

Rebuttal to Lann N. Ramez's

Reply to Mohammad Shafiq Khan's Paper "On the electrodynamic of moving bodies' by Albert Einstein is Based on Trickeries (Open Letter to Professors, Teachers, Researchers and Students of Physics)"

&

Commentary on Shafiq Khan's paper "Experimental & theoretical evidences of fallacy of space-time concept and actual state of existence of the physical universe"

Mohammad Shafiq Khan
House no.49, Al-Farooq Colony, Rawalpura, Srinagar, Jammu &
Kashmir, 190005, India
shafiqifs@gmail.com

Abstract: The papers written by Lann N. Ramez are as a consequences of not understanding the fact that Einstein had used two different velocities of light in two coordinate systems though explained in great detail in the paper Mohammad Shafiq Khan (2012) thereby Einstein had violated the very postulate of constancy of velocity of light which he had introduced in Albert Einstein (1905) as in one coordinate system he adopts the velocity of light as 'c' which is in accordance with the postulate of constancy of velocity of light whereas in other coordinate system he adopts the velocity of light as constant 'c' not with respect to the observer but with respect to space as he uses $c + v$ and $c - v$ as velocity of light. The purpose of writing the paper Mohammad Shafiq Khan (2012-Elixir-I) was to show that in the Einstein's 'equation of trickery' [as declared in the Mohammad Shafiq Khan (2012)] the term $\frac{\partial \tau}{\partial x'}$ is simply baseless, incorrect and mathematical manipulation whereas it has been shown in Mohammad Shafiq Khan (2012) that $\frac{\partial \tau}{\partial x'} = 0$ and also in Mohammad Shafiq Khan (2012-Elixir-II) it is again shown, by using simple calculus, that $\frac{\partial \tau}{\partial x'} = 0$. This demonstrates that both the papers of Lann N. Ramez are preposterous, absurd and as the result of not understanding the papers Mohammed

Shafiq Khan (2012) and Mohammed Shafiq Khan (2012-Elixir-I). Lann N. Ramez and Einstein have not given any logic for using two different velocities of light in two coordinate systems.

Background: - The background of the theory of special relativity is discussed in the introduction of Mohammad Shafiq Khan (2012). Lorentz transformation which Einstein derived in his paper Albert Einstein (1905) fraudulently from the ‘equation of trickery’ just to claim the credit of introduction of postulate of constancy of velocity of light irrespective of linear uniform motion of the source and the observer. Now then there are three transformations firstly Woldemar Voigt transformation, secondly Lorentz or Einstein’s transformation and thirdly my transformation though all the three transformations are mathematically correct. The decision as to which transformation is correct can be taken on the basis of experimental investigation and actual state of existence of the physical universe. This exercise has been accomplished in the paper Mohammad Shafiq Khan (2012) and it has been shown that only time dilation without involvement of space is correct. The constancy of velocity of light irrespective of the linear uniform motion of the observer is weird and against the mathematical axioms mathematical results need not be accepted against the physical and factual state of existence of space.

The papers written by Lann N. Ramez are concerned with the derivation of ‘equation of trickery’ by Einstein and one of the equations in Mohammad Shafiq Khan (2012-Elixir-I). Lann N. Ramez should have known that rebuttal, reply or commentary of the papers published in peer-reviewed journals, wherein the contents of the papers are claimed to be incorrect, must be published in the peer-reviewed journal. After having realised that both the papers are preposterous, absurd, as the consequence of not understanding my papers and not published in peer-reviewed journal I deemed it proper not to pay any attention to these papers and did not write the rebuttal. Now since I am in the process of publication of the second edition of my book ‘Natural World Order and The Islamic Thought’ wherein this issue is also discussed I do not want anybody to raise fingers because common readers do not know that rebuttal, reply or commentary of the papers published in the peer-reviewed journals have to be published in the peer-reviewed journal. Under these circumstances I have written the rebuttal which would demolish the validity of the preposterous and absurd papers of Lann N. Ramez. It is the matter of record that Lann N. Ramez (2018-II) has been

submitted to viXra under his name but got published as anonymous whereas in the General Science Journal he has got it published under his name. All the three links are given in the references

