

Re: How to Replicate NoEinstein's M-M Invalidation (is Copyrighted.)

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2008-01/msg01864.html>

- *From:* NoEinstein <noeinstei@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 22 Jan 2008 18:11:03 -0800 (PST)
-

On Jan 21, 6:51 pm, Eric Gisse <jowr...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Dear Eric: [by the numbers] (1.) Google doesn't allow using italics. Since I wished to emphasize that one sentence, my only option was to capitalize it. (2.) Congratulations; you are trying! However, you have missed "catching" the most important distinction between a path length variation in ONE arm caused by the PHYSICAL micro-adjustment of the location of a mirror, or the target; and: A light path length change that KEEPS all of the 'designed' apparatus dimensions.

How could the latter case vary the path length, and still have ZERO physical change in the designed layout of the optics? VERY SIMPLE! Because M-M was an Earth-mounted experiment, the changing velocity component of the Earth [depending on the hour of the day; season of the year; movement of the Sun about the galactic center; movement of the Sun in our neighboring star grouping; movement of the Milky Way in our galaxy's cluster; and... the supposed movement of 'everything' away from... the Big Bang event point (sic)] ALSO affects the velocity of the M-M apparatus, itself.

When light is in transit from the source to a mirror, the location of that mirror, as a 'destination', CHANGES depending on the Earth's velocity component at that particular instant. Suppose that light does have only velocity 'c'. If it takes x amount of time to cover the 'designed' apparatus length (in a single axis), then it will take $x + \delta$ if the apparatus is moving away from the light source; and $x - \delta$ if the apparatus is moving toward the light source. The value of δ can be calculated using simple algebra. Measure (via interference) or assume an Earth velocity and use such value to compute how far the mirror will move while the supposed 'c'-velocity-light is in transit to it. Once you know how far the mirror or target has moved, then you can calculate how much additional time is required to get there--which is your δ .

A unique aspect of the two tee-shaped light courses in M-M is that they are asymmetrical. And the two axes have portions that are common for each. For example: the last leg heading toward the target. I

Re: How to Replicate NoEinstein's M–M Invalidation (is Copyrighted.)

have calculated the total time for each course to circuit the apparatus from source to target and find that the 'assumption' that 'c' is constant doesn't yield equal times of arrival. Those were the same 'logic' calculations performed by Michelson and others—that didn't work for them, either! Because those calculations didn't explain the failed results of M–M, Lorentz and FitzGerald concocted their 'contraction' factor Beta: $(1 - v^2/c^2)^{1/2}$.

Amazingly, not a single person before yours truly, NoEinstein, actually 'did the math' and plotted the arrival times USING the Lorentz transformation! When I did, the arrival times are no were close to being the same! The simple reason: The supposed contraction factor beta must have a DIFFERENT value for each light course while traveling over the SAME portion of stone! That's because one light course can have 'two legs' on a single axis, while the other light course, simultaneously, has only 'one leg' on that same axis. Obviously, the velocity component isn't going to affect both light courses in the same way, so the arrival times vary widely. And if they HAD varied widely, hundreds of interference changes would have been observed! But since none were observed, then, light velocity cannot be "only" 'c', and L–F can't explain the nil results!

The most easy to visualize, and devastating invalidation of Lorentz–FitzGerald is that it is a 'contraction factor' only. In order for any physical change in the apparatus—due to velocity alone—to have 'explained' the nil results of M–M, that factor would have to become an "expansion" factor for the 180 degrees of apparatus rotation in which the Earth's velocity component is ADDITIVE. And such would require that all objects experiencing an additive velocity STRETCH in length to infinity at velocity 'c'! Haahahaha! Quote me on this: "L–F was just a supposed 'law of nature' batted about over BEERS, and everyone just said: Yeah, that could explain it." In the last century, no one before NoEinstein has done the math! If and when physicists get off of their pompous asses and do–the–math, then their past idiocy will become the stuff for the history books!

(3.) Yes, I do! The M–M apparatus includes a micro adjustment screw. When Michelson measured the length of the 'official' meter stick, he incrementally moved such using a spacer block which he had previously calculated the length of via interference. By adjusting his micro screw to move the meter stick an amount equal to the precision spacer, he could count how many increments of the spacer he needed. Then, he could use his micro adjustment screw to measure the amount above the combined multiples of his spacer.

(4.) Absolutely! That is... unless the velocity of the light 'c' always gets increased or decreased to match the additive or subtractive Earth velocity component. I tested that most intuitive assumption [intuitive, because that's what 'sound' does], mathematically, and found it to be TRUE! When both the light source—which can be either the light itself, or the re emission or

'reflection'—and the perpendicular mirror or target toward which it is aimed are moving with identical velocity components, the time for the light to travel such distance is exactly the same as if the apparatus isn't moving at all!

The last sentence is my 4th Law of Light. The light speeds up and slows down, but because the distances the light must travel increase or decrease EXACTLY proportionately, there will always be zero fringe changes evident in M-M! So, no L-F factors were or are needed—because the intuitive hypothesis explains everything! Things would be so different in science IF there had been a physicist in the last 100 years who knew his ass from a hole in the ground.

(5.) Eric, when you try to reach conclusions based on your own misunderstanding of spatial, and other issues, it is you who err, not me. — NoEinstein —

However, when James Clerk Maxwell proposed to Michelson that his interferometer, when rotated, might be able to detect velocity changes... that was something his instrument, by its design, was NOT suited to detect. INTERFEROMETERS THAT CAN DETECT PHYSICAL LENGTH CHANGES ARE NOT NECESSARILY SUITED TO DETECT VELOCITY CHANGES! Why?

For the same reason I don't think what you have to say is more truthful or even important because you put it in capital letters? (1.) If the velocity of light was different along the respective arms, the path lengths the light took would be different and there would be phase shifts. (2.) It really isn't that complicated.

Velocity detection is a race of two photons (actually a train of photons) to circuit the entire instrument; and races are TIME(D) events. Whereas, length change in one arm isn't a timed event at all. It is just a gradual adjustment of the length of one arm and observing the phase shifts as the length changes—by letting the light course that doesn't change length act as the control.

It doesn't matter if the length change is a "gradual adjustment" – something you have no evidence for – or not. (3.) A change in length means there will be phase shifts. (4.)

If the points of reference on each of the two light beams always circuit the interferometer in the same amount of TIME, regardless of the instrument's orientation relative to Earth's velocity vector, then it is because the instrument, for the purpose of velocity detection, has no CONTROL. I've explained all of this to you in various ways,

Re: How to Replicate NoEinstein's M-M Invalidation (is Copyrighted.)

before. But you just won't listen, or you just can't read. I think history will show where stupidity lies. — NoEinstein —

Actually I think history will completely ignore you. Your inane whining on USENET is indistinguishable from the inane whining of every other crank that has had delusions about relativity. You are not special in any way. (5.)
