Re: SR consistency is crap.

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2004−12/0687.html

---

From: Eric Gisse (*fsegg_at_uaf.edu*)
Date: 11/23/04

Date: 22 Nov 2004 16:53:46 −0800

"eleaticus" <eleaticus@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:<_6iod.39575$z3.17781@bignews5.bellsouth.net>...
> "Eric Gisse" <jowr.pi@gmail.com> wrote in message
> news:929ed0f8.0411220041.4656e535@posting.google.com...
> > "eleaticus" <eleaticus@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> news:<RV9od.39407$z3.3390@bignews5.bellsouth.net>...
> > > SR is supposed to be physics, a theory about the physical. Hence, its
> basic
> > > effects must be physical or it is complete nonsense.
>
> > > Contraction is one of those basic effects and the PoR says both of two
> > > bodies in relative motion must be contracted relative to the other.
>
> > Thats not what the principle of relativity states. That is a result
> > derived from special relativity. Learn the difference.
>

Mark your snips. I am not sure why I complain because you have made it obvious that intellectual honesty is not one of your strong suites.

> How do you manage to be such an idiot on what must be such short notice?

The same way you have managed to be an idiot your whole life. Which is to say there is no reason, that is just how I am.

>
> SR says no such thing. SR says a inertialy moving object contracts. Period.

No.

Again, that is a result derived from SR not an initial assumption.

> It is the PoR that says if that is so then the stationary object must also
> contract because it too is moving inertially, wrt the supposed moving
> object.

No, it is you who says that − not the PoR. It is never surprising to

see a false conclusion drawn from an invalid premise.

Tell us, eleaticus: How long have you been misinterpeting relativity?
If you have been doing math before Robert Kolker was born, you would
have to be in your 80's, at least.

>
> *eleaticus*

[Google cries 'internal server error', Repost #1]