

Re: "The Observational Collapse of Einsteinian Physics"

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2005-09/msg02082.html>

- *From:* The Ghost In The Machine <ewill@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 26 Sep 2005 03:00:06 GMT
-

In sci.physics, Androcles

<Androcles@xxxxxxxxxxxx>

wrote

on Sun, 25 Sep 2005 23:26:52 GMT

<[0nGZe.5933\\$Am6.241@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:0nGZe.5933$Am6.241@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>:

>

> "The Ghost In The Machine" <ewill@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in

> message news:onli03-ln1.ln1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

> | In sci.physics, Androcles

> | <Androcles@xxxxxxxxxxxx>

> | wrote

> | on Sun, 25 Sep 2005 07:20:47 GMT

> | <[jdsZe.6909\\$I1.6818@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:jdsZe.6909$I1.6818@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>:

> | >

> | > "The Ghost In The Machine" <ewill@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in

> | > message news:r05h03-i3k.ln1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

> | > | In sci.physics, Androcles

> | > | <Androcles@xxxxxxxxxxxx>

> | > | wrote

> | > | on Sat, 24 Sep 2005 20:28:10 GMT

> | > | <[uFiZe.3809\\$f16.3796@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:uFiZe.3809$f16.3796@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>:

> | > | >

> | > | > "The Ghost In The Machine" <ewill@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote

> | > | > in

> | > | > message news:4lag03-dmg.ln1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

> | > | > | In sci.physics, Androcles

> | > | > | <Androcles@xxxxxxxxxxxx>

> | > | > | wrote

> | > | > | on Sat, 24 Sep 2005 01:17:22 GMT

> | > | > | <[CO1Ze.1780\\$I1.1632@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:CO1Ze.1780$I1.1632@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>:

> | > | > | >

> | > | > | > "The Ghost In The Machine" <ewill@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

> | > | > | > wrote

> | > | > | > in

> | > | > | > message news:mkee03-pkn.ln1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

> | > | > | > | In sci.physics, Ypoc

> | > | > | > | <ypoc@xxxxxxx>

> | > | > | > | wrote

Re: "The Observational Collapse of Einsteinian Physics"

>|>|>|>| on Fri, 23 Sep 2005 11:10:24 -0400
>|>|>|>| <ba2b1\$43341ae9\$d8080eaa\$12893@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>:
>|>|>|>|> "The Observational Collapse of Einsteinian Physics"
>|>|>|>|>
>|>|>|>| [rest snipped]
>|>|>|>|>
>|>|>|>| You're still not fooling anyone, you know.
>|>|>|>|>
>|>|>|>| $x_A = (x_O - v * t_O) / \sqrt{1-v^2/c^2}$
>|>|>|>| $t_A = (t_O - v * x_O/c^2) / \sqrt{1-v^2/c^2}$
>|>|>|>|>
>|>|>|>| You are still not fooling anyone, you know.
>|>|>|>|>
>|>|>|>| [quote]
>|>|>|>|> we establish by definition that the "time" required by a
>|>|>|>|> turtle
>|>|>|>|> to
>|>|>|>|> travel
>|>|>|>|> from A to B equals the "time" it requires to travel from B
>|>|>|>|> to
>|>|>|>|> A.
>|>|>|>|> [end quote]
>|>|>|>|> Ref: <http://www.fourmilab.ch/etexts/einstein/specrel/www/>
>|>|>|>|>|
>|>|>|>|> Correct, the times are *NOT EQUAL*. At least in SR.
>|>|>|>|>|>
>|>|>|>|> Phuckwit. Of course the times are equal in SR, but SR is crap.
>|>|>|>|> You are still not fooling anyone, you know.
>|>|>|>|>|
>|>|>|>|> The times are not equal in SR, either.
>|>|>|>|>|>
>|>|>|>|> Yes they are, $2AB/(t'_A - t_A) = c$ in SR.
>|>|>|>|> It's not my fault you don't know SR.
>|>|>|>|> You are still not fooling anyone, you know.
>|>|>|>|>|
>|>|>|>|> OK.
>|>|>|>|>|>
>|>|>|>|>|>
>|>|>|>|>|>
>|>|>|>|>|>
>|>|>|>|>|> And no, I can't fool you.
>|>|>|>|>|>|>
>|>|>|>|>|> That's right, you can't.
>|>|>|>|>|>|>
>|>|>|>|>|> Disprove you, maybe,
>|>|>|>|>|>|>
>|>|>|>|>|> You can't do that either, you don't even know SR.
>|>|>|>|>|> You are still not fooling anyone, you know.
>|>|>|>|>|>|>
>|>|>|>|>|> It doesn't matter. You have disproven SR with a masterful stroke.
>|>|>|>|>|>|>

