

## Re: SR's velocity addition -- ANY Experimental Evidence?

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2004-07/3361.html>

---

**From:** Androcles (*androcles\_at\_nospamblueyonder.co.uk*)

**Date:** 07/18/04

Date: Sun, 18 Jul 2004 10:25:40 GMT

"Jim Greenfield" <greenfield\_7@hotmail.com> wrote in message news:3c4afb26.0407172130.388b2f25@posting.google.com...  
| dubious@radioactivex.lebesque-al.net (Bilge) wrote in message news:<slrncfgqpg.58.dubious@radioactivex.lebesque-al.net>...  
| > Androsleaze:  
| >  
| > > Good. I'm glad we understand that, so since there is no a-priori reason to  
| > > suppose anything should be Lorentz-symmetry, but there IS a prior reason  
| > > to observe Galilean symmetry, since we do, your point isn't made.  
| >  
| > The term ``a priori" refers to reasoning which is independent of  
| > of sensory experience (example: A priori, there was no reason to assume  
| > you were an ineducable moron. The reasons for concluding you are an  
| > ineducable moron come from reading arguments such as the one above,  
| > in the articles you post.) If you actually used words and terms consistent  
| > with the definitions of those words and terms, you'd realize just how  
| > stupid your arguments are.  
| >  
| > > I dont assume Galilean symmetry, I observe it.  
| >  
| > I don't assume lorentz symmetry. I observe it. You might try  
| > observing something that depends upon speeds faster than you  
| > can acheive on foot, on horseback, in your car or in an airplane.  
|  
| Bilge, do you agree that there is "existence" without light?  
| Can things move in the dark?  
| If so, a stick should shrink at high speed in the dark!  
| How about an explanation of the degeree of shrinkage of at stick  
| travelling at 290,000kps.....in the dark?????????????  
|  
| Jim G

Oh dear. I hadn't realized the moron from alt.moron had pathetically attempted to paraphrase me, since I have him on my not-worth-bothering-with list.

Galilean Transforms.

mapping from K to k

$$x' = x - vt,$$

$$t' = t.$$

Mapping k  $\rightarrow$  K

$$x = x' + vt,$$

$$t = t'.$$

Also we can change direction by letting  $u = -v$ .

mapping K to k

$$x' = x - ut,$$

$$t' = t.$$

Mapping k  $\rightarrow$  K

$$x = x' + ut,$$

$$t = t'.$$

Thus I observe the Galilean Transforms to be symmetric.

Now what is the idiot claiming, he can OBSERVE the Lorentz Transforms are SYMMETRIC?

Let's see.

mapping from K to k

$$x' = (x - vt) / \sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}$$

$$t' = (t - vx/c^2) / \sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}$$

mapping from k to K,

$$x = [x' * \sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}] + vt.$$

$$t = [t' * \sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}] + vx/c^2$$