

Reply to William Lyne's: Flunking the Debunker

By Bobdee.

A response to "Flunking the Debunker", which was written by William R Lyne in response to my "Debunking William Lynes, Occult Aether Physics"

Lies, lies and more lies:

It is amazing the lies that Lyne tells to try and convince people that the phony theory he proposes was Tesla's also. The very first paragraph is filled with personal attacks and I am referred to as an "Opportunistic sociopath always looking for weaknesses to "pounce on" to make myself look better." No Lyne, I was amazed and felt sorry for the number of people who took all your lies and technical blunders as facts and I have been working to set the record straight.

Lyne jumps straight into the second paragraph with his first lie of the text.

He claims that the statement by Tesla in his "Lecture before the Institution of Electrical Engineers, London (1892)." Reads: "The most probable medium filling all space is one consisting of independent carriers immersed in an insulating fluid."

THIS IS AN OUTRIGHT LIE! If you were to go to, "The Inventions, Researches and Writings of Nikola Tesla" by Thomas Commerford Martin, where this text is located you would find that the actual quote is, "The most probable medium filling the space is one consisting of independent carriers immersed in an insulating fluid." (Refer to appendix 1 for a scanned copy of the original text.) Lyne has changed the to all. This simple word change puts a completely different spin on things. For instance Lyne wishes us to believe that Tesla, in this sentence is describing the Aether in the vacuum of space. Tesla is in fact only talking about the space between one of high voltage coils here on earth not in space and so there is air the medium also not just a vacuum.

Lyne then tries to twist what I said in "Debunking Lynes..." to reflect his argument.

*"Having failed in that, he then tried to split hairs by saying that Tesla was referring to the "air" as the ether's "insulating fluid" ("fluid"?) As his "proof", he presented a completely different statement by Tesla, regarding the air, in which he said in
- "But the action, as explained, implies that the air is insulating-that is, that it is composed of independent carriers immersed in an insulating medium.""* – From Lyne's "Flunking the Debunker".

If you are familiar with my text "Debunking Lynes....." you will know that a) I never referred to the insulating fluid as the air, I said it was the aether. (Refer to appendix 2 for proof) and b) This is the very same statement that I caught Lyne changing the word air to aether as "proof" of his phoney theory. I then provided a scanned copy of the original text to show readers his obvious lies. He now ignores that he lied and carries on to say that I am mistaken!!! When I read this I couldn't stop laughing as it is so plain and obvious!! How stupid does he think his readers are?!!!

He then carries on stating that I can't differentiate between the air and the aether?? A quick look at appendix 2 will reveal that I can.

J J Thomson and William R Lyne, strange bedfellows:

Readers who follow Lyne will know that he proposes Thomson's, "Tubes of force/Electromomentum" theory as the theory Tesla agreed with. Lyne states that the reason that he thinks J J Thomson's theory is the one that Tesla agreed with is because, quote, "Tesla never disputed Thomson's Electromagnetic Momentum Theory, never said a word about it." Yes! This is the only actual reason he gives! It doesn't take much to figure out the validity of this claim.

I have already proved in "Debunking Lynes.....," why Thomson's theory could not have been Tesla's as well. Here it is again for those who aren't familiar with that text.

First of all I gave a quote by J J Thomson.

"On this view of the constitution of matter, part of the mass of any body would be the mass of the ether dragged along by the Faraday tubes stretching across the atom between the positively and negatively electrified

constituents. The view I wish to put before you is that it is not merely a part of the mass of a body which arises in this way, but the whole mass of any body is just the mass of the ether surrounding the body which is carried along by the Faraday tubes associated with the atoms of the body, In fact, that all mass is mass of the ether, all momentum, momentum of the ether, and all kinetic energy, kinetic energy of the ether. This view, it should be said, requires the density of the ether to be immensely greater than that of any known substance.”- J J Thomson. Electricity and matter, 1904.

The reason why this disproves Thomson's theory as Tesla's is because of the last sentence, “*This view, it should be said, requires the density of the ether to be immensely greater than that of any known substance.*” It is well known that Tesla believed in a gaseous aether:

"We must rather accept the view that all space is filled with a gaseous substance. On repeating the Hertz experiments with much improved and very powerful apparatus, I satisfied myself that what he had observed was nothing else but effects of longitudinal waves in a gaseous medium, that is to say, waves, propagated by alternate compression and expansion. He had observed waves in the ether much of the nature of sound waves in the air... . On further investigation I found that this gas was so light that a volume equal to that of the earth would weigh only about one-twentieth of a pound.”
-Nikola Tesla tells of new Wireless theories, 1929.

Lyne still hasn't responded to this quote from J J Thomson and probably never will because it proves that his theory is wrong. His only answer is that, “Tesla must have believed in the Thomson theory because Tesla never tries to dispute it!” From this one can see how pathetic his argument really is.

