

# Re: OWLS Without Absolute Synchronization

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2006-09/msg00019.html>

- *From:* "Sorcerer" <[Headmaster@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:Headmaster@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
- *Date:* Thu, 31 Aug 2006 22:53:28 GMT

"Henri Wilson" <HW@..> wrote in message  
[news:vklef2hiqunbmfuh4s12dsohqu6vusoan2@xxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:vklef2hiqunbmfuh4s12dsohqu6vusoan2@xxxxxxxxxxx)  
 | On Thu, 31 Aug 2006 08:11:47 GMT, "Sorcerer"  
 <[Headmaster@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:Headmaster@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>

| wrote:

|

|>

|>"Henri Wilson" <HW@..> wrote in message

|>[news:fc7cf2hohks1lf7da6mbt7b083dce4b9n8@xxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:fc7cf2hohks1lf7da6mbt7b083dce4b9n8@xxxxxxxxxxx)

|>| On Tue, 29 Aug 2006 23:15:15 +0200, "Paul B. Andersen"

|>| <[paul.b.andersen@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:paul.b.andersen@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

|>|

|>|>Henri Wilson wrote:

|>|>> On Wed, 23 Aug 2006 13:13:19 GMT, [tb2@xxxxxxx](mailto:tb2@xxxxxxx) (TymBuk2) wrote:

|>|>>

|>|>>> .....OWLS Without Absolute Synchronization.....

|>|>>>

|>|>>> Place Clocks 1 and 2 at two nearby points\*

|>|>>> on Earth's equator.\*\*

|>|>>> \*(e.g., the points can be 50 miles apart)

|>|>>> \*\*(see crude diagram)

|>|>>>

|>|>>> . \* .

|>|>>> - -

|>|>>> \* \* to Sun

|>|>>> + + ^

|>|>>> + + !

|>|>>> + + !

|>|>>> + @ +

|>|>>> + Earth's No. Pole + -----> orbit

|>|>>> + +

|>|>>> + +

|>|>>> + + /

|>|>>> + + / clockwise

|>|>>> + + / rotation

|>|>>> + - - +

|>|>>> ||

|>|>>> 1 2

## Re: OWLS Without Absolute Synchronization

|> >>>  
|> >>> Send a light signal eastward from Clock 1 to Clock 2,  
|> >>> having Clock 1 start on zero as the signal is sent, and  
|> >>> having Clock 2 start on zero when the signal arrives.  
|> >>>  
|> >>> Wait 12 hours (per Clock 2) as Earth rotates 180 degrees,  
|> >>> then send a light signal back from Clock 2 to Clock 1.  
|> >>>  
|> >>> The signals travel one way in the same direction in space.  
|> >>>  
|> >>> Compute the speed of light from the net elapsed time  
|> >>> shown by Clock 1 after subtracting 12 hours for the hold  
|> >>> period, and you will get the one-way speed of light for  
|> >>> a given direction in space.  
|> >>>  
|> >>> Synchronization of clocks is irrelevant in this experiment.  
|> >>> The clocks need not be synchronized. They merely need to  
|> >>> have same rate, so the 12-hour hold period can be  
|> >>> precisely accounted for.  
|> >>>  
|> >>> Physicists need to show why this one-way speed of  
|> >>> light would not vary directly with Earth velocity.  
|> >>>  
|> >>> TymBuk2  
|> >>> tb2@xxxxxxx  
|> >>  
|> >>  
|> >> Why go to all this trouble? You are bound to get the answer: OWLS =  
|> 'c'.  
|> >>  
|> >> Light moves at  $c$  wrt its source. It moves at  $c-v$  towards an object  
|> moving at  $v$   
|> >> in the source frame.  
|> >>  
|> >> Since your clocks are in the same (supposedly inertial) frame, light  
|> from  
|> >> either will move at  $c$  wrt the other.  
|> >>  
|> >> OWLS can never be directly measured (with absolute confidence).  
However  
|> it is  
|> >> possible to COMPARE light speed from differently moving sources by  
|> measuring  
|> >> the time taken for their light to simultaneously traverse the same  
|> spatial  
|> >> distance.  
|> >>  
|> >> For the only known practical way to do this, see:  
|> >> [www.users.bigpond.com/hewn/moonrelay.jpg](http://www.users.bigpond.com/hewn/moonrelay.jpg)  
|> >  
|> > Why go to all that trouble?

Re: OWLS Without Absolute Synchronization

|> >The BaT MUST be correct.  
|>  
|> At least I've finally managed to get THAT truism into your brain.  
|>  
|> >If an experiment says otherwise, it must be because it is wrong.  
|> >A lot of wrong experiments are made. Not a single one got it right!  
|> >So why bother?  
|> >There is obviously no point in doing experiments.  
|>  
|> Yes there is. We obtain light curves like the dots in this.  
|> [www.users.bigpond.com/hewn/lmc1.jpg](http://www.users.bigpond.com/hewn/lmc1.jpg)  
|>  
|> Then we see how the BaTh predicts them so easily (red curve).  
|>  
|>A nice array of dots.  
|  
| Andersen is a dot worshipper...  
|  
|>Androcles

Have a nice array of rotating dots:

<http://www.androcles01.pwp.blueyonder.co.uk/Wilson/RotateMickeyLarge.gif>

.