Re: Einstein's Train Gedanken Re−visited

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2009−06/msg02168.html

- *From*: "kenseto@xxxxxxxxxx" <kenseto@xxxxxxxxxx>
- *Date*: Mon, 22 Jun 2009 06:43:48 −0700 (PDT)

On Jun 21, 9:06 pm, "Whoever" <no...@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

> <kens...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
>
> news:4ff9c265−bb13−4cf8−b924−15e21a264c61@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

> > On Jun 20, 8:55 pm, "Whoever" <no...@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
> >
> > <kens...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
> >
> > news:d9a7119a−63b8−4eb3−b26b−5412fcb833c4@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

> > > On Jun 19, 7:55 pm, Bruce Richmond
> > > <bsr3...@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
> > >
> > > > On Jun 18, 8:58 am,
> > > > "kens...@xxxxxxxxxx"
> > > > <kens...@xxxxxxxxxx>
> > > > wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > On Jun 17,
> > > > > 12:04 pm,
> > > > > G
> > > > > <gehan.ameresek...@xxxxxxxxx>
> > > > > wrote:

On Jun 17, 6:01 pm, "kens...@xxxxxxxxxx" <kens...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

> On Jun 16, 9:23 am, "Whoever" <no...@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
>
> > <kens...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
> >
> > news:58b41ffa−d497−4aa6−a6ef−aee7f0a1b2
> >
> > > On Jun 15, 8:33 pm, "Whoever" <no...@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
> > >
> > > > "Henry Wilson, DSc" <hw@..> wrote in messagenews:isjd351ova94k

On Mon, 15 Jun 2009 17:42:54 +1000, "Whoever" <no...@xxxxxxxxxx wrote:

> "G" <gehan.amer wrote in message news:6f7c63
>
> > By the way, Eins mad mist
> >
> > http:
>
> Yes .. Einstein was human and his theories changed and evolved. Big deal.

Einstein was

a plagiarist and a hoaxer.

Doesn't really matter even if he was. What matters is the SR and GR models that he helped develop

His theory is just a disguised version of LET.

Its LET with the need for any mysterious physical

shrinkage of objects and distnaces, and slowing of processes with by their movement in an undetectable ether with properties that are inconsistent with known substances. SR does not require that

Sigh....of course the ether unique and has unique properties that no known substance has.

If it existed. Which by the nature of the properties it would have to have, we cannot show. How convenient :)

> You are wrong....SR does require the special properties of the ether.

It requires no ether, nor does it say there cannot be one.. SR

works quite happily with corpuscular/balistic theories, or wave/ether based theories. SR postulates that the speed of light is the same for observations in all inertial (non accelerating) frames. It really doesn't give a hoot about how the light gets from point A to point B .. as long as the speed

is
the
same
for
everyone.

Then
why
does
physicists
refused
to
measure
the
one−way
speed
of
light
directly??

For
example:
An
SR
observer
claims
that
all
the
clocks
in
the
universe
moving
wrt
him
are
running
slow
and
all
the
rod
moving
wrt
him
are

contracted.....these are the exclusive properties of an observer at rest in the ether frame.

Not at all. In SR it is a property of every inertial (non accelerating) frame.

That's the point: Every SR observer claims that he is in a state of absolute rest

and
that's
why
he
claims
the
unique
properties
of
the
absolute
rest
frame.
BTW
that's
why
SR
is
incomplete.....No
object
in
the
universe
is
in
a
state
of
absolute
rest.

Ken
Seto

In
ether
theories,
like
LET,
it
is
the
property
of
a
unique
frame.

But SR is not LET. You're obviously confused about these two theories.− Hide quoted text –

–
Show quoted text –

Maybe you have an experiment in mind to measure the one way speed of light directly?

Yes.
1. Two touching and synchroneous

clocks are
moved very
slowly in
the
opposite
directions at
the same
time with
the same
velocity and
stop
these clocks
at equal
distance
from the
atarting
point
simultaneously.
These
procedures
can be
accomplished
by using
opposite
conveying
screws that
are
opertated by
a common
motor.
2. These
two clocks
will remain
synchronized....according
to SR and
LET.

Guess again Ken.

According to LET a clock
moved in the same direction
as the frame is
moving in relation to the
ether will run a bit slower
during the move
and will lose time. A clock
moved in the opposit

direction will run
faster during the move and
gain time.

These LET assertions have been disproved
by experiments....namely the
speed of light is isotropic.

Thought you said light speed wasn't isotropic.

No I didn't say that. I said that the SR concept of Relativity of Simultaneity asserts that the speed of light in the observed frame is anisotropic.

No .. it says it is isotropic.. it must be because the speed is a constant c in every frame .. so if the average speed if c, that means the speed all the time must be c.

RoS says that M' in Einstein's train gedanken is rush toward the light front from the front (c+v) and receding away from the light front from the rear (c−v)....so how can M' measure the one−way speed of light to be isotropic????

If it is, then OWLS is
always c, because TWLS is always c.

No the value of OWLS is distance dependent even though OWLS is isotropic.

Please show where SR says that .. or if SR show the formulas that you believe do show this, and how much is the speed of light affected by distance, and does it increase with distance or decrease?

In SR a slowly transported
clock results in the same
sync as light

> > signals.
>
> Not quite....my proposed experiments involve two opposite moving clocks....SR says that both clocks will remain synchroneous.

> Only if you assume SR is correct,

> No....clock rate is motion sensitive is not an SR assumption. It is observed experimentally.

> We've observed time dilation due to movement. So its is not valid to say clock motion does not affect clock reading from the inertial frame in which the clock is moving.

I didn't say that clock rate is not effect by motion. I said thatthe two clocks moving in the opposite directions will remain synchronized. Comppered to a clock remained at the startiing point both traveling clocks are running at a slower rate.

> SR says that the effect is independant of direction tho, only speed, so you can move clocks in opposite directions at the same speed (relative to the inertial frame) and they will stay in sync in that frame. According to SR.

> > in which case there is no point in performing the experiment because SR says OWLS is the same as TWLS and is isotropic. So you don't need to measure it.

> But the value of OWLS is distance dependent and the value of TWLS is not distance dependent. That's why you need to measure the value of OWLS directly.

> OWLS being distant dependant means speed can travel faster than c. Do you claim light travels faster than c?

Now....the max. speed is 300000 km/sec. Increasing distance between the source and the detector will reduce this speed.

> If OWLS is isotropic, but varies with distance, then TWLS *must* also
> istropic and varies with distance.

No.....this is only an assumption. You need to measure the value of
OWLS directly with varying distances between the source and the
detector.

> There is no evidence of this .. indeed
> it has been shown the c is the same despite distance. So your assertion is
> already disproved. There is no need to measure OWLS to know this.

The value of TWLS is measured to be the same c in directions but the
value of OWLS need to be measured directly at varying distances. This
is only good science.
BTW physicists measured OWLS to be isotropic where are the value of
OWLS for these isotropy measurements?

Ken Seto

> > No.....OWLS can bed isotropic but the value of OWLS is distance
> > dependent.
>
> Sorry .. experimental evidence says NO.. Your theory is refuted.− Hide quoted text −
>
> − Show quoted text −

.