



# The reference for $c$

Author: Ir. S. J. Uitterdijk

Cover design: author

Publisher: Heijink, Hardenberg, The Netherlands

ISBN: 9789462549845

© December 2013, Sjaak Uitterdijk

*To my wife Lutske,  
Tammo and Immy*

*You can't be the only one who is wise,  
only the majority is wise and is right.*

Source: Leeuwarder Courant, 26-10-2005  
Trinus Riemersma  
*Do you teach quality?*

# Contents

Foreword

Introduction

- 1 The two hypothesis on which the STR is based
- 2 A critical look at Einstein's basic ideas about his STR
- 3 The concepts of time and simultaneity
- 4 The Principle of Relativity in relation to the STR
- 5 The meaning of the concept of invariance in relation to the laws of nature.
  - 5.1 Galilean transformations
  - 5.2 Lorentz transformations
- 6 The reference for the velocity of light in relation to the Maxwell equations
- 7 The reference for the velocity of light in the expression of Fresnel
- 8 The Doppler shift
  - 8.1 Moving source and receiver
  - 8.2 Moving mirror
- 9 The mysterious equation  $E=mc^2$
- 10 Einstein's hypothesis and mathematics
- 11 The "New-Approach-STR"
- 12 The "DD-STR"
- 13 Measurements and experiments that 'prove' the validity of the STR

Attachment 1: Around-the-World Atomic Clocks experiment

Attachment 2: The velocity of light in a GPS

Attachment 3: The muon paradox

Encore

## Foreword

About 25 years ago I started scrutinizing Einstein's original article, describing his Special Theory of Relativity (STR). After having read the first 10 pages at least 10 times I finally came to the conclusion that I had to make a choice: either to accept that I will not be able to understand his theory, notwithstanding my academic education in Electronics, or to decide that it might be that Einstein possibly did not argue in a logical way. I took the last mentioned choice.

Out of this initial investigation followed a report about all the contradictions and faults I discovered, at least in my opinion. By the way, during this initial phase I had no doubt at all about the validity of Einstein's two hypotheses, on which he based his theory.

Around that time frame I also scrutinized Michelson & Morley's (M&M) experiment and came, just like them, to the conclusion that the negative result of it is unbelievable.

In that same period my son studied Physics at the University of Delft and I requested him (carefully!) to ask the professor, who lectured STR, how he might explain the negative result of the M&M experiment by means of the STR. His answer was: "I don't have time to explain that".

I finally succeeded in arranging a short discussion with this same professor. At one point he mentioned a specific property of light and I only remember that I didn't understand at all what he meant. Once back home I suddenly realized the fundamental problem. Einstein's hypothesis: "the velocity of light, in vacuum, is  $c$  in the stationary system, must be wrong. Instead it has to be: "the velocity of light, in vacuum, is  $c$  with respect to its source at the moment of emission".

With this new hypothesis the negative result of M&M's experiment, for example, can be explained "on the back of a used envelope".

It turned out to be impossible for me to publish this fundamental mistake of the STR in numerous scientific magazines, despite showing my arguments from several points of view.

Given this impossibility I have tried over the last three years to convince the "community of physics" by sending 7000 physicists,

in Europe, the USA and Israel, about ten times an e-mail with these arguments. However, this did not result in expressions of reservation about the validity of the STR, except one: "I would say that this is definitively the game changer that physics has been looking for."

I never succeeded to get in touch with this person, after that message!

Besides the wrong hypothesis on which the STR has been built, Einstein also made an overwhelmingly evident blunder in the last pages of his article. I never showed this, because if the basis of the STR is already wrong, why should one complain about the mathematics in this theory. This blunder is so clear, that Einstein must have made it purposely. The only purpose I can think of is that he wanted these results to look like those published in 1904 by Lorentz.

Showing 2 physicists Einstein's manipulative mathematics, they independently reacted in the same way: we don't rely anymore on Einstein's theory; we developed our own one!

About a month later I discovered that the two physicists meant 2 mutually completely different STR's!

Studying this "New-Approach-STR" as well as the "DD-STR" (these are my own abbreviations) it showed me that the "New-Approach-STR" is based on a completely different, however magic, hypothesis and it applies similar manipulative mathematics as used by Einstein.

And "everyone" does accept it !!

The "DD-STR" died already at its birth due to the lack of a hypothesis about the property of the velocity of light, as far as I can judge.

Hopefully this booklet may finally lead to the hypothesis about the reference for the velocity of light as proposed above and lead the return to genuine science.

*Remark:*

*The chapters in this booklet can be read independently, with the consequence that fundamental arguments against the validity of the STR are repeated in some chapters.*