

Non-time-orthogonality and tests of special relativity

Robert D. Klauber
1100 University Manor, 38B, Fairfield, Iowa 52556
email rklauber@netscape.net

May 10, 2000

Abstract

An intriguing, and possibly significant, anomalous signal in the most accurate Michelson-Morley type experiment performed to date is contrasted with a simple first order test of special relativity subsequently performed to discount that signal as spurious. Analysis of the non-time-orthogonal nature of the rotating earth frame leads to the conclusion that the latter test needed second order accuracy in order to detect the effect sought, and hence was not sufficient to discount the potential cause of the anomalous signal. The analysis also explains the perplexing result found from Sagnac type experiments wherein interference fringing remained unchanged when different media were placed on the rotating apparatus in the path of the light beams.

I. Introduction

In 1981 Aspen¹ showed that a persistent non-null test signal recorded by Brillet and Hall² in the most modern version of the famous Michelson-Morley experiment would correspond to a test apparatus velocity of 363 m/sec. As the earth surface speed at the test location is 355 m/sec, it was suggested that perhaps the rotating earth's surface velocity is somehow subtly different from the solar and galactic orbital velocities, which had long since been shown to yield null signals. To date there has been no other Michelson-Morley type test with sufficient accuracy to detect a possible effect from the earth surface velocity.

In 1985, Byl et al³ performed a first order test of special relativity which ostensibly showed no effect from the earth surface velocity, and led to the conclusion that the Brillet and Hall signal was erroneous. The Byl et al test was simple, clever, and based on an analysis that included certain, seemingly reasonable, kinematic and constitutive assumptions.

In this article we first review this test/analysis, then note that underlying assumptions are not in accord with that derived from non-time-orthogonal (NTO) analysis of rotating frames. It is then shown that if the NTO derivation result is correct, then the effect of the earth surface velocity would be second, not first, order, and hence undetectable by the Byl et al experiment. This re-opens the question of the meaning and validity of the Brillet and Hall anomalous signal.

II. "First Order" Test of Special Relativity

A. The Experiment

Byl, Sanderse, and van der Kamp split a laser beam into two, directed one beam through air and one through water, and then combined the resultant beams to yield an interference pattern. According to their analysis

¹ H. Aspen, "Laser interferometry experiments on light speed anisotropy," *Phys. Lett.*, **85A**(8,9), 411-414 (1981).

² A. Brillet and J. L. Hall, "Improved laser test of the isotropy of space," *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **42**(9), 549-552 (1979).

³ John Byl, Martin Sanderse, and Walter van der Kamp, "Simple first-order test of special relativity," *Am. J. Phys.*, **53**(1), 43-45 (1985).

(summarized below), the existence of an ether (privileged frame) would cause one of the beams to be slowed more than the other when both were aligned with the direction of absolute velocity. This would result in relative phase shifting and a movement of the fringes as the apparatus was turned.

B. The Analysis

Byl et al considered two cases: i) a direct Galilean transformation between the earth and ether frames with no ether drag, and ii) a Fresnel ether drag effect. We note that conclusions for each were similar and so only review the first case.

Assume a Galilean universe with light speed c relative to the ether. The test apparatus moves towards the right with speed v . The top half of the original beam is directed toward the right through air while the bottom half is directed toward the right through water. Both travel a distance D where the bottom beam emerges into air, and are at that point combined to form interference fringes.

The travel time for the top beam is

$$t_1 = D / (c - v). \quad (1)$$

The travel time for the bottom beam is

$$t_2 = D / u_G = Dn / (c - v) \quad (2)$$

where u_G is the presumed Galilean speed of light in water, and n is the index of refraction of water.

The time difference is

$$T_a = t_2 - t_1 = D(n - 1) / (c - v). \quad (3)$$

When the apparatus is rotated 180° the difference in travel time becomes

$$T_b = D(n - 1) / (c + v). \quad (4)$$

The change in time difference is thus

$$\Delta T = T_b - T_a = 2D(n - 1)vc / (c^2 - v^2). \quad (5)$$

The displacement length of one wave to the other is then $c\Delta T$, leading to a displacement in M wavelengths, or fringes, of

$$M = c\Delta T / \lambda = 2D(n - 1)vc / [\lambda(c^2 - v^2)] \quad (6)$$

or

$$M = 2D(n - 1)(v/c)\lambda + O\left[(v/c)^3\right] \quad (7)$$

Hence, the experiment was considered to have first order accuracy in (v/c) , be more sensitive than the (second order) Michelson-Morley experiment, and be capable of readily detecting any effect from the earth surface velocity.

