

Re: Replacing helium on earth

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2005-12/msg01745.html>

- *From:* "jgreenfield@xxxxxxxxxxxx" <jgreen@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 23 Dec 2005 17:29:24 -0800
-

Timo Nieminen wrote:

> On Fri, 23 Dec 2005, jgreenfield@xxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:
>
>> Timo Nieminen wrote:
>>> On Fri, 22 Dec 2005, jgreenfield@xxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:
>>>>
>>>> Wallace clearly explains (and Shapiro admitted) that that the
>>>> astronomical observations were subjected to, and obtained through
>>>> systems USING $c=c+v$, BEFORE "data" was analysed.
>>>> (ie the data was AE spaghetti before conclusions were made from it.)
>>>>
>>> And the observations so analysed agreed well with Newtonian modelling of
>>> the orbits. They also agreed even better with GR modelling of the orbits,
>>> but that's beside the point of current discussion.
>>>
>> If you are claiming that the distances to the distant astronomical
>> bodies was NOT arrived at per AE, BEFORE data was collected or
>> analysed, I say, as does WALLACE, RUBBISH!!!
>>
> Can you provide anything other than hot air? Ash et al show how well the
> processed-using- $c'=c$ data agrees with Newtonian modelling of the orbits.
> Where is Wallace's same presentation showing that processing using $c'=c+v$
> fits the Newtonian (or GR) orbits better? Not in Farce.

Read it again; the data Wallace needed to confirm was withheld (still in Russia??)

>
>>> A quick look at Ash's graphs shows that the deviation from the modelled
>>> orbit, as given by the difference in the speed of light required to give
>>> the difference in time of flight, is about 1 m/s.
>>>
>>> Same ol same ol! The distance again was ???????????
>>>
> Avoiding the issue? If $c'=c+v$ is correct, why are the radar returns
> such that v would need to be less than 1m/s, when the relative speeds are
> much greater than that?

Bloody hell! What is my rel speed to the sun at noon? What is at dawn?

Re: Replacing helium on earth

Use the "noon" data, and of course there is negligible difference. What was CAREFULLY avoided, was comparisons (SIMULTANEOUS) at dawn and dusk (America and Russia)

>

> So tell me, was Wallace claiming $c'=c+v$, or $c'=c+\epsilon v$, where ϵ is much smaller than 1?

>

>>> Since Wallace doesn't give any of the data or analysis in his book, it >>> isn't clear whether $c+v$ conversion of radar observations to positions >>> would have agreed as well or better, but given that changes in relative >>> speed due to the rotation of the Earth would be 100s of m/s, rather than >>> 1m/s or less, it doesn't look too good. Wallace's book is a diatribe >>> against the "physics establishment", a work on the politics of science, >>> largely devoid of any science content.

>>

>> "Physics establishment" and "politics" fit well!

>> Money, power and ego drive the whole AE wagon, and the cliff ahead

>> (make that the stone wall) is ignored

>

> Money, power, and ego (well, money and power, at least) will go to anyone

> who provides a convincing overturning of the "whole AE wagon". Care to

> have a crack at it yourself? It's really simple: $c'=c+v$ means that the

> Maxwell equations are wrong. Design, build, and perform a reliable and

> replicable experiment to prove that.

Too easy!

1) Just do the old radar measure to venus again. This time allow the data

from different radars taken SIMULTANEOUSLY to be HONESTLY evaluated.

2) Compare the arrival times of simultaneously emitted emr bursts from differently moving sources (ref us and from large distance) which are reasonably close.

30kms per sec at saturn would show an order of one sec here

>

> Hard work, perhaps, but far more productive than bleating on usenet. If

> you really think $c'=c+v$ is correct, then you'll be successful, right? How

> can you lose, with Nature on your side?

How can "The Establishment" lose, with 100 years of brainwashing, the US govt, and billions of dollars in defence and grants at stake? Not to mention the pathetic tender egos of too many in the science community.

Example this very days paper: The "top" scientist in a Korean university (professor) quit because he was caught blatantly cheating and falsifying data. Pity he couldn't have just hidden it like Shapiro, eh?

Jim G

$c'=c+v$

- *Follow-Ups:*
 - ◆ **Re: Replacing helium on earth**
 - ◇ *From:* Timo Nieminen

- *References:*
 - ◆ **Replacing helium on earth**
 - ◇ *From:* jgreenfield@xxxxxxxxxxxx
 - ◆ **Re: Replacing helium on earth**
 - ◇ *From:* Hans Lohninger
 - ◆ **Re: Replacing helium on earth**
 - ◇ *From:* tadchem
 - ◆ **Re: Replacing helium on earth**
 - ◇ *From:* jgreenfield@xxxxxxxxxxxx
 - ◆ **Re: Replacing helium on earth**
 - ◇ *From:* tadchem
 - ◆ **Re: Replacing helium on earth**
 - ◇ *From:* jgreenfield@xxxxxxxxxxxx
 - ◆ **Re: Replacing helium on earth**
 - ◇ *From:* Timo Nieminen
 - ◆ **Re: Replacing helium on earth**
 - ◇ *From:* jgreenfield@xxxxxxxxxxxx
 - ◆ **Re: Replacing helium on earth**
 - ◇ *From:* Timo Nieminen
 - ◆ **Re: Replacing helium on earth**
 - ◇ *From:* jgreenfield@xxxxxxxxxxxx
 - ◆ **Re: Replacing helium on earth**
 - ◇ *From:* Timo Nieminen
 - ◆ **Re: Replacing helium on earth**
 - ◇ *From:* jgreenfield@xxxxxxxxxxxx
 - ◆ **Re: Replacing helium on earth**
 - ◇ *From:* Timo Nieminen

- Prev by Date: **Re: Replacing helium on earth**
- Next by Date: **Re: Replacing helium on earth**
- Previous by thread: **Re: Replacing helium on earth**
- Next by thread: **Re: Replacing helium on earth**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **Date**
 - ◆ **Thread**