Proof: - Einstein’s ‘equation of trickery’ is as follows

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{c-v} + \frac{1}{c+v} \right) \frac{\partial \tau}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial \tau}{\partial x'} + \frac{1}{c-v} \frac{\partial \tau}{\partial t} \quad \dots\dots\dots(i)$$

It has been shown in Mohammad Shafiq Khan (2012) that by adopting the postulate of constancy of velocity irrespective of linear uniform motion of the observer and the source in both the coordinate systems

$$\frac{\partial \tau}{\partial x'} = 0$$

So, the ‘equation of trickery’ could be written as

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{c-v} + \frac{1}{c+v} \right) \frac{\partial \tau}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{c-v} \frac{\partial \tau}{\partial t}$$

which could be also written as

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{c-v} + \frac{1}{c+v} \right) = \frac{1}{c-v} \quad \dots\dots\dots(ii)$$

Thus equation (ii) could now also be written as

$$\frac{1}{2} \left[t + t + \frac{x'}{c-v} + \frac{x'}{c+v} \right] = t + \frac{x'}{c-v} \quad \dots\dots\dots(2)$$

This is the equation (2) in Mohammad Shafiq Khan (2012- Elixir-I) and Lann N. Ramez's sole argument is based on the source of this equation. Evidently the source of equation (2) in my above-mentioned paper is the Einstein's 'equation of trickery'. This is also the equation, when the velocity of light is treated as constant 'c' with respect to space against the postulate of constancy of velocity of light, when we apply to the formula $\tau_0 + \tau_2 = 2\tau_1$ the timings of the light pulse as in stationary coordinate system at origin of moving coordinate system, point 'x' and back to the origin. Thus, there are two sources of the equation (2) in Mohammad Shafiq Khan (2012-Elixir-I) which Lann N. Ramez had questioned in his reply whereas both the sources are in Albert Einstein (1905). This should be enough to demolish the reply of Lann N. Ramez (2018-I).

Since in Lann N. Ramez (2018-II) he has written some commentary about Mohammed Shafiq Khan (2012) he may not agree to the derivation of $\frac{\partial \tau}{\partial x'} = 0$. In that case refer the paper Mohammad Shafiq Khan (2012 – Elixir – II) which being very brief, as such is reproduced below.

You have got to understand simple calculus.

If τ is a function of x'

Then

$$\frac{\partial \tau}{\partial x'} = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{\tau(x' + h) - \tau(x')}{h}$$

The derivation is defined by taking the limit as 'h' tends to zero, meaning that it considers the behavior of ' τ ' for all small values of 'h' and extracts a consistent value of 'h' approaching zero.

Since in the moving coordinate system k point x' is always at a constant distance from the origin; there is no question of increment of x' and 'h' cannot be assigned any value

Hence,

$$\tau(x'+h) = \tau(x')$$

$$\tau(x'+h) - \tau(x') = 0$$

Hence,

$$\frac{\partial \tau}{\partial x'} = 0$$

Then as an honest man accept Einstein was a trickster.

Even by simple calculus also $\frac{\partial \tau}{\partial x'} = 0$ so the equation (2) in Mohammad Shafiq Khan (2012 – Elixir – I) is justified. Consequently, in Mohammad Shafiq Khan (2012 – Elixir – I) the equation (2) leads to $V = 0$. But in Mohammad Shafiq Khan (2012 – Elixir – I) by taking the equation (2) I have demonstrated step by step as to how Einstein had arrived at the ‘equation of trickery’. He had added ∂t for no reason whatsoever.

However, the misconception of Lann N. Ramez that I have taken

$$\tau(x, y, z, t) = t$$

and like $\tau_0 + \tau_2 = 2\tau_1$ I have presumed $t_0 + t_2 = 2t_1$ whereas t_0 , t_1 and t_2 correspond to timings of τ_0 , τ_1 and τ_2 respectively in stationary reference frame, needs to be clarified.

Nowhere in Mohammad Shafiq Khan (2012-Elixir-I) I have used this misconception of Lann N. Ramez.

