

# Re: Light Speed Test versus Special Relativity

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.astro/2005-03/3034.html>

---

**From:** OG ([owen\\_at\\_gwynnefamily.org.uk](mailto:owen_at_gwynnefamily.org.uk))

**Date:** 03/23/05

Date: Wed, 23 Mar 2005 18:55:17 -0000

"Stan Byers" <[sbyers11@comcast.net](mailto:sbyers11@comcast.net)> wrote in message  
news:74KdnV810aNsKNzfRVn-1A@comcast.com...

> *Hello Owen and Group,*

>

> *Thanks for the message. Your question highlights the important part  
that SR*

> *does not notice.*

> *It is impossible to have the same relative speed with light when you  
are*

> *moving in the same direction,... as you have when you are at rest in*

> *relation to the source. If you are parked beside the road and a train  
is*

> *passing parallel going west at 100 miles per hour(mph),...and then you  
start*

> *driving west at twenty mph, SR says that the train will still be  
passing you*

> *at 100 mph.*

What a stupid comment.

> *Now you and I both know that you could not teach such a concept to  
grade*

> *school children.*

For trains, no.

But we're not talking about trains, we're talking about light. Light is  
totally different, because light is the 'mediator of synchronicity'.

> *Think of the Io eclipse events as an audible clock ticking. When the  
Earth*

> *has no relative speed in relation to Jupiter there is an "at rest  
rate".*

> *When the Earth retreats from Jupiter the Doppler effect reduces the  
rate. SR*

> *says the relative speed of sound remains the same after you start*

> *retreating. Now if the speed of sound stayed the same,... the moving*

sci.astro: Re: Light Speed Test versus Special Relativity

Earth

> *would hear the "at rest rate" while it was retreating.*

No it doesn't. You already know that the distance is increasing, think about it

> *That is exactly why*

> *SR is impossible. If SR were true there would be no 1003 sec delay as*

> *observed by Roemer. As long as the 1003 sec delay exists since 1676*

> *AD,...SR is impossible.*

Guess what, you are wrong, think about it.

> *If two things have different speeds in the same direction relative to*

> *Jupiter it is impossible for the relative speed to be equal to the*

*fastest*

> *speed. This same statement is true for rotation on a common axis.*

>

> *"OG" <owen@gwynnefamily.org.uk> wrote in message*

> *news:3abv7mF6ae48oU1@individual.net...*

>>

>> *"Stan Byers" <sbyers11@comcast.net> wrote in message*

>> *news:DYKdnVNi2Jg7zqHfRVn-3A@comcast.com...*

>>>

>>> *Gentlemen of physical science.*

>>>

>>> *This notice is posted with a request for reviews. All comments,*

>> *corrections*

>>> *and alternate views are welcome. Reviews may be posted on this*

*group*

>> *or*

>>> *emailed. Reviews will not be posted on the web site or news groups*

>> *without*

>>> *the reviewing author's prior permission. The links for the graphs*

*are*

>>> *listed below and the graphs are currently available on the website.*

>>>

>>> *Io's period change graphs via Excel spreadsheet.*

>>>

>>> *Earth retreating from Jupiter*

>>> <http://home.netcom.com/~sbyers11/IoAppro.gif>

>>>

>>> *Earth approaching Jupiter*

>>> <http://home.netcom.com/~sbyers11/IoEcipChange4.gif>

>>>

>>> *This entire article is available on the website. Newsgroup readers*

*may*

>>> *review the*

>>> *complete article at the link*

>>>

>>> [http://home.netcom.com/~sbyers11/litespd\\_vs\\_sr.htm](http://home.netcom.com/~sbyers11/litespd_vs_sr.htm)

sci.astro: Re: Light Speed Test versus Special Relativity

- > >>
- > >> *Shortly after the reviews have been received this content will be*
- > >> *incorporated with the other pages on the site.*
- > >> *Citations or links to arguments correcting or refuting this*
- > >> *interpretation of Roemer's data will be appreciated.*
- > >> *A link or quote of rational arguments will be added to the web*
- page.
- > >
- > > *Your site includes the following key paragraph*
- > > *QUOTE*
- > > *If the speed of the train of light and events from Jupiter was not*
- > > *reduced in relation to the retreating Earth, succeeding observations*
- of
- > > *eclipse events would remain in synchronism with the observations of*
- the
- > > *near point. How could a station 2.6549 million miles further from*
- > > *Jupiter observe an eclipse event at the same time that it is*
- observed at
- > > *the near point*
- > > *END QUOTE*
- > >
- > > *That is a pretty big IF. . .*
- > > *Please explain precisely WHY successive observations would remain in*
- > > *synch if speed of light was not reduced.*
- > > *They would move out of synch simply because of the increased*
- distance.
- >
- > *Yes, that is exactly right. and the Earth's distance per unit time is*
- > *producing the distance.*
- > *Therefore the relative speed has changed. Just like the train,...  $C-v$ .*

What is this, ""proof by assertion"?"

- > *SR says the speed of light stays the same after you start retreating.*
- > *If the speed stays the same the light's frequency stays the same.*
- > *If the frequency stays the same the period between wave crests stay*
- the
- > *same.*

What on earth makes you say this?

- > *If the period for the light wave stays the same the period for the*
- events
- > *carried by the light stay the same.*
- > *If the period of events (eclipse) stay the same, there will be no 1003*
- > *second delay.*

You forget that in the interval between tics there is in increase in distance.

As I said. . . .

sci.astro: Re: Light Speed Test versus Special Relativity

- > > *It is, of course, no coincidence that the change in eclipse period*
- is
- > > *proportional to the relative speed of the Earth and Jupiter, since*
- the
- > > *relative speed times 152,916seconds gives the increase in distance.*

Technically, I think you would be correct if the speed of light was infinite, but in real life you are not correct.