Re: "The Observational Collapse of Einsteinian Physics"

> I know I have.
>
> | The only thing that needs doing at this point is submitting your
> | work to _Nature_ or other such peer-reviewed journal -- which might
> | be a slight problem as you have no peers.
>
> I did, but they are now dead. Newton... Kepler... Galileo...
> Copernicus...
> Michelson...Faraday... Gauss....even Russell. Yes, it IS a problem.
>
> | Once it has been accepted and published, acclaim will follow.
>
> Ah... but I'm not seeking acclaim, only truth. Not that you could
> ever understand that, motivated as you are by greed.

Greed nothing. This is a necessity to further the cause of science. Perhaps "peer review" is not the term, but "peer *acceptance*".

Einstein had to take a few years before everyone accepted his stuff (and some of the protestation was quite virulent), and perhaps we should have been more scrutinizing, for now we are embroiled in a major controversy, assuming such things as dark energy, when the explanation is surprisingly simple: give up SR.

But there's some work to be done here, and the problem is that a replacement theory for all experimental phenomena currently using SR as a crutch must be found.

>
>
>
> |>
> |> with
> |> | careful analysis of data (assuming two things: that
> |> | I can do a careful analysis of any data, and that I
> |> | have any data to carefully analyze).
> |>
> |> Carefully analyze this:
> |> <http://www.fourmilab.ch/etexts/einstein/specrel/www/>
> |
> | [Including]
> |
> | ON THE ELECTRODYNAMICS
> | OF MOVING BODIES
> | By A. Einstein
> | June 30, 1905
> |
> | It is known that Maxwell's electrodynamics--as usually
> | understood at the present time--when applied to moving

Re: "The Observational Collapse of Einsteinian Physics"

- > | bodies, leads to asymmetries which do not appear
- > | to be inherent in the phenomena. Take, for example,
- > | the reciprocal electrodynamic action of a magnet and a
- > | conductor. The observable phenomenon here depends only
- > | on the relative motion of the conductor and the magnet,
- > | whereas the customary view draws a sharp distinction
- > | between the two cases in which either the one or the
- > | other of these bodies is in motion. For if the magnet
- > | is in motion and the conductor at rest, there arises in
- > | the neighbourhood of the magnet an electric field with
- > | a certain definite energy, producing a current at the
- > | places where parts of the conductor are situated. But if
- > | the magnet is stationary and the conductor in motion,
- > | no electric field arises in the neighbourhood of the
- > | magnet. In the conductor, however, we find an electromotive
- > | force, to which in itself there is no corresponding energy,
- > | but which gives rise—assuming equality of relative motion
- > | in the two cases discussed—to electric currents of the
- > | same path and intensity as those produced by the electric
- > | forces in the former case.
- > |
- > | [No data available; above paragraph not analyzed]
- > |
- > Well, it is just an example of the Principle of Relativity that
- > Copernicus first applied to the Earth, Sun and Moon and
- > came up with the heliocentric universe theory. Galileo explained
- > it rather well in his Dialogue Concerning the Two Chief World Systems,
- > 1632
- > As for data, there are many electric motors and generators,
- > analyze those.
- > Maxwell's equations are fucked up and Einstein couldn't fix them, they
- > are still fucked up.

Then you should replace them with equations that work. This will buttress science -- and your claim.

- >
- >
- > | Examples of this sort,
- >
- > There it is.. the subject of the paragraph.
- > Some idiot writing in Wackypedia thinks the PoR is some
- > crap about laws of physics being the same in all inertial frames.
- >
- > | together with the unsuccessful
- > | attempts to discover any motion of the earth relatively
- > | to the ``light medium,"
- >
- > A reference to MMX.

MMX was a bad experiment, as it used a stationary lightsource.

Re: "The Observational Collapse of Einsteinian Physics"

- >
- > | suggest that the phenomena
- > | of electrodynamics as well as of mechanics possess no
- > | properties corresponding to the idea of absolute rest.
- >
- > ... he's saying there is no universal frame.

And then goes ahead and ASSUMES one! See below.

