

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

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

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2006-06/msg02304.html>

- *From:* "Sorcerer" <Headmaster@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 30 Jun 2006 16:35:52 GMT
-

"Rudolf Drabek" <newsrudy@xxxxxx> wrote in message
news:1151619701.464124.288570@xx

Rudolf Drabek schrieb:

Sorcerer schrieb:

"Rudolf Drabek" <newsrudy@xxxxxx> wrote in message
news:1151589031.035060.178890@xx

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.

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

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>

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.

Speed = distance/time.

The blue ray goes further than the red ray in the same time, therefore the speed of the blue ray is greater than the speed of the red.

That's what you wanted, proof of c+v, c–v.

Doppler's equation is

$$f' = f \frac{c+v}{c+u}$$

but there is no u in this case and the frequencies are

$$f' = f \frac{c+v}{c}$$

and

$$f' = f \frac{c-v}{c}$$

|> I can explain it to you, I can't understand it for you.

The formulas are clear.

Curious, rotation seems to have an aspect of absolute motion.

First I need some time to think about.

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

Einstein fits good to the majority of effects in nature.

Yeah, sure. An apple fits good to an orange, both are round.

It may not be the final answer. According to Sir Popper we must always question

current state of the art.

<http://www.mahag.com/srt/sagnac.php> in German language.

Here it is stated that this effect troubles SR and main stream physicists

avoid this matter.

I must think longer...

By all means think, Rudi. Take all the time you need.

Geschwindigkeit is the magnitude of Geschwindigkeit.

Androcles.

rgds Rudi

Sagnac is not an "experiment", ring laser gyroscopes are commonly used daily in aircraft.

Androcles.

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 avoid simply by introducing a 2nd receiver at some

distance to the 1st one.

Do you agree with that?|

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

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

<http://www.androcles01.pwp.blueyonder.co.uk/DominoEffect.GIF>

We are now in a position to measure this exactly with radio signals from manmade spacecrafts, that have an increasing distance to Earth. This condition is necessary otherwise one could argue against the method. So there is some "c + v" given.

On Earth simply two antennas are placed at some distance, say around 10 km with 1cm accuracy to have resolution of 10^{-6} . Measurements are done when the antennas are "one behind the other" in direction to the spacecraft.

A clock at the same distance to both antennas supplies time marks to the x-axis of oscilloscopes at both antennas where the received signals are viewed. So here the time between a significant "mark" in the signal can be measured e.g. a phase jump in the modulation. With a cw signal this measurement is not possible. So I think, that carrying out this with light will have some problems to find a "mark" in the incoming light, but I'm no expert for this.

So we have $s = \text{distance between antennas}$
 $t_e = s/c$ which also can easily be measured with a signal originating from a source on earth. This time is used to "calibrate" the distance between the antennas.

If signals from the spacecraft are coming in

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

with $c + v$ then we
would
measure
 $t_n = s/(c + v)$ If v would be 3 km/sec then we
have a ratio of
 $c/c+v$ according
(but also at certain times in the year you
have ± 30 km/sec
additionally. don't forget).
 t_n can also be written for $v \ll c$ as $t_n = t_e(1 \pm v/c)$
So you see the experiment is quite robust to
deviations of the
distance
s.

Now we compare t_e and t_n . If there is a
difference Einstein is wrong
and the Non Sirians can jubilee.

Indeed if $t_n = t_e$ this is not to explain with
logic. But if light or
em-waves behave so, we must accept it, as
Einstein did as a physical
secret unsolved to date. May be the Non
Sirians can't accept this.
We
will see.

I hope the setup is clear. May be this was
already carried out, but
i
found no reference.

It is carried out right now, here's a reference
: NASA-JPL.

<http://www.androcles01.pwp.blueyonder.co.uk/Synchronize/Synchronize.htm>
Einstein is wrong.
Androcles.

This is a little bit too quick for me. Can we agree 1st that the
setup
proposed is good enough to make evidence of $c \pm v$
possibility or not?

Roemer's "clock" was the Jovian moons. He knew with some
precision
exactly when light would be emitted from a moon as it
appeared

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

from behind Jupiter. What he did not know was the distance to Jupiter, but he was close. That is OWLS. Embedded in the page I gave you is a reference to

<http://saturn.jpl.nasa.gov/operations/saturn-time.cfm>

and so Roemer's method is repeated every time we receive a time-stamped image from Cassini, which is set to UTC. Ask Cassini the time, and you have TWLS. JPL engineers are not going to repeat Einstein's stupidity and figure out the time the request arrives at Saturn, they rely on Cassini's clock, not Cassini's mirror. As it turns out, for six months of the year the time for a signal to reach Cassini is greater than the time it takes to get an answer, and for the other six months it is less than the time it takes to get an answer. So Einstein's claim "we establish by definition that the "time" required by light to travel from A to B equals the "time" it requires to travel from B to A" is nonsense.

Your "experiment" will never be performed (unless you do it yourself) because it is unnecessary.

"the velocity of light in our theory plays the part, physically, of an infinitely great velocity."– Einstein.

Einstein's disciples play the part, physically, of Munchkins singing "Follow the yellow brick road", seeking Einstein, the Wizard of Oz. One should not confuse mathematical games with physics.

Androcles.

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

Rudi

If something is overseen from me, I see it in
yr comments, friendly
I
hope!
Rudi