

Regarding Special Relativity

Gertrud Walton: <http://home.btconnect.com/sapere.aude>

Allow me to draw your attention to a point commonly ignored. What physicists take as experimental confirmation of "relativistic time dilation" is merely the Lorentz Factor turning up all over the place. That has nothing to do with SR, even though the factor, BY MISTAKE, turns up in SR also. In experiments, the factor points to some unexplained physical/dynamic effect for which nobody is even looking.

Ironically, the factor is not even compatible with Einstein's 1905 transformation: the reason why it is "reciprocal" is because it arises by mistake (false value for v' in the inverse transformation). If that is corrected, Einstein's factor cancels (reduces to 1). Worse, if we assume that there is an effect in S' e.g. $l' = al$, it reverses in S - $l = l'/a$.

Minkowski has made Einstein's maths difficult to read (the terrible blunder of time in Einstein as a fourth dimension). Perhaps that explains, excuses, why so few are able to check Einstein's equations.

It occurs to me that we might exploit this in some way. If you know of friends that are interested, please forward my message. (I cannot very well keep bombarding all and sundry, uncertain where exactly they stand.)

The recent exchanges (even Doolin was fruitful) had given me ideas how to rewrite my homepage where I now hammer everything home (with the grotesque invalidity of the maths):

frames not equivalent - no principle of relativity;

propagation in S' not spherical - no principle of the constancy of the velocity of light -

"In sum, SR is inapplicable in reality (Einstein-clocks do not exist); his the derivation and the outcome of his transformation are invalid, and he has not reconciled his two fundamental principles."

And, most importantly, SR as proof of a monumental mathematical cock-up involving the top of the profession.