Correspondence with Paramahamsa Tewari

Analysis (in blue) of the paper: "Einstein's contribution to physics in understanding nature." Sent to me by mentioned author

Einstein in his Special Theory of Relativity (STR) postulated that Galilean relativity, as per which the laws of motion were not affected by uniform movement, applies to all physical laws including electromagnetism and optics too (notice that relativity in Newton's mind implies that light speed depends of the state of motion of the source and/or observer; this is classical relativity, that it was abandoned when invented the aether two hundred year ago). He also postulated that the light velocity is invariant to all inertial systems with a defined reflection procedure to measure the velocity. These postulates, though apparently contradictory (these postulates are logically contradictory and generate necessarily just more contradictions, the euphemistically named "paradoxes"), lead to some profound laws of physics (of which Einstein would not have been aware) when analyzed with a new concept of light-- the light produced following annihilation of an electron and a positron (discussed in detail elsewhere), provided space is postulated to be a mass less, nonmaterial fluid medium (ether) with respect to which light is transmitted, unlike STR's presupposition of empty and inert space without assigning a velocity vector to any point of space (STR).

Analysis of this way of thinking

In a ray of light, conventionally, all points constituting the ray are considered luminous. Reflection of a light-point in a ray when it meets a stationary or moving mirror is accepted as instantaneous. Similarly, the center of a photon moving at the speed of light with respect to its source strikes a mirror and is believed to have instantaneous reflection, whether the mirror is stationary or moving relative to the source. Now consider a wave motion of a single spherical shell of light with wavelength λ (radial width of the shell) in fluid space medium (ether), transmitting symmetrically around the source at speed c relative to the medium. On meeting a stationary mirror, the wave front of the light-shell will be reflected instantaneously at an instant say t_1 while the wave tail will be reflected at a different instant t_2 (**ok**). That is, unlike the instantaneous reflections from a mirror in the cases of a ray of light or a

photon, a shell of light has a duration $t_1 \_ t_2$ required for reflection, but this aspect is generally overlooked. This mistake is the root cause for misinterpretation of Sagnac's experiments in which the speed of light is shown to be non invariant (explained later) in different frames of reference. (This description is real but it does not explains Sagnac's experiments) Suppose S is a source of light that produces spherical shells of light of constant wave length λ successively without any time gap between the tail-end of one shell and the front of the next shell (Fig. 1). (This suggests that light has a discrete structure where discreteness arises due to independent successive light shells rather than corpuscular or photon like structure.) An observer O (believing in the applicability of universal time for all) standing on the ground will receive say f nos. of shells in one second which he defines as the frequency of the light. Let him measure the two instants t_1 and t_2 at which the front and the tail end of a single shell interact with his eyes. He will compute speed of light within the wave length relative to the fluid-space as: $c = \lambda / (t_1 - t_2)$(ok) In unit time, O will receive $1 / (t_1 - t_2)$ nos. of shells which is the frequency f and with these he writes the equation: $c = f \lambda$. (ok) Now, if O moves at velocity v towards S, his velocity relative to the wave front of the shell will be c + v and this is also the velocity of the shell's front passing over him, opposite to his direction of motion.(ok) The whole wavelength λ will now pass over him in a shorter time duration $\lambda / (c + v)$ compared to λ / c when he was standing and was stationary in space (ok; up to this point the writer has rejected the constancy of light speed postulate. Look how he goes on…). During the time $\lambda / (c + v)$ the shell will transmit in space up to a length $[\lambda / (c + v)] c$, that is, $\lambda c / (c + v)$ which, as per O, is the new wave length (explained below pictorially) No; the writer said before that $\lambda / (c + v)$ is the shorter time for O, due to his velocity relative to the wave front of the shell is c + v; consequently, for O the "new wave length" it's not $[\lambda / (c + v)] c$ but $[\lambda / (c + v)] c + v$, that is λ, the same for source and O. Happen that suddenly the writer bring into play the earlier rejected S.T.R second postulate. Also, the inverse of the time $\lambda / (c + v)$ is $(c + v) / \lambda$ that is the nos. of shells passed over O in unit time, which is the frequency of light now. The observer O notices that the product of the new wave length and the new frequency: $[\lambda c / (c + v)] \times (c + v) / \lambda]$ is still c (No; it is $[\lambda c + v / (c + v)] \times (c + v) / \lambda]$ and its results is now (c + v) what just was said by the author at the beginning.

