

Re: Redshift without expansion

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.astro/2006-06/msg00439.html>

- *From:* "sean" <jaymoseley@xxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 29 Jun 2006 02:34:59 -0700
-

Jan Panteltje wrote:

On a sunny day (26 Jun 2006 06:25:12 -0700) it happened "sean" <jaymoseley@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in <1151328311.865188.13890@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>:

William Hamblen wrote:

On Fri, 23 Jun 2006 16:34:21 GMT, Jan Panteltje <pNaonStpeatmje@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

I once did read something like:
The changing electric field creates a magnetic field at 90 degrees, when that magnetic field finally collapses (=changes) it creates an changing electric field again, etc etc the wave rolls along....
Fun, do not know (was that Maxwell too?) who it was that wrote that.

You have your oscillating E (electric) field and your B (magnetic) field (or H field depending on the system of notation you're using) and the E vectors and B vectors are at right angles to each other.
You don't have one without the other, which is why they call it electromagnetic radiation. The fields don't collapse, exactly, until they interact with something, which is when quantum mechanics raises its head

Re: Redshift without expansion

But its not oscillating in a dimension. So how can 2 vectors that are not dimension vectors or at least not the flux vector, be at 90 degrees to each other. Thats sort of like saying that sound waves amplitude is at right angles to its direction of propogation.

Well, I am not endlessly going to try defend something I just did read, but think for a moment:

The changing electric field will generate a magnetic field 'further away', theat in turn will generate an electric field even further away....

The electric and magnetic fields are 90 degrees out of phase.

So one 'vector' is rotating $\sin(\omega t)$ and the other $\cos(\omega t)$ where ' ω ' is $2 \times \pi \times f$.

Yes thats sort of the way Ive read it too.

Now I say,... change that picture slightly. Instead of two rotating fields, make it one. A combo flux/magnetic field. And its flux is constant in that it does not oscillate in amplitude and only decreases with brightness over distance. Then, have that field rotate 360 at right angles to direction of propogation so that the flux/mag rotates sort of like a turning corkscrew looked at from the front . Then when it hits any surface or filter lets say it gets polarized in that only one angle of this rotating field is seen every cycle . What you have then is the flux/mag field popping on and off and giving the impression of a variable flux amplitude. And this model can explain all known observed qulities of light. And if you then give this rotating flux/mag field a decceleration over time without altering its forward propogation at constant c then the effect will be to decrease its frequency over time. Thats also called redshift without expansion.>>I thought one way to describe redshift without any new particles or

tired light baggage would be to have the speed of oscilattion of the magnetic field slow by a very small constant amount each oscillation coupled with a constant c of wave propogation. So that only over great cosmological distances would the lengthening of wavelength be observable.

Sean

That is 'tired light' theory is it not?No. definitely not. Tired light tries to explain a redshift without altering maxwells definition. I propose changing maxwells definition.

And why not? After all Maxwell made this model up more than a 100 years ago well before redshift was discovered. If hubble had been alive during Maxwells day and discovered redshift before Maxwell did his work Im sure Maxwell would have added an extra variable to account for redshift on light on cosmological distances. The thing everyone forgets now is he developed his model based on what was known at the time. And at the time no-one knew that light was redshifted. Therefore if he had of known about redshifted light he couldnt have formulated his equations unless he accomodated it by having a decreasing spin over

Re: Redshift without expansion

distance.

Sean

www.gammarayburst.com

.