

# Re: relativity vs velocity addition

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2006-12/msg01656.html>

---

- *From:* [lkoluk2003@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:lkoluk2003@xxxxxxxxxx)
  - *Date:* 18 Dec 2006 00:58:12 -0800
- 

Sorcerer yazdi:

<lkoluk2003@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message  
[news:1166089679.248549.246580@xx](mailto:news:1166089679.248549.246580@xx)  
|  
| Sorcerer yazdi:  
| > <lkoluk2003@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message  
| [news:1165919683.448586.288430@xx](mailto:news:1165919683.448586.288430@xx)  
| > | It seems that the assumption that the maximum distances between the  
| > | twins during inbound and outbound part are equal is not generally true.  
| > | I.e. the most general formula is  $t_1=x_1/v_1$  and  $t_2=x_2/v_2$  where  $x_1$  is not  
| > | equal to  $x_2$ . In this case, the only explanation is that the clock rates  
| > | of both twins are the same even from the point of view of the twins.  
| > |  
| > | On the other hand, the relativity principle is fully compatible with  
| > | this. I copied the following from my text in another thread.  
| > | "Each tick in a clock is an event and an event's observed time can be  
| > | different from time dilation. For example one can set a clock by using  
| > | a light pulse  
| > | and two mirrors.  
| > |  
| > | 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.  
| > |  
| > | <http://physics.nist.gov/cuu/Units/second.html>  
| > |  
| > | See anything about setting a counter with two mirrors?  
| > |  
| > | Send a caesium atom to Proxima Centauri and back, COUNTING transitions.  
| > |  
| > | The count will match an identical caesium atom that remains here.  
| > |  
| > | During the journey it will \*appear\* not to match due to  
| > |  
| > | transitions being "in flight", aka Doppler shift.  
| > |  
| > | There are no missing or additional counts, hence no count dilation,  
|

Re: relativity vs velocity addition

| Ok. But what is the mechanism behind this light emitting?

Strike a match. That emits light.

Does the

| frequency relate to distance/speed relation?

No, frequency relates to the inverse time law,  $f = 1/t$ .

Blind Poe can explain inverse laws to you.

| For example is the

| frequency proportional to  $(d_1 - d_2)/(v_1 - v_2)$  where  $d_1$  &  $v_1$  is the radius of

| an orbital and the speed of an electron in this orbital respectively

| and  $d_2$  &  $v_2$  is the radius & electron speed at the orbital where the

| electron drops to after it emits a photon?

No.

|

| >

| > hence no time dilation.

| >

| > Einstein was an idiot.

| >

|

| I don't think

Of course you don't. Nobody ever said you did. That's why I have to tell you Einstein was an idiot, you can't work it out for yourself. You are an idiot too, you CAN'T think.

| so.

Exactly.

| His mistake

If he made a mistake he was an idiot.

| was to assume the light speed is the same

| for all inertial frames

Einstein never said it was. That's your mistake.

Re: relativity vs velocity addition

| and the others vary respectively in the  
| relation  $\text{light speed} = \text{distance} / \text{duration}$ . However, the relativity  
| principle requires that the duration is the same for all inertial  
| frames and the others vary respectively.

What relativity principle?

Read this, published in the British Journal of Theoretical Physics  
<http://www.androcles01.pwp.blueyonder.co.uk/PoR/PoR.htm>

It seems that you are either an idiot who does not have an ability to grasp what I am asking or your purpose of writing here is different than mine. In either case, discussion is a loss of time.

Lokman Kolukisa

.