



## Re: Is the LT for time correct?

the cuckoo malformations he blamed on Lorentz. That says you can't use  $c+v$ .

What troll looks like Schwartz, Poe, McCullough, Roberts, Draper, Lawrence, Andersen, Nieminen, ewill, Olson, Tom & Jeery et. al. fail to realise is the existence of isomorphism

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Isomorphism>

between Sagnac's real experiment and Einstein's hallucination experiment, shown here:

<http://www.androcles01.pwp.blueyonder.co.uk/TwoSpeedRack.gif>

Einstein sends light along the rack and back again, the rack moving at velocity  $v$  in his pipe dream.

Sagnac sends the light around the gear wheel for real.

If you analyse one you should get the same result as the other, but you cannot use SR to derive SR, that is *petitio principii*, circularity.

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Begging\\_the\\_question](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Begging_the_question)

$c+v$  is essential to the derivation of the cuckoo malformations, the part where Einstein screws up is:

'we establish by definition that the "time" required by light to travel from A to B equals the "time" it requires to travel from B to A' because I SAY SO. — Rabbi Albert Einstein

<http://www.androcles01.pwp.blueyonder.co.uk/Smart/tAB=tBA.gif>

Here are some mathematical proofs:

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mathematical\\_proof](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mathematical_proof)

Not included are

Proof by "because I say so",

Proof by "everybody knows",

Proof by "it is written",

the three most popular forms used in sci.physics.relativity.

You'll often see this pathetic mob muttering "Lorentz Transformations" but they haven't a clue how they are derived and faithfully follow their indoctrination like lemmings.

Catch 22:

<http://www.fourmilab.ch/etexts/einstein/specrel/www/figures/img22.gif>

<http://www.fourmilab.ch/etexts/einstein/specrel/www/figures/img76.gif>

Prediction:

The troll looks will ignore it, they are too stoopid to understand a proof.

RULES OF REASONING IN PHILOSOPHY.

Re: Is the LT for time correct?

Re: Is the LT for time correct?

RULE I.

We are to admit no more causes of natural things than such as are both true and sufficient to explain their appearances.

To this purpose the philosophers say that Nature does nothing in vain, and more is in vain when less will serve; for Nature is pleased with simplicity, and affects not the pomp of superfluous causes.

— Sir Isaac Newton