Re: SR theory is simplistic

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2007−03/msg00661.html

- *From*: "PD" <TheDraperFamily@xxxxxxxxx>
- *Date*: 7 Mar 2007 13:57:20 −0800

On Mar 7, 3:29 pm, HW@....(Henri Wilson) wrote:

> On 7 Mar 2007 06:27:06 −0800, "PD" <TheDraperFam...@xxxxxxxxx> wrote:
>
> > This was settled a century ago.
> > The − basically same − faulty calculation
> > pops up every
> > now and then, "proving" that you can have
> > fully dragged
> > ether AND stellar aberration.
> > IIRC, you presented such a wrong derivation
> > some time ago.
> >
> > Paul
>
> A very likely scenario is that local EM frames of reference
> surround every
> significant mass. The Earth has one, the whole solar system
> has another, the
> MMX apparutus had its own such frame...and so does a
> particle accelerator.

Lovely. Let's see if we can piece this together. You've said that a frame of reference is all those objects that are stationary with respect to a defined point. So the whole solar system has a "local EM frame of reference" but it doesn't include the Earth, because the Earth is not at rest with respect to the solar system. So the "local EM frame of reference" corresponding to the whole solar system has to exclude the "local EM frame of reference" that contains the Earth. Pray tell, where is the boundary between the whole solar system local EM frame of reference and the earth local EM frame of reference?

> Draper, the concept of 'frames' is obviously much too hard for you.
> You really should give up physics.

Well, since you can't answer a simple question about YOUR notion of "local EM frames of reference", one has to wonder about how hard it is for you, too, Henri.

> These 'frames vary in strength.
> The Earth also has an atmosphere that acts very much like an 'aether'.

> One thing is certain, light moves initially at c wrt its source and at c+v wrt
> the remote observer.

> > How certain is it? Perhaps you could come up with a calculated (or simulated) deviation from what's from invariant c for the case of the highly elliptical orbit of Halley's comet. Since the light on approach is coming faster than c, then it should appear further ahead of the position expected from light traveling at c.

> Hahahahahohohohohho! ..yet another Draperian blunder....

Really? Perhaps you could point out the blunder.
Tell me, Henri, suppose you have a gun approaching you and it emits bullets at two different firings, and one of those bullets has speed c +v and the other has speed c, and it so happens that they both arrive at the target at the same time. From this, which bullet was fired first and which one was fired second? Can you figure out this simple puzzle?

> Have another go Draper....

> > Likewise, since the light
> > on recession is coming slower than c, then it should appear further behind the position expected from light traveling at c. I'm sure you can calculate this expected deviation and compare it to measured

> positions. In fact, you should be able to do that for just about every
> comet in our systems. And since you claim there is a "local EM frame"
> associated with the solar system, there shouldn't be must effect due
> to convergence to c, should there?

> Positions of comets are not where we see them. We see the Willusion based on a
> varying c+v. Astronomers use a constant c...end get the orbits wrong.
> ...So when astronomers predict that a certain comet will miss planet Earth,
> they could easily be very wrong.

Ah, very good, and so when we predict where the comet should be seen next month, based on where it was two months ago, using Newtonian mechanics and assuming a constant speed of propagation of light c, we will obviously be making a mistake and it won't end up where we think it will be, because the speed of propagation ISN'T c, it's c+v. And so you should be able to tell us how far off that prediction should be. Unless of course, both the constant speed of propagation AND Newtonian mechanics is wrong, and comets proceed by dynamics other than what Newtonian mechanics predicts. What say you, Ralph? Where's your numbers?

> Empty space, below the Wilson Field Density Threshold
> progressively loses all
> 'aetherlike' properties as the proportion of space occupied by
> 'Wilson
> Nort−holes' increases.

> And what are the laws that govern electromagnetic fields in a "Wilson
> Nort−hole"?

> Nort−holes are regions completely devoid of fields. Fields are quantized and
> cannot go to 1/infinity. They everntually become fragmented.

Fragmented into what?

So let's see, you have little holes in space which are *defined* to be the places where nothing is, even fields. And you don't know what the laws of physics are in those "Wilson Nort−holes" are, and the second you try to learn anything about them by, say, observing a particle or a field in them, they disappear because they are no longer empty by definition. Sounds like a Wilson Nort−Hole is a close relative to the leprechaun's pot of gold at the bottom of a rainbow.

Superb physics, that!
I think it would be good if you could also turn your physics attention
to the density of pin−dwelling angels.

PD

.