

Re: Finally, Special Relativity Is Proven False

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2008-07/msg01416.html>

- *From:* PD <TheDraperFamily@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 15 Jul 2008 10:54:03 -0700 (PDT)
-

On Jul 15, 7:31 am, Strich 9 <Strich.9.2c29...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote:

ppapar...@xxxxxxxx;1187405 Wrote:

On 14 jul, 09:26, Strich 9 Strich.9.2c14...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:--
ppapar...@xxxxxxxx;1186354 Wrote:

--
On 13 jul, 09:44, Strich 9 Strich.9.2bff...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
wrote:--
-It is indeed amazing how a century of indoctrination dulls the
intellect.--
--
Do moving rods contract? Do moving clocks run slow?--
--
The DAVID Arguments:-
--
Let there be two frames M and N with relative velocity zero. A rod D
measuring 1 meter in M is equal to a rod D' measuring 1 meter in N.--
--
These 2 frames are also moving at 0.995c relative to an arbitrary
observer O. This does not alter the measurements noted above.--
--
Now M slows down to zero relative to O. Now had an actual length
contraction occurred when rod D was speeding at 0.995c relative to
O,
then when it comes to rest with O it un--contracts to a length of
10meters. Also, as M is now moving at -0.995c relative to N, N
observes
this rod as measuring 1 meter. This is the same length observed by N
when M was at rest relative to itself. A contradiction.
--
--

Re: Finally, Special Relativity Is Proven False

As you have been told several times, your argument is wrong. The moving observers in relativity do not observe length contraction or time dilation on their comoving objects (we could say all the moving stuff contracts the same), so M and N measuring a rod as 1m on their respective frames means the rod proper length at $v=0$ is exactly 1m. Now observer O should measure those moving rods to be 0.1m, since with respect to this observer both M and N are experiencing length contraction. When M stops, his rod will be 1m long both in M and O frames and N will measure that rod to be 0.1m. So there is no contradiction at all.

—
The same argument applies for moving clocks.—

—
Let there be two frames M and N with relative velocity zero. An atomic clock A ticks 1 second in M synchronously with a 1 second tick in an atomic clock A' in N.—

—
These 2 frames are also moving at 0.995c relative to an arbitrary observer O. This does not alter the measurements noted above.—

—
Now M slows down to zero relative to O. Now had an actual time dilation occurred when A was speeding at 0.995c relative to O, then when it comes to rest with O it un-dilates and ticks 10 times faster. Also, as M is now moving at $-0.995c$ relative to N, N observes A to be running slow by a factor of 10, so A' ticks 100 seconds for each tick of A in M. A contradiction again.

—
—
Again, and for the same reason given in the length contraction case, you are wrong. Moving observers will not detect time dilation of their comoving clocks, so all your reasoning is flawed.

—
—
—
Strich 9—

—
—
Miguel Rios—

Did you just say the rod was $*-1 \text{ meter}-*$ from M viewpoint when M was going at $*-0.995c-*$, and was $-*1 \text{ meter}*-$ from M viewpoint when it was going at at $*-0c-*$? Implying that the rod in M remained

Re: Finally, Special Relativity Is Proven False

–*invariant*–

at 0c and 0.995c? Have you not just shown to yourself and your ilk that the premise of proposition 5 in this thread is true (moving rods and clocks keep same length and time)?

Well I have proved that already, but you will believe it if you derive it yourself.

By the way, do a complete reanalyses of the atomic clocks as well to complete your proof. Do not just say 'for the same reason' as it is not exactly the same analyses. Note also you have applied SR using the 21SR interpretation rather than EISR which is why you arrived at –no contradiction–. See my elegant post:<http://tinyurl.com/5grdvm>

—
Strich 9–

You have to be careful in what terms you use. If $v=0.995c$, $\sqrt{1-v^2/c^2} = 0.099875$, $\gamma = 10.0125$
 $\Delta t' = \Delta t / 0.099875$; $L = L_0 * 0.099875$

If I'm aboard a space ship M that is sitting still with respect to an near earth inertial frame of reference E (Earth Space Station), so as the relative speed is 0, then a 1m rod will be measured as 1m in both frames. If then M speeds up to 0.995c, when that M space ship is moving inertially at that speed with respect to E, that same rod measured within the moving frame M will still be 1m long. From the point of view of one observer at the E frame, the rod length will be contracted to 0.1m. On the other hand the moving M clock will still appear to a co-moving observer to tick at the same rate it did before the trip. However for the observer in the E frame the clock at M will appear to slow with respect to the rate it had before the trip, all this following the Lorentz equations.

If the trip last for 10 years, on the E frame, the space ship will be 9.95 light years away at the end of that period. The space ship clock will, however, show its Captain that the trip took only one year (approx.).

Re: Finally, Special Relativity Is Proven False

There are no contradictions!

Miguel Rios

The proposition of the Argument assumes that time dilation and length contraction represent *–*real physical changes**–. This leads to a *–*contradiction**–.

When you remove the reality of the relativistic changes and assume that time dilation and length contraction are *–*illusory **–, then the **–contradiction disappears–**.

False dichotomy. Your claim is that one of two and only two possibilities are to be entertained:

1. There is a physical interaction that physically **alters** the object. (This would entail that this effect is the same as seen by all observers, since there can only be one outcome for one physical alteration.)
2. It is an optical illusion and real physical properties are not affected at all.

But these are not the only two options. (However, many novices to the subject suffer from this preconception, so don't feel bad.)

The truth is yet another option. I'm actually explaining this in some detail in a string of posts in a separate thread with M Luttgens, if you're interested.

You have proved EXACTLY my point that time dilation and length contraction are only apparent changes and do not represent reality, which is what the Argument is supposed to prove. Notice that your rods and clocks kept EXACTLY the same measure and time whether they were in motion or not.

What, you need another century to get this point?

—

Strich 9