Re: What causes time dilation?

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2004−09/4338.html

---

From: Androcles (*androc1es_at_nospamblueyonder.co.uk*)
Date: 09/10/04

Date: Fri, 10 Sep 2004 12:35:48 GMT

"Alex Green" <dralexgreen@yahoo.co.uk> wrote in message
news:42c8441.0409100139.73ee579b@posting.google.com...
| "Androcles" <androc1es@nospamblueyonder.co.uk> wrote in message
news:<puX%c.3606$YX.35873969@news−text.cableinet.net>...
| > "Alex Green" <dralexgreen@yahoo.co.uk> wrote in message
| > news:42c8441.0409090117.1f2ba244@posting.google.com...
| > | "Androcles" <androc1es@nospamblueyonder.co.uk> wrote in message
| > news:<Y4k%c.2274$Nf5.24086599@news−text.cableinet.net>...
| > | > "Alex Green" <dralexgreen@yahoo.co.uk> wrote in message
| > | > news:42c8441.0409070212.2d350af1@posting.google.com...
| > [snip]
| > | > | Modern relativity theory does not have this foundation. It is
based
| > | > | on invariance and symmetry. The geodesics are derived from the
concept
| > | > | of a (3+1)D universe.
| > | > |
| > | > | See:
| > | > | http://www.users.globalnet.co.uk/~lka/conz2b.htm
| [snip]
| > | >
| > | > The third theory predicts that light from a moving source will have
| > | > the velocity of light added to the velocity of the source. This will
| > | > produce an apparent retrograde motion of a star in orbit, although
| > | > we don't have suffiently powerful telescopes to observe this.
| > | > However, this apparent retrograde motion has another effect, that
| > | > of changing the intensity of the light as it reaches us.
| > | > In the empirical data below, the retrograde motion appears between
| > | > the two maxima.
| > | > http://www.britastro.org/vss/gifc/00918−ck.gif
| > | >
| [snip]
| > | In Galilean time the past is gone,
| > Yes.
| >
| > | The future does not exist,
| > Correct.

| >
| > | there is only the zero amount of time that is the frozen present.
| >
| > Incorrect. 'Now' is moving. It is not frozen.
| > Your model of time places 'now' as a moving point between yesterday
| > and tomorrow.
| >
| > yesterday (−) now (0) tomorrow (+)
| > _____|_____
| >
| > with tomorrow as fixed as yesterday. Predestination. How will you
| > change tomorrow? Why would you construct a safety device?
| > Just how illogical is the woman in the street who shrugs "When your
| > time is up..." for those that die, and then yells at the kids not to
play
| > ball in the road?
| >
| >
| > My model of time places 'now' at the tip of a growing crystal
| >
| > yesterday (−) now (0) tomorrow (+)
| > _____|−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−
| >
| > Tomorrow isn't fixed. We can change it.
|
| Time as a dimension would only fix the past. Other phenomena such as
| QM may leave the future open.

May? What is this, conjecture?

|
| Your model does not concur with your previous statements where the
| past and future do not exist.

Show where I made that statement. Then ask... was it in the past, perhaps?

This is your model:
|
| yesterday (−) now (0) tomorrow (+)
| nothing | nothing

That is your model. My model is
yesterday (−) now (0) tomorrow (+)
_____|−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−

|
| But the now has no duration either so is also nothing. There is no
| time in Galilean Relativity except that which is recorded in the
| magical transtemporal observer's notebook.

"Except" ?
That exception is all we need. It's recorded right here, as we write.
Nothing magical about it. Magic refers to the supernatural. This
is not supernatural, this is a natural as it comes.

|
| >
| > |
| > | See: http://www.mathpages.com/rr/s3−07/3−07.htm
| >
| > Why should I look at Zeno?
|
| Albro Swift points out that moving bodies differ depending on which
| observer views them because their coordinate systems are different.
| The problem of what distinguishes a moving from a non−moving system is
| therefore resolved, just look at the clocks.
|
| [snip]< −−− by Alex Green, unable to answer.

[snip]<−−− by Androcles, who can't be bothered either.
Androcles