

Re: Article: A Century of Einstein

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2004-10/4994.html>

From: Androcles (*dummy_at_dummy.net*)

Date: 10/18/04

Date: Mon, 18 Oct 2004 01:38:02 GMT

"Ole D. Rughede" <ole.rughede@privat.dk> wrote in message
news:4172f437\$0\$310\$edfadb0f@dread11.news.tele.dk...

> *Hello freshman!*

>

> *We were discussing a serious problem here to which
> you add some innocent babble, and from which you
> have removed essential arguments.*

>

> *Now, this is a public forum where anybody, including
> you, may demonstrate your ignorance.*

>

> *I suggest you take a talk with your mentor. But before
> bothering your physics professor, be sure to understand
> the problem in question:*

>

> *"Bilge" <dubious@radioactivex.lebesque-al.net> wrote
> news:slrncmv6ks.4o7.dubious@radioactivex.lebesque-al.net...*

>

>> *Ole D. Rughede:*

>>>

>>> *Pardon, but it seems we have a very serious problem.*

>>>

>>> *If namely GR in any possible way could reduce to SR,
>>> and if SR is a false theory, then also GR is false.*

>>>

>>> *[Bilge]*

>>> *By the same token since special relativity reduces to newtonian
>>> mechanics, if newtonian mechanics is false, special relativity
>>> could be false and therefore general relativity could be false.*

Bilge is a complete idiot, Ole. He doesn't have a logical bone in his body. There is no way time dilation can reduce to $\tau = t$ with the single exception $v = 0$, and then you have no mechanics at all. This is the only case where SR reduces to NM. He's right that if NM were false, and SR reduced to NM then SR would also be false, but totally incorrect that this would imply if NM were not false then SR is not false. All he can do is snip and sneer.

You won't change him.

The Seven Deadly Sins of Special Relativity.

For quotations following, reference:

<http://www.fourmilab.ch/etexts/einstein/specrel/www/>

("On the Electrodynamics of Moving Bodies" by Albert Einstein)

1) "light is always propagated in empty space with a definite velocity c which is independent of the state of motion of the emitting body", a totally unproven assumption without any evidence to support it.

2) "In agreement with experience we further assume the quantity $2AB/(t'A-tA) = c$ to be a universal constant– the velocity of light in empty space.",
an admitted assumption that is quite worthless when there is any relative motion between A and B, yet essential to the derivation of the remainder of Einstein's nonsense.

3) The equation

$\frac{1}{2}[\tau(0,0,0,t)+\tau(0,0,0,t+x'/(c-v)+x'/(c+v))] = \tau(x',0,0,t+x'/(c-v))$,
the $\frac{1}{2}$ of which is derived from 2) above and is tantamount to saying $(1/3 + 2/3)/2 = 1/3$.

4) The missing $0'$ from that equation, since $x' = x-vt$, hence $0' = 0-vt$, and the equation should be

$\frac{1}{2}[\tau(-vt,0,0,t)+\tau(-vt,0,0,t+x'/(c-v)+x'/(c+v))] = \tau(x',0,0,t+x'/(c-v))$
at the very least.

5) The further assumption "IF we place $x' = x-vt$... " without considering IF we place $x' = x+vt$, from which we derive (using Einstein's method)

$$\tau = (t+xv/c^2)/\sqrt{1-v^2/c^2}$$

$$x_i = (x + vt)/\sqrt{1-v^2/c^2}$$
 –Paul B. Andersen

6) The statements

"But the ray moves relatively to the initial point of k ,
when measured in the stationary system, with the velocity $c-v$..."
and

"It follows, further, that the velocity of light c cannot be altered by composition with a velocity less than that of light. For this case we obtain $V = (c+w)/(1+w/c) = c$."

which are contradictory, the first being Galilean, the second being contrary to the vector addition of velocities, an axiom of a vector space.

7) The lack of a check to verify the theory is self-consistent by feeding the new PoR given in 6) into the equation given in 3) and finding a total failure.

Check:

$$(t1-t)/(t2-t)*[\tau(-vt,0,0,t)+\tau(-vt,0,0,t+x'/V+x'/V)] = \tau(x',0,0,t+x'/V)$$

where $V = (c+v)/(1+v/c)$ as required by the redefined PoR.

