

Review of: "A Basic Problem in the Theory of Special Relativity"

Stephan Gift¹

¹ The University of the West Indies, Trinidad and Tobago

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

In this paper, the author attempts to develop a simple example showing a contradiction in special relativity. In reading through the presentation, I had difficulty with some of the notation. For example, the notation in the time dilation formula following equation (1) was not properly defined. Also, the notation used in the group of equations following the Lorentz factor needs to be better defined for improved clarity. Because of these notation difficulties, I am unable at this time to draw a firm conclusion about the validity of the contradiction indicated by the author at the end of section (2).

My comments on his set of Remarks are as follows:

Remark 4.1 is unclear.

Regarding Remark 4.3, it is not true to say that the invalidity of special relativity leads to the simple velocity composition rule of Newtonian mechanics. One would need to find the correct space-time transformations to replace the Lorentz transformations that connect two inertial frames. This is the central problem of relativity.

Regarding Remark 4.4, the author should note that time dilation (clock retardation) has been experimentally confirmed in the GPS satellite clocks.