

Re: Androcles and Draper resume Einstein 1905

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-01/1787.html>

From: RP (*no_mail_no_spam_at_yahoo.com*)

Date: 01/09/05

Date: Sun, 09 Jan 2005 08:19:54 -0600

Androcles wrote:

> "PDraper" <pdraper@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:BE062240.A2C%pdraper@yahoo.com...
>
>> On 1/8/05 10:15 AM, in article
>> XNSDd.29680\$C8.10512@fe3.news.blueyonder.co.uk, "Androcles"
>> <dummy@dummy.net> wrote:
>>
>>
>>> "PDraper" <pdraper@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>>> news:BE054FDB.8DA%pdraper@yahoo.com...
>>>
>>>> Let's see. Where were we?
>>>> You seem to be done with Randy Poe, so let's pick up somewhere near
>>>> where we
>>>> left off.
>>>>
>>>> However, unlike your discussion with Randy, let's try to stick with
>>>> the 1905
>>>> paper.
>>>>
>>>> That's what I tried to do with Randy, Paul, but he was lost in
>>>> Einstein's notation.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> Would you mind including the URL to the translated paper again for
>>>> this thread?
>>>>
>>>> Gladly.
>>>> <http://www.fourmilab.ch/etexts/einstein/specrel/www/>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> Also, in light of your discussion with Randy, I'd like to suggest an
>>>>> amendment to the basic ground rules. Let me know if you agree to it.
>>>>>

>>>Err, the ground rules were already agreed to.
>>>
>>>"
>>>Draper:
>>>: *Androcles, in your case, I will get over my disenchantment.*
>>>:
>>>: *But I want this to be a fruitful exchange between the two of us, so*
>>>: *let's agree on some ground rules. We'll go things one little step*
>>>at
>>>a
>>>: *time. When we get to a point of conflict, we'll identify what the*
>>>: *error is on either side, and the party in error MUST acknowledge*
>>>the
>>>: *error and remove the erroneous statement from further discussion.*
>>>
>>>Androcles:
>>>I'll agree to your terms.
>>>My terms:
>>>Either one of us could inadvertantly make a typographical error
>>>or simple arithmetic error, and should correct it if noticed.
>>>I'd require: the error to be acknowledged and corrected; the
>>>discussion continued until I have convince you or you have
>>>convinced me. Failing to respond in a reasonable time
>>>is a Pyrrhic victory and unsatisfactory. The penalty for failing
>>>to respond is to be hounded by me at any time I choose.
>>>
>>>You are currently in violation of the ground rules.
>>>You have not responded in a reasonable time or acknowledged error.
>>>
>>>I see no good reason to agree to any further rules.
>>>
>>>Androcles.
>>
>>Well, let's try it anyway.
>>We'll say that there is a fixed-length rod with an emitter and a
>>receiver at
>>one end, along with a clock, and a mirror at the other end, along with
>>a
>>clock. By "fixed" I mean the rod does not change length as time goes
>>by.
>>
>>We'll say that the clocks are synchronized in a frame of reference if:
>>A. The rod is stationary in the frame of reference.
>>B. $t_2 = (1/2)(t_1 + t_3)$, where t_1 is the time of emission of a light
>>pulse
>>from the emitter, t_2 is the time of reflection from the mirror, and t_3
>>is
>>the time of receipt at the receiver.
>>
>>OK so far?
>

- >
- > *No. You are using Poe's dreadful notation. Stick to Einstein's.*
- > *$t1 = (t0 + t2)/2$ under the conditions specified.*
- >
- > *Understand I was having fun jerking Poe's chain, he said I was idiotic*
- > *at the get-go and snipped any point he was unable to answer.*
- > *This he calls 'nettiquette', and I call willfully ignorant.*
- > *McCullough is another like him.*
- >
- >
- > *We'll also say that the measuring tapes are synchronized in a frame*
- > *of reference if:*
- > *A. The clocks match second for second in the frame of reference.*
- > *B. $x1 = (x0 + x2)$, where $x0$ is the place of the emitter, $x1$ is the place*
- > *of the mirror, and $x2$ is the place of the receiver.*
- >
- > *Ok so far?*
- >
- > *Androcles.*

Androcles,

To you and your detractors, why continue any further with these arguments? Special relativity requires the acceptance of a few postulates that you simply don't accept, and thus regardless of their effort they cannot convince you because they are not addressing the problem of first principles. This is why I made an attempt to show that symmetry is ultimately a logical necessity. And because a theory is only as good as its correspondence to the empirical data, the universe bears out that the logic of symmetry is at least supported by the data. This is not to say that the model is absolute, as I and many others, even many of those who are highly regarded, have maintained.

So if you have a problem with special relativity, then you'll have to eventually admit that the problem stems from inherent psychological predisposition rather than from the facts, since the facts support the model. Again, this is not to say that the support of one model negates support of other models. This is in itself a concept that too many are slow to understand.

OTOH, if you maintain that the data doesn't support the theory, then keep in mind that it is always possible that the data is either defective, or else the adherents have incorrectly interpreted either it, or the theory that they applied to it, or even as is the case in many domains, both models are equally explain the behavior within experimental error, and even in some cases make perfectly equivalent predictions. There is also some ambiguity when it comes to data extracted from events that are occurring light years away, which is evident if you read the many conflicting speculative proposals coming regularly from that field of research. Even Hawking cannot seem to make up his mind.

Now as for the derivation, as I've already noted, there are literally hundreds of these available on the web, and I doubt that any of them would convince you. Based upon direct personal experience, I certain that the only argument that will persuade you will be one in first principles, and not just any argument, but one that via chance and luck, and chance correspondence to the logical facts (depending upon its authorship), will strike a chord within you.

Richard Perry