

Re: Formula for Decelerating Light

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2008-05/msg00678.html>

- *From:* none <"doug\"@none">
 - *Date:* Thu, 08 May 2008 18:15:43 -0700
-

Michael Helland wrote:

On May 8, 2:41 pm, jjs...@xxxxxxxxxx wrote:

On May 8, 3:48 pm, Michael Helland <mobyd...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:> On May 8, 8:17 am, jjs...@xxxxxxxxxx wrote:

On May 8, 6:12 am,
MichaelHelland<mobyd...@xxxxxxxxxx>
wrote:
<snip>
Mikepeople have tried to explain why your
wrong to you, but you don't
seem to listen so believe what-ever the hell
you want.

Most people have said "The Speed of Light is Constant!" and
thought
that was it.

Yes because of experimental evidence... none of which you grasp...

I have no trouble accepting that the speed of light traveling in
distances under 500 million light years the speed of light could be
constant.

But experimental evidence (Hubble redshift) shows that the farther you
go out, light is taking longer to get here than it should.

No, you claim that. The experiments do not show it.

<snip> crap

Re: Formula for Decelerating Light

But to each his own.

For those like you who will never hear reason.... yes...

We could trade these subjective commentaries back and forth.

I accept that SR is a very good theory (I can only accept that because I lack understanding it) but maybe it has its limits and the range of electromagnetic force starts to die out at Hubble redshift distances.

So you are just guessing. Research is not done that way. You are supposed to test and justify your conclusions.

Someone made an excellent point, that if very old light was slower than new light, we would see them drop away from the edge of the moon in delays according to distance. That was an excellent criticism.

Which however you ignored along with the issue of Tolman Surface Brightness test...

<snip>

In other words, the effects of gravity on old light would be the same on new light. But that can't possibly be right.

You know this how? Because you've studied cosmology in depth? No.. you have no idea of what the hell your talking about.

Because even though the photon is massless, if it's traveling at half speed it's going to be in the gravitational field twice as long, the gravitational effect should be greater.

<snip> didn't someone post a reading list for you, have you read a single book off of the list? No, well since that is the case go read some books then come back...

Re: Formula for Decelerating Light

Just for shits and giggles, do you know why quantum mechanics makes extensive use of harmonic oscillators? Or how to solve a partial differential equation?

Nope.

Do you know why the Universe is expanding?

Because in physics, electromagnetism goes on forever along the same inverse square law, the force that holds together every atom on earth, doesn't lose its effect even after 650 million light years.

Isn't it true that the nuclear forces die out at some range?

Are you aware that there are books that explain these things?
They even have classes to help you learn these things.

.