Re: 1c+1c Closing Velocity of Light and Matter

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005−01/4636.html

---

jgreenfield_at_seol.net.au
Date: 01/23/05

Date: 22 Jan 2005 17:30:10 −0800

Henri Wilson wrote:
> On 20 Jan 2005 21:23:43 −0800, "jgreenfield@seol.net.au"
<jgreen@seol.net.au>
> wrote:
>
> >
> >Henri Wilson wrote:
> >> On 19 Jan 2005 17:19:01 −0800, "jgreenfield@seol.net.au"
> ><jgreen@seol.net.au>
> >> wrote:
>
> >> >
> >> >OK
> >> >How long will Cassini be there (Saturn)
> >> >Ghosts calcs gave .5sec from Saturn diff with source velocity of
> >> >30km/sec.
> >>
> >> Let's see, Saturn is about 15E8 kms from us.
> >> Light moving at c will takes some 5E3 seconds, or 83 minutes to
reach
> >earth.
> >>
> >> 0.0001 of that is 0.5 secs. Ghost is correct.
> >>
> >>
> >> >So earth to Cassini diff with two satellites (earth orbiting)
with
> >rel
> >> >speed of 14.6 k/s would be about .25 sec (signal would be
> >RE−EMITTED
> >> >by Cassini, so the returning signals would not be following c+v
if
> >we
> >> >can match signal to Cassini when it is not approaching/regressing
> >from
> >> >earth).
> >>

> >> *Yes. I get the picture.*
> >>
> >> >*At these distances, the tiny amount of travel of the source,*
> >*compared*
> >> >*to the time lapse between the returning signals, becomes*
> >*insignificant.*
> >> >*The positions of the emitting satellites could be determined*
> >*acurately*
> >> >*within a few kms (or less), while the order of difference in the*
> >> >*positions of the returning pulses is 70,000kms*
> >>
> >> *Yes I believe that should work. I see no technical difficulties*
> >*associated with*
> >> *detecting and retransmitting the two signals (0.25 secs apart) by*
> >*cassini. They*
> >> *would have to be exactly the same frequency in case of any*
refraction
> >*effects.*
> >> *In fact, the two signal arrival times only have to be recorded at*
> >*cassini and*
> >> *the combined wave shape relayed back any time.*
> >>
> >> *One would expect something like this:*
> >>
> >> *~~~~~/WW\~~~0.25s~~~/WW\~~~~~*
> >>
> >> *The positions of the sources should be determinable to within*
metres
> >*using GPS*
> >> *or other methods. At 7000m/s, 0.25 secs represents 1750m.*
> >
> >*And the returning signal is not picked up by the satellites, so who*
> >*gives a stuff where they are then? All we need is this locating of*
the
> >*satellites at emission, so as to prevent any claims of influence in*
the
> >*time differential due to their separation.*
>
> *Accurate positioning is critical though.*
> *But there's no reason why the two sources shouldn't be almost*
adjacent when
> *they send the signals.*
> *Did you suggest that before?*
> *The two sources are arranged so that they are traveling in opposite*
directions
> *in almost the same orbits − but not so they will crash into each*
other. When
> *adjacent, they both emit their signals.*

If they were 100km apart, it still only gives a time difference due to
their positions

in the order 1/3000 sec, compared to the round trip to Saturn of the
two signals of .5sec, so position is fairly insignificant, as long as
we know how they are both travelling ref Sat.
> *>*
> *>*
> *> >>*
> *> >> The only problem I can see is that there might be some kind of EM*
> *> >reference*
> *> >> frame surrounding the Earth which will tend to unify the two*
> *> >velocities.*

No. Two very quick pulses will not be in each others
"space"− they will not be "aware" of the others existence
> *> >>*
> *> >> Something like that apparently happens with distant stars because*
> *> >thermal*
> *> >> velocities of the atomic sources should have a significant effect*
on
> *> >predicted*
> *> >> brightness curves and don't appear to do so (although I am not*
100%
> *> >sure about*
> *> >> that). That could be a result of a gaseous outer layer acting as a*
> *> >unifying*
> *> >> medium.*
> *> >*
> *> >I've long suspected that photons in a beam (as opposed to separated*
or
> *> >sparse photons), "share" energy, if that is the right approach. They*
> *> >seem to have a preferred shared velocity, like a wing of ducks.*
> *> >Harmonics??*
> *>*
> *> Yes, that's part of my H−aether theory.*
> *> Light interacts very slightly with other light that it meets in its*
travels and
> *> it all tends towards a common velocity over great distances.*

Yes, "as it meets"− in this case it won't (except near Saturn and when
going in opposite directions)
> *>*
> *> >I'd like to detonate an A bomb in space, and take a moving picture*
from
> *> >here. The flash is very short duration (instant), but would the*
picture
> *> >on the moving film be a line/spectrum?? I know different wavelengths*
> *> >travel at the same speed (from the same source), but there is*
something
> *> >weird about redshift and Fraunhoffer lines which is sus*
> *>*
> *> there's a lot of weird stuff out there Jim.*

But what about this spectrum on a moving photo plate− do you think we'd see one? (indicating different wavelengths were travelling at slightly different speeds)
I think maybe not (?) but Fraunhoffer lines are dodgy, somehow :−(
Ooroo
Jim G
c'=c+v