Lyne also claims that “Tesla considered that the ether consists of “...independent carriers immersed in an insulating fluid””

Lyne implies here, that the independent carriers and the insulating fluid are both part of the aether. This was debunked in my, “Debunking Lyne’s..” when I showed that he had doctored up a quote to “prove” this, amongst other things. We can easily put an end to this idle speculation of a multi-constitutional aether by showing the following quote from Tesla:

“ I must confess, that I cannot believe in two electricities, much less in a doubly-constituted ether.”

-Experiments with Alternating Currents of Very High Frequency and their application to methods of Artificial Illumination.

I showed this in “Debunking Lyne’s....” but he had no answer for it. Everyone can see for themselves by reading Tesla’s pre-1890 lectures and my “Debunking Lyne’s..” (Available from my website) that Lyne has not only mis-read Tesla but lied and lied to try and “prove” his point.

Since I started writing my attacks on Lyne’s credibility another researcher has also been doing some very excellent research on Lyne’s claims. His name is Dimitrije Lukovic. Dimitrije has documented and exposed several major lies of Lyne’s and readers are encouraged to visit his website listed below. Dimitrije was kind enough to let me use his text on Lyne’s technical blunder that a Tesla coil with the secondary adjusted to a ¼ wavelength will produce a high voltage direct current. It also exposes another doctored quote from Lyne. Does Lyne ever stop his lies?

Refuting Lyne's Nonsense About 1/4 Wave Tesla Coils Producing DC

By: Dimitrije Lukovic

One of the pivots upon which Lyne's entire phony "theory of electropropulsion" turns, is his idea that by making the physical length of the secondary of a Tesla coil equal to 1/4 of the operating wavelength, one can produce high voltage D.C. instead of A.C. His theory depends on this because, says he, Tesla's flying machine requires high voltage D.C. in the front of the ship.

This is, quite simply, the most absurd scientific idea I've ever heard. Anyone who has ever dabbled in amateur radio knows that this is ludicrous. Look at a quarter wave antenna. Does it produce D.C.? Obviously not, or it

wouldn't function correctly. I don't know how gullible people actually have to be to believe this guy.

As has already been noted by others, Lyne can't even get his electrical terminology correct. He says that one must "tune [the Tesla coil] to 1/4 wavelength." This is wrong: to tune a circuit means to adjust its capacitance and inductance to put it in a state of resonance with another circuit. Lyne should've instead said that the *physical length* of the secondary wire must be made equal to 1/4 of the operating wavelength. This is exactly how Tesla always explained it (for instance, in his Colorado Springs Notes).

Back to his idea that at 1/4 wavelength a Tesla Coil will produce D.C., in a vain attempt to refute someone else who has discovered his lies, Lyne wrote the following:

In another slanted argument (citing Wikipedia), Daniel referred to a drawing from Nikola Tesla's patent #723,188, Method for Signaling (from page 197, my book Pentagon Aliens) stating that an oscillating high frequency electromagnetic dipole, tuned to three-eighths (or one-quarter) wavelength, produces only "an A.C. node". This flies in the face of the fact well-documented (from a standard electrical engineering text) in the first edition of my 1993 book Space Aliens From the Pentagon-

"...an oscillating electric dipole consists of two equal and opposite charges of dipole moment p , where p oscillates sinusoidally with time. A dipole which is tuned to 3/8th (or 1/4, the same) will continue to throw out energy even when the conditions are reversed, because there is a time lag between changes in charge and current distribution.
" (5)

So Daniel's "node" is not really there, and what results is negative electrostatic discharges, D.C. in sign. Most schlubs would assume that the dipole is "supposed" to produce an A.C. node, but it does not do so at sufficiently high frequency, because of this phenomenon, which Tesla knew about in the 1890s, which is why he called his single terminal ("pancake")coil "...my method for producing direct current with an alternating current."

I'd first like to remark that citing wikipedia, as the man who wrote this refutation against Lyne did, is better than citing nothing at all, and instead saying that you know tons of people whose names you cannot reveal, as does Lyne! Lyne doesn't understand that the reason Tesla made the length of his secondary coils 1/4 of the operating wavelength was so that the points of highest voltage on the secondary would be on the free terminal. He obviously doesn't know that in a Tesla coil secondary, there are waves of voltage on the wires, which reflect, producing standing waves of voltage. In other words, the voltage and current vary from point to point on a secondary. Thus, Tesla made their length 1/4 of a wavelength so that the point of highest voltage would be on the terminal. Read, for instance, what Tesla said in his Patent #645,576 (System of Transmission of Electrical Energy):

"The length of the thin-wire coil in each transformer should be approximately one-quarter of the wave length of the electric disturbance in the circuit, this estimate being based on the velocity of propagation of the disturbance through the coil itself and the circuit with which it is designed to be used...By such an adjustment or proportioning of the length of wire in the secondary coil or coils the points of highest potential are made to coincide with the elevated terminals D D' and it should be understood that whatever length be given to the wires this condition should be complied with in order to attain the best results."