With the given apparatus, accuracy was deemed to be at least 20 times that needed to check the earth surface speed hypothesis. Repeated testing showed no detectable motion of the fringes.

III. Index of Refraction and NTO Frames

A. NTO Frames Theory

Klauber^{4,5,6} has analyzed the NTO metric obtained when one makes a straightforward transformation from the lab to a rotating frame such as that of a relativistically spinning disk. Unlike other researchers he has not assumed that it is then necessary to transform to locally time orthogonal frames. Instead he considered what phenomena would result if one proceeded using the NTO metric as a physically valid representation of the rotating frame.

Klauber found time dilation and mass-energy dependence on tangential speed ωr that is identical to the predictions of special relativity and the test data from numerous cyclotron experiments. He further found resolutions of several well known, and other not so well known, paradoxes inherent in the traditional analytical treatment of rotating frames.

However, he also found behavior that seems strange from a traditional relativistic standpoint, and which is difficult to verify experimentally. In particular, it was found that the speed of light in the circumferential direction for rotating (NTO) frames is non-invariant, non-isotropic, and equals⁷

$$|u_{light, circum}| = \frac{c \pm r\omega}{\sqrt{1 - (r\omega)^2/c^2}} = \frac{c \pm v}{\sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}}, \quad (8)$$

where ω is the angular velocity, r is the radial distance from the center of rotation, and $v = \omega r$.

This relationship leads to the prediction of a signal due to the earth surface speed v precisely like that found by Brillat and Hall. For bodies in gravitational orbit (8) does not hold, and $|u_{light, circum}| = c$, as in traditional relativity. This is because such bodies are in free fall, and are essentially inertial, Lorentzian, time orthogonal (TO) frames. They are not subject to the idiosyncrasies of non-time-orthogonality, so their orbital speed would not result in a non-null Michelson-Morley signal.

The most relevant of Klauber's findings for the present purposes is the generalization of (8) to an arbitrary velocity (other than for light). This, the transformation of tangential (circumferential) velocities between inertial and rotating frames, is⁸

$$u = \frac{-r\omega + U}{\sqrt{1 - (r\omega)^2/c^2}} \quad (9)$$

where lower case represents the rotating frame and upper case the inertial frame in which the rotation axis is fixed.

B. Speed of light in water

As NTO frames have unique properties, it is not appropriate to simply assume that a beam of light in such a frame passing through a medium fixed in that frame would have speed $(c \pm v)/n$, as was presumed in (2) and (4). However, given what we know about NTO frames and Lorentz frames, we can determine what a rotating frame observer would see for a beam of light passing through a medium in a Lorentz frame having the same instantaneous velocity as that observer. It may then seem reasonable to assume that this speed is the proper one to use in calculations such as those of section II.B. Further support for this assumption may be found in the Appendix, which provides an alternative derivation for the results of this section.

Consider three frames: the rotating frame k , the non-rotating frame K in which the axis of rotation is fixed, and a Lorentz frame K_1 , having velocity $v = \omega r$ (relative to K) in the direction of the instantaneous

⁴ Robert D. Klauber, "New perspectives on the relatively rotating disk and non-time-orthogonal reference frames", *Found. Phys. Lett.* **11**(5), 405-443 (1998).

⁵ Robert D. Klauber, "Comments regarding recent articles on relativistically rotating frames", *Am. J. Phys.* **67**(2), 158-159, (1999).

⁶ Robert D. Klauber, "Non-time-orthogonal frames in the theory of relativity", xxx.lanl.gov paper gr-qc/0005121, submitted for publication May 2000.

⁷ Ref. 4, pg. 425, eq. (19) modified by the time dilation factor discussed in the subsequent paragraphs to yield physical velocity, and pg. 430, eq. (33).

