

## Re: Two photons... relative distance question

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-05/msg00584.html>

---

- *From:* "Curious" <[anthonyroseuk-curious@xxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:anthonyroseuk-curious@xxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* 8 May 2005 17:08:10 -0700
- 

Dave A. Smith wrote:

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

Sorry, I'm viewing as tree and it doesn't show ambiguity that way.

As to the rest, I have 3 thoughts.

1. I suspect that your theory would be in trouble if you admit an absolute reality. Just a passing thought.
2. If you look carefully, I have not forced an absolute reality above. I've merely said that practically speaking we act as if there is one. We live on assumptions, any one of which could one day come tumbling down and, horror of horrors, we DO find that the sun did not send us a ray at the time we thought! Our assumptions are not proven and so we walk on a tenuous line of what we THINK is real.
3. But just because we