The constancy of light speed is an impossible concept. Here it is the principal problem since 200 years ago: all physicists suffer the ether subjacent dogma; even Einstein did, because his second postulate implies that every reference system are at rest in the Lorentz's ether; this is the reason why in every system have to measure the same light speed and in the other system happen Lorentz's contractions, slowing of the clock and more strange things. As postulates are contradictory the consequences too; one of them is that Einstein find that interferometer was contracted is its own reference system. It seems that who suffers ether dogma can't be conscious of this fact.

Thus, for a moving observer towards a light source, frequency is increased and wavelength is proportionately decreased such that their product still remains c (no valid; in this reasoning c was not a conclusion but a premise). Similarly an observer moving away from a source will find decrease in frequency and increase in wavelength and their product will still be c, the same for a stationary observer (no valid).

In Fig. 2, the observer's position at the time t_1 coinciding with the position of the wave front of the light-shell is shown. If O remains standing, as said before, the whole wavelength λ will pass over him during time λ / c. But since O is moving at velocity v in the direction opposite to the shell, when he reaches the wave tail of the shell at time t_2, only the length L_2 of the wavelength has passed over to the right of the observer's position t_1, as shown in the figure by the position of the light shell shown at the time t_2. The observer starts his time measuring device at position t_1 and stops it at position t_2 and during this period the full wavelength λ does not have time enough to transmit to the left of the position t_1. The observer thus finds, as concluded earlier, increased frequency and proportionate decrease in the wavelength when he moves opposite to the light shell (no valid).

In the well known Sagnac's experiment a light beam is split into two halves and reflected through mirrors, travels around closed identical paths in opposite directions. The split beams are combined again in a detector to examine interference patterns. When the apparatus is rotated it produces shift in interference fringes as a function of the angular velocity of rotation and thereby leading to the conclusion that the velocities of light in the two paths are different. What is not taken note of is that the reflecting mirrors that are in rotation change the wavelength and frequency of the light beams as discussed above and consequently shift in fringes appear. The writer's idea

can't explain the Sagnac's experiment results; shift in fringes appear due the unique difference between both beams of light: they suffer different acceleration. Remember the "light clock", a beam of light trapped between two mirrors; a beam of light in an accelerated system has to travel longer to reach a predetermined distance; so, actually light with less acceleration arrive first to the start point.

The conclusion is that the velocity of light relative to the fluid space medium is the same for moving as well as stationary observers when most fundamental nature of light is recognized and used for analysis (remember at the beginning he said for O light speed is c + v). That being the case it is concluded that both, length-contraction and time-dilation of STR are certainly erroneous concepts (the conclusion is right by another reason).

Einstein, in his postulates, has been unwittingly led to the true behavior of the most fundamental nature of light (no valid)

The limitation imposed on the material motion in space only up to the speed of light (STR) led to the writer to adopt a more generalized postulate that the medium of mass less fluid space itself breaks down in its flow at a limiting angular rotation (fluid-space circulation) and using this spatial property, electron's creation and matter in general have been explained, and basic equations on mass and charge have been theoretically derived. Explanations to all the properties and observed behavior of electron, derivation of the known universal constants and fields, discovering new spatial fields in nuclear/ atomic structure and also around cosmic bodies, give authenticity to the space vortex structure of electron.

