

## Re: Special Relativity is Dead! (Third Proof)

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2006-11/msg01598.html>

---

- *From:* "Dirk Van de moortel" <[dirkvandemoortel@xx](mailto:dirkvandemoortel@xx)>
  - *Date:* Sun, 19 Nov 2006 11:42:27 GMT
- 

<jan.verheul@xxxxxxxx> wrote in message  
<news:1163931909.484485.71200@xx>

If I am well informed, constant velocity movement causes time delation, according to Special Relativity. Acceleration causes also time dilation, according to General Relativity.

From your other postings you seem to be unaware of the fact that special relativity can handle accelerated motion perfectly. Perhaps you have been reading old-fashioned literature. In any case, it seems that you are very badly informed.

Anyone with some mathematical intuition and some feeling of how nature works can know now that Relativity (Special as well as General) CANNOT be valid, without considering the details of both theories.

The thing is, unlike what most retired engineers you'll meet here think, it doesn't merely take mathematical intuition. It takes much more than that. This is physics.

Velocity and acceleration are two completely different things, seen from a mathematical viewpoint. They are related as derivative and integral to each other. If both constant velocity and constant acceleration lead to the same phenomena (time delation) you have messed up things. It would be the same as if both acceleration and constant velocity would cause (reaction)force.

In the time before Newton and Galilei, people thought that force is required for both constant velocity and (extra force) for acceleration. It was not yet discovered that if you remove all drag (which is very

## Re: Special Relativity is Dead! (Third Proof)

difficult or impossible in practice), constant velocity requires no force for its maintenance. Twentyfirst physicists should have learned this lesson. A quantity and its derivative (or integral) CAN NEVER HAVE the same physical consequences, because they are entirely different things, and in fact orthogonal. A theory in which a quantity and its derivative have the same or similar effect (time delation in this case) can NEVER be consistent.

Acceleration 'causes' change of velocity, right?  
Velocity 'causes' time dilation, right?  
So acceleration 'causes' change of time dilation, right?  
Change of time dilation can 'cause' time dilation, right?  
So both Acceleration and Velocity can 'cause' time dilation, right?  
It seems you have a problem with logic.

I have read many textbooks on Special and General Relativity, among which the text of mister Einstein himself, and the famous "Lectures" of Feynman.

Ha. Very old-fashioned indeed :-)  
You have some serious catching up ahead.

Virtually no writer discriminates consequently between acceleration because of externally applied force, and acceleration because of a freefall in a gravitation field. If I understood General Relativity well, acceleration due to freefall in a gravitation field causes no time delation because the free falling object is just taking the "path of least resistance" in warped space.

No, you didn't understand general relativity well.

It is as if it were inertial. If we take the words of mister Einstein seriously, we can corner his idiot theory of Special Relativity in less than twenty lines of plain english text. No equations required.

Consider two clocks K and K' that are in orbit around some heavy body (earth or sun or whatever). They are both in the same perfect circular orbit, however, both clocks are orbiting in exactly the opposite direction. They meet each other twice during each period of the orbit. There is a slight difference in both orbits, so that the clocks will not collide, but will approach each other close enough to synchronize sufficiently precise.

## Re: Special Relativity is Dead! (Third Proof)

Both clocks are in freefall in a gravitation field, and so experience no time delation because of acceleration. In fact, there is no speed increase, so if there were time delation because of the gravitation field, it is the same for both clocks, and therefore cancels out.

Both clocks are "inertial" because they both follow the path of least resistance in warped space. Each clock is constantly moving with regard to the other. So according to Special Relativity each clock observes that the other clock walks slower. After the initial synchronization both clocks meet at the opposite position in the orbit. They compare clocks. It appears that clock K is ahead of K' and K' is ahead of K...

Peels of laughter.....

You seem not to understand special relativity or general relativity at all.

It does *\*not\** appear that "clock K is ahead of K' and K' is ahead of K"

If the planet is not rotating, at the events where they meet and pass each other, they show exactly the same time, but the clocks appear to each run slower than the other one.

When the clocks are brought together and suddenly stop moving, they show the same time, and they run at the same rate.

If the planet is rotating in, let's say, the same direction as one of the clocks, then it will appear that clock K is ahead of K' and K' is *\*behind\** of K.

How is it possible that so many intelligent people (at least they pretend...) cling to theories that are no more than ridiculous nonsense?

How is it possible that so many people misunderstand theories and then go about attacking the consequences of their personal misunderstandings?

Billions of dollars have been spend on research projects that assume Special Relativity as if it were an axiom. Wasted! Mister Einstein was one of the biggest jokers that science has known. He has misled the world for more than 100 years (101 if I am well informed) with a fallacy that is so convoluted that everyone thought it was brilliant.

Be prepared for the fourth proof of invalidity of SR. This time it will be a well documented experiment with two atomic clocks in two

Re: Special Relativity is Dead! (Third Proof)

airopplanes...

Yes, we've treated that one as well – many times.

I'm curious how you will formulate your misunderstanding of that one.

You seem to extremely badly informed.

Who informed you and how much time and effort did it take?

Dirk Vdm

.