

## Reply to the Note of Jeremy Danning-Davies

### Reported Under

### 'Further Comments on Khan's So-called 'Equation Of Trickery'

### ViXra: 1202.0054

The articles 'Experimental & Theoretical Evidences of Fallacy of Space-time Concept and Actual State of Existence of the Physical Universe' [1] available on [www.wbabin.net](http://www.wbabin.net), [www.worldsci.org](http://www.worldsci.org), viXra: 1201.0022 & 'On the Electrodynamics of Moving Bodies' By Albert Einstein is Based on Trickeries (Open letter to Professors, Teachers, Researchers and Students of Physics) [2] & reply to the earlier note of the author Jeremy Danning-Davies viXra 1202.0018 published by Elixir Online Journal in February issue on page 6809 under heading comments [3] under the heading comments; exposes the trickeries of Albert Einstein which has happened after 107 years when both the trickeries have been identified simultaneously. Einstein's first trickery is that he has adopted two different velocities of light while working out the timing of the light pulse at three points in two reference frames in relative uniform motion thereby violated the very principle of constancy of velocity of light in different inertial reference frames which he had introduced in the article. This is very adequately and in sufficient detail explained in the article "Experimental & Theoretical Evidences of Fallacy of Space-time Concept and Actual State of

Existence of the Physical Universe"[1]. The rectification of this trickery leads to  $\frac{\partial \tau}{\partial x} = 0$ .

The second trickery is exposed in the article 'On the Electrodynamics by Albert Einstein is Based on Trickeries' (Open letter to Professors, Teachers, Researchers and Students of Physics) [2] which would require some clarification for easy understanding. I would reproduce the two sentences in section 3 of the article "On the Electrodynamics of Moving Bodies" [4] wherein second trick has been played.

*"If we place  $x'=x-vt$ , it is clear that a point at rest in the system  $k$  must have a system of values  $x', y, z$ , independent of time. We first define  $\tau$  as a function of  $x', y, z$ , and  $t$ ."*

In these two sentences the second trickery is hidden. He accepts that point  $x', y, z$  is at rest in the moving coordinate system  $k$  which implies that point  $x', y, z$  is independent of time  $\tau$  in the moving coordinate system. Evidently point  $x', y, z$  is always at a fixed distance from the origin of the moving coordinate system  $k$  and as such  $\tau$  is not a function  $x', y, z$  as this is a fixed point in the moving coordinate system  $k$ . In the following sentences he plays the trick of making  $\tau$  a function of  $x', y, z$  and  $t$  as variables. This is explained partly in the clarification which stands also published by Elixir Online Journal in February issue on page 6809 [ under the heading comments.

The above-mentioned note was sent to Mr. Jeremy Dunning-Davies. The above clarification and the two articles [1] & [2] should have been sufficient as the reply to Mr. Jeremy Dunning-Davies but still I would like to educate him as to what he is writing. He says that the time taken by the ray of light to cover a distance  $x'$  in the forward direction is  $t$  then  $t$  is given by

$$t = x'/(c-v)$$

whereas the time taken in the reverse direction to cover the same distance  $x'$  is shown to be

$$t = x'/(c+v)$$

time to cover the same distance  $x'$  in the same reference frame in opposite directions should be same if there is no medium of luminiferous ether and equating the above two time intervals we get

$$c+v = c-v$$

so

$$v=0$$

Any reader can understand the absurdity of comments of Mr. Jeremy Dunning-Davies. It is very unfortunate that those so-called physicists who have no idea about how, why and what are theories of relativity have adopted the theories of relativity and the author of the note being one of such so-called physicists. The author applies the constancy of velocity of light to arrive at  $c+v$  &  $c-v$  without realising that when Galilean transformation is applied to the wave-equation the constancy of velocity of light/radiation is not justified. That is why we get the value of  $v=0$ . It is clearly stated in the article [1] as to how & why theory of special relativity came into being; to quote the article it is stated in the Discussions & Conclusion

'It needs no over-emphasis that classical physics has absolutely no explanation of Doppler Effect and it is because of this main factor the theories of relativity came into being.'

**Classical physics can neither explain the wave nature of light/radiation nor can it explain the Doppler Effect.**

The article [4] simply gives the physical interpretation & justification of the Lorentz transformation especially the adoption of the Lorentz factor and dependence of time on space with the help of trickeries.

Further the expressions  $x'/(c-v)$  &  $x'/(c+v)$  adopted by Jeremy Dunning-Davies for time of travel in the same reference frame in opposite directions violates the principle of constancy of velocity of light which had been introduced by Einstein in the article [3] and that is why we get the value of  $v=0$ . I fail to understand under what arguments the author of 'further comments' justifies the validity of the 'Equation of Trickery'. If the author does not still understand the meaning of what he is writing; then I will pray to God to help him.

The author claims to be member of the Department of Physics, Hull University, England and if he is actually the member, I request the other members of the institution to guide the author as by bringing such fallacious arguments to deny the logical, theoretical & mathematical truth would bring bad name to the university. In so far as the stand of R. Cahill on Michelson-Morley experiment is concerned I have communicated him the article Michelson-

**Morley experiment: A Misconceived & Misinterpreted Experiment [4]. Though I have not received the comments I hereby challenge his stand on Michelson-Morley experiment also.**

**Conclusion: - On the one hand the author of the ‘further comment’ accepts that he is sceptical about theories of relativity and on the other hand he justifies the validity of ‘Equation of Trickery’ on irrational, incorrect and self-contradictory basis. Mr. Jeremy Dunning-Davies does not know as to what he is writing and this I leave to the judgment of readers.**

**References:-**

[1] ‘Experimental & Theoretical Evidences of Fallacy of Space-time Concept and Actual State of Existence of the Physical Universe’. By Mohammad Shafiq Khan available on [www.wbabin.net](http://www.wbabin.net), [www.worldsci.org](http://www.worldsci.org) , viXra.

[2] ‘On the Electrodynamics of Moving Bodies’ By Albert Einstein is Based on Trickeries (Open letter to Professors, Teachers, Researchers and Students of Physics). By Mohammad Shafiq Khan available on [www.elixirjournal.org](http://www.elixirjournal.org)

[3] reply to the earlier note of the author Jeremy Danning-Davies viXra 1202.0018 published by Elixir Online Journal in February issue on page 6809 under heading comments. By Mohammad Shafiq Khan available on [www.elixirjournal.org](http://www.elixirjournal.org)

[4] ‘On the Electrodynamics of Moving Bodies’ By Albert Einstein

[5] Michelson-Morley Experiment: A Misconceived & Misinterpreted Experiment. By Mohammad Shafiq Khan available on [www.indjst.org](http://www.indjst.org)