⁸ Ref. 4, pp. 424-425. See eq. (18) modified by the factor in the subsequent paragraph to yield physical velocity.

velocity of a point fixed in k . K_1 is sometimes called a “tangent” or a “co-moving” frame. Consider a medium such as water fixed in K_1 with a light beam passing through it in the direction of \mathbf{v} . As measured in K_1 , a Lorentz frame, the speed of that beam is c/n where n is the index of refraction of the medium.

K and K_1 are both Lorentz frames and the transformation law for velocities between such frames tells us that the light beam in question has speed

$$U = \frac{c/n + v}{1 + \frac{(c/n)v}{c^2}} = \frac{c}{n} + v - \frac{v^2}{n^2} + O[1/c] \quad (10)$$

as seen from K . We are only concerned with the three leading order terms in (10).

Transformation of U to the rotating frame is done using (9) whereupon we find the speed of the light beam in a transparent medium is seen from the rotating frame to be

$$u = \frac{c}{n} - \frac{v^2}{n^2} + O[1/c]. \quad (11)$$

IV. Fringe Analysis Revisited

Repeating the analysis of section II.B, we find the travel time for the top beam (in air) from (8) as

$$t_1 = \frac{D\sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}}{(c - v)} \cong \frac{D}{c - v}, \quad (12)$$

where the approximately equal sign indicates we are only considering first order terms.

The travel time for the bottom beam with the light in water velocity of (11) is

$$t_2 = \frac{D}{u} \cong \frac{D}{(c/n)(1 - v/cn)} = \frac{Dn}{c - v/n}. \quad (13)$$

The time difference is

$$T_a = t_2 - t_1 \cong \frac{D}{c} \left(\frac{n}{1 - v/cn} - \frac{1}{1 - v/c} \right), \quad (14)$$

which becomes (terms in $1/c^2$ cancel)

$$T_a = \frac{D}{c} (n - 1) + O[1/c^3]. \quad (15)$$

Ignoring higher order terms, one finds this result is independent of v , and so, through second order, it will also equal T_b . Therefore the fringe shift change

$$M = \frac{c\Delta T}{\lambda} = \frac{c(T_b - T_a)}{\lambda} = O[1/c^2] \quad (16)$$

is second, not first order.

Thus, no matter which way the apparatus is turned, there will be no first order phase shift between water and air light beams. Hence, if k is the earth frame, there will be no observable change in fringe location in the experiment of section II.

V. Sagnac Experiments with Rotating Media

Post⁹ summarized results of several Sagnac type experiments, some of which analyzed the effect of placing transparent media on the rotating apparatus in the paths of the oppositely directed light beams. Surprisingly, in repeated testing, no interference fringe change was observed between the light beams in air and light beams

⁹ E. J. Post, “Sagnac Effect”, *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, **39**(2), pp. 475-493 (1967).

in other media configurations. Change was, however, observed when the media was stationary while the apparatus rotated.

The NTO frame analysis presented herein is in agreement with these results, as evidenced by (16). To first order both the counterclockwise and clockwise beams should be retarded to the same degree by media fixed on the rotating apparatus, resulting in no observable fringe shift.

The Galilean analysis leading to (7), on the other hand, would predict a first order fringe shift. A purely Lorentzian analysis, while predicting no such shift for different media, would also predict no fringe change for variations in angular velocity. That such change does in indeed occur is an indisputable experimental fact. Unlike the Lorentz frame analysis, the NTO frame analysis predicts fringe changes with rotational speed in accord with experiment.

VI. Summary and Conclusions


The persistent non-null signal found in the most modern and accurate Michelson-Morley type experiment appears to correlate with the earth surface velocity. Non-time-orthogonal analysis of the rotating frame of the earth predicts this signal and implies that it can not be deemed spurious on the basis of the subsequent first order test carried out by Byl et al.

Sagnac type experiments carried out with various transparent media in the path of the light beams yield results that are in harmony with the predictions of NTO frame analysis, but are at variance with Lorentzian and Galilean frame analyses.


NTO analysis is ultimately consonant with the theory of relativity. Due to the idiosyncratic nature of NTO frames, however, it makes some predictions that do not seem traditionally relativistic.¹⁰

A Appendix: Light Speed in Rotating Medium

The following discussion assumes some knowledge of NTO frames (see references 4 and 6).



