (although that has never been directly proved).
| >
| >c is the speed from A to A in time t'A−tA relative to A,
| >and is 0/0 millimetres/year,
| >u is the speed from A to B relative to A in time t,
| >and is 300,000 km/sec.
| >Speed exists only relative to another object and NEVER reverses
direction.
| >

| >You are jealous because I found Einstein's first real blunder before you
| >did.
|
| Nah!
| I'm smug because I know that not all integrals around closed loops equal
zero.

That's dodging the issue. The integral of dx/dt .dt from A to B equals
the integral of dx/dt.dt from B to A and the sum is zero, so you can
wipe that smug grin off your face, Ritz said so.

You are jealous because I found Einstein's first real blunder before you
did.

| >| >They are different animals, one is a measurable scientific quantity,
| >| >the other is a mathematical fuckup Einstein made.
| >|
| >| 'c' is a universal constant.
| >
| >Constants do not reverse direction.
| >c = 0/0 millimetres/year in all inertial frames of reference.
| >u = 300,000 km/sec relative to the source.
|
| Gord! another engineer gone bad!

Nah, I'm still sane. You are jealous because I found Einstein's
first real blunder before you did.

|
| >| It has the dimension of velocity.
| >
| >No such animal, the only dimensions in physics are mass, length and time.
|
| All physical quantities have dimensions. So do many constants.
| Velocity has dimension L/T.

That's two dimensions, L and T, silly old wabo. Obviously
you've never heard of dimensional analysis, invented for dumb
physicists to check their work.

|
| >| ..and yes, becasue of the red Einsteinian herring, nobody has bothered
to
| >| enquire as to why light leaves its source at 'c'.
| >
| >

| >It doesn't, it leaves at 'u'.
| >'c' means it returns to the source after reflection.
|
| ...this I cannot follow....

Why, do you object to me calling the speed of light 'u'?
Einstein used to call it Geschwindigkeit 'V'.

"daß sich das Licht im leeren Raume stets mit einer bestimmten, vm
Bewegungszustande des emittierenden Körpers unabhängigen Geschwindigkeit V
fortpflanze."

but he got his Corpses mixed up with Bodies.
'c' is Einstein's fake velocity of light, 'u' is Androcles' real velocity of
light.

Anyway, since 'V' has been dropped, let's that instead.

|
| >| >| There's no fucking mirror...you silly old pom...
| >| >
| >| >Oh, I thought you said Ritz said there was, daft old abo.
| >|
| >| I didn't.
| >
| >Yes you did. You said on 08 January 2006 at 20:58
| >" Do you thing it will pass customs? TWLS = 2AB/(t'A−tA) = OWLS = c,
| > in any one frame. Ritz said so." −− Henri Wilson.
| >
| >It didn't pass customs because you welched on a bet, but it is
| >ok to bring it back in since all duties have already been paid
| >and there has to be a mirror for TWLS to be equal to OWLS,
| >Ritz said so.
|
| Yes...and the mirror must be at rest wrt the source and detector....

What, the GPS receiver mirror? Nah, people carry them
around in cars, they still work. No need to stop the car.
We engineers have it figured out, we don't care what you dumb
physicists say.
I had a girlfriend who used mine to check her makeup.
No, wait, that was my rear view mirror, I had to reset it.

|
| >| It is possible to monitor the RATES of GPS clocks, simply by checking
| >their
| >| readings every time they complete one of their own orbits. The relative
| >orbit

| >| periods of all GPS clocks can also be accurately ascertained. Clock
| >readings
| >| are monitored at many check points around the Earth. However this might
be
| >| classed as a two way exercise since the orbit must be known very
| >accurately for
| >| these reading to be taken seriously.
| >|
| >| GPS signals travel in one direction at c+v wrt the observer.
| >
| >They can't do.
| >c = 2AB/(t'A−tA), Ritz said so, Einstein said so, Wilson said so.
| >You need a mirror at every GPS receiver to work out tB = (t'A−tA)/2,
| >Ritz said so.
|
| .....have a good night's sleep then start again, A.

Nah, I had a nap this afternoon, Ritz said so.

| >| Because they are
| >| so far away, the v part is usually pretty small, but it's enough to put
| >| Einstein out of business if the establishment will recognize that it
| >exists.
| >
| >The vertical accuracy of GPS is +/− 23 metres.
|
| ..one can find all kinds of quoted figures.
| believe them if you wish...
|
| >| GPS clocks don't need mirrors.
| >
| >Of course they do. The time at the receiver has to be known,
| >doesn't it?
|
| That is the whole point of using accurate and stable clocks.

