

Re: LIGO.

Re: LIGO.

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2007-02/msg00930.html>

- *From:* cliff wright <c.c.wright@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 12 Feb 2007 16:40:49 +1300
-

Martin Hogbin wrote:

"cliff wright" <c.c.wright@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message [news:45cdc049\\$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](news:45cdc049$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

Martin Hogbin wrote:

"cliff wright" <c.c.wright@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message [news:45cd6bab\\$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](news:45cd6bab$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

Well this is all very interesting but we still appear to have a non functional, very expensive apparatus here!

Not yet functional! You have not responded to my latest post about our bet. I want to place a serious bet. We need to agree some basis on which the winner is decided otherwise it could end up as an argument as to who has won. I will not pay up unless I am sure that you would have paid up had you lost.

Do you want to place a serious bet or shall we call it off?

Michelson and Morley used an old cellar and a relatively simple optical interferometer, in fact they had to cut their programme short because someone else needed the cellar. Perhaps, it being in Dublin, a Guinness

Re: LIGO.

Re: LIGO.

delivery was expected.

Strange, I always thought that Semantics were to do with the meaning of language, but I suppose that mathematicians are running out of names for ever more abstruse calculations and logical operations.

None of this however more than partially answers my original quest