

# THE RELATIVITY OF TIME. THE TIME OF THE RELATIVITY

XAVIER TERRI CASTAÑÉ

*LA PARADOJA DE LOS GEMELOS DE LA TEORÍA DE LA RELATIVIDAD ESPECIAL DE EINSTEIN:*

<http://www.bubok.com/libros/10519/La-paradoja-de-los-gemelos-de-la-Teoria-de-la-relatividad-de-Einstein>

*viXra. org:* <http://vixra.org/abs/0909.0022>

*EINSTEIN vs TEORÍA CONECTADA:*

<http://teoraconectada.soom.com/>

**ABSTRACT:** Demonstration without mathematical formulas of the theory of special and general relativity of Einstein is false.

**KEYWORDS:** light clock, mutually symmetrical comparison methods, time dilation, special relativity, gravitational redshift, general relativity, relational processing, relational theory, connected theory.

## THE LIGHT CLOCK

A photon is characterized by its frequency. A clock lighting is being built with the frequency of monochromatic light (characterized by its unique frequency) and which functions like any other clock, is based on the rule: 'constant number of oscillations = per unit time'. Its size, which is chosen arbitrarily, is defined as the number of oscillations of light that determine a time unit. Every 100000 oscillations a second, for example.

## MUTUALLY SYMMETRICAL COMPARISON

To study the relativity of time we need to compare clocks that are identical. Otherwise, if the clocks were not identical and functioned as a priori distinctly, nothing would compare. Furthermore, this comparison has to be mutually symmetrical. Otherwise, if asymmetrically we will privilege *a priori* about the clock A clock B or B over the A of no use to argue that any subsequent differences in their temporary records are a real consequence of the relativity of time, since such differences could be attributed to asymmetries introduced *a priori* the method of comparing identical clocks.

Defining a 'mutually symmetrical comparison method': given two observers A and B, A will use to build their light clock the frequency of a monochromatic light ray B sends to A and B used to construct its light clock the frequency of another light ray, identical to the above that A sends to B. (Exchanged rays are numerically different, there are two rays instead of one, and Entice identical, the two light rays, independently

of the frequency that the receiver can receive, have the same frequency from the viewpoint of the issuer: its natural frequency .)

To avoid introducing any asymmetry in the method of comparing identical clocks A and B are exchanged two separate light rays.(Indeed, if the method of comparing two identical clocks were not mutually symmetric, then these two clocks would not actually identical.)

Only when it is assumed, symmetrically, that A and B are related by exchanging light signals makes sense to start thinking about the relativity of time. Relational relativity of time. Not absolute. Otherwise, what sense does it say that time is relative? Are there still absolute movements? Does a clock is “aware” that is moving with respect to “do not know what” and therefore ‘accordingly’ (according to the relativity, of course), “knows” that has to delay the recording time? Is a photon aware, like any other clock is characterized by its size or frequency, which for him, as certain luminaries of current thinking argue that relativity still argue, “time stands still”? It seems impossible to always be washed in luminous waters of immortality, human beings are so ephemeral.

To prove the truth, we do not need a single mathematical formula.

## TIME DILATION OF SPECIAL RELATIVITY

A is considered at rest and B moves at a certain speed with respect to A. A measure the time with a light clock built with the frequency of light ray that B sends to A.

B is considered at rest and A moving at a certain speed with respect to B. B measures the time with a light clock built with the frequency of light ray that A sends to B.

A and B are symmetric and using the comparison method mutually symmetric clocks. By the symmetry of motion, speed of B relative to A is the same as the speed of A relative to B (except sign). Who of the two time goes slower or faster? “A or B?” “B or A?”

In the above example, the measurement method to determine a possible relativization of time has been based on a comparison mutually symmetrical order not to introduce any asymmetry *a priori*, A and B have exchanged two separate light rays, with which they have built two separate light clock. It's easy to see that with such clocks, which are identical and operate relationally by exchange of light, time goes exactly the same for A than for B. Then, the time dilation of special relativity by Einstein does not exist. (The Doppler effect to detect A for the light ray that B sends to A is exactly the same, by the symmetry of motion, the Doppler effect to detect B to the light ray , identical to the above that A sends to B.)

No sophistry. You do not need an infinite number of clocks, only two, to show that the time dilation of special relativity is false. (The relativistic “demonstration” of time dilation supported by the famous clock of mirrors, designed by Einstein and which is described in *The end of broken spacetime*, it is a fallacy: it is still based on the outdated metric of the Pythagoras theorem, who is an absolute metric, not relational.)

Special relativity is false.

Is time dilation “verified” empirically with great precision? How did this? With cheats mesons, muons, atomic clocks, ... and all the strange fauna relativist school uses at will to try to convince –deceive– that the stones fall up and circles are square. How is it ensured that similar type of “clocks” can be identical? If it gets verify that two

different particles have a half life time, this never means that we managed to verify, with "extremely precise", the Lorentz time dilation, but these two particles are actually different, not identical "clocks". Moreover, reasonable people, when they want to make an appointment, agree to be when the handles of their watches are in a certain position, not when they are already broken, or ceased to exist, a number of clocks specified statistical mean life or specified expiration date.

Relational theory can afford to doubt whether the concept 'photon': the frequency of light is or no composed of photons, is something that is measured daily in the humblest of laboratories.

It goes without recourse to empirical evidence to disprove special relativity. It was enough to think symmetrically to show that time dilation is false.

Lorentz transformations of special relativity is merely a mathematical game that has neither head nor tail. They are absurd. We must refute the Lorentz transformations of Einstein and replaced by the new transformations connected relational theory.

