

Re: The speed of light can not be physically constant to all

Re: The speed of light can not be physically constant to all

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2006-03/msg02260.html>

- *From:* "Spaceman" <Realspace@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 19 Mar 2006 17:18:04 -0500
-

"The Ghost In The Machine" <ewill3@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message news:pan.2006.03.19.20.09.18.983864@xxxxxxxxxxxx

Gosh what a surprise. Still, the example above illustrates some of the difficulties; $1.06 \cdot 10^{-13}$ mph would be extremely difficult to measure; a car traveling at that speed will take 664 years to move 1 millimeter. Were one contemplating two planes moving at 200 mph and 400 mph, the delta would be $1.06 \cdot 10^{-11}$ mph; 1 mm would only take 6.64 years at that speed, but walking would probably be a little faster.

So you are saying 186,000 miles + 93,000 miles does not equal 279,000 miles then?
I will never hire you to drive my starship..

However, far easier verification methods are possible; the one I happen to like, for example, involves a "malfunctioning" muon, which is trapped inside of a storage ring while traveling at very high speed. There was also an experiment involving pi mesons moving at a substantial fraction of lightspeed ($0.2c$), throwing off gamma rays as they decay; the speed of the gamma rays turns out to also be lightspeed, *relative to the lab*. Presumably, one can also measure the energy of said gamma rays.

So when a muon travels a 1 ring distance it does nto actually travel a 1 ring distance?
You have no proof of anything about adding distances with a muon.

Other issues include the design of the LHC, and the stipulation of a proton beam speed that is close to light when the amount of energy thrown at the beam is many times the value $\frac{1}{2} \cdot m_p \cdot c^2$ as required by Newtonian/Galilean theory.

Re: The speed of light can not be physically constant to all

Re: The speed of light can not be physically constant to all

That is totally irrelevant to the discussion.

All of these show "rubber rulers", "taffy time", and "magic mass", but if that's what is required for consistent interpretation of the phenomena, so be it.

No,
none of them show that adding distances is incorrectly done with basic math like I am using.
They only show you have ignored what I stated to squeel about some irrelevant garbage.