

Re: Faster than Light?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2008-07/msg02871.html>

- *From:* "Sue..." <suzysewnshow@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 28 Jul 2008 23:56:52 -0700 (PDT)
-

On Jul 29, 12:48 am, Peri of Pera <rie...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Faster than Light?

The theory of relativity claims that the motion of physical objects cannot exceed a speed of 300,000km/sec. However, we know from experience (e.g. equatorial rocket launchings, multistage rocket vehicles etc) that the final velocity of objects is their starting velocity plus their own velocity. There is no reason to believe a maximum applies.

Cherenkov radiation.

<http://farside.ph.utexas.edu/teaching/em/lectures/node50.html>

A spaceship travels away from star X at a speed of 300,000km/sec (v_1). The spaceship fires off a rocket from its nose. It has a velocity of 100km/sec (v_2). The speed of the rocket is now 300,100km/sec (v_1+v_2), i.e. the rocket travels away from the spaceship at 100km/sec and star X at 300,100km/sec. Special relativity however demands it can only be 300,000km/sec, the maximum velocity allowed by the theory. This is only possible if at the moment of the firing the speed of the rocket is reduced to zero or the speed of the space ship is reduced to 299,900km/sec or a combination of the two. SR cannot provide evidence or even a theory to explain how the reduction is possible or occurs. It relies on the mathematical formula obtained by Fizeau (1819–1896) in his experiments about the propagation of light through flowing water in 1851. The formula is $v = \frac{v+w}{1+vw/v^2}$. AE, citing Fizeau, proposed this formula for the addition of velocities of all physical objects (AE, *Relativity: The Special and General Theory*, Chapter 13, Methuen & Co Ltd 1920). AE claimed it paralleled his illustration of relativity in the train example he used to prove special relativity. It has been swallowed by science ever since.

No...Not by "science".

Re: Faster than Light?

Perhaps by those with need to deceive themselves or others.

<http://www.quackwatch.org/01QuackeryRelatedTopics/pseudo.html>

<<special relativity was always a provisional theory with recognized epistemological short-comings. As mentioned above, one of Einstein's two main reasons for abandoning special relativity as a suitable framework for physics was the fact that, no less than Newtonian mechanics, special relativity is based on the unjustified and epistemologically problematical assumption of a preferred class of reference frames, precisely the issue raised by the twins paradox. Today the "special theory" exists only (aside from its historical importance) as a convenient set of widely applicable formulas for important limiting cases of the general theory, but the phenomenological justification for those formulas can only be found in the general theory. >>

<http://www.mathpages.com/rr/s4-07/4-07.htm>

<<for sufficiently large $v < c$ we obtain $\Delta t' < 0$: i.e., there exist [imaginary] inertial frames in which cause and effect [] appear [] to be reversed. Of course, this is impossible in deterministic physics. It follows, therefore, that information can never appear to propagate with a superluminal velocity in any inertial frame, otherwise causality would be violated. >>

<http://farside.ph.utexas.edu/teaching/jk1/lectures/node9.html>

Sue...

Peter Riedt