- >
- > | They
- > | suggest rather that, as has already been shown to the first
- > | order of small quantities, the same laws of electrodynamics
- > | and optics will be valid for all frames of reference for
- > | which the equations of mechanics hold good.(footnote 1)
- >
- > Forget "first order of small quantities", Sagnac works
- > to second, third and fourth order. To understand why, you have
- > to ignore the "customary view" of the first paragraph, place
- > MMX on a carousel and watch the fringe shifts.
- >
- >
- > | We will raise this conjecture (the purport of which will
- > | hereafter be called the ``Principle of Relativity")
- >
- > See... there it is, the example given.
- >
- >
- > | to the status of a postulate, and also introduce another
- > | postulate, which is only apparently irreconcilable
- >
- > Actually it is totally irreconcilable. In 1920, 7 years after
- > Sagnac proved him wrong, he was whining:
- >
- > "VII. The Apparent Incompatibility of the Law of Propagation of Light
- > with the Principle of Relativity
- >
- >
- > THERE is hardly a simpler law in physics than that according to
- > which light is propagated in empty space."
- >
- > This is to divert attention from "Take, for example, the
- > reciprocal electrodynamic action of a magnet and a conductor." and he
- > goes on:
- > "Every child at school knows, or believes he knows, that this
- > propagation takes place in straight lines with a velocity $c = 300,000$
- > km./sec."
- > This is to make you think you are an idiot for not agreeing with
- > what a child at school knows. Children are gullible, but that's
- > allowed. Children at school still believe in Sant Claus. We lie

Re: "The Observational Collapse of Einsteinian Physics"

> to them.
>
>
>
>
> with the
> | former, namely, that light is always propagated in empty
> | space with a definite velocity c which is independent
> | of the state of motion of the emitting body.
>
> Which is a belief in aether without the aether.
>
> | These two
> | postulates suffice for the attainment of a simple and
> | consistent theory of the electrodynamics of moving bodies
> | based on Maxwell's theory for stationary bodies.
>
> Except it is a hoax, plain and simple, to the greater glory of Einstein.
>
>
> The
> | introduction of a "luminiferous ether" will prove to be
> | superfluous inasmuch as the view here to be developed will
> | not require an "absolutely stationary space" provided
> | with special properties, nor assign a velocity-vector
> | to a point of the empty space in which electromagnetic
> | processes take place.
>
> He's going to fuck with time instead. H.G.Wells "Time Machine"
> got to him as a teenager, it was a best seller, and he's a patent clerk
> looking at new patents for Swiss cuckoo clocks.
> He's got a hard-on for time. You can forget the reciprocal
> electrodynamic action of a magnet and a conductor, that's
> not part of the deal.
>
>
> | [Luminiferous aether cannot be detected by definition.]
>
> Yep...
>
> | The theory to be developed is based—like all
> | electrodynamics—on the kinematics of the rigid body,
> | since the assertions of any such theory have to do
> | with the relationships between rigid bodies (systems
> | of co-ordinates), clocks, and electromagnetic
> | processes. Insufficient consideration of this
> | circumstance lies at the root of the difficulties which
> | the electrodynamics of moving bodies at present encounters.
> |
> | [OK]
> |

Re: "The Observational Collapse of Einsteinian Physics"

- > | Let us take a system of co-ordinates in which the equations
- > | of Newtonian mechanics hold good.(footnote 2)
- >
- > Yeah... Sagnac will do nicely.

So will a black hole, methinks. Anything sufficiently curved will do.

- >
- >
- > In order to
- > | render our presentation more precise and to distinguish
- > | this system of co-ordinates verbally from others which
- > | will be introduced hereafter, we call it the ``stationary
- > | system."
- > |
- > | [Operation error. No system is stationary. Arbitrary designation of
- > | such may lead to inconsistencies.]
- >
- > It appears in inverted commas. Is is a name of convenience (and
- > | deliberate confusion). The carousel is the "stationary system" if
- > | you are riding it, the wooden horses are not moving relative to you.
- > | This is the "customary view" which switches with the observer
- > | as he steps off the carousel and watches it turn.
- > |
- > | [System overload. Skipping to math equations.]
- >
- > It shouldn't be a system overload.
- > | Frame jumping to the carousel enables the understanding
- > | of Sagnac.

Perhaps so. But the verbiage got to me. I prefer math.

- >
- >
- >
- > | If at the point A of space there is a clock, an observer
- > | at A can determine the time values of events in the
- > | immediate proximity of A by finding the positions of
- > | the hands which are simultaneous with these events. If
- > | there is at the point B of space another clock in all
- > | respects resembling the one at A, it is possible for an
- > | observer at B to determine the time values of events in
- > | the immediate neighbourhood of B. But it is not possible
- > | without further assumption to compare, in respect of time,
- > | an event at A with an event at B. We have so far defined
- > | only an ``A time" and a ``B time." We have not defined
- > | a common ``time" for A and B, for the latter cannot be
- > | defined at all unless we establish by definition that the
- > | ``time" required by light to travel from A to B equals the
- > | ``time" it requires to travel from B to A. Let a ray of
- > | light start at the ``A time" t_A from A towards B, let it

Re: "The Observational Collapse of Einsteinian Physics"

- > | at the ``B time" t_B be reflected at B in the direction
- > | of A, and arrive again at A at the ``A time" t_A .
- > |
- > | In accordance with definition the two clocks synchronize if
- > | $t_B - t_A = t'_A - t'_B$
- > |
- > | [Operation error: ownership is missing on term "definition".]
- > |
- > He's using the royal "we" of Queen Victoria, "WE are not amused".

