Lorentz Versus Einstein Relativity Copyright 20 November 2015 by Glenn A. Baxter, P.E.
www.k1man.com Institute@k1man.com 207 242 2143 Draft 20 November 2015 4:55 P.M.

ABSTRACT

Many talk about Dr. Einstein's Special Relativity when they are thinking Lorentz/Einstein 1916 "Lorentz Relativity." The difference is described in this paper.

ARGUMENT

Dr. Einstein was very bright and had both scientific instinct and "big balls." He did not understand light velocity and light relative velocity, incorrectly set them to be equal, derived all the Special Relativity equations (I show the equivalent of his math in www.k1man.com/c1) and then boldly embraced his crazy results such as t = t'[(square root of 1 – v^2/c^2)], which is time dilation, m = m'/[square root of (1 – v^2/v^2)], and E = mc^2, which he stated meant that mass can be converted directly into energy. Dr. Einstein "sucked up" to Lorentz by taking his Lorentz transformations off the shelf, so to speak, followed by Lorentz "sucking up" to him in 1916. This resulted in so called Lorentz Relativity, with an earth centered inertial frame, eliminating the famous Special Relativity twin paradox symmetry problem. The "Lorentz Relativity" equations are all identical to Einstein Special Relativity formulas.

Many consider so called Lorentz Relativity to be Einstein Special Relativity. A little "slight of hand." . Dr. Einstein incorrectly changed his mind in 1916 and adopted aether, when he should have waited for me and my LOCATION theory. See www.k1man.com/c62.pdf

When world class chemist Dr. Otto Hahn split uranium into barium and krypton and sent his results to Dr. Lise Meitner, she common plugged published mass figures into E = mc^2 and then totally"freaked out." This experimental and other information landed at Columbia University, where Dr. Enrico Fermi had just joined their physics department after receiving the Nobel in 1938 for his excellent work with neutrons. They were all right about a lot of energy coming out during fission but wrong about the source of that energy. It was Coulomb forces and not mass being converted to energy via E = mc^2.

Listen eight minutes into Dr. Richard Feynman's Cal Tech lecture:

www.k1man.com/Feynman620927.mp3

My problem is far greater with all the Dissidents who think they understand this stuff when they don't, as compared to the Main Stream who assume that what they were taught in college is correct. Dissidents who think they understand when they don't is much much worse.

Dr. Einstein went "viral" when the fission bombs went off in 1945. Everyone assumed that was proof that E = mc^2 and that Dr. was the greatest scientist that ever lived. Walk into any United States high school, and Dr. Einstein's likeness and E = mc^2 are boldly displayed on the corridor walls.

Special Relativity and its crown jewel E = mc^2 are the corner stone of 21st century physics; all wrong! What a fine kettle of fish!

It is hoped that my physics papers will change all this over the next 100 years or so. That, is how science works! See www.k1man.com/v

"To kill an error is as good a service, and sometimes even better than, establishing a new truth or fact."

Charles Darwin

"Great causes are never tried on the merits; but the cause is reduced to particulars to suit the size of the partisans, and the contention is ever hottest on minor matters." - Ralph Waldo Emerson - From his essay "Nature" 1844

Mr. Baxter has a degree in Industrial Engineering from the University of Rhode Island and is a Licensed Professional Engineer in Illinois and Maine. He is a graduate of Vermont Academy, which honored him in 1993 as a Distinguished Alumnus with the Dr. Florence R. Sabin Award. It was at Vermont Academy as a student where Mr. Baxter attended a talk and met the very popular relativity author James A. Coleman. Mr. Baxter has been doing research in relativity and physics ever since and is currently Executive Director of the Institute for Advanced Research. See www.k1man.com His current interests include physics, philosophy, and theology.

SIXTH ANNUAL PHYSICS COLLOQUIUM IN PORTLAND, MAINE - 20 August 2016

The 20 August 2016 Physics Colloquium will be held at a hotel in the immediate Portland, Maine airport area and will feature two speakers in the morning and two in the afternoon. The Colloquium fee is $95, and the pdf proceedings and the video of all presentations and discussions recorded on a thumb drive will be free for all attendees, and will be $95 postpaid anywhere in the world for everyone else. We are now extending invitations for world class speakers.