It is stated in Mohammad Shafiq Khan (2012-Elixir-I) that no physicist to date has bothered to check or explain the source of Einstein's ‘equation of trickery’ and Lann N. Ramez should have shown the source of the Einstein's ‘equation of trickery’ before justifying its correctness. Yes, I have done imaginary operations while deriving the ‘equation of trickery’ so as to demonstrate as to what trickery Einstein had done to arrive at the ‘equation of trickery’. This should be sufficient to demolish the reply of Lann N. Ramez (2018-I) as preposterous, absurd and misunderstanding of Mohammad Shafiq Khan (2012-Elixir-I).

The rebuttal will be further clarified while discussing the commentary of Mohammad Shafiq Khan (2012) in Lann N. Ramez (2018-II) below.

So far as the commentary on Mohammad Shafiq Khan (2012) is concerned it is very unfortunate that Lann N. Ramez has not understood the tricks of Einstein in Albert

Einstein (1905) which are so elegantly described in the paper in question. Einstein had introduced the postulate of constancy of velocity of light irrespective of linear uniform motion of the source and the observer not as his original concept.

When we apply this postulate to the moving coordinate system's timings of the light pulse at the origin of the coordinate system τ , (Lann N. Ramez has used τ whereas he has used τ_0 in the other paper) at the point x' as τ_1 and reflected back from the point x' to origin of the moving or travelling coordinates system τ_2 then since the distance between the origin of the moving coordinate system to the point x' remains constant so,

$$\tau_1 - \tau = \frac{x'}{c} \quad \dots\dots\dots(\text{iii})$$

And

$$\tau_2 - \tau_1 = \frac{x'}{c} \quad \dots\dots\dots(\text{iv})$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_1 - \tau &= \tau_2 - \tau_1 \\ 2\tau_1 &= \tau + \tau_2 \quad \dots\dots\dots(\text{v}) \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\frac{1}{2}(\tau + \tau_2) = \tau_1$$

This has to be a valid equation keeping in view the postulate of constancy of velocity of light irrespective of the linear uniform motion of the source and the observer. This equation is also derived in Lann N. Ramez (2018-II) in piece meals taking the velocity of light pulse as 'c'.

Adopting the same postulate of constancy of velocity of light which Einstein has introduced in Albert Einstein (1905) in the stationary coordinate system to the timings of the light pulse at three points namely origin of the moving coordinate system ' t ', the point x' as ' t_1 ' and reflected back to the origin of the moving coordinate system as ' t_2 ' would be

$$t_1 = t + \frac{x'}{c}$$

$$t_2 = t + \frac{2x'}{c}$$

which Lann N. Ramez calls as my misconception.

The trickery of Einstein which Lann N. Ramez is trying to conceal or has failed to understand is that Einstein has taken two different velocities of light into consideration while working out the timings of the light pulse in two coordinate systems.

It is evident that in '*From the perspective of the "stationary" observer in $k(x, y, z, t)$* ' he is taking the velocity of light ' c ' with respect to the space, which is explained in great detail in Mohammad Shafiq Khan (2012), in violation to the postulate of constancy of light irrespective of the linear uniform motion of the source and the observer. He assumes the velocity of light is ' c ' with respect to space and during the period light pulse is moving to the point x' , the point x' has moved to point which is $x' + v \cdot \Delta t_1$ from the origin of the moving coordinate system from where the light pulse was emitted. Thus, by violating the postulate of constancy of velocity of light introduced by Einstein in Albert Einstein (1905) Lann N. Ramez goes on to derive

$$t_1 = t + \frac{x'}{c - v}$$

$$t_2 = t + \frac{x'}{c - v} + \frac{x'}{c + v}$$

$$\Delta t_1 = t_1 - t = \frac{x'}{c - v}$$

this equation reveals that Δt_1 being the time interval which the light pulse takes to move from origin of the moving coordinate system to the point x' as such the velocity of light pulse has been taken as $c - v$ which is the violation of the constancy of the velocity of light irrespective of linear uniform motion of the source and the observer. Similarly,

$$\Delta t_2 = t_2 - t_1 = \frac{x'}{c+v}$$

here Δt_2 being the time-period which light pulse takes for reaching the origin of the moving coordinate system after the light pulse was reflected from the point x' as such the velocity of light has been taken as $c + v$ again in violation of the postulate of constancy of the velocity of light irrespective of linear uniform motion of the source and the observer

and thereby Lann N. Ramez justifies Einstein's equation:

$$\frac{1}{2} \left[\tau_{(0,0,0,t)} + \tau_{(0,0,0,t+\frac{x'}{c-v}+\frac{x'}{c+v})} \right] = \tau_{(x',0,0,t+\frac{x'}{c-v})} \quad \dots\dots\dots(vi)$$