Neither am I. It is *his* definition, and it is his job to prove it. Since he is now dead, that may prove rather difficult.

- > He means *I* when he says "we". This trait continues in the court
- > system today, British and American.
- > A lawyer will say "May it please the court", showing deference to
- > a superior, when he really means the arsehole in the big high chair
- > with the power. It's arse-kissing, and the protocol from the arsehole
- > in the big high chair, representing the LAW, bigger than both of
- > them, is to pretend he's the court and give "our" judgment.
- > The court was originally the monarch and his entourage, going
- > around the country dispensing justice. Today of you are prosecuted
- > in England it will be the Crown vs Ghost. In the USA the "People" vs
- > Ghost. I don't know about other countries.

In the British system it may very well be the Crown; I'd have to look. In the US it's typically the governing authority one's allegedly run afoul of (e.g., Roe v. Wade refers to Wade County, TX).

- > The US Constitution begins "We" the people hold these truths to be
- > self evident...
- > All men are born free and equal is a legal axiom. Slavery was ok,
- > black people were animals, beasts of burden, not men.
- > That was self-evident, they were uneducated (but don't educate them,
- > it might turn them into men). Sigh.... why do I feel guilty for being
- > white?

Because you've probably been brainwashed by the Liberals. But that's a debate for another newsgroup.

- >
- > | We assume that this definition of synchronism is free from
- > | contradictions, and possible for any number of points; and that the
- > | following relations are universally valid:--
- > |
- > | [Operation error: multiaxiom system cannot be assumed free of
- > | contradiction.]
- > |
- > Well... Einstein likes to assume. Rhetorical persuasion in a scientific
- > and mathematical paper has no place, it is clear, so ist klar, in

Re: "The Observational Collapse of Einsteinian Physics"

> agreement with experience.

Yes, he does. But it is very far from clear. Consider, for instance, that MMX was not done in vacuum — it was done in the open air. The mercury bearing was simply sitting on the ground, with the granite block exposed to the elements — on a clear day, or perhaps inside of a building. No doubt later experiments may have rectified that to some extent but a hard vacuum is very hard to come by.

>

>

> |

> | 1 If the clock at B synchronizes with the clock at A, the clock at A

> | synchronizes with the clock at B.

> |

> | [Operation error: Clocks do not synchronize without infinite time.

>

> Hmm... this is saying IF B= A THEN A = B.

> Nothing wrong with it, surely?

> I'd call that universally valid.

I'd call it daft nonsense. Clock A may well be reading in standard 60:60:24 time, but Clock B may be using Swatch time. A more realistic issue: suppose clock A were running at 1.000005 seconds per true second, and clock B were running at 0.999995 seconds per true second. Suppose that one can read clocks A and B to the nearest thousandth of a second. It will take 100 true seconds to discover the discrepancy in this case — suppose the clocks were only synchronized using a 10 second procedure? That no worky.

There's also the possibility of a clock C running at true time. Between A and C, and between B and C, no detectable discrepancy will ensue for 200 seconds, but between A and B after 100 seconds they'll be off by 1 millisecond.

Surely these clocks are not in sync.

>

> | A. Clock points can synchronize easily enough but clocks

> | will drift. (All clocks are imperfect timekeepers.)

>

> Sure, but we are to hypothesize a perfect clock for the purpose

> of discussion. We can't get far if we don't.

> Real clocks are not perfect, I agree.

Real clocks can be error-estimated.

>

>

> | B. Clock synchronization is done within a certain error.

> | After the synch is done the clocks will drift until

Re: "The Observational Collapse of Einsteinian Physics"

- > | out of error. (All synchs are imperfect.)
- >
- >
- > Again, this is a theoretical synchronization. You reset your
- > wristwatch to local time when you travel, yes?
- > Nothing magic about it.

No, but one has to be careful.