Androcles

- > *In physics we have to distinguish between tokens and*
- > *forcing logic. Special Relativity, which is a false physical*
- > *theory of empty space, that is found nowhere in the whole*
- > *universe, cannot /reduce/ to Newtonian mechanics of the*
- > *real world of masses, fields, and forces in space and time.*
- >
- > *Much in physics "could be, if so and so". It is much more*
- > *interesting to hear why in physics things are what they are,*
- > *because of forcing logical reasons.*
- >
- > *Since SR was so defined by Einstein as the false abstract*
- > *"physics of empty space", it is out of question to /augment/,*
- > */expand/, or /extend/ SR to any real world physics.*
- >
- >> *[Bilge]*
- >> *On the other hand, if newtonian mechanics was correct, we wouldn't*
- >> *have special relativity, and if special relativity was correct,*
- >> *we wouldn't have general relativity. Is there a point there somewhere*
- >> *other than stream-of-consciousness non-sequiters?*
- >
- > *This is solid babble, as you probably can see yourself by*
- > *a closer look. Newtonian mechanics is perfectly correct*
- > *at its own premisses and is widely trusted in every day's*
- > *physics by all knowing people. It has its shortcomings when*
- > *asking beyond Newtonian premises, which is why General*
- > *Relativity is believed to remedy the problems in better ways.*
- >
- > *That the false SR theory of empty space was made first and*
- > *became a sort of step-stone to General Relativity does not*
- > *make SR any more valid, but /obsolete/, while the contrary,*
- > *that SR should in any way make Newtonian mechanics and*
- > *General Relativity superfluous, is completely out of question.*
- >
- > *For reasons I have given, stating the problem of falseness in*
- > *SR, not even corrections of SR by definition of a Lambda*
- > *term from GR with a constant radiant energy density u and*
- > *a constant pressure $p = u/3$ in all SR space in consideration*
- > *would validate the unphysical massless SR, because it has*
- > *still no idea of the Newtonian G and the Maxwell-Lorenz*
- > *constant c and their dependence of Aether energy density u .*
- >
- > *Without masses or massive fixpoints in the SR space, not*
- > *even length L , or Time T , or any velocity L/T has meaning*
- > *or any existence. They are only abstract ideas of extension*
- > *that cannot be measured relative to any physical objects.*
- >
- > *Space, time, velocity, frequencies, wavelengths, or physical*
- > *fields therefore do not exist in SR, and it won't help you to*
- > *snip my arguments, pretending that such serious critics were*

> never raised with forcing logic and in valid physical terms of
> undoubtedly reality.
>
>> >We assume the GR → SR reduction follows from the
>> >physical concept of mass-less space, where no force
>> >of gravitation acts. That is not to say the Newtonian G
>> >equals zero. It is saying that $\Sigma m_n = M = \text{zero}$.
>> >
>> >Such conditions are found nowhere in the world, why
>> >the idea is false because of lack of reality. – But since
>> >SR is based on such conditions, we conclude that SR
>> >is a false theory of physics,
>>
>> Strictly speaking, the existence of general relativity implies that
>> someone recognized this fact as early as 1916. Since then, the news
>> has spread like wildfire and now, almost everyone is aware of it.
>
> Strictly spoken babble. But any way an act of admission!
>
>> >while it may very well be true for the abstract geometric – but
>> >quite unphysical – conditions of empty space it was made for.
>>
>> [Bilge]
>> Apart from the fact that general relativity uses the same
>> concept known as spacetime.
>
> Newtonian physics and General Relativity operates in terms
> of the real world. The concept of space-time existed before
> the invention of SR and brings no reality to the SR-illusion of
> space-time in empty space, or any other physical reality to SR.
>
> The reality of General Relativity thus can on no account prove
> any reality of the empty space of Special Relativity founded on
> three /assumptions/ claimed as /principles/: The non-existence in
> physics of the concept of absolute rest, called "the principle of
> relativity"; and that light in empty space always propagates with
> a certain velocity V independent of the movements of the light-
> emitting bodies. Further assuming non-existence of the Aether.
>> >
>> >However, Einstein's SR postulate that the velocity of
>> >light in empty space is a universal constant V cm/sec
>> >according to experience is certainly not an empirical
>> >fact experienced anywhere in the physical world, why
>> >SR is fundamentally wrong; and it is even false at the
>> >abstract conditions at which it should be valid.
>>
>> [Bilge]
>> Au contraire. It's a physical fact everywhere in the world to any
> level
>> of precision anyone has been able to measure. Even were it not a fact,
> as

