

Re: "Mike" and the circular logic

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2006-11/msg01207.html>

- *From:* "Dirk Van de moortel" <dirkvandemoortel@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 15 Nov 2006 15:36:53 GMT
-

<karandash2000@xxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:1163604653.648738.268790@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Mike wrote:

The proper way to do it is determine the minimum time light must cover a given distance so that your measurements are significant. Thus, you must vary the distance until you determine that there is no more variation in k . This is a difficult experiment nobody has done. The reason that is difficult is that nobody knows when local variations end and global variation begin. You may need 1 Km and you will not be able to do the experiment. The truth of the way the universe works conceals itself so that stupid people like you always get the results they expect.

Mike

Drolly (drooly?) –Trolly
Here is a recap of your fumbles:

1. You asked for experiments that test $c+kv$, you got a list of about 10.
2. Then, you tried a ploy about $k=k(v)$, you got the answer.
3. You then tried the ploy that v is not large enough, and that was foiled (Alveger is at $0.99975c$).
4. You mumbled and bungled something about not being able to match the delays to the emitter and receiver, that only proved that you don't understand simple delay matching and the fact that the respective delays do not play any role in the experiment.
5. Then you said that the distance between emitter and receiver is a function of c . It was pointed out to you that :
 - Alveger did not use c in the definition of s
 - THIS IS A BIG ONE: even if one used c to measure s , there is a significant difference, the " c " used in measuring s comes from a lab comoving source (do you know what that is?), so there is no dependence

Re: "Mike" and the circular logic

of any "v" , so that your above argument is screwed. What Alveger and other measured is the alleged $c+kv$ coming from a lac MOVING source 6. In the above posting you did a GO TO 2 (like in the old days of Fortran), so your circular logic is complete.

Next last ditch squirm. And try to put in some of your fumbling "calculations". You are so much more drol when you "calculate". Remember, in order to have a valid refutation you need to produce calculations.

You mean those things like

<http://users.telenet.be/vdmoortel/dirk/Physics/Fumbles/BrainHoles.html>

?

Dirk Vdm