- >
- >
- > | This can introduce paradoxes of the form $0.0 \approx 0.01 \approx 0.02 \approx \dots$
- > | 1.00 — the "approximate equality paradox".
- > |
- > |]
- > |
- > | 2 If the clock at A synchronizes with the clock at B and also with the
- > | clock at C, the clocks at B and C also synchronize with each other.
- > |
- > | [Operation error: "approximate equality paradox"]
- >
- > Aww... come on. IF $A = B$.AND. $B = C$ THEN $A = C$.
- > That's syllogism in its simplest form.

If $A \approx B$ and $B \approx C$, A is not necessarily $\approx C$.

(" \approx " is approximately equals.) For example, orange is almost yellow, and lime green is almost yellow, and blue-green is almost lime green. Is orange almost blue-green?

See the problem here yet?

- >
- >
- > | Thus with the help of certain imaginary physical
- > | experiments we have settled what is to be understood
- > | by synchronous stationary clocks located at different
- > | places, and have evidently obtained a definition of
- > | "simultaneous," or "synchronous," and of "time." The
- > | "time" of an event is that which is given simultaneously
- > | with the event by a stationary clock located at the place
- > | of the event, this clock being synchronous, and indeed
- > | synchronous for all time determinations, with a specified
- > | stationary clock.
- > |
- > | [Operation warning: "imaginary experiments" are just that.]
- >
- > Yes.
- >
- > |
- > | In agreement with experience we further assume the quantity

Re: "The Observational Collapse of Einsteinian Physics"

> |
> | 2AB
> | ----- = c,
> | t'_A - t_A
> |
> | to be a universal constant—the velocity of light in empty space.
> |
> | [Operation error: assumption]
> |
> Far worse than that. FALSE.

Yes, it is a false assumption.

>
> AB does not equal BA, it has opposite sign.

It's worse than that. "AB" is measured by observer A, which is sitting at origin A. "BA" is measured by observer B, which is probably *moving*, and will get a different reading.

> This equation says the velocity of light, c, is ZERO.

Actually, it's simply a wrong equation. For all we know c is infinite and the mirror holds the light for a fraction of a second, long enough to fool us.

Einstein's assumptions include zero reflective time. Since most mirrors are glass/silver affairs, that is far from clear.

> Now... "we" can debate speed and velocity, but later "we"
> definitely mean directional velocity.
> Hence the need for the persuasion. This is the giveaway of the hoax.
> Einstein is way too smart for it to be a blunder, but he tipped his hand
> with that equation and the psychological appeal to "experience".
> Nobody has the experience of that equation.
> I can forgive a blunder, but this is outright intent to deceive with
> malice aforethought.
> Some time has passed and the light is where it started. $c = 0$.

>
>
>
> |
> | [Operation error: inconsistency with standard definition. The
> | standard definition $v = r/(t-t_0)$, where v = velocity, t = time,
> | t_0 = initial time, and r = position. While it is true that one
> | can organize an experiment such that one can measure this quantity,
> | there is the problem that one cannot assume that $v_1 + v_2 = c$,
> | or how the quantity
> |
> | $v_{20} = 2r/(t_2 - t_0)$ [east-west]
> |

Re: "The Observational Collapse of Einsteinian Physics"

> | relates to the quantities
> |
> | $v_{10} = r/(t_1 - t_0)$ [direction east]
> |
> | and
> |
> | $v_{21} = r/(t_2 - t_1)$ [direction west]
> |
> | The best one might do here is note that
> |
> | $v_{20} = \text{Harmonic_Mean}(v_{10}, v_{21})$
> |
> | and this proves nothing as to whether the two are equal, or not.
> |
> |]
> |
> | Let there be given a stationary rigid rod; and let its length be l as
> | measured by a measuring-rod which is also stationary.
> |
> | [Operation error: measuring-rod cannot be stationary during
> | the course of a measurement.]
> |
> | Yes it can. It had better be, all he's done is laid two rulers
> | side by side.

[1] The ruler may be too short.
[2] How are the marks on the ruler made?
[3] How are the marks *verified*? Only the "0" mark is on the observer's origin. The rest -- well, there's no way to know without shifting the ruler, which subjects it to, among other things, torsions, flexes, and stretching/shrinking.

See the problem here? Also, many modern measurements are done via light-detection equipment -- which sort of begs the question, does it not? Surely you're not suggesting a ruler 10 light years in length...

>
> |
> | We now imagine the axis of the rod lying along the axis
> | of x of the stationary system of co-ordinates, and that
> | a uniform motion of parallel translation with velocity v
> | along the axis of x in the direction of increasing x is
> | then imparted to the rod.
> |
> | [Operation warning: Young's Modulus, momentum conservation,
> | energy conservation effects.]
> |
> | It's still ok, slide one rule past the other. The basis of the slide
> | rule, actually.

