

# Re: What is Proper Time?

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2008-03/msg00871.html>

- *From:* "Androcles" <[Headmaster@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:Headmaster@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
- *Date:* Sat, 08 Mar 2008 17:50:01 GMT

<vanep@xxxxxxx> wrote in message  
[news:3cc3f5a4-e420-49e3-8e20-60052b596ca7@xx](mailto:news:3cc3f5a4-e420-49e3-8e20-60052b596ca7@xx)  
 On Mar 7, 9:39 pm, "Androcles" <[Headmas...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:Headmas...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

"The Ghost In The Machine" <[ew...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:ew...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in  
 message [news:upa9a5-2li.ln1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:upa9a5-2li.ln1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)  
 | In sci.physics.relativity, HW@....(Dr. Henri Wilson)  
 | <[HW@](mailto:HW@)>  
 | wrote  
 | on Fri, 07 Mar 2008 22:08:00 GMT  
 | <[8ue3t3dlj5le0r4rqhhvsg6ii7mqfs...@xxxxxxx](mailto:8ue3t3dlj5le0r4rqhhvsg6ii7mqfs...@xxxxxxx)>:  
 | > On Thu, 6 Mar 2008 20:59:16 -0800, The Ghost In The Machine| >  
 | <[ew...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:ew...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

| >  
 | >>In sci.physics.relativity, HW@....(Dr. Henri Wilson)  
 | >>><[HW@](mailto:HW@)>  
 | >  
 | >>>>We can tell that  $t_{12} = t'_{12}$  and  $t_{23} = t'_{23}$  but that tells us  
 | absolutely  
 | >>>>nothing about the relationship of  $t_{12}$  and  $t_{23}$ , or  $t'_{12}$  and  $t'_{23}$ .  
 | >>>>  
 | >>>>If one assumes absolute time, the fact that TWLS experiments show  
 | the  
 | >>>>same speed indicates that there's no "headwind". The path there  
 | >>>>is S-M-S, and the S-M path goes at speed  $c-v$  (velocity  $v-c$ ) with the  
 | >>>>M-S path  $c+v$  if one has a headwind with speed  $v$ . The total transit  
 | time  
 | >>>>is therefore  
 | >>>>  
 | >>>> $t_h = d/(c-v) + d/(c+v)$   
 | >>>>  
 | >>>>(or  $(-d)/(v-c) + d/(v+c)$ )  
 | >>>>  
 | >>>>=  $(d(c+v) + d(c-v))/(c^2-v^2) = 2dc/(c^2-v^2) = 2(d/c)/(1-v^2/c^2)$   
 | >>>>  
 | >>>> That's what aether theory states.  
 | >>>> There is no aether, therefore it's wrong. Why do you even bother

## Re: What is Proper Time?

with  
the

| >>> maths?

| >>

| >> You will, of course, have alternate maths for BaTH, I trust?

| >

| > the math is obvious.

| > In BaTh the whole MM apparatus may be considered 'at rest'.

| >

| >  $t_{AB}=L/c$

| >  $t_{BA}=L/c$

|

| A little more complicated than that, as the MMX measures

| (or attempts to measure) crabwinds versus headwinds;

| however, both BaTH and nBat can (and do) assume that the

| MMX apparatus is at rest, since the aether "surface" (if

| there is one) is essentially frictionless.

Pedant point:

Michelson was attempting to measure the speed of light in the sure

and certain hope of the aether. You are mistaken if you believe

he doubted the aether and wanted to test it for even a moment.

The experiment was not and was never intended to be a test.

It failed. That is when the aether was questioned, not before.

In SR the aether is still present mathematically, if not physically.

"But the ray moves relatively to the initial point of k, when measured in

the

stationary system, with the velocity  $c-v$ ".

That is a LIE, no measurement was ever done. It is written to agree with

the second postulate.

The ray moves relatively to the initial point of k with the velocity c,

and if the initial point of k is moving with velocity v then the

light is shifted and MEASURED in the stationary system using

a grating to be  $c+v$ .

|

| Hence my terminology of "hockey pucks", and any "aether

| wind" is ignorable since the puck's velocity is not

| affected thereby.

|

| For its part SR isn't quite as simple to characterize, as

| the light photon is moving at c no matter who's observing

| it;

No. Einstein specifically states

"But the ray moves relatively to the initial point of k, when measured in

the

stationary system, with the velocity  $c-v$ ".

| time and space twist in odd fashions (and are provable

| from this hypothesis more or less alone, as Einstein showed

## Re: What is Proper Time?

| long ago) in order to assure this constancy.

No no, that's handwaving mystery mongering, not mathematics.

You are depending on the crank third postulate:  
the ``time" required by light to travel from A to B equals the ``time"  
it  
requires to travel from B to A.

Einstein wants his cake and eat it too.

The ray travels out at  $c-v$  in theoretical aether, returns at  $v-c$ .

The distance should be AB one way and BA back.

Einstein shortens it by saying the distance is  $x' = x-vt = AB-vt = d-vt$ .

$$t_{out} = (d-vt)/(c-v)$$

Now we get into a schoolboy blunder. We should have:

$$t_{in} = (d+vt)/(c+v)$$

but we don't, we have

$$t_{in} = d-vt/(c+v)$$

| It turns

| out, mathematically anyway, that the "aether wind" doesn't

| affect the photon either, in SR.

Handwaving bullshit.

Wilson is right about MMX, but Wilson cannot explain why Einstein is wrong,

Either can you or any other dumbshit crank.

he's just handwaving and doesn't listen.

[rest snipped by A for brevity]

Grow up, vain peacock. I'm discussing mathematics with Ghost, not his shadow.

.