

Re: Painful but inevitable resignation

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2004-12/0306.html>

From: Andr? Michaud (*srp_at_microtec.net*)

Date: 11/22/04

Date: 22 Nov 2004 09:14:19 -0800

greenfield_7@hotmail.com (Jim Greenfield) wrote in message
news:<3c4afb26.0411212334.7262d71f@posting.google.com>...
> *srp@microtec.net* (Andr? Michaud) wrote in message
news:<562f286c.0411200533.1572d05@posting.google.com>...
> > greenfield_7@hotmail.com (Jim Greenfield) wrote in message
news:<3c4afb26.0411191755.7e53b3cf@posting.google.com>...

So, we agree on the physical existence of the "present moment" (or
"now moment").

Great.

[snip]

> > *How to tell "objective" reality? Science collects data from deep space,
> > > and then subjects that data to ASSUMPTIONS, especially that c is
> > > unvariable. From that they build a model which is claimed to be
> > > objective, and a true picture of the universe, but if it has a built
> > > in bias?? (that light is NOT always c)*
> >
> > *This issue seems to have been pretty much ascertained. There remains
> > little doubt about the constancy of the speed of light. Too many
> > processes would not work properly if c was not constant, starting with
> > radar Doppler ranging.*
>
> *:-(Doppler can be (and often is) misunderstood. Whenever a change
> of frequency is observed, DHR's claim that as c is constant, the
> change is due to a change of wavelength, NOT a change in c. This
> unwarranted assumption is at the heart of the circular logic on which
> Relativity is based.*
> *Consider: if c alters due to source dependency, and wavelength stays
> the same, a Doppler effect will STILL be seen, but under present
> (wrong) assumption about light speed, the result is wrongly
> attributed (although still correct)*

There is far more than Doppler as evidence that all EM frequencies all
travel at precisely c in vacuum.

sci.physics: Re: Painful but inevitable resignation

But as I said, however unfortunate it is for the rate of progress that no one will reconsider from scratch any fundamental conclusion that he reached, I will bring no argument to bear. We all have the same data available to analyze.

[snip]

> > > *Does a blind man live forever, or not at all?*
> > > *How did science get so confused, just because an atom has a preferred
> > > speed for ejecting a photon?*
> >
> > *Even in the deepest night, at ambient temperature, electrons are excited
> > and de-excited in surrounding materials and emit photons. The numbers
> > however simply are below the sensitivity threshold of our eyes.*
> >
> > *So, this is not a real problem.*
>
> *But there are none of these "observers" slinking about, on who all
> seem to have to rely as to what is happening.*

Then, all of them have been relying on a delusion. Common sense is a better guide than subjective and arbitrary restrictions.

> > > > >
> > > > *May I ask you for being so fair to pass on my message to your students
> > > > in case you consider it serious but do not share it, just like one more
> > > > opinion?*
> > >
> > > *I suggest that it is so politically incorrect within science
> > > institutions to criticise AE, that any teaching to students along
> > > these lines will lead to a very short teaching tenure.*
> >
> > *You are absolutely right. That route is barred by peer pressure to
> > conform. Only orthodox views can be taught in formal institutions.*
> >
> > *All strays are quickly chastized to conform or they are out. For
> > the same reason, no paper not stemming from totally orthodox
> > foundations has been allowed into formal print since SR, GR and
> > QM set the "acceptable" orthodox foundation.*
> >
> > *Other means must be resorted to to spread coherent ideas that are
> > not mainstream. That's what I do.*
>
> *Carry on, and good luck!*

Thank you, but this is too important to have been left the whims of lady luck.

André Michaud