Re: Our greatest problem!

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2007−04/msg01980.html

- *From*: The Ghost In The Machine <ewill@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
- *Date*: Thu, 19 Apr 2007 21:55:59 −0700

In sci.physics.relativity, karandash2000@xxxxxxxxx
<karandash2000@xxxxxxxxx>
wrote
on 16 Apr 2007 07:23:40 −0700
<1176733420.744322.199310@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>:

> On Apr 16, 7:10 am, "kenseto" <kens...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
>
> > On Apr 14, 4:27 pm, The Ghost In The Machine
>
> > <e...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
>
> > > In sci.physics.relativity, kenseto
> > > <kens...@xxxxxxxxxx>
> > > wrote
> > > on 14 Apr 2007 12:10:09 −0700
> > > <1176577809.746905.256...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>:
>
> > > > SIGH...How
> > > > many times
> > > > do I have to
> > > > tell you that
> > > > I didn't
> > > > make any
> > > > claim that
> > > > the MMX
> > > > in the same
> > > > gravitational
> > > > will detect
> > > > fringe shift.
> > > > I claimed
> > > > that if the
> > > > *PLANE
> > > > OF THE
> > > > ARMS* are

> oriented
> vertically
> then
> a fringe
> shift will be
> observed as
> the
> apparatus is
> rotated.

> 1. Where is the
> mathematical proof that
> permits you to predict this?

Mathematic cannot proof anything.

> Maybe not, but from various axioms one can prove that
> certain systems
> are nonsensical.

> Every axiom of math is based on specific assumptions. For example karandash2 claims that matrix multiplication is a fundamental law of nature. Such claim is based on the bogus assumption that the units of measurement (clock second and meter length) are universal. We know that in SR and ether theories such claim is bogus.

Sorry, dr. Seto. Matrix multiplication is a UNIVERSAL MATHEMATICAL FORMALISM. It DOES NOT depend on any physical assuptions, more the less on what you call "the units of

> measurement (clock second and meter length) are universal."

You need to brush up on mathematics, we all know that this is your weak area (together with experiment). But your logic is your strong suit.

> For instance, one can assume two entities (call them A
> and B), both equipped with light source and sufficient
> detection
> equipment, identically configured.
>
> If one assumes an absolute matrix (e.g., the rigid
> luminiferous aether),
> one can affix A to that matrix, if one likes. However, one has
> to
> in that case show cause for the existence of that matrix, or,
> failing
> that, why that matrix doesn't show up as a 10^−8 variability
> of certain
> observations depending on day of the year, and an about 2.4
> * 10^−12
> variability depending on time of day (at least, at the equator).
>
> If one does *not* assume an absolute matrix, the observers
> are then interchangeable, and the coordinate transform of
> (x,t) space from A to B, given the velocity of B relative
> to A, has to be identical to the coordinate transform of
> (x,t) space from B to A, given the velocity of A relative
> to B. Since v_AB = −v_BA, one immediately gets
>
> T_ab(v) = T_ba(−v).
>
> This assumption is wrong. A and B will measure different relative
> velocity.
>
> Ken Seto

Sorry, but that is not true. The laws of nature are symmetric:
v_AB = −v_BA.

Pedant point: That's more antisymmetric than symmetric, although you're
right; any reasonable system would have this property if it's isotropic
and independent of absolute motion; the sign flip can't be helped.
If car A is moving 5 km/hour westward relative to car B, then by

necessity car B is moving 5 km/hour eastward relative to A, at least near the equator; there's a few corner cases at the poles that could get slightly silly.

(Both Galileo and SR satisfy these requirements.)

> We all know by now that you claim asymmetry in IRT, but this is not how nature works.

Pedant Point #2: It's not how we observe nature to work at this time. Extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence, and the preponderance of the evidence is currently in SR and/or GR's favor, with Gravity Probe B adding its voice to the multitudes, although it appears to have been bothered by some sort of issue that they're having to calculate out.

Were there an absolute coordinate system we'd have seen it by now, since we move in a circular orbit at about 10^−4 c, with sufficiently sensitive equipment.

> Need to brush up on experimental evidence, it is the
> your other weak area. Of course, you more than compensate with your superior logic.

––
#191, ewill3@xxxxxxxxxxxx
Linux. Because vaporware only goes so far.

.