He says nothing about A.C. turning into D.C. here. In fact, these coils HAD to produce A.C., in order for his system of wireless transmission to work. Next, Lyne cites a text which he claims supports his idea that a 1/4 wave secondary will produce D.C. What's weird is that he calls his citation "well documented," when, in actuality, all he cited was the name of the book and author - no page number, no chapter, nothing! Now this is the laughable part. The quote Lyne provided in his self-defense was totally altered from what one reads in the book. Lyne left out parts, and also added parts that are not even in the book! When I saw what he had done, I was hysterical laughing. This is the quote Lyne gives (without any page number):

"...an oscillating electric dipole consists of two equal and opposite charges of dipole moment p , where p oscillates sinusoidally with time. A dipole which is tuned to 3/8th (or 1/4, the same) will continue to throw out energy even when the conditions are reversed, because there is a time lag between changes in charge and current distribution.
"

The first sentence he gives from this quote, does actually appear in the book, on page 154. The WHOLE quote is:

"In theory, an oscillating electric dipole consists of two equal and opposite charges of dipole moment p where p oscillates sinusoidally with time as shown in Fig. 9.6. In practice, an oscillating current in a conducting wire is

equivalent to an oscillating dipole as indicated in Fig. 9.7."

Okay, all nice; but this proves nothing for Lyne. The second sentence is where the lies come. The words, "A dipole which is tuned to $3/8$ th (or $1/4$, the same) will continue to throw out energy even when the conditions are reversed," ARE NOWHERE TO BE FOUND IN THE BOOK. These words were cunningly added by Lyne to mislead. Do you not see how evil this man is? Simply go get the book for yourselves to verify this. Note for example, how he uses his incorrect terminology "tune to $3/8$ th," instead of saying that the "length is made $3/8$ wavelength." No electrical engineer would speak like this. Further, notice how he says "continue to throw out energy." That is exactly how Lyne speaks, and is proof that he totally doctored this quote. So the first half of the second sentence was made up. The last part of the second sentence, however, was indeed taken from the book. It reads: "...because there is a time lag between changes in charge and current distribution." This was taken from page 155, and is part of the ORIGINAL, non-altered quote, which Lyne used in his disgusting book. I will get back to that in a moment, but let me summarize:

- 1) The quote Lyne just gave in his re-refutation to Daniel, supposedly from the book by Robin L. Armstrong, was altered by him.
- 2) Lyne took two real quotes from the book (on pages 154 and 155), and put them together with a sentence that is of his own writing, to make this fake quote.

Lyne finishes this part of his "refutation," by saying:

*Most schlubs would assume that the dipole is "supposed" to produce an A.C. node, but it does not do so at sufficiently high frequency, because of this phenomenon, which Tesla knew about in the 1890s, which is why he called his single terminal ("pancake")coil "**...my method for producing direct current with an alternating current.**"*

Ah, yes, the old "my method for producing direct current..." quote. Let me ask you, Mr. Lyne, where in all of Tesla's papers is this quote? I've looked everywhere, and I have never been able to find it. Where is it? Well, folks, I'll tell you that it is *nowhere*. The quote was made up by Lyne; Tesla never said or wrote it. That is why he provides no citation for it. If I am wrong then simply prove it, and end everything by showing the quote. But no, you obviously cannot and won't. And, as I said before, you will say things like "I have it but I'm not giving it to you," to distract from the fact that you simply cannot answer the question because you are a liar.

Now, what, you may ask, of the non-altered quote from that same Armstrong book, which Lyne originally gave as support of his theory? Here is the quote in its entirety:

"Since electromagnetic effects are not transmitted instantly from point to point in space...there is a time lag between changes in charge and current distribution on the dipole," which "...allows some of the energy to continue flowing outward even though conditions at the dipole may have changed to indicate an inward flow of energy...as if some of the electric and magnetic field has become detached from the dipole or 'shaken off' by the oscillation."

What Lyne did here, is very simple to explain. Lyne purposely misinterpreted the quote to suit his own agenda. This quote, was not at all talking about part of the A.C. waveform getting "shaken off" so that it becomes D.C. Instead, what the author was doing was discussing electromagnetic radiation, and getting ready to introduce the concept of "retarded time." It has nothing to do at all with what Lyne says it means. Retarded time means that once launched, an EM wave will take a finite time to propagate from the source to a detector. A specific electromagnetic disturbance, once "detached" (radiated) from the source, propagates outward at the speed of light and is no longer affected by anything the radiating source does afterwards. The radiating source could even disappear, but the wave created by the initial disturbance will still propagate outward at the speed of light. This independence of source behavior was what Armstrong was referring to for a launched EM wave.

