Re: Testing the oneway lightspeed constancy

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.astro/2008−03/msg00193.html

- *From*: xray4abc <lemhenyil@xxxxxxxx>
- *Date*: Fri, 21 Mar 2008 17:16:11 −0700 (PDT)

On Mar 21, 6:43 pm, "N:dlzc D:aol T:com \(dlzc\)" <dl...@xxxxxxx>
wrote:

> Dear xray4abc:
>
> "xray4abc" <lemhen...@xxxxxxxx> wrote in message
>
> news:3ff69dc1−b2d5−4aa8−a6a4−5d8ed3d23523@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
> On Mar 21, 3:18 pm, "N:dlzc D:aol T:com \(dlzc\)" <dl...@xxxxxxx>
> wrote:
>
>> Dear xray4abc:
>>
>> "xray4abc" <lemhen...@xxxxxxxx> wrote in message
>>
>> news:abcf10f2−27f1−4a78−9909−3df143fc5aa4@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
>> On Mar 20, 11:45 pm, dlzc <dl...@xxxxxxx> wrote:
>> ...
>>
>>> 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!)
>>
>> This is not correct. *Any* determination of
>> speed *requires* two−way measurement. Note

> > that any "standard distance" confers "two−way"
> > to any measurement.
>
> Than should I conclude that there is no
> real, direct experimental, evidence validating
> the c=const. postulate?

If by your question you meant "one way", correct. You should also note that SR's second postulate is not required, since Maxwell requires a constant speed of light as a result (not a postulate), and Maxwell is covered in the first of special relativity's postulates.

I am working right now with Maxwell's equations.
I'll let you know if I find something different.
Until now I took it as given the usual interpretation.
I have learnt from Jefimenko that things can be seen from different angles and in different ways.
So, wish me luck! :−)

> Do not forget, I am just interested in
> the subject of speed−constancy here and not
> the speed value itself! Note that, should the
> light have "any" speed with respect to the
> observer, this would not have any impact on
> the measured frequency ! As such, the
> speed of light is not an issue for me right now.

OK.

> (On the other hand I doubt that " any
> determination of speed requires 2−way
> measurement" as you state above.

It is fact.

> I sense a, kind of, "circus vicious" here.
> But let's forget about it ,as it is not the point
> here!)
> I am aiming to understand how c=const
> can happen.

Learn Maxwell. You will a "how", but not a "why".

> But then, I want to make sure that I am dealing with an experimental fact and not just a postulate meant to build a theory!

Postulate not required, as previously stated.

> The fact that this theory gives good results here and there does not impress me any more.

I am sorry.

> −(−1)=1 You know what I mean! (2 mistakes can cancel each other giving a correct result!)

All theories we have are wrong. They just happen to give useful results oever a certain domain. The domain for special relatiivty is fairly broad. Two mistakes cannot cancel themselves out over the whole domain.

...

> > 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 .

> > The muon "sees" no difference in its energy levels. How does it know how much energy others see it having?

> You think so?
> O/\/\/\/\/\O <−−−−−−−−F
> Then, if you push the system of 2 bodies, would they "know" how much energy they should get?

> Do you know *anything* about muons, and how they are formed?
> They are formed in a single "impulse", there is no "acceleration
> history".
>
> > Note that muons do not "live longer" if high
> > speed protons are shot past them... except
> > to the protons of course.
> >
> > My bottom line is : The muon behaviour
> > probably will be explained by quantum
> > mechanics without any SRT involved!
>
> So you don't know any quantum mechanics either.

Probably not as much as you do!
But I understand it , and I feel it.
I have a great imagination at least, I have physics and
mathematics in my blood if not at the tip of my pen.
That muons

> have a "halflife" is described by quantum mechanics. That is
> halflife is some proportion of some other unstable system's
> halflife is covered by quantum mechanics. That the halflife is
> so many microseconds in a rest frame... quantum mechanics can't
> go there.

I would not be so sure!
Laws like the disintegration −law depend after all on the internal
structures of the entities involved, not as form but as constants.
This is where some work could be done!
Did they find the halflife, based on a study of the structure of
muons ?
I doubt that. You may be better informed!

>Relativity, being classical, does.

I feel that it could be done without any relativity involved.
But, then why the headache? If no questions...no headaches!
You must be a happy man! Or not?

> David A. Smith− Hide quoted text −
>
> − Show quoted text −

Regards, LL
.