>> *indeed is a possibility (slim, but not completely out of the
> question),
>> who cares? That just means light doesn't propagate at `c', but `c' is
>> still a constant. That some velocity `c' exists is certainly a fact
> and
>> you can calculate it from the upper limit on the photon mass. There is
> a
>> serious problem but it can be remedied through your investment in a
> good
>> basics physics textbook.*
>
> *It is unclear whether you intend to deceive your readers,
> or if you just suffer from some kind of self-deception.
> Calculations presupposes exact measurements in the real
> world. – In empty space nothing can be measured.
>
> The velocity of light has never been measured in true
> empty space void of all gravitating masses and with an
> energy density of zero at the absolute temperature of
> zero degrees Kelvin. Such conditions are found nowhere
> in the universe, and can never be realized artificially.
>
> I have shown that the constancy of light-velocity c in
> space far from gravitating masses depends on the energy
> density u of the radiant energy in space called the Aether;
> everywhere in the universe of a definite local temperature
> $T(\text{Aether})$ proportional in the 4th power to the density u .
> The Aether is a product of real radiating bodies in space
> and time.
>
> It is precisely this Aether-condition that falsely and tacitly
> is used to postulate the "validity" of Special Relativity by
> measurements of $c = 2.99792458E10$ cm/sec, though
> this condition is by no means clarified or even mentioned
> by Einstein with his invention of "empirical facts" regarding
> the velocity of light in empty space, and although his later
> amendment with the Lambda-term to the General Relativity
> has been so much doubted and was at times even called
> by himself his "greatest blunder".
>
> So perhaps, dear freshman Bilge, you would please inform
> us in which good basic physics textbook this empirical fact
> of tacitly fraud in physics is described to correspond with
> Einstein's original SR-denial of the Aether, luckily withdrawn
> 15 years later, but still without precise idea of the universal
> Aether of radiant electromagnetic energy, the space-time-
> energetic continuum on which the light velocity c depends.
>
> Einstein's SR-proof:
> "Die betrachtete Welle ist also auch im bewegten System
> betrachtet eine Kugelwelle von der Ausbreitungsgeschwin-*

- > digkeit V . Hiermit ist gezeigt, dass unsere beiden Grund-
- > prinzipien miteinander vereinbar sind",
- >
- > is nothing but a worthless repeating his own presupposed
- > assumptions made into conditions (Voraussetzungen):
- >
- > "Wir wollen diese Vermutung (deren Inhalt im folgenden
- > "Prinzip der Relativität" genannt werden wird) zur Voraus-
- > setzung erheben und ausserdem die mit ihm nur scheinbar
- > unverträgliche Voraussetzung einführen, dass sich das Licht
- > im leeren Raume stets mit einer bestimmten, vom Bewe-
- > gungszustande des emittierende Körpers unabhängigen
- > Geschwindigkeit V fortpflanze".
- >
- > To restore what you have tried to repress, I repeat my
- > remaining original words about the problem in discussion:
- >
- > To set $V = c = 2.99792458E10$ cm/sec would no
- > way better the situation, but adds further to falseness
- > of the Special Theory of Relativity and its postulates
- > of relativity.
- >
- > SR seems to reflect the idea of Galilean-Newtonian
- > physics, why we have to consider that some changes
- > are needed in Newton's fundamental laws:
- >
- > 1. A body on which no /net/ forces are acting remains
- > at rest or moves with constant velocity.
- >
- > 2. The acceleration of a body is proportional to the
- > force acting on it.
- >
- > 3. Action and reaction are equal and opposite, /i.e.
- > antiparallel in case of bodies at rest, otherwise dis-
- > placed to or deviating from a parallel direction/.
- >
- > Since forces are acting in time, there is in the time
- > Δt a displacement between action- and reaction-
- > directions of forces in case of moving bodies.
- >
- > Now these fundamental laws are supposed to hold
- > for a single body in empty space, deduced from
- > experience by innumerable physical experiments.
- >
- > But when empty space is nowhere to be found, we
- > conclude the idea should be that Newtonian laws
- > are valid everywhere in the universal space far from
- > all gravitating masses, meaning at such positions in
- > space where the forces of gravity acting on a single
- > test-body are equal in all directions, why no external
- > net-forces are acting on that body.

