

Re: Einstein "mixem up his grades"

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2009-07/msg00029.html>

- *From:* "Androcles" <Headmaster@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 1 Jul 2009 05:45:44 +0100
-

"Uncle Ben" <ben@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:7d3b7d70-bdd2-4852-a653-28b5c5513fe7@xx

John Parker, "Androcles", has finally given us enough information to be able to diagnosis his ridiculous assertion -- that Einstein in his initial SR paper of 1905 derived a formula expressing the dilation of a rigid rod's length because of its motion.

The received wisdom of the century has been that what was shown was instead a contraction, the very phenomenon that Fitzgerald, Lorentz and others had hypothesized so as to explain the null result of the Michelson-Morley Experiment. John "observes" that the Einstein Dilation was derived by AE but was misunderstood as a contraction in spite of algebraic proof of a dilation.

In his gentle way, John excuses AE for the error on grounds of insanity.

In a message to our friend Glird today (US time) in the thread called "Linear",

news:
2a4f3d6e-82ec-44e6-9ee7-26be3d2ec17b@xx

(I can't swear to the link. Google doesn't do links well. Please advise me on a better news reader.)

John repeated his assertion, but this time he explained what his symbols mean. This was a first, to my knowledge. Here are his words:

Note that Einstein doesn't know what a ratio is and gets his grades mixem up.

...

$$xi = x' / \sqrt{1-v^2/c^2},$$

Re: Einstein "mixem up his grades"

x_i is the length of the moving rod,
 $\sqrt{1-v^2/c^2}$ is less than one.
When I went to school $\gamma = 1/0.5$, the moving rod gets longer with increasing speed. i.e. the greater the value of v , the greater the lengthening.

John may be amazed to read that I agree with him that $x_i > x$! But what is " x_i "?

While we must agree with John's arithmetic, we should try to verify his assertion that " x_i is the length of the moving rod." Moving w.r.t. what?

Presumably, with respect to the frame L[aboratory] in which it is moving. (Otherwise, one immediately gets a contraction.)

The K-frame,
the ectoplasm frame,
the astral plane frame,
the absolute frame,
the universal frame,
the aether frame,
the one that doesn't exist frame.

It is NOT the embankment frame or the train frame, those are relative.
No presumption about it, Einstein was a proven kook.

Our conclusion will be to respectfully disagree.

The Bonehead contention:
The empty space (x_i , k-frame, moving "stationary" frame) gets longer because the stationary "moving" sphere of radius R (x' , K-frame) gets shorter.
The faster the empty space travels the longer it gets.
Insane Bonehead insists $x_i > x'$ and $x_i = x'/\sqrt{1-v^2}$, Einstein said so.

The train (x_i , k-frame, moving "stationary" frame) gets longer because the embankment (x' , K-frame, stationary "moving" frame) gets shorter.
The faster the train travels the longer it gets.
Insane Bonehead insists $x_i > x'$ and $x_i = x'/\sqrt{1-v^2}$, Einstein said so.

The faster the embankment remains stationary the shorter it gets.
Insane Bonehead insists $x_i > x'$ and $x_i = x'/\sqrt{1-v^2}$, Einstein said so.

Einstein mixed up his frames.

Re: Einstein "mixem up his grades"

Re: Einstein "mixem up his grades"

The faster the Michelson Morley experiment remains stationary the shorter it gets because the empty space (xi, k-frame, moving "stationary" frame) gets longer.

Insane Bonehead insists $\xi > x'$ and $\xi = x'/\sqrt{1-v^2}$, Einstein said so.

And it is all so simple...

"The discovery of the aberration of light was soon followed by an explanation according to the emission theory."

<http://www.aip.org/history/gap/PDF/michelson.pdf>

lex parsimoniae

Bonehead has repeatedly given us more than enough information to be able to diagnosis his psychosis— that Einstein in his initial SR paper of 1905 derived an idiot formula expressing the contraction of a train's length because of its stationariness.

We'll disagree but Uncle Bonehead Green Jr. Ph.D. physics 1956 American Redneck of Non-science cannot be respected as if he were sane.

Nature doesn't care how many sheep bleat Einstein's "bah", it's still humbug.

<crap snipped>

Disrespectfully, Androcles Ph.D. mathematics.

.