**Fig 1. Light in Two Media,
Radial Direction vs Time**



**Fig 2. Circumferential
Direction vs Time**

Figure 1 depicts the radial direction and time axes at a point fixed in the rotating frame k for both the rotating frame and a Lorentz frame K_1 having velocity equal to the tangential velocity of that point. The X_1 axis of K_1 is aligned with the radial axis of k . Event A has coordinates $(ct = 0, r = r_o, \phi = 0, z = 0)$ in k and $(cT_1 = 0, X_1 = 0, Y_1 = 0, Z_1 = 0)$ in K_1 . All distances and times are small. Both the r axis in k and the

¹⁰ See ref. 4.

X_1 axis in K_1 are orthogonal to their respective time axes. Only first order effects are considered, so any time dilation or Lorentz contraction effects are ignored. Hence, the coordinate time t in k is, for present purposes, effectively equal to the time on local standard clocks in k , as well as time T_1 in K_1 .

Each frame carries a tube of water aligned in the radial direction as well as standard clocks and measuring rods to determine both the speed of a light beam in water and that of a parallel light beam in air. (“Air” is considered equivalent to “vacuum” here.) The light beam in air travels spacetime path AP from event A to event P. The light beam in water travels from event W to event P where it interferes constructively with the air light beam AP.

As all velocities are perpendicular to the spatial axes shown in Figure 1 of both k and K_1 , we can assume paths AP and WP are identical in both frames. More specifically, light in the rotating tube of water travels at the same speed as light in the Lorentz frame tube of water, i.e., WP is the path of light through water in both frames.

The speed of light in air for both frames is c . The speed of light in water for both frames must be c/n , where n is the index of refraction in water for a Lorentz frame. The wave amplitude peak for the water beam that arrives at P must be emitted (event W) before the wave amplitude peak of the air beam (emitted at A) so that they constructively interfere at P.

Now consider turning the apparatus in both frames until the tubes are pointed in the circumferential direction, $r\phi$ axis in k and Y_1 in K_1 , as shown in Figure 2. The Lorentz frame remains unchanged in all regards. Time is still orthogonal to the Y_1 axis and all phenomena (time and location of emissions and subsequent constructive interference events) are identical. The rotating frame along the circumferential axis is, however, not time orthogonal (as described in references 4 and 6). The degree of non-time-orthogonality in the tube direction increases as the tubes are turned, reaching a maximum in the circumferential direction.

The NTO frame treatment of the aforementioned references analyzes identical events, but due to the NTO nature of the frame, measured quantities such as time, distance, and light speed between those events differ from that of TO frames. We assume a similar stance with regard to the light beam passing through water. That is, there appears to be no constitutive reason why the path WP of a light beam in water in the Lorentz frame K_1 should differ from that of a light beam in water in the rotating frame k . The emitting event W and the constructive interference event P should be the same.

The issue then is to determine the speed of the light beam in water as measured in k . The first step in doing this is to note that the time of event P differs in the two frames. From Figure 2 it is seen to equal to the value on the time axis of event M in K_1 , and to that of event N in k . We know the speed of light in water in the Lorentz frame K_1 is

$$V_{water,K1} = c/n = \frac{L_1}{\Delta t_{WM}}. \quad (17)$$

The speed of the same light beam as seen in the rotating frame k is

$$v_{water,k} = \frac{l}{\Delta t_{WN}} \cong \frac{L_1}{\Delta t_{WM} + \Delta t_{MN}}. \quad (18)$$

where the RHS results because to first order $l \cong L_1$. From the slope $-v/c = -\omega r/c$ of NP, we find

$$c\Delta t_{MN} = L_1 \frac{v}{c}. \quad (19)$$

Using this in (18) along with (17), we find

$$v_{water,k} \cong \frac{L_1}{\Delta t_{WM}} \left(1 - \frac{L_1}{\Delta t_{WM}} \frac{v}{c^2} \right) = \frac{c}{n} \left(1 - \frac{v}{cn} \right), \quad (20)$$

the same relationship (where approximately equal means to zeroth order in $1/c$) as (11).