

Re: c = constant is still under discussion in this group

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2006-06/msg02165.html>

- *From:* "Rudolf Drabek" <newsrudy@xxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 29 Jun 2006 06:50:31 -0700
-

Sorcerer schrieb:

"Rudolf Drabek" <newsrudy@xxxxxx> wrote in message
news:1151534175.310971.311350@xx
Sorcerer schrieb:

"Rudolf Drabek" <newsrudy@xxxxxx> wrote in message
news:1151516048.818174.99200@xx
This matter is not solved in this group.
It may be that it is solved, but I don't know the source.
One link I've found but can't recover, was optical with interference.
The various techs to measure c are, except of Römer, TWLS.

Oh, do come off it, Rudi. All it takes is an oscilloscope and a couple
of phototransistors, I've measured the speed of light myself.
c is a different matter.

I do not want to measure c (I have also the needed equipment as you).
Also I do not want to synchronize clocks.
What I want is to measure is, if light (em-waves) can come in with c
+- v or not.

↳ That's easy enough. Use doppler.
Doppler says in my view not all. You can have Doppler shift of
frequency but still c can be constant.
Therefore I designed this experiment to have an end of the discussion
in this group.
Thank you in any case if this was your final answer.

rgds Rudi

<http://www.androcles01.pwp.blueyonder.co.uk/Sagnac/Sagnac.htm>

Re: $c = \text{constant}$ is still under discussion in this group

I looked to that Sagnac exp. What I can follow is, that if you turn the device, during that time you see changing interference pictures.

If I have only a source, moving or not rel. to the receiver and one receiver I never can measure the speed of the incoming signal if I don't know the distance. And I would need synchronized clocks.
All this I can