Forgetting the fact that the equation $\frac{1}{2}(\tau + \tau_2) = \tau_1$, on the basis of which equation (vi) has been written was derived by adopting the velocity of light 'c' not with respect to the space but with respect to the point x' (the observer) as per the postulate of constancy of velocity of light irrespective of linear uniform motion of the source and the observer.

In the '*From the perspective of the "travelling" observer in $K(\xi, \eta, \zeta, \tau)$* ' he adopts the velocity of light as per the postulate of constancy of velocity of light irrespective of the linear uniform motion of the source and the observer.

He derives

$$\tau_1 = \tau + \frac{\xi}{c}$$

$$\tau_2 = \tau + \frac{2\xi}{c}$$

He thinks by writing τ instead of τ_0 and ξ instead of x' he could deceive the physicists of the world. In Lann N. Ramez (2018-I) he has used the proper connotations. These two equations are the same as I have derived equation (iii), (iv) and (v); however, the most important fact is that Lann N. Ramez assigns no reason whatsoever for adopting two different velocities of light in his calculations.

Discussion: - In Lann N. Ramez (2018-II) in the very abstract he is quoting the equation of Einstein

$$\frac{1}{2} \left[\tau_{(0,0,0,t)} + \tau_{(0,0,0,t+\frac{x'}{c-v}+\frac{x'}{c+v})} \right] = \tau_{(x',0,0,t+\frac{x'}{c-v})}$$

as having been questioned by me because of my misconception. Actually, this equation is the consequence of Einstein's application of the equation

$$\frac{1}{2}(\tau + \tau_2) = \tau_1$$

(Which was derived, treating the velocity of light as per the postulate of constancy of velocity of light, to the timings of the light pulse in the stationary coordinate system at the three points namely origin of moving coordinate system, the point x' , and reflected back light pulse to the origin of moving coordinate system in the time frame of the moving coordinate system.

The trick of Einstein which Lann N. Ramez has repeated in "*From the perspective of the 'stationary' observer in $k(x, y, z, t)$* " by deriving the timings at the above mentioned three points treating the velocity of light as constant 'c' with respect to space in violation to the postulate of constancy of velocity of light which Einstein had introduced in the paper Albert Einstein (1905). The climax of absurdity is that the formula $\frac{1}{2}(\tau + \tau_2) = \tau_1$ was derived as per the postulate of constancy of velocity of light whereas the timings of the three points in stationary coordinate system he has used the velocity of light with respect to space and while the light pulse is moving from origin of moving coordinate system, at the velocity 'c' with respect to space, the point x' has moved ahead by the distance $V(t_1 - t)$, V being the velocity with which the moving coordinate system is moving and $t_1 - t$ being the time period which light pulse takes to reach the point x' which Lann N. Ramez has shown as Δt_1 . Treating the velocity of light constant 'c' with respect to space then the light pulse has to move the distance $x' + V(t_1 - t)$ to reach the point x' and so the time it takes is $\frac{x'+V(t_1-t)}{c}$. Adopting the same symbols as has been used by Lann N. Ramez

$$\Delta t_1 = \frac{x' + V\Delta t_1}{c}$$

$$c \cdot \Delta t_1 = x' + V\Delta t_1$$

$$\Delta t_1 = \frac{x'}{c - V}$$

The interpretation of this equation is that distance being x' ; the velocity of light with respect to the observer at the point x' is $c - V$. This is in violation to the constancy of the velocity of light and the observer and the climax of absurdity is that in Lann N. Ramez (2018-II) in "*From the perspective of the 'travelling' observer in $k(\xi, \eta, \zeta, \tau)$* " he derives the equation $\frac{1}{2}(\tau + \tau_2) = \tau_1$ but in piece meals using ξ instead of x' so as to deceive the physicists of the world. This trick was done by Einstein also as he too had used x' in the moving coordinate system just to confuse the physicists of the world. Lann N. Ramez has derived the equations