The receiver has an accurate and stable clock? I thought
it had a quartz crystal...

|
|
| >| >
| >| >
| >| >GPS is easy. It uses OWLS, it is mathematics that is beyond daft
| >| >old wabos who insist c = 2AA/(t'A−tA) (B = A).
| >| >See, signal from satellite to receiver, ONE WAY.
| >| >Daft old wabos say it has to be TWO WAY.
| >|
| >| The satellite and Earth observer are not in the same frame.... you
silly

| >old
| >| pom....so that doesn't apply at all.
| >
| >We still have to know tB, we get that from tB = (t'A−tA)/2.
| >You need a mirror for that. Then we can work out the distance.
| >
| >" Do you thing it will pass customs? TWLS = 2AB/(t'A−tA) = OWLS = c,
| > in any one frame. Ritz said so." −− Henri Wilson.
| >
| >See? TWLS = OWLS, Ritz said so.
|
| Neither Ritz nor I said anything of the kind.

It's on the line above, mate. You wrote it alright.
You are just jealous because I found Einstein's first real blunder
before you did, but that does take an engineer, of course.

|
| >| In any TWLS experiment where the mirror
| >
| >There you go, GPS receivers need mirrors.
|
| stop raving..

You are jealous because I found Einstein's first real blunder
before you did.

| > and source are mutually at rest,
| >(ie.,
| >| in the same frame) OWLS = TWLS = c. That is a direct prediction of the
| >| BaTh...but probably too hard for a pommie engineer..
| >
| >Nah... I fully understand now.. GPS receivers need mirrors, Ritz said so.
|
| piss off, pommie engineer.....

Nah... you still owe me 3 cases of quality whisky.

|
| >| >Daft old wabo, the satellite takes 6 hours to cross the sky, 12 hours
| >orbit,
| >| >v is negligible.
| >|
| >| Is 4.6E−10 negligible too?
| >
| >Sure, since GPS is no better than 100 nanoseconds.
| >Tusselad was forced to agree, I rammed it down his throat.

|
| Good. That's one useful thing you have done.

I can whip him with 10,000,000 neurons tied behind my back,
he's only got one.

|
|
| >| >It's only a sketch, the experiment can be repeated on the
| >| >other side of the Earth.
| >|
| >| It might work.. but it depends on very accurate positioning. You have
to
| >know
| >| exactly when and where the signals are transmitted.
| >
| >The ISS flies well below the GPS constellation, so does HST.
| >All it takes is a laser on ISS, Hubble to see the reflection and
| >a spreadsheet.
| >
| >|
| >| Let's do the maths.
| >| Maximum satellite orbital speed relative to the ground is about 8000
| >m/s....or
| >| say, 0.000027c
| >|
| >| siganls take about 2.6 secs to moon and back.
| >|
| >| ...so the difference in times would be around 0.000150 secs.
| >|
| >| CMIIW.
| >|
| >| In that time the satellite will move 1.2 metres.
| >| You have to know its position to much better than 1.2 metres.
| >| CMIIW.
| >
| >You are fucking hopeless at simple arithmetic.
| >ISS moves a 17,000 mph, 4.7 miles/second, or after 2.6 seconds,
| >12.25 MILES. GPS is much better than that. I'll agree to 8 km/sec,
| >your figure, 8 km/s* 2.6 sec= 20.8 km. How the fuck did you
| >come up with 1.2 metres? Too much red plonk has fucked
| >your neuron. You'll never make it as a engineer.
|
| You're fucking hopeless today....
|
| The maximum speed of an Earth satellite is ~8 km/s.

Ok, so that's −8 km/s * 2.6 seconds = ~20.8 km, not 1.2 metres.
You failed first grade and that's why you became a physicist, right?

Does an engineer know why?
|
| The kind of time difference you are looking at is the total travel time
(2.6
| secs) times 2v/c.

c has fuck all to do with it, Einstein. The time difference is 2.6 seconds,
a daft old wabo said so.

|
| >| >| >This can be done TODAY, no need to visit the moon.
| >| >| >You are not practical, H. It takes an engineer.
| >| >|
| >| >| Fuck engineers. There wouldn't be ANY if physicists hadn't shown
them
| >how.
| >| >
| >| >
| >| >An engineer designed the wheel and the roads to run them on,
| >| >a chemist designed fire to propel them.
| >| >It took a physicist to design the club to beat you over the head with.
| >|
| >| Nah, an engineer might have stumbled across the wheel but it took a
| >physicist
| >| to invent the other three.
| >
| >Fire is chemistry.
|
| ....the other three WHEELS.... you silly old pom.
|
| What's the good of having ONE wheel?

One wheel is very useful.
The rolling log was thought of before the pony and trap, the
engineer could only get them one at a time, he had to steal
the physicist's club. No physicist would think of that, he'd
have to write a theory on paper and apply for a patent while
the engineers put up Stonehenge and the Pyramids. By then
the patent was rejected, it was already in the public domain.

| >The first club was designed by a physicist to beat a woman
| >with because his hormones were out of control and so she burnt
| >the fucking thing, handed him a bow and arrow and a fishing rod
| >her engineer lover had given her and told him to go walkabout
| >and find food if he wanted nooky. Women are even smarter than
| >engineers, physicists have no chance as evolution has shown.
|
| Fucking bullshit!

Yep. Engineers can even out−bullshit physicists as well.
We win, you lose.
ROFL!
Androcles

.