Astronomical Test Proposal cont.

3 mensajes

Juan Joaquín Schulz Poquet <jjschulzpoquet@gmail.com>   19 de enero de 2010 18:55
Para: Slava G Turyshev <~~████████~~@jpl.nasa.gov>
Cc: "Marr, James C (7030)" <james.c.marr@jpl.nasa.gov>, "michael.shao" <michael.shao@jpl.nasa.gov>, Stephen C Unwin <stephen.c.unwin@jpl.nasa.gov>, astijose@~~████~~.gov.ar, ~~████████~~@usa.net, fmirabel ~~████████~~.org>, ~~████~~.uba.ar

Dr. Slava G. Turyshev,   Research Scientist
Relativistic Astrophysics Research Group
NASA Jet Propulsion Laboratory, MS 301-486
~~4800 Oak Grove Drive~~, Pasadena, CA 91109 USA

Dear Slava,

After a little rest for you -I had some labor and personal inconveniences, here again, thanking your gentle words and disturbing your peace with my comments.

Despite I don't consider the #2 postulate as directly proved, I can't ignore the value and utility of all the formulas and equations derived from STR in the high speed's dynamic calculations. As a result, nowadays they represent a fundamental tool equipment, among others, in your task of astrometry.

These assertions may appear contradictory but if you read my published article you may notice that I'm proposing an alternative theory, that "of the moving fields" that could yield similar formulas. It was posed only as an example, surely it may be improved.

I know that for a scientific worker may doesn't matter if the principles are correct or not, that the important fact is to have equations that can predict the respective results when processing specified parameters.

But this comfortable position, if extended in time, may be a trap for Science, as happened during centuries in Astronomy with the handy data available with the geocentric theory of Ptolemy.

Well, once more, this is my petition, that in spite of the good tools you have to properly determine the actual positions of celestial bodies, and other features through Relativity, may you probe its #2 postulate with the application of the Stellar Aberration test to the case of visually close celestial bodies with quite different radial speeds.

And my additional petition is do not wait until the projected 2015 launch of your SIM mission. I think you have available the registered data of the past Hipparcos mission and, of course, the capability to analyze them adequately. I asked ESA to do the same but up to day I didn't receive any response from them.

Let's now immerse in the marrow of this matter. Suppose this fact: two close rays of light, traveling together from the bottom of the universe, but with different speeds c and c' due to the ones of their sources.

How to evidence this difference? Due to the electronic reemission, once a ray of light, with velocity c' pass through, or is reflected by, a dielectric, the emerging light will be c, independent of which had been the incident one: only will vary the wave length, to say, here we have the Doppler Effect, that, effectively let us to determine the wanted difference. The pity is that under the STR formulas we also may explain the suffered spectrum shift, although as a change in the wave length in the source, measured by the observer, instead of a change in the velocity of the light. This is the reason why so many experiments carried out in laboratories gave null result when probing variances in light speed.

But in the case of stellar aberration, the dielectric of the telescope lens play   in favor of us, not against us, because it is the place where the composition of speeds takes place, where the observer encounters the light of the star. And the formula $\tan A = v/c$ has different significance in the Bradley than in the STR conceptions, first at all, because in the last one no variances of first order may happen with celestial bodies with different radial speeds, since the light speed is supposed to be constant. While with the Bradley model a speed $c' = c+R$ is possible, that will yield a different aberration A' .

I apologize my insistence, may be I am abusing of your patience, but these are my thoughts, and I thank you very much the opportunity to expose them. Now the ball is in your field. I would like to know from you and yours plans again.

With my best wishes and respects, sincerely,

Juan J. Schulz Poquet