Very simply, Armstrong was saying that since an EM wave has a finite velocity, it takes time to reach a detector, so that even if conditions at the source change, the wave will still exist. This is observed every night in looking at the stars. Stars far away are emitting electromagnetic radiation. Since it takes a finite time for this radiation to reach us, what we are seeing in the sky is what the star looked like in times past. In other words, the star may not even exist anymore, but since the radiation is independent of the source (star), we still see it.

Lyne, as I said before, is so conceded, trying to portray himself as some prodigal, genius inventor, whose inventions everyone is out to steal. And yet, judging by this mere incident, one can see that he really truly is stupid. His "science" is his own fleeting fantasies.

In the closing paragraphs Lyne states, "I didn't say that Tesla did not consider the ether as gaseous as Daniel falsely concluded, but only that it wasn't the "half-hearted gaseous ether of Lorentz". See what I mean? False conclusions."

Actually you did imply that you thought the aether wasn't gaseous when you jumped on Thomson's, Tubes of Force bandwagon, in which the main part of that theory is that the density of the aether must, "*be immensely greater than that of any known substance.*"

A warning to all:

Since I and Dimitrije have begun to research claims of Lyne's we have discovered more and more lies. Go to Dimitrije's website below. I am up to the point where I don't believe a word this man says. He is an evil liar who has tricked many innocent people into believing and even spending sums of money on his claims, particularly the infamous idea that Watt/hour meters will give you free energy(to be covered in a future paper). Why he does this is beyond me but Dimitrije has a few ideas. As an electrical engineer and natural philosopher who has spent years studying classical physics I can tell you now: This man has almost no knowledge of classical physics. This is obvious to an experienced researcher from the common mistake made amongst newcomers that Newton believed in "action at a distance", anyone who has studied Newton will see that Newton was quite the opposite; he believed that you would have to be "mental" to subscribe to such an idea. Lyne also has no idea in electrical matters as pointed out by Dimitrije's piece on the ¼ wave coil above. A word to all laymen and newcomers: STAY WELL CLEAR OF LYNE.

Thanks to natphil and Dimitrije Lukovic for their help in writing this.

Dimitrije's website is: <http://williamrlyneliar.blogspot.com>

I may be contacted at: bobusbeeus@gmail.com

Updates available from: <http://sickofmisinformation.mysite.com>

8/6/2009

-Bobdee

Appendix 1: A scan of the original Thomas Commerford Martin text (p137) where the quote is located, proving Lyne is a liar and quote doctor.

air at ordinary pressure. Though no positive evidence has been obtained, it is thought, nevertheless, that a high frequency brush or streamer, if the frequency could be pushed far enough, would be decidedly rigid. A small sphere might then be moved within it quite freely, but if thrown against it the sphere would rebound. An ordinary flame cannot possess rigidity to a marked degree because the vibration is directionless; but an electric arc, it is believed, must possess that property more or less. A luminous band excited in a bulb by repeated discharges of a Leyden jar must also possess rigidity, and if deformed and suddenly released should vibrate.

From like considerations other conclusions of interest are reached. The most probable medium filling the space is one consisting of independent carriers immersed in an insulating fluid. If through this medium enormous electrostatic stresses are assumed to act, which vary rapidly in intensity, it would allow the motion of a body through it, yet it would be rigid and elastic, although the fluid itself might be devoid of these pro-

Appendix 2: A scan of my original "Debunking Lyne..." text to prove that I never referred to the insulating medium in the following quote as the air.

"But the action as explained implies that the air is insulating that is, - that it is composed of independent carriers immersed in an insulating medium."

-Experiments with Alternating Currents of High Potential and High Frequency, 1982

It was quite obvious to anyone that Tesla was referring to the air as the independent carriers and the insulating medium as the aether. (More examples shortly will prove this.) Not that the aether was independent carriers and an insulating medium. I pointed this out to Lyne. He told me that it was a typing error and that I was still wrong. Up until then I had been using an online version of the Thomas Commerford-Martin book. I then switched to the hardcopy and found that the quote was exactly the same. Until now I had never thought of the man as a liar but it appeared to me that it was a deliberate lie. (It is interesting to note that since the first edition of this PDF he still advocates this lie. See the section below entitled "Further correspondence and outright lies from Lyne".) I then politely asked where he actually said the aether was composed of carriers immersed in an insulated medium. He replied, "We have it but we are not giving it to you".