

## Re: Testing the oneway lightspeed constancy

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.astro/2008-03/msg00180.html>

---

- *From:* xray4abc <[lemhenyil@xxxxxxxx](mailto:lemhenyil@xxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Fri, 21 Mar 2008 11:00:54 -0700 (PDT)
- 

On Mar 20, 11:45 pm, dlzc <[dl...@xxxxxxxx](mailto:dl...@xxxxxxxx)> wrote:

Dear xray4abc:

On Mar 20, 1:25 pm, xray4abc <[lemhen...@xxxxxxxx](mailto:lemhen...@xxxxxxxx)> wrote:

On Mar 19, 4:12 pm, dlzc <[dl...@xxxxxxxx](mailto:dl...@xxxxxxxx)> wrote:

...

<snip, looking for change in detected frequency based on Earth's motion>

This will not establish a value for  $c$ . You would have to assume that Maxwell was correct, and the "ballistic photon" folks do not assume that.

At this point I am interested only to find out if the lightspeed was really found experimentally constant, using cosmic sources of radiation, and of course to learn where this information was published and accessible for the public.

Yes. Used in MMX experiments, and yielded a constant.

... you can start here: <http://hermes.physics.adelaide.edu.au/~dkoks/Faq/Relativity/SR/experi...>

OK. Now by your knowledge, which of those experiments does not use 2-way propagation or reflections of light ? (Reflections falsify the speed of light measurements!) The DeSitter experiment I have analyzed a while ago and it seems to me not convincing can not see why would be the

## Re: Testing the oneway lightspeed constancy

2 half-periods of revolution different, as both have one half involving movement in forward direction and another half involving movement in backward direction.

The MMX experiments use 2-way propagation for the same signals so do not really matter in my opinion.

That is why I was referring to an experiment using ONLY one-way propagation of signals/light.

You could use the Moon as a shutter, and if the CMBR or other high- $z$  source that should be occulted by the Moon is not occulted at a similar time as local visible light objects, then you will have detected an anisotropy. The 1.3 second one-way transit time can be multiplied by a  $(1+z)$  of almost 5 for some objects, and more than 1000 for the CMBR.

Might even get to publish a fancy paper or two on the subject.

Thanks for the tip!

I am not really interested in publishing now.

I just got this challenge for myself, to understand how things are with special relativity theory and the basics of EM theory. I do not reject anything from the start and I not accept anything as real physics without experimental facts. Even the experimental facts are subject to interpretation. For example, I can imagine easily an alternative interpretation to time-dilation found for the case of muons.:—)

Good. Now review all the data of muons measured at different altitudes, and with systems that use multiple detectors at different levels, and all yield velocity less than  $c$ .

The problem with "special case solutions" is that they fail when you get away from the special case... and relativity goes a lot further before it fails.

Re: Testing the oneway lightspeed constancy

I am not thinking of a special case solution.  
I think that the behaviour of muons could be explained by considering the increase in the number of internal states of the muon as a system of components rather than time dilation. This increase of the mean lifetime is supposed to follow the increase in energy, so that the ratio of "disintegration" states to the number of "relatively stable states" is dropping .

David A. Smith– Hide quoted text –

– Show quoted text –

Regards, LL

.