To conclude:

Einstein is right that no material motion can exceed the speed of light with the qualification that light transmits in fluid space and its speed is taken relative to space. Light speed is unavoidably dependent of the state of motion of the source and/or the observer, in accordance with Newton's laws, because light propagate at c speed by the means of the source's systems; glass and mirrors behave as sources with their means-systems; it was demonstrated by all the experiments historically made but is impossible be conscious of it with the ether subjacent in mind. Newtonian fields do not exist in a no-relativistic fluid space but in the system of their cores.

Einstein's concept is erroneous in "time-dilation" and in ignoring the existence and interaction with fluid-ether in space.

Light speed is the highest speed and will be found to be invariant in all the reference frames provided the speed within a single wavelength is

theoretically analyzed and experiments like Sagnac's are repeated for confirmation on the changes to wavelength and frequency by reflection from the rotating mirrors (no valid).
Einstein's explanation on photoelectric effect which led to the photon-nature of light is also erroneous. This writer's explanation is erroneous too.

Modestly,
José Miguel Ledesma

Paramahansa Tewari answered
In the enclosed sketch an observer O is stationary relative to fluid-space (mass less ether). One shell of light of known wavelength lambda is transmitting relative to the fluid- space at postulated velocity c and its wave front meets the eyes of O at position t1 of O. O starts his clock at his position t1 and stops it when his eyes meet the wave tail. O calculates the velocity of transmission of light effect in, and relative to, space; lambda / (t2-t1) = c.
Now let O move at velocity v relative to space when his eyes meet the wave front (position of O at t1), relative to which he is moving at velocity c + v towards the wave tail. At his position t1, O starts his clock and stops it when the wave tail meets his eyes. He plots the two positions of the same light pulse as shown in the figure. It is seen that while O, 'travelling within the wavelength' has moved towards the wave tail by a distance L1, the wave tail has transmitted relative to space at velocity c from the wave tail position at t1 to the tail's position at t2 by a length L3 - L1 only, and approached O earlier than when he was not moving in the first experiment. He also notes that the front of the shell has transmitted behind his position at t1 by a length L2 which is shorter than lambda.
Time interval measured by O when he has been within the shell is: lambda / (v + c). The observer believing in the existence of pre-relativity 's fluid space and universal time now calculates the length to which the shell's front and tail would have transmitted in fluid space, knowing the velocity of transmission of the light-shell with respect to

the fluid-space from his first experiment when he was standing relative to space. (He is also aware that his movement in space can not alter space -property in transmitting light effect with respect to space):
Wave length as per O when in motion = [lambda/ (v + c)] x c which is shorter than lambda.
Please see if this clarifies.
Best wishes,
Paramahamsa
Conclusion: an erroneous mix together of Galileo and Einstein

I replied
When you begin your explanation write:

When O is at rest	t is	λ / c	and	f is c / λ
When O moves	t is	$\lambda / c + v$	and	f is $c + v / \lambda$

This is absolutely true, unquestionable, logic, revolutionary and in accordance with Newtonian physics; you are saying that light speed depends of the state of motion of O, wavelength is constant and frequency increased. You don't need more to change the science because Einstein does not say like that.
But if you don't write $[\lambda / (c + v)] c + v$, but $[\lambda / (c + v)] c$, you are mixing two different state of motion and introducing c as valid for two different reference systems as premise, that is same to your conclusion. You don't infer c, it's your premise.
You know that S.R.T is contradictory; there has to be a better way to explain reality. When I say "ether does not exist" I'm not saying there are nothing between the material bodies but the bodies are not just what are under their surface; bodies are surrounded, are the center of an infinite system with material properties, one of them is supporting Newtonian fields and propagate light at c speed respect the mentioned system. This point of view joins without contradiction Newtonian and Maxwellian theories, eliminates all famous paradoxes and gives reasonable explanation to phenomena occurring at luminous speed.
Yours Sincerely
José

Paramahamsa Tewari replied repeating his arguments.