

Re: Two photons... relative distance question

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-05/msg00566.html>

- *From:* "N:dlzc D:aol T:com \\\(dlzc\)" <N: dlzc1 D:cox T:net@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 8 May 2005 13:00:17 -0700
-

Dear Curious:

"Curious" <anthonyroseuk-curious@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:1115572661.596004.161660@xx
> Wow.

It would really be good if you could leave some attribution to whom you were replying.

> What defines 'non-local'?

When you can't measure a delay in signalling, that would be local.

- > How can we rely on the Michelson and
- > Morely experiment if time is affected by
- > our hurtling through space? (Being
- > genuine, not facetious).

Consistency. Nature is repeatable, or Science could not exist. MMX shows that motion through the aether (if there is any) is fully consistent with:

- 1) no aether, or
- 2) a Lorentz aether, or
- 3) a dragged aether (other experiments disallow dragging).

- > For the record, I believe that we can
- > DEDUCE that something happens
- > *NOW* distantly.

As does Mr. Seppalla. And what we "deduce" is unverifiable. Science is about experimentation, verification, modelling, prediction, and more experimentation (etc.).

- > For that deduction we rely on our
- > understanding of space-time to be
- > accurate, which of course it may not be,
- > but has proven so far to be reliable
- > enough for our purposes.

Re: Two photons... relative distance question

It is a persistent illusion. And it still confounds those who expect their provincial "common sense" to control Nature.

- > If we know
- > anything, this is how we know it –
- > dependent on our assumptions proven
- > by experience. So ultimately, yes, one
- > can 'know' that something distant
- > happens 'now', even if we don't measure
- > it directly, because we can reliably
- > predict the event based on other prior
- > events and our formulae.

So assuming this thing—which–must–be–constantly–challenged is true, then "x" can be known?

- > For example, I 'know' that right now
- > there are some light rays leaving the
- > sun headed directly towards me.

For any given *now*, can you prove this? I'm just pulling your leg a little, "don't sweat the small stuff".

- > I also believe similarly that one can
- > theoretically analyse a scenario in
- > which distant things are postulated
- > to happen *NOW* and be quite
- > logical about it.

Experiment cannot discount no–aether vs. Lorentz–aether. Therefore, we cannot *with certainty* know about "simultaneity" in remote locations. All we can do is synchronize clocks, and be unsurprised by the results we receive "back here".

- > In such an analysis one can define
- > any realistic event and a theory should
- > still hold water (be self–consistent) when
- > used to analyse the event, and in this
- > case proving the event by measurement
- > is of course not relevant.

It is the only relevancy available.

- > (Perhaps Dave feels the same way
- > and you have misunderstood each other.
- > Or [perhaps I have just put myself in
- > the same boat as him?!)

You are solidly in the same boat, yes. For something like 5 years, he has adopted new ways of describing the exact same

Re: Two photons... relative distance question

misunderstanding. At one time, he was naive (I'm sure). Now he has raised towering structures to protect his misunderstanding.

A couple of thoughts...

- 1) Get "Spacetime Physics" by Taylor and Wheeler.
- 2) Remember that reality (for science) is what you measure. All else ("Truth", "Reality", etc.) is the domain of philosophy. It ultimately comes down to: someone you "don't like" gets the same measurement that you do.

David A. Smith

• **Follow-Ups:**

- ◆ **[Re: Two photons... relative distance question](#)**
◇ From: Curious

• **References:**

- ◆ **[Two photons... relative distance question](#)**
◇ From: Curious
- ◆ **[Re: Two photons... relative distance question](#)**
◇ From: Curious
- ◆ **[Re: Two photons... relative distance question](#)**
◇ From: Jon Bell
- ◆ **[Re: Two photons... relative distance question](#)**
◇ From: Curious
- ◆ **[Re: Two photons... relative distance question](#)**
◇ From: N:dlzc D:aol T:com \(\dlzc\)
- ◆ **[Re: Two photons... relative distance question](#)**
◇ From: Curious
- ◆ **[Re: Two photons... relative distance question](#)**
◇ From: N:dlzc D:aol T:com \(\dlzc\)
- ◆ **[Re: Two photons... relative distance question](#)**
◇ From: Curious
- ◆ **[Re: Two photons... relative distance question](#)**
◇ From: N:dlzc D:aol T:com \(\dlzc\)
- ◆ **[Re: Two photons... relative distance question](#)**
◇ From: Curious

- Prev by Date: **[Re: Length "contraction" and time "dialation" bad language.](#)**
- Next by Date: **[Re: Caltech Football Team](#)**
- Previous by thread: **[Re: Two photons... relative distance question](#)**
- Next by thread: **[Re: Two photons... relative distance question](#)**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **[Date](#)**
 - ◆ **[Thread](#)**