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

***Source:*** http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2006−11/msg01611.html


- *From*: "Sorcerer" <Headmaster@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>


- *Date*: Sun, 19 Nov 2006 12:02:48 GMT


"Dirk Van de moortel" <dirkvandemoortel@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote
in message news:DqX7h.192783$Dv2.2704441@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
|
| <jan.verheul@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:1163931909.484485.71200@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
| > 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.
|

Dork Van de shithead being the very bad informant.
(Peels of scornful laughter.)

| > 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.

"This is PHYSICS, not math or logic, and "proof" is completely irrelevant."
−− Tom Roberts, retired (fired) professional shithead and FAQ author.
(More peels of scornful laughter.)

|
| >
| > 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
| > 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?
"This is PHYSICS, not math or logic, and "proof" is completely irrelevant."
So WRONG if I say it is. I don't have to prove it.

| Velocity 'causes' time dilation, right?
| So acceleration 'causes' change of time dilation, right?

Wrong, there never is, was or will be time dilation.

| Change of time dilation can 'cause' time dilation, right?

Wrong.
"This is PHYSICS, not math or logic, and "proof" is completely irrelevant."

| So both Acceleration and Velocity can 'cause' time dilation,
| right?
| It seems you have a problem with logic.

We know you do, and a problem with mathematics.
If T = 5, the stay−at−home twin ages 10 years. −Dork Van de fuckwit.

|
| >
| > 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.

Wrong. Anything from you is wrong. Ha!

|
| > 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.

No, you are wrong.

|
| > 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.
| >
| > 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.

No, you are wrong.

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

| ahead of K"
| If the planet is not rotating,

HAHAHAHAHA!
If you only had a brain.

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

No, you are wrong.

|
| > 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
| > airoplanes...
|
| 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.

The very bad informant is Dork Van de shithead.

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

Dork Van de local village dog tord did.

Given:
The second is the duration of 9 192 631 770 periods of the radiation corresponding to the transition between the two hyperfine levels of the ground state of the cesium 133 atom. −− NIST, Dork Van de Psycho.

A year is 9,192,631,770 * 60 * 60 * 24 * 365.2425 periods of the radiation corresponding to the transition between the two hyperfine levels of the ground state of the cesium 133 atom. −− Wackypedia

"So if T = 5 years and v = 0.8c, then the stay at home twin will have aged 10 years while his travelling twin sister will have aged 6 years." −− Dork Van de Psycho.
(5 years is 10 years or 6 years, I'm not sure which).

"Time is what a clock says" Dork Van de shithead.

Now for the stupid question.
What happened to the missing 1,160,365,758,078,260,000 periods of the radiation corresponding to the transition between the two hyperfine levels of the ground state of the cesium 133 atom's prodigal twin sister?

−−
Der alte Hexenmeister und Engineer
Androcles Dumbledore B.A., M.Sc., Ph.D.,
Headmaster, hogwarts.physics school for zauberlehrlings.
"One muggle's magic is another sorcerer's engineering"

http://www.androcles01.pwp.blueyonder.co.uk/

.