Sliding involves heating, stretching, and distortion. It will tamper with the measurement.

>
>
> |
> | We now inquire as to the length of the moving rod, and
> | imagine its length to be ascertained by the following
> | two operations:--
> |
> | (a) The observer moves together with the given
> | measuring-rod and the rod to be measured, and measures
> | the length of the rod directly by superposing the
> | measuring-rod, in just the same way as if all three
> | were at rest.
> |
> | (b) By means of stationary clocks set up in the stationary
> | system and synchronizing in accordance with Â§ 1, the
> | observer ascertains at what points of the stationary
> | system the two ends of the rod to be measured are
> | located at a definite time. The distance between
> | these two points, measured by the measuring-rod
> | already employed, which in this case is at rest, is
> | also a length which may be designated ``the length
> | of the rod."
> |
> | In accordance with the principle of relativity the length
> | to be discovered by the operation (a)--we will call it
> | ``the length of the rod in the moving system"--must be
> | equal to the length l of the stationary rod.
> |
> | [Operation error: the assumption that $r_{11} = r_{00}$, where r_{11} is the
> | length of the moving rod (1) as measured by the moving observer (1)
> | and r_{00} is the length of the arbitrarily-designated stationary
> | rod as measured by the stationary observer (0), is not proven.]
>
> Ah, but all this crap is to fall in line with the Lorentz-Fitzgerald
> contraction those phuckwits proposed to answer the null result
> of MMX and light speed being constant in aether. Einstein wanted to
> make a name for himself. He succeeded. Never underestimate the
> skill of the con artist. Einstein was the best ever, world wide fame
> and a life of
> "A table, a chair, a bowl of fruit and a violin; what else does a man
> need to be happy."

The MMX is guaranteed to generate a null result. Pick one.

[1] It's moving vertically through the light rays, which are vibrating E/M fields. Regardless of experiment orientation (or even polarization, for that matter!) there's no method by

Re: "The Observational Collapse of Einsteinian Physics"

which one can do anything but.

[2] The light rays come in at c from a stationary source, and move through the apparatus at speed c , regardless of its orientation through any aether, hypothetical or otherwise. It's a bit like slapping an ice puck while still versus while moving; the ice puck moves faster *relative to the ice*, but not to you (assuming similar stick motion).

[3] SR.

>
>
> | The length to be discovered by the operation (b) we will call ``the
> | length of the (moving) rod in the stationary system." This we shall
> | determine on the basis of our two principles, and we shall find that
> | it
> | differs from l .
> |
> | Current kinematics tacitly assumes that the lengths determined by
> | these
> | two operations are precisely equal, or in other words, that a moving
> | rigid body at the epoch t may in geometrical respects be perfectly
> | represented by the same body at rest in a definite position.
> |
> | [Operation note: Perhaps.]
> |
> | [System overload. Please save all work and reboot.]
> |
> | [Include aborted]
> |
> |
> | > I did!
> | > You are still not fooling anyone, you know.
> |
> | Your analysis of course will have to be reviewed.
>
>
> Please do.

Not by me! Whoever gave you the idea that *I* was the peer in "peer acceptance"?

No, you need to submit it to Nature. They will review it, and then get back to you, presumably.

>
> | >
> | >
> | > |
> | > | >

Re: "The Observational Collapse of Einsteinian Physics"

> |> |>
> |> |> |>
> |> |> |> [quote]
> |> |> |> For velocities greater than that of a turtle our
> deliberations
> |> |> become
> |> |> |> meaningless; we shall, however, find in what follows, that
> the
> |> |> velocity
> |> |> |> of a turtle in our theory plays the part, physically, of an
> |> |> infinitely
> |> |> |> great velocity.
> |> |> |> [quote]
> |> |> |> Ref: <http://www.fourmilab.ch/etexts/einstein/specrel/www/>
> |> |> |>
> |> |> |> Einstein can "prove" (ha ha) nothing can go faster than a
> |> turtle.
> |> |> |>
> |> |> |> Oops!... Did I say 'a turtle'? Sorry...'light'.
> |> |> |>
> |> |> |> Einstein has proven nothing.
> |> |> |>
> |> |> |> That's right, he was a phuckwit like you.
> |> |> |>
> |> |> |> Superluminal muons are routinely observed.
> |> |> |>
> |> |> |> Yep.
> |> |> |>
> |> |> |>
> |> |> |> Protons are accelerated many times faster than light in
> |> accelerators
> |> |> |> such as the LHC, despite the beam specs suggesting otherwise.
> |> |> |>
> |> |> |> No they are not, phuckwit.
> |> |> |>
> |> |> |> Good point; however, I'm still researching it.
> |> |> |>
> |> |> |> You'll be a long time, you don't have a theory on which to base it.
> |> |> |>
> |> |> |> The priests of
> |> |> |> the Holy Accelerators claim teraelectronvolts when all they can
> |> |> |> do, according to theory, is half a giga.
> |> |> |>
> |> |> |> $(1/2) m_p c^2 = 469.136014 \text{ MeV}$, where m_p is the proton mass.
> |> |> |>
> |> |> |> Prove it. All theoretical estimates from the Lord High Priests of
> |> |> |> Relativity
> |> |> |> are based in the relativist look-up table.
> |> |> |> gamma Desired velocity
> |> |> |> 1 0.0000000000000000
> |> |> |> 10 0.994987437106620

