

Re: Are SR effects real or not? Simplified case.

## Re: Are SR effects real or not? Simplified case.

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2008-07/msg01011.html>

---

- *From:* "Androcles" <[Headmaster@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:Headmaster@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Sat, 12 Jul 2008 18:18:54 +0100
- 

"Uncle Ben" <[ben@xxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:ben@xxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
[news:3fe287f5-3ee9-41aa-ba09-16130b25feb9@xx](mailto:news:3fe287f5-3ee9-41aa-ba09-16130b25feb9@xx)  
On Jul 12, 12:27 pm, "Androcles" <[Headmas...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:Headmas...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

"Uncle Ben" <[b...@xxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:b...@xxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message

[news:7af63343-b5f0-4623-8bbb-4958d03a72ba@xx](mailto:news:7af63343-b5f0-4623-8bbb-4958d03a72ba@xx)

| There is another thread in sci.physics.relativity entitled "Are  
| 'observed' SR effects real?" I have trouble following the discussion,  
| as maybe you do too. I prefer to phrase the question in a way that to  
| me is much clearer.

|  
How come you don't respond to the task you were given?  
Are you just another fucking chickenshit troll?

What task was I given?

=====

Can't remember?

"Uncle Ben" <[ben@xxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:ben@xxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
[news:fc17fcb3-7cf5-48d6-977c-8fe7078f793c@xx](mailto:news:fc17fcb3-7cf5-48d6-977c-8fe7078f793c@xx)  
On Jul 10, 3:02 pm, "Androcles" <[Headmas...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:Headmas...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

"Uncle Ben" <[b...@xxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:b...@xxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message

[news:609e125c-9c62-4c95-84e2-6524e95547c7@xx](mailto:news:609e125c-9c62-4c95-84e2-6524e95547c7@xx)

On Jul 10, 12:57 pm, "Androcles" <[Headmas...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:Headmas...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

"Uncle Ben" <[b...@xxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:b...@xxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message



Re: Are SR effects real or not? Simplified case.

What aether? What set? In every case the eye at the bottom remains fixed relative to the source at the left.

=====

Suppose that they are all moving w.r.t. the ether as in your diagram at top right.

=====

What aether?

=====

If the light paths are of unequal length,

=====

What "if"?

The path lengths are equal, I was careful to draw them that way.

why don't

they observe a fringe shift as they change the direction of motion (by rotating the interferometer) and the difference in path length changes?

=====

They do if you change the path length. Michelson fitted a screw thread that moves the mirror to change the path length.

(Shown top left where the red ray reflects – there are four fixed mirrors at three locations and at the fourth location there is one adjustable mirror

with three fixed. The adjustable mirror is beside the eyepiece.)

When Michelson got the interference set up how he wanted it he then turned the granite block through 90 degrees (it is resting on wood which is floating on mercury) and that makes the supposed aether wind change direction. If there were any aether that would affect the interference pattern,

but that doesn't happen. Conclusion: No aether wind.

No aether needed, no SR needed.

Then in 1913 Sagnac repeated it, but arranged for the whole thing to turn at a constant rate. Because he couldn't run around he put a photographic

plate at the eyepiece and photograph the fringe shift, thus PROVING beyond doubt there is no aether.

It's really quite simple. Light behaves like a bullet from a gun.

So...

100 years later we have a very simple idea that is very difficult for indoctrinated minds to understand. Ockham's razor wins again.

If you were not so insistent that light is a wave you'd see it straight away.– Hide quoted text –

– Show quoted text –

Re: Are SR effects real or not? Simplified case.

I think I misunderstood you at first. Now I know that you are arguing that light is like an elastic bullet.

=====

Yeah, we call them "photons".

=====

Like Spaceman, you want to say that light bouncing off a moving mirror changes its speed like an elastic ball.

=====

More like Newton, actually. Driscoll still has a lot to learn.

=====

So we agree: no ether.

=====

Good. So that answers your question "What do the anti-relativity folk have to say about this experiment?"

=====

But we disagree about the speed of light reflected from a mirror. Right?

=====

I haven't paid attention to your view, you seem to be obsessed with waves.

=====

If so, consider what I commented to him about radar ranging. How can radar ranging work if the speed of the returning em wave is unknown?

=====

These two waves have identical wavelengths and identical frequencies:

<http://www.androcles01.pwp.blueyonder.co.uk/Wave/waves.htm>

What are their speeds?

=====

Still can't remember?

Go on, carry on recreating the same boring old paradoxes we've heard a gazillion times before and give us the answer in a weeks time if you can remember that long.

Re: Are SR effects real or not? Simplified case.

Re: Are SR effects real or not? Simplified case.