

## Re: Followup: Lorentz v. Einstein on SR

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2004-08/2849.html>

---

**From:** Harry ([harald.vanlintel\\_at\\_epfl.ch](mailto:harald.vanlintel_at_epfl.ch))

**Date:** 08/13/04

Date: Fri, 13 Aug 2004 16:03:54 +0200

"Martin Hogbin" <[goatNOSPAM1@hogbin.org](mailto:goatNOSPAM1@hogbin.org)> wrote in message  
news:cfgifi\$223\$1@hercules.btinternet.com...

>

> "Andrew Dabrowski" <[dabrowsa@indiana.edu](mailto:dabrowsa@indiana.edu)> wrote in message  
news:cfgc9b\$g4j\$1@hood.uits.indiana.edu...

> > Martin Hogbin wrote:

> > > "Andrew Dabrowski" <[dabrowsa@indiana.edu](mailto:dabrowsa@indiana.edu)> wrote in message  
news:cff0hp\$1ll\$1@hood.uits.indiana.edu...

SNIP

> You may see that as a reasonable assumption based on  
> observations but it is still an assumption or postulate.

>

> It is readily observed that the speed of light is measured  
> to have the same value in all inertial frames.

>

> Einstein's second postulate is therefore very reasonable.

>

> Remember, I am not claiming that LET is wrong but

> I do claim the following:

>

> LET has not proved interesting or useful over the last century.

>

> LET is not any more natural, obvious, or fundamental than SR.

Lorentz' interpretation of SRT is just an interpretation, and so is that of Einstein. In the last century few people cared about explanation of physics (certainly not Feynman!). That pragmatic attitude was very successful, although it may be a little one-sided in the long run.

Harald