Re: OWLS & Out of Sync Clocks−By How Much Are They Out of Sync.

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005−11/msg00100.html

- *From*: "PD" <TheDraperFamily@xxxxxxxxx>

- *Date*: 2 Nov 2005 07:16:33 −0800

kk wrote:
> Tom Roberts wrote:
> >Please re−read what I wrote. You are free to use ANY clock
> >synchronization method you prefer.
>
> I already carefully read what you wrote, so I do not need
> to do so again.
>
> Sure, you are free to use any clock "synchronization" method,
> but only one will give you correct results, so why mess around
> with failures?
>
> Here is what I mean by "failures":
>
> All methods which are compatible with relativity, including your
> aforementioned slow clock transport method.
>
> Why are all these methods failures?
>
> They are all failures because relativity − admittedly − does not
> have absolute simultaneity, which, as anyone knows, means that it
> has no way to absolutely synchronize two separated clocks, and yet
> only absolutely synchronous clocks can yield correct results.
>
> −−snip−−
>
> >So your claim above is irrelevant. I repeat: this is physics −−
> >errorbars are important; errors significantly smaller than other
> >errorbars are irrelevant.
>
> This is *not* physics, it's *theoretical* physics, and in
> theoretically physics, a miss is as good as a mile.
>
> In theoretical physics, either clocks are absolutely
> synchronous, or they're not, and Einstein's are not.
>
> Besides, if Einstein uses his method to "synchronize" two

> clocks which are either very far apart or moving rapidly
> in relation to light, then the out−of−synch error can be
> huge by anyone's standards.
>
> −snip−
>
> >This is a DEFINITION of clock synchronization in SR.
> >If you don't like it, don't use it. <shrug>
>
> It matters not what I do with it; what matters a lot
> is that physicists believe that E−'synch' is the proper
> way to relate clocks, and that all the results thereof
> are valid and meaningful physical results.
>
> For example, physicists believe that light's one−way speed
> is experimentally c because Einstein's clocks get c, and yet
> this "result" is merely given up front as part of a mere
> definition. It is not an experimental result, and it can
> never be an experimental result, so it has no part in either
> theoretical or applied physics.
>
> It is *only* Einstein's definition of "synchronization"
> that makes special relativity special relativity.
>
> But no scientific theory can be solely a definition.
>
> Are you beginning to get a glimpse of what is not right
> about Einstein's method of clock "synchronization"?
>
> >>There is one and only one way to correctly measure light's
> >>one−way speed, and that is by using unslowed, absolutely
> >>synchronous clocks which are affixed to an unshrunken ruler.
>
> >Perhaps you will explain how to do that. Unobtanium is NOT
> >admissible in a physical theory or an "experiment".
>
> Then you will have to eat your own words (or Einstein's),
> because one−way, two−clock light speed invariance is
> unobtanium at its worst, since it cannot possibly occur
> experimentally, so it is not admissible.
>
> >>Unfortunately for special relativity, the result of
> >*this* experiment will not be c invariance.
>
> >Nonsense. The claimed "result" of an impossible experiment
> >does not mean anything at all.
>
> You need to prove that it is impossible. Until then, the
> one−way light speed case is definitely open, even if I
> do not proffer a way to absolutely synchronize clocks.
>

> ==kk==

The obvious question, kk, is how you would propose to absolutely synchronize two spatially separated clocks. There are two strategies you might consider filling in with details:
1. Separating the clocks spatially and then synchronizing them.
2. Synchronizing the clocks and then spatially separating them and then verifying their synchronization once separated, to be sure that nothing happened to the synchronization during the separation.

Please fill in the details.

PD

.

- ***Follow−Ups***:
  - ♦ ***Re: OWLS & Out of Sync Clocks−By How Much Are They Out of Sync.***
    - ◊ *From:* kk
  - ♦ ***Re: OWLS & Out of Sync Clocks−By How Much Are They Out of Sync.***
    - ◊ *From:* kenseto@xxxxxxxxxx

- ***References***:
  - ♦ ***Re: OWLS & Out of Sync Clocks−By How Much Are They Out of Sync.***
    - ◊ *From:* kk
  - ♦ ***Re: OWLS & Out of Sync Clocks−By How Much Are They Out of Sync.***
    - ◊ *From:* kk

- Prev by Date: ***Re: OWLS & Out of Sync Clocks−By How Much Are They Out of Sync.***
- Next by Date: ***Re: Incommensurability of Mathematical Logic and Scientific Logic***
- Previous by thread: ***Re: OWLS & Out of Sync Clocks−By How Much Are They Out of Sync.***
- Next by thread: ***Re: OWLS & Out of Sync Clocks−By How Much Are They Out of Sync.***
- Index(es):
  - ♦ ***Date***
  - ♦ ***Thread***