Re: "The Observational Collapse of Einsteinian Physics"

> | > 100 0.999949998749938
> | > 1000 0.99999949999875
> | > 10000 0.999999995000000
> | > 100000 0.99999999950000
> | > 1000000 0.9999999999500
> | > 10000000 0.9999999999995
> | >
> | > Whatever you measure you'll get the number you want.
> |
> | Correct. However, I'm still wondering as to the energy of the
> | incoming superluminal muons.
>
> <http://www.fourmilab.ch/documents/ohmygodpart.html>
> Phucking fat or fucking fast?
>

Fast. It was a 51-joule particle --- or $3.183 * 10^{20}$ eV.
This translates to 582,441 x the speed of light, if one
uses Newtonian assumptions.

>
>
>
> |
> | >
> | > | That's the absolute speediest that they can accelerate things to,
> | > | according to Newtonian theory.
> | >
> | > You don't even know Newtonian theory.
> | > You are still not fooling anyone, you know.
> |
> | Publish a Web page and teach us. Make it part of your submission
> | to _Nature_.
>
> I did present a page.
> It was scoffed at. I've always been scoffed at.

You presented it *here*, not to _Nature_. This is not Nature.
No doubt there are readers of Nature here, of course (I'm not
one of them).

> I became ill last January, had to give up posting, ran out of money,
> had to close it down. I've since written a booklet, but can't find
> a publisher.

Keep looking.

> "Honesty is praised and starves." ---Juvenal
> Know who Juvenal was? Google for him.
> "I refuse to join any club that would have me as a member!"---"Groucho"
> Marx

Re: "The Observational Collapse of Einsteinian Physics"

>
> |
> |>
> |>
> |> |>
> |> |> | Delta Cepheids are ordinary stars with small planets around
> them
> |> |> causing
> |> |> | them to wobble, and allowing us to view the strange light
> curves
> |> |> | therein simply by varying lightspeed (from our vantage point).
> |> |>
> |> |> Nope. Large planets.
> |> |
> |> | They wouldn't need to be all that large; it depends on several
> |> factors,
> |> | namely, distance from Earth, planet density, star/planet distance,
> |> | and star/planet mass ratio.
> |>
> |> There is only one delta Cepheid, namely delta Cepheus.
> |> Lots of cepheids, but you aren't talking about those.
> |> You are still not fooling anyone, you know.
> |
> | The Cepheids are a general star class that are used, presumably
> | incorrectly, in modern astronomy.
>
> Yep. Henrietta Swan Leavitt discovered something about them.
> She was barking up the right tree at the wrong squirrel.
> Androcles' law:
> Distance, Period and Major Axis form a similar triangle, all other
> parameters being constant. The shape of the light curve will be
> unaltered if this ratio is maintained. We know the Period.

Actually, I'm not sure about that. The star may be moving,
changing the period as observed by us.

>
>
>
> | Since GR is no more the
> | usage of them as "signpost markers" to incorrectly determine the
> | size of the galaxy and the size of the Universe will have to
> | be done via alternate methods.
>
> GR was built on SR by the same huckster.
> I see no reason for a detailed analysis, and I have my own
> research to continue – dwarf cepheids, RR Lyrae, quasars.

Do you even know what they are? Do *we*? The GR assumptions
are many here, and it's clear that they need to be reexplained.

Re: "The Observational Collapse of Einsteinian Physics"

- > I thought I had Henri Wilson engaged on dwarf cepheids, but
- > he's gone overboard with "his" theory of Wilson Cool fairy dust
- > and Wilson Cool Heavies. He wouldn't know what a
- > Seyfert Galaxy was, doesn't know what the Roche limit is.

The problem is that he assumes that only one object is needed. There may be a gaggle of planets affecting the star's motion; the star would then exhibit a short period of 5 days with this gaggle of planets, even though they may take the better part of an Earth year to complete an orbit. With 72 smallish objects in roughly circular orbits, this is possible.

