

Re: Absolute Frame

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2004-07/4393.html>

From: Ahmed Ouahi, Architect (ahmed.ouahi_at_welho.com)

Date: 07/21/04

Date: Wed, 21 Jul 2004 23:43:05 +0300

<http://tinypic.com/wqyg>

<http://tinypic.com/wqxk>

<http://tinypic.com/wqxu>

<http://tinypic.com/wqwx>

<http://tinypic.com/wqxx>

<http://tinypic.com/wqy0>

<http://tinypic.com/wqy8>

<http://tinypic.com/wqyc>

<http://tinypic.com/wqyd>

<http://tinypic.com/wqyh>

<http://tinypic.com/wqyp>

--

Ahmed Ouahi, Architect

Best Regards!

"Martin Miller" <mmtimber@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:a0ac0bee.0407210732.f350287@posting.google.com...

> Tom, the following proof requires neither a definition
> of "absolute clock synchronization" nor the notion of
> "motion through space," so you should have no more
> objections.

>

> (Disclaimer: I am not implying here that either of
> the two just-mentioned concepts are not allowed in
> physics. In fact, I properly pictured two absolutely
> synchronous clocks on paper, just as Einstein has for
> decades properly pictured his asynchronous clocks on
> paper, and I proved using two separate experiments
> that motion through space exists.)

>

> =====
> Here is a simple physics experiment:

>

> Given:

- > 1. Light source S
- > 2. Rod A at rest wrt S
- > 3. Rod B in motion wrt S

> [] = unstated clock

> ~~~~> = light from S

> =====

Re: Absolute Frame

sci.physics.relativity: Re: Absolute Frame

> Note:
> The procedure involved here is simply the
> simplest version of Einsteinian synchronization,
> i.e., the use of midpoint light signals to start
> equidistant clocks on zero.
> =====
>
> The Experiment:
>
> []-----Rod A-----[]
> c<~~S~~>c
> []-----Rod B-----[]-->v
>
>
> []-----Rod A-----[]
> c<~~~~~S~~~~~>c
> -----[]-----Rod B-----[]-->v
>
> The Analysis:
>
> Point 1a:
> Just as in Einstein's train/embankment example, Rod B's
> left-hand clock moved toward its light signal, and
> B's right-hand clock move away from its signal,
> whereas A's clocks moved neither toward nor away from
> their light signals; therefore, we must conclude that
> B's left-hand clock will meet its signal earlier
> than will A's left-hand clock, and B's right-hand clock
> will meet its signal later than will A's right-hand
> clock. This clearly conflicts with Einstein's definition
> of "synchronization," which, of course, mandates the
> same time (zero) for all four clocks (when they are
> started by their light signals).
>
> Point 1b:
> Again, just as in Einstein's train example where his two
> observers saw the left-hand light signal at different
> times, the two left-hand clocks above "see" the left-
> hand signal at different times, and the two right-hand
> clocks "see" the right-hand signal at different times,
> which is in harmony with Einstein's train example, but
> which is in direct conflict with his "synchronization"
> definition. (Note in particular Einstein's key phrase
> "earlier than" in his train example.)
>
> Point 2:
> Since Rod B's clocks do not remain symmetrical about S,
> there is no physical reason for making these two clocks
> read the same time; indeed, the asymmetry calls for
> different readings, again in conflict with Einstein's
> "synchronization" definition.
>
> The Conclusion:
> Even if we give Einstein correct clock synchronization
> in the case of Rod A's clocks, we cannot give him this
> for Rod B's clocks or for the clocks of any other frames
> which move asymmetrically wrt the light source S. Thus,
> experiment tells us that Einstein's clocks are generally
> asynchronous (i.e., they are incorrectly related).
>
> The Ramifications of the Conclusion:
> Since Einstein's clocks are asynchronous, none of the

sci.physics.relativity: Re: Absolute Frame

> results of his clocks are correct, including the one-way
> speed of light, the times t and t' (along with the speeds
> v and v') of Einstein's transformation equations, and each
> of the relativistic results (such as its "time dilation").
> Since special relativity is based solely on one-way light
> speed invariance/isotropy, we see that there is no basis
> either in fact or in theory for special relativity (SR).
>
> Further Explanation of the Ramifications:
> The following simple example covers all three of the
> relativistic effects (i.e., it covers SR's "time dilation,"
> "length contraction," and "mass increase."):
> Since the above simple experiment proved that Einstein's
> clocks are asynchronous (in general), it also proved that
> all of the results of Einstein's clocks are incorrect,
> including those of SR's "time dilation," etc. In the
> case of "time dilation," the asynchronosness of Einstein's
> clocks in each frame causes the observers to (incorrectly)
> find that a passing clock runs slower than their onboard
> clocks. This leads to the apparent absurdity that each
> frame's clocks run slower than the other's. However, as
> the diagram below shows, this reciprocity is merely a
> point-of-view effect, just as is the reciprocity in the
> case where two separating observers each see the other
> "grow smaller":
>
> -----[6]passing clock
> -----[6]---E-Frame A--[7]
>
> -----[6]passing clock
> [6]---E-Frame A---[7]
>
> As we can all see, none of the clocks ran slower; all 3
> ran at the same rate; but the Einsteinian observers in
> Frame A found that the passing clock "ran slower" than
> their own clocks, in direct conflict with reality and
> with physical possibility (because the observers in the
> frame of the passing clock would find that Frame A's
> clocks run slower, and it is not possible for both
> frames' clocks to run slower).
>
> There Is NO Experimental Evidence for SR:
> Special relativity does not pertain to real or intrinsic
> clock slowing, nor does it pertain to actual or physical
> length contraction or to intrinsic mass, so none of the
> corresponding experiments (e.g., the particle accelerator
> experiments) support or pertain to SR. And, as we have
> seen, experiment actually conflicts with the very basis
> of SR, namely, Einstein's light postulate - which calls
> for one-way light speed isotropy/invariance between two
> same-frame clocks.
>
> Final Conclusions:
> SR is at best merely a stopgap definition of clock
> synchronization (to be used only until we can correctly
> synchronize clocks). SR says absolutely nothing nontrivial
> about the nature of Nature. (For example, it is a trivial
> fact that if one forces clocks to obtain one-way light
> speed invariance, then one will obtain one-way light speed
> invariance. For another example, it is also a trivial fact
> that if one uses asynchronous clocks, then one will obtain
> incorrect, irrelevant and trivial results such as the SR

sci.physics.relativity: Re: Absolute Frame

> "time dilation" effect discussed above.) Since the basis
> of SR (Einstein's postulated one-way invariance) is false,
> SR itself is baseless. That motion exists that is not merely
> Einstein's frame-to-frame relative motion is proved by the
> two facts that (1) light rays move through space, and (2)
> so do all inertial objects (because observers in a closed
> lab can detect a change in their speed, which, in turn,
> proves the existence of such a speed (i.e., a speed that
> is not related to some passing inertial reference frame).
> We need SR like we need a hole in the head; what we really
> need are (truly) synchronous clocks. Given such clocks, we
> could determine our speeds through space, and we could also
> have Newton's absolute time.
>
> If Tom still believes that there is no such thing as motion
> through space, then let him explicitly deny the fact that
> light rays travel through space, and let Tom explicitly
> deny the fact that that which can change must exist (so
> a closed-lab-detected speed change proves the existence
> of such a speed, one that is unrelated to any passing
> reference frame). And if Tom still believes that Einstein's
> clocks are correctly related temporally, then let him
> prove this (at least on paper).