

Re: A silly fact about an atomic clock that relativist never want you to know.

# Re: A silly fact about an atomic clock that relativist never want you to know.

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2008-07/msg01263.html>

---

- *From:* PD <TheDraperFamily@xxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Mon, 14 Jul 2008 10:48:05 -0700 (PDT)
- 

On Jul 14, 12:37 pm, "Spaceman" <space...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

PD wrote:

No, you're right. A straight beampipe starts at one elevation and goes to a different one. But you missed what I just said. Particles going through the same beampipe at *\*different\** speeds get *\*different\** time dilations, even though they are going through the *\*same\** variation in the gravitational field.

The variation in the differential changes would of course make different changes in any clock doing such speeds.

Please understand cause and effect. If you have two objects that exhibit DIFFERENT effects and they are subject to the SAME influence, then the influence cannot possibly be the cause of the effect.

Different speeds, is not the "same influence" PD.

Yes, but you don't think that different speeds are what's responsible. You think g-forces are responsible for time dilation. Here you have different particles with different speeds but the *\*same\** variation in g-forces, and they have *\*different\** time dilations. The g-forces, which you say are the cause of time dilation, cannot possibly be the cause, because you have *\*different\** effects for the *\*same\** claimed cause.

Please put the beer down and try to think coherently.

Re: A silly fact about an atomic clock that relativist never want you to know.

Then you'll have to explain why traveling through the SAME beampipe, through the SAME variation in gravitational field, can produce DIFFERENT time dilations.

Different speeds are not the "same variation change"  
And even relativity gets that right most of the time.  
Usually referred to as "relative" mass.

Are you \*sure\* that's what it's called? Try again.

A 1 kg mass moving at 20 meters per second has a different relative mass than a 1 kg mass moving at any different speed than 20 meters per second.

Yes, that's right.

Therefore, you do not have the "same" relative mass at all when you have different speeds at all.

Right, but you don't think relativistic mass (an SR prediction) is what's responsible. You think g-forces are. You are dismissing what SR says is the reason and you say it is malfunctioning due to g-forces and differences in acceleration. Now you don't seem to be so sure about g-forces and are starting to bring in stuff from special relativity, like "relative mass".

C,mon PD, that is relativity 101.  
(some of the actually correct stuff in relativity)

:)

—

James M Driscoll Jr  
Spaceman