$$\Delta \tau_1 = \Delta \tau_2 = \frac{\xi}{c}$$

and

$$\tau_1 = \tau + \frac{\xi}{c}$$

$$\tau_2 = \tau + \frac{2\xi}{c}$$

which leads to

$$\frac{1}{2}(\tau + \tau_2) = \tau_1$$

and $\Delta \tau_1$ and $\Delta \tau_2$ equating to the ξ divided by 'c' which is though in accordance with the postulate of constancy of velocity of light without considering the fact that the point x' or ξ has moved also ahead by the distance $V\Delta \tau_1$ if we consider the velocity of light constant 'c' with respect to space as both Einstein and Lann N. Ramez had done in the stationary coordinate system.

Similarly, if we consider the velocity of light constant ‘ c ’ with respect to space then $\Delta\tau_2 = \frac{x'}{c+V}$ because in the stationary coordinate system origin of the moving coordinate system moves towards the approaching light pulse after the light pulse is reflected from the point x' thus the velocity of light has been taken as $c + V$ after the light pulse is reflected from the point x' .

Lann N. Ramez in the confusion of concluding the commentary has used term ξ as the fixed point in the moving or travelling coordinate system so as to convey that it a variable coordinate in the x-axis. He is so much confused that he has forgotten the equation of Einstein which I have defined as ‘equation of trickery’ which is given as (i) in this rebuttal whereas he calls equation (vi) as the ‘equation of trickery’.

By simply applying postulate of we arrive at the equations

$$t_1 = t + \frac{x'}{c}$$

$$t_2 = t + \frac{2x'}{c}$$

in exactly the same manner in which he arrives at

$$\tau_1 = \tau + \frac{\xi}{c}$$

$$\tau_2 = \tau + \frac{2\xi}{c}$$

Thus, there was absolutely no misconception in the paper Mohammad Shafiq Khan (2012), whereas Lann N. Ramez tried to justify the paper Albert Einstein (1905) wherein the trickeries of Einstein are exposed which trickeries Lann N. Ramez has repeated using different symbols. Lastly Lann N. Ramez has written the commentary on Mohammad Shafiq Khan (2012) either without understanding the postulate of constancy of velocity of light which Einstein had introduced in Albert Einstein (1905) or he has deliberately tried to mislead the physicists of the world. This is simply preposterous, absurd and misunderstanding

on the part of Lann N. Ramez to have written such baseless papers to question the internationally known scientist.

Conclusion: - The whole reply and commentary of Lann N. Ramez are concerning the ‘equation of trickery’ as proved in the papers mentioned in the ‘open challenge’. It is this equation from which Einstein derived the Lorentz transformation.

The equation

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{c-v} + \frac{1}{c+v} \right) \frac{\partial \tau}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial \tau}{\partial x'} + \frac{1}{c-v} \frac{\partial \tau}{\partial t}$$

has been shown to be absurd wherein the term $\frac{\partial \tau}{\partial x'}$ has been gotten from nowhere. This term has been shown to be equal to zero by two different methods. Anybody knowing basic calculus will understand that x' being a fixed point in the moving coordinate system is a constant (not a variable). This is shamefully deceitful on the part of Einstein and Lann N. Ramez.

