

TIME IS NOT RELATIVE

By Peter V. Raktoe

10th July 2018

peterraktoe@hotmail.com

ABSTRACT

An atom requires a certain amount of energy for a transition between two energy levels, we can use that amount of energy in an experiment to prove that time is not relative.

INTRODUCTION

Einstein claimed that time is relative but he didn't even know what time was, his unsubstantiated claim was only based on the speed of the seconds. Einstein's claim was a fallacy because a second doesn't say anything about what time is, a second is just a time period (a certain amount of time). So when you determine that time runs faster or slower in a certain situation by looking at the seconds, then you cannot claim that time itself is relative. You can only determine that the seconds are formed more quickly or more slowly in a certain situation, the speed of those seconds doesn't say anything about time. A second is formed by an atomic clock and it forms a second after a certain amount of cycles, a second is based on the duration of 9.192.631.770 cycles of radiation corresponding to the transition between two energy levels of the caesium-133 atom (Wikipedia). So a second is only formed when that process is finished, an atomic clock will always wait until those 9.192.631.770 cycles are finished before it forms a second. And the length of a second is based on the speed of that process, so if that process would slow down (unnoticed) then a second will become LONGER and if that process would speed up (unnoticed) then a second will become SHORTER. But a difference in the length of the seconds would be too small to measure, so we need to measure it in a different way. An atom's transition between two energy levels requires a certain amount of energy, we can use that amount of energy in an experiment to prove that time is not relative.

THE EXPERIMENT

We need to use a certain amount of energy for an atomic clock on a high altitude, and that amount of energy is based on the transition of a certain amount of atoms. We need to measure how much energy it takes to form a certain amount of seconds with that atomic clock on a high altitude, and then we need to use that SAME amount of energy for an atomic clock near the Earth's surface. If time is relative, then the amount of energy will result in the transition of the SAME amount of atoms for both atomic clocks. But if time is not relative, then the amount of energy will result in the transition of a LESS amount of atoms for the atomic clock near the Earth's surface. It would prove that the formation of a second requires less energy on a high altitude, and if it requires less energy then a second will be formed more quickly on a high altitude. So if time is not relative then the amount of energy will result in more seconds in the same time period for the atomic clock on a high altitude but those seconds are SHORTER, and that same amount of energy will result in less seconds in the same time period for the atomic clock near the Earth's surface but those seconds are LONGER. That experiment would prove that there is an unnoticed difference in the length of the seconds, and that means that time is not relative. I explained what time dilation is in my Vixra paper 1607.0495 and why time is not relative, and that paper also explains what gravity and time are.

CONCLUSION

This experiment will prove that time is not relative, time itself has no speed. Time is the same for a traveller and an observer, but there are more shorter seconds for that observer in the same time period.