## THE GRAVITATIONAL REDSHIFT AND GENERAL RELATIVITY

The gravitational redshift is a phenomenon empirically proven: Given a ray of light traveling in a vertical direction, it is proven that the stationary observer located at a higher gravitational potential (greater distance from the center of the gravitational source, the more "height") measure a Light less frequently than those situated at a lower potential (lower altitude).

A is at a greater height than B. To measure the time with a clock frequency lighting built with a beam of light that B sends to A. Since A is taller than B, due to the gravitational redshift, the clock to run slower than clock B.

B is a bit lower than A. B measures the time with a clock frequency lighting built with a beam of light that A sends to B. Since B is a bit lower than A, due to the gravitational redshift (in this case would be better named "BlueShift." But as the mathematical structure of relativity is asymmetrical, ordinary language that it generates when it tries to explain is also asymmetric), B's clock will run faster than the clock of A. A and B using the method of comparing clocks mutually symmetric, but are not symmetrical. The above paragraph is not valid if we exchange A for B and B by A, since if A is found at higher elevations than B, then B knows that B is a bit lower than A and therefore B, same as A, recognizes that A is at a greater height than B.

It is easy to see that both will agree that time is relative to height (gravitational potential) and time to run slower than the time of B. Then, time goes slower at higher altitudes.

The Schwarzschild metric of general relativity asserts the opposite of what the clock shows lighting, that "time goes faster at higher altitudes. Then the Schwarzschild metric is false.

The Schwarzschild metric is a consequence of Einstein's equations of gravitational field, then Einstein's equations of gravitational field are false. (You can access the article Einstein's equations of gravitational field through the Einstein vs. Theory Connected blog.)

General relativity What is "verified" empirically with great precision? More still is the gravitational redshift. Furthermore we can not afford to even use the term 'photon': the frequency of light is something that is measured daily in the humblest of laboratories.

As much as relativists try to persuade us, experience the gravitational redshift, has never "verified" empirically general relativity. Instead, the contests with crystal clarity.

General relativity is false.

The theory of relativity, special + general, is false.

In reality it is pure logic that has already refuted with brilliant clarity the relativity theory. Relativistic, however many interests at stake, who still pretend to deceive?

No need to resort to experience to see that relativity destroys logic.

You do not need mathematical formulas to prove that relativity is false. Some lie. To demonstrate this, as we shall see, just a simple "calculus of propositions".

It's the end of spacetime broken. Relativity time has come to its end.

## THE RELATIVITY OF TIME. RELATIONAL AND NOT ABSOLUTE

Only after we have secured a total symmetry, identical clocks and lighting comparison method mutually symmetrical, you may start thinking sensibly about the relativity of time. If A and B are not symmetric, then perhaps the time may show its relative nature. If A and B are symmetric, then it is quite impossible: the time has to occur exactly the same for both. The opposite would be contradictory. Idea of harmony not ever. Paradoxical. Reality is not symmetric asymmetric unreal. Who does not remember the fascinatingly fascinating paradox, contradiction of the twins! All checks glorious school relativistic about the relativity of time is false. Lies certain that they are infected by the absolute motion implicit in the twin paradox (see the paper The twin paradox of special relativity theory of Einstein Bubok.com or Google).

What is time itself that is relative? This is even more absurd than the metaphysical absolute time of Newton. Allow comment.

What is time itself is relative and relativity is independent of the types of clocks used to verify? So why relativistic school cares so much to choose carefully its so "accurate" clocks? Why not "verify" the gravitational redshift with a pendulum clock? The phenomenon of gravitational redshift luminous follows, from the standpoint of theory, from the temporary array element of the metric of spacetime: Does not this mean that the time at which the theory refers is the time recorded by a luminous watch, and not another? Why the theory of relativity is incompatible with the clock lighting? (It is easy to show that according to general relativity, in a gravitational field performance mirrors the famous Einstein's clock depends on its spatial orientation, one of the many things of relativity that have neither head nor tail. The theory can demonstrate connected Einstein's clock behaves like a light clock.)

Lucid thought it never becomes asymmetrical symmetrical. One theory is required to define consistently, without cheating and without further need of having to rectify asymmetries a priori by definition a hesitant start, what she meant by "clock". Relativity is unable to do so. Relativity refuses to define what she meant by "clock". Whatever definition you try the turns to the absurd and contradictory. So we can allow freedom to choose the foolish strange clock that pleases him in each case to "verify" what it wants to "verify" - and, for that matter, no (you) can allow freedom of cunning chosen in each case the clock that pleases him: to remain bound to choose allows you to "verify" empirically all strange nonsense. How Einstein's relativity will define what is a watch if you do not understand what is the movement, if it believes in absolute and real movements of Newton!

No one knows what is 'on' time (I admit, at least I do not know). However, the relativity of time is nothing mysterious: only refers to the relational comparison of the oscillations of light. If time is relative, then it is relational. (As long as the spatial coordinates are also relational and absolute space does not exist, something similar to Newton, Leibniz said, but, of course, was not Leibniz which he created the theory of Newton.)

The timing has to be molded to the universal invariance of physical laws. Since the service of absolute relativity of motion.

The new Copernican revolution: The new connected theory.

PS: Question: Why is the local speed of light is the same for all observers? Answer: Because for all local observers light travels exactly the same length in exactly the same time. The length contraction and time dilation Lorentz exist. (See About the time dilation and length contraction Lorentz-Einstein.)

(From the blog Information section 'Einstein vs. Teoría conectada' can access all references in the text.)