- > Then there is the Crab... I have to work alone, there is nobody
- > that has caught up to the basics that I can discuss ideas with.
- > What I find is for ME anyway, I don't care what other people
- > think. I try to teach, but is not really worth anything to me.
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >
- > |> |
- > |> |>
- > |> |> | Supernovae prove $c'=c+v$.
- > |> |>
- > |> |> Nope. Recurrent novae do though.
- > |> |
- > |> | So do Delta Cepheids.
- > |>
- > |> There is only one delta Cepheid, namely delta Cepheus.
- > |> Lots of cepheids, but you aren't talking about those.
- > |> You are still not fooling anyone, you know.
- > |>
- > |> |>
- > |> |> |
- > |> |> |>
- > |> |> |> But.... same math, different animal.
- > |> |> |>
- > |> |> |> Turtle speed = (turtle speed +v)/(1 + v / turtle speed)
- > |> |> |
- > |> |> | Actually, no.
- > |> |>
- > |> |> Actually yes. Because I say so, stomp foot, bang shoe in
- > lectern.
- > |> |
- > |> | Actually, no. Turtle speed' = Turtle speed + v. If you're
- > |> | going to interchange turtles and photons at least be consistent
- > |> | about it. ;-P
- > |>
- > |> I am as consistent as SR.
- > |

Re: "The Observational Collapse of Einsteinian Physics"

- > | You're more consistent. Newtonian physics lasted 300 years.
- > | SR has barely lasted 100.
- >
- > Time is irrelevant to science. Ptolemy's epicycles lasted 1400 years,
- > kept the astrologers in business. "Oh look, I told you last year those
- > planets would be in conjunction in the third house and they are.
- > Now you'll be rich, so cross my palm with silver"
- > There have always been con artists.

And they are now building multibilliondollar accelerators, based on GR assumptions. (This despite the fact that, absent more data, anything past 490 MeV — for protons, anyway — is gravy, or, if one prefers, total wastage of energy.)

- >
- > | > c is a speed. Doesn't matter what it's the speed of, the math
- > | > is the same. I've chosen turtle speed.
- > |
- > | c is an abstract quantity that may or may not be related to the
- > | actual speed of photon propagation. In fact, at this time
- > | c is an *assumption*; the last known actual speed measurement
- > | was done sometime prior to 1983, when the powers—that-be simply
- > | defined $1\text{m} = 1/299792458\text{ s}$.
- > |
- > | It is not light speed, any more than the "60 mph" designation on
- > | my speedometer is my car speed. (The car may be sitting on
- > | a dynamometer, for example. The tires may wear, leading to small
- > | inaccuracies. The tires may be replaced by "BigFoot" tires (with
- > | appropriate structural modifications), leading to readings that
- > | are nonsensical.)
- >
- > All speeds are relative.

You persist in the thinking that c is a speed. It is *not* a speed. It is an abstract quantity that may or may not be related to true lightspeed. It has units m/s, but then so does 67 mph if one converts it.

c is also the product of permittivity and permeability. Is there meaning therein? Good question. I can't say I know the answer.

But c is not necessarily lightspeed. What it is, I don't know.

[rest snipped]

—
#191, ewill3@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx
It's still legal to go .sigless.

Re: "The Observational Collapse of Einsteinian Physics"

- **Follow-Ups:**
 - ◆ **Re: "The Observational Collapse of Einsteinian Physics"**
 - ◇ From: Androcles

- **References:**
 - ◆ **Re: "The Observational Collapse of Einsteinian Physics"**
 - ◇ From: The Ghost In The Machine
 - ◆ **Re: "The Observational Collapse of Einsteinian Physics"**
 - ◇ From: Androcles
 - ◆ **Re: "The Observational Collapse of Einsteinian Physics"**
 - ◇ From: The Ghost In The Machine
 - ◆ **Re: "The Observational Collapse of Einsteinian Physics"**
 - ◇ From: Androcles
 - ◆ **Re: "The Observational Collapse of Einsteinian Physics"**
 - ◇ From: Androcles
 - ◆ **Re: "The Observational Collapse of Einsteinian Physics"**
 - ◇ From: Androcles

- Prev by Date: **Re: Jeff Relf: Yenta**
- Next by Date: **Re: Integrals and delta x/delta ts**
- Previous by thread: **Re: "The Observational Collapse of Einsteinian Physics"**
- Next by thread: **Re: "The Observational Collapse of Einsteinian Physics"**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **Date**
 - ◆ **Thread**