The formula used by Einstein for the timings of the light pulse at the origin of the moving coordinate system as τ_0 , at point x' as τ_1 , and back to the origin of the moving coordinate system as τ_2 is

$$\tau_0 + \tau_2 = 2\tau_1$$

Or

$$\frac{1}{2}(\tau_0 + \tau_2) = \tau_1$$

While deriving this equation Einstein has used the postulate of constancy of velocity of light as introduced by him in the paper Albert Einstein (1905). Now he applies the velocity of light with respect to space for working out the timings at the same three points in the stationary coordinate system in the above formula. Even if we allow that, which will be absolutely incorrect, which was challenged in Lann N. Ramez (2018-I),

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(t + t + \frac{x'}{c - V} + \frac{x'}{c + V} \right) = t + \frac{x'}{c - V}$$

which could be written as

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{x'}{c - V} + \frac{x'}{c + V} \right) = \frac{x'}{c - V}$$

which is equivalent to

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{c - V} + \frac{1}{c + V} \right) = \frac{1}{c - V}$$

which means $V=0$

What is the source of the term $\frac{\partial \tau}{\partial x'}$ in the 'equation of trickery' neither Einstein has explained nor Lann N. Ramez can explain even if he spends the rest of his life thinking about it. This should be sufficient rebuttal to Lann N. Ramez (2018-I) & Lann N. Ramez (2018-II), reply and commentary papers, as both are preposterous, absurd and nonsensical.

Open challenge put forward by me has been circulated to almost all professors and leading universities of the world besides the same has been send to all the research institutions of the world whereas only one professor namely Jeremy Danning-Davies of Hall university accepted the challenge and failed. Even after twelve years the open challenge is standing and will continue to stand because it is based on facts. Facts cannot be challenged by deceit and absurdities as the tricks of Einstein are already exposed in the paper Mohammad Shafiq Khan (2012). I wonder how come Lann N. Ramez couldn't understand Mohammad Shafiq Khan (2012) or else he has deliberately tried to deceive the physicists of the world. Hence Lann N. Ramez (2018-I) and Lann N. Ramez (2018-II) are surely shown to be preposterous, absurd and nonsensical by this rebuttal.

Though repetitive I have clarified every word of the reply and commentary of Lann N. Ramez so that in future no other so-called physicist could try to accept the open challenge.

References

1. Albert Einstein (1905) 'ON THE ELECTRODYNAMICS OF MOVING BODIES' <https://users.physics.ox.ac.uk/~rtaylor/teaching/specrel.pdf>
2. Mohammad Shafiq Khan (2012) 'Experimental & Theoretical Evidences of Fallacy of Space-time Concept and Actual State of Existence of the Physical Universe' Indian Society for Education and Environment (iSee) In Indian Journal of Science and Technology (Vol. 5, Issue 3, pp. 2217–2218) [Journal-article]. <https://indjst.org/articles/experimental-theoretical-evidences-of-fallacy-of-space-time-concept-and-actual-state-of-existence-of-the-physical-universe>
3. Mohammad Shafiq Khan (2012-Elixir-I) '“On the Electrodynamics of Moving Bodies’ By Albert Einstein is Based on Trickeries (Open letter to Professors, Teachers, Researchers and Students of Physics)’ Elixir International Journal, Elixir Criticism 43 (2012) 6694-6695 https://www.elixirpublishers.com/articles/1687775513_201202035.pdf
4. Mohammad Shafiq Khan (2012-Elixir-II) Elixir International Journal Comments 43 [Comments]. Elixir Comments, 43, 6809. https://www.elixirpublishers.com/articles/1687776585_201202056.pdf (Original work published 2012)
5. Mohammad Shafiq Khan Open Challenge <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/385346617> and <https://www.gsjournal.net/Science-Journals/Communications-Relativity%20Theory/Download/4018>

6. Lann N. Ramez (2018-I). ‘Reply to Mohammad Shafiq Khan’s paper “On the electrodynamics of moving bodies by Albert Einstein is based on Trickeries (Open letter to Professors, Teachers, Researchers and Students of Physics)”’
<https://vixra.org/pdf/1807.0335v2.pdf>

Though shown as Anonymous on viXra but in the third link it is shown on his name in General Science Journal

7. Lann N. Ramez (2018-II) ‘Commentary on Shafiq Khan’s paper:
“Experimental & theoretical evidences of fallacy of space-time concept and actual state of existence of the physical universe”’
<https://www.vixra.rxiv.org/pdf/1807.0447v1.pdf>
https://www.vixra.rxiv.org/author/lann_n_ramez &
<https://www.gsjournal.net/Science-Journals/Research%20Papers/View/7395>