- >
- > *In other words: Left alone in space at such positions,*
- > *our test–body remains at rest, weight–less. But given*
- > *some velocity it will immediately behave under a force*
- > *of gravity in the direction of movement.*
- >
- > *The static situation of rest says nothing about the real*
- > *magnitude of the acting gravitational forces. They may*
- > *have any possible one and same value in all directions.*
- >
- > *Having so clarified what should be understood by the*
- > *Galilean–Newtonian dynamics in real physical space,*
- > *we may turn to the problem of Einstein's velocity of*
- > *light V in empty space, meaning at positions in space*
- > *where a test–body remains at rest relative to all other*
- > *masses in the whole universe.*
- >
- > *According to the Aether Equation we see that both*
- > *the Newtonian G and the velocity of light c depends on*
- > *the specific local energy of the aether U at the position*
- > *of our test–body, when U erg is the radiant energy in*
- > *the local space irradiated from all astrophysical bodies*
- > *in the universe:*
- >
- > $\kappa * U * V = G * h * c^2$
- > *at $T(\text{Aether}) = T(\text{CMBR}) = 2.692064$ Kelvin.*
- >
- > $\kappa = 1 \text{ cm}^2/\text{g} * \text{sec}^3 = 1 \text{ erg}/\text{sec} * \text{g}^2$
- > $U = 3.973637E-13 \text{ erg}$
- > $V = 1 \text{ cm}^3$
- > $G = 6.672426E-8 \text{ cm}^3/\text{g} * \text{sec}^2$
- > $h = 6.626176E-27 \text{ erg} * \text{sec}$
- > $c = 2.99792458E10 \text{ cm}/\text{sec}$
- >
- > *The Newtonian factor of proportionality G therefore*
- > *is a local variable defining the actual force of gravity*
- > *acting on a test–body, and since c^2 is proportional*
- > *to U/G with U of another proportionality to $G * c^2$,*
- > *the velocity c is certainly not constant and the same*
- > *everywhere in the real physical space, meaning that*
- > *c is also a variable, and rays of light are deflected by*
- > *the fields of gravity, whereby light loses energy and*
- > *becomes red–shifted according to experience.*
- >
- > *Such are the real physical conditions, as it seems,*
- > *and unless SR be modified to comply with this, it is*
- > *still a false physical theory and should be avoided or*
- > *fall completely in favour of GR, applicable to the*
- > *physics of the real world in space–time only of final*
- > *extension, provided careful definition of the Λ*
- > *term for the local aether energy density $u \text{ erg}/\text{cm}^3$*

- > *and the local aether pressure $p = u/3 \text{ dyn/cm}^2$.*
- >
- > *The relation of coefficients x to U , y to G , and z to c*
- > *in $\kappa(xU)V = (yG)h(zc)^2$, meaning that*
- > *$x = yz^2$, should then possibly be found from the*
- > *studies of differential velocities of galactic spins, and*
- > *from experiments in low energy physics below the*
- > *temperature of the cosmic background radiation,*
- > *$T(\text{CMBR}) = 2.692064 \text{ Kelvin}$, where G may attain*
- > *magnitudes less than the ordinary $6.67E-8$, hitherto*
- > *– but falsely – considered as an universal constant.*
- >
- > *Flat Euclidian space–time and Galilean–Newtonian*
- > *dynamics are abstract ideas that cannot be realized*
- > *exact anywhere in the universe.*
- >
- > *The Aether of radiant energy as the space–time–*
- > *energetic continuum, which is the medium of all fields*
- > *and forces in physics, should be considered from*
- > *thermodynamic reasons, as already indicated in GR*
- > *by the Lambda term, as well as by the mass–energy*
- > *tensor and the fact that mass /and/ energy gravitates.*
- >
- > *Embedding 4D GR in 5D Kaluza–Klein with the*
- > *aether parameters as the 5th dimension seems to*
- > *enable the unification of all physical forces, and make*
- > *an end to the speculative idea of big bang as a mere*
- > *4D illusion, meaning that the ongoing creation of new*
- > *stars and galaxies from present mass and energy in the*
- > *universe, conserving mass, energy, and momentum,*
- > *seems realities that may be real subjects of physics.*
- >
- > *$V * L / c * u / Kh = 1$ dimensionless*
- > *at $T(\text{Aether}) = T(\text{CMBR}) = 2.692064 \text{ Kelvin}$.*
- >
- > *$UL / hc = Gc / \kappa L^2 = K$.*
- > *$L = 1 \text{ cm}$, $u = U/V$, $K = 2.000343E3$ dimensionless.*
- >
- > *Ole D. Rughede*
- >
- >
- >