The presentation paper pdf files will be e-mailed to all those registered well before the Physics Colloquium so that the papers can be studied ahead of time, which will greatly improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the Physics Colloquium itself. Attendees are cordially invited to dinner in Portland, Maine on Friday evening, August 19, 2016 at 7:00 p.m., to informally meet and to also discuss physics. Please register for the Physics Colloquium by sending an E-mail to Institute@K1MAN.com. All meals (and drinks) are separate at the hotel (off the menu) or wherever else is desired. www.k1man.com Telephone 207 242 2143 See you there?

Glenn A. Baxter, P.E., at his home in Belgrade Lakes, Maine U.S.A.

Glenn A. Baxter, P.E., age 4, with his dad, Frank H. Baxter (Bachelor of Science Degree, Mechanical Engineering, 1914, Rhode Island State College), and President of Frank H. Baxter Associates, 370 Lexington Avenue, New York City. See www.k1man.com/fhb and also www.k1man.com/w10 and www.k1man.com/Loons

Al:

Glenn,

One way to look at your LOCATIONS is to imagine the locations of everything in the universe at one specific time, t = 0. All locations can be considered to be fixed in that instant in the same grid.

GLENN:

OK

Al:

If we assume that this grid has no net average motion relative to the universe of objects,

GLENN

No. You have lost it right away, as usual. All objects probably have motion relative to the grid. LOCATIONS in the grid do not have motion relative to each other

Al:

then this "frame" would generally represent the average velocity of all the galaxies

GLENN

Absolutely wrong. The galaxies all have individual velocities with respect to the LOCATION absolute frame

Al:

and other matter in the universe.

GLENN

No. Same as above.

Al:

Since I believe that the universe is not expanding, I am OK with this generalization.

GLENN

Not relevant. Makes no difference if the universe of galaxies is expanding or not.

Al:

Furthermore, it seems reasonable to me that this "average frame" for the universe is a good definition of the absolute frame for light velocity.

GLENN

Absolutely not. You are completely missing it, as usual.

Al:

At any given LOCATION, the velocity of light will be c in all directions RELATIVE TO THAT LOCATION, but not relative to the changing locations of the object after t = 0

GLENN

Correct. Now you have relative velocity of light.

Al:

if the object at that location is moving relative to the t = 0 LOCATION. I think you may agree with this.

GLENN

You are off track now.

Al:

For example, the LOCATION of your dock is forever fixed in the specific 3-D grid of all locations at t = 0

GLENN

Not forever. Only at t = 0

Al.

The speed of light from stars arriving at your dock LOCATION at t = 0 will be c

GLENN

Assuming the approximate void, yes

Al

, but after t = 0, your dock moves at 8 km/s relative to the void around your dock

GLENN

At t = o there is no velocity. There is only velocity during t = 0 and t = 0 + dt, etc.

Al

. Therefore, in the frame of your dock, starlight arrives at an observer on your dock at c + / - 8 km/s.

GLENN

No. Light arrives at c. You are talking about relative velocity. You still don't understand the difference and neither did Dr. Einstein.

Al:

When we say light speed is "c," we really mean to say more precisely 1 / sq rt of mu times epsilon

GLENN

In the approximate void

Al:

. This covers the variations of speed in space vs atmosphere vs glass, etc.

GLENN

OK, Now out if the approximate void.

Al:

Given the aether, I would define the absolute frame in terms of the aether,

GLENN

What the hell is aether? Is it required for light propagation? My model says no. The approximate void is all you need and it has both permeability and permittivity.

Al:

but your definition of the absolute frame seems reasonable and it avoids the aether question.

GLENN

Yes, but I discuss adding whatever aether you wish next. See
www.k1man.com/c48.pdf

Al, as usual, no progress whatsoever.

You need to first understand my model so you can predict what will happen in my model. Then add whatever aether you want and predict what my model then says.

Then compare with what your model says.

You really don't have a model because your thinking jumbles things together. How does a car run on gas? How does it run on alcohol? You always start by mixing the two and never answer the question will the car run faster on the mixture than just gas alone? Your analysis of our models is all jumbled up and your questions are always not relevant. You should be able to answer your own questions but you can't because you jumble things in the same way each time. You show that you don't understand light and relative motion c' as opposed to c.

Like loading a 357 with 22 shells and asking me what would happen if you pointed that gun at your head and pulled the trigger. You reason me responding that it would kill you. Wrong. It will not go off.

) and light will self propagate at c. Adding anything between points A and B will affect the light.