Re: Speed of Light is Constant in Tired Light Models, Decelerated Light is a new model

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2008−05/msg00664.html

- *From*: Michael Helland <mobydikc@xxxxxxxxx>
- *Date*: Thu, 8 May 2008 16:31:48 −0700 (PDT)

On May 8, 3:07 pm, jjs...@xxxxxxxxx wrote:

> On May 8, 3:56 pm, Michael Helland <mobyd...@xxxxxxxxx> wrote:
>
> > On May 6, 4:08 pm, "OG" <o...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
> >
> > > "Michael Helland" <mobyd...@xxxxxxxxx> wrote in
> > > message
> > >
> > > news:480fde48−5665−44c4−8266−b448d4542cb3@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
> > >
> > > > On May 2, 6:49 pm, Eric Gisse
> > > > <jowr...@xxxxxxxxx> wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > On May 2, 5:23 pm,
> > > > > Michael Helland
> > > > > <mobyd...@xxxxxxxxx>
> > > > > wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > > On May 2,
> > > > > > 4:28 pm,
> > > > > > "OG"
> > > > > > <o...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
> > > > > > wrote:

"Sam
Wormley"
<sworml...@xxxxxxxxx>
wrote
in
message

news:EJMSj.92984$TT4.16809@xxxxxxxxxxxx

OG
wrote:

"Sam
Wormley"
<sworml...@xxxxxxxxx>
wrote
in
message
news:wlsSj.91494$TT4.50522@xxxxxxxxxx

OG
wrote:

So
some
light
is
travelling
slower
than
other
light...

No
the
speed
of
light
is
the
same
for
all

inertial
observers.

I'm
just
restating
a
onsequence
of
his
flawed
theory
so
that
we
can
draw
out
the
inconsistencies

What
inconsistencies?

Dunno
yet;
he's
not
told
us
enough
so
far*!
Personally,
I'm
looking
for
inconsistencies
with
'real
life',
but
unless
we
know

know
more
about
physics
in
the
'world
of
M_Helland'
we
won't
know
where
his
'physics'
gets
close
enough
to
reality
that
he
will
start
to
think
critically
about
his
theory.

As I've
shown, c =
fw

As you have ASSERTED...

Either c is
constant,
and when f
drops, w
expands to
compensate.

> Or w is
> constant,
> and when f
> drops c
> drops too.

> No matter
> which way
> you
> calculate c
> and w, f
> should be
> consistent
> with
> observations.

> > Only if you are incredibly
> > naive and refuse to actually
> > think very
> > hard.

I've thought hard about it.

This implies that I'm suggesting properties
of an EM wave that don't
fit on the traditional EM spectrum.

> > You continue to refuse to
> > elevate the discourse past
> > "well it
> > expands to compensate...".
> > Remember the Tolman
> > surface brightness
> > test? I'm sure you do since
> > you carefully ignore every
> > mention of it
> > now.

> Tired Light fails the surface brightness test, because the galaxy is not receding, and the light doesn't slow down.
>
> However, when the light slows down (w is constant and c decreases) you wind up with all the exact same frequencies as when space expands (c is constant and w increases).
>
> Decelerating light predicts all the same values as expansion, because
>
> > How the hell would you know? You know bugger all about physics, and you've ignored the point that lenses don't differentiate between your proposed 'deccelerated' light and normal light when bringing it to focus.

I apologize for not responding satisfactorily.

I thought I responded to it.

The rule says that new light travels at c, and its velocity drops as the millions and billions of years go by.

When light enters a lens, it hits electrons, and new photons are emitted with the same energy.

But it is new light, so its traveling at c.

> Once the light hits something and is re−emitted, it travels at c.
> According to the rule.
>
> The light in the lens matches that prediction.
>
> Hmmm.... lets see how does this match with reality? Anyone want to take a stab at this one?

The code shows that even though light decelerates after a few hundred million light years, it is emitted at c.

In QED, when light enters a lens, it is absorbed by electrons in the atoms and emitted elsewhere.

So the photons in the lens are traveling at c, but they are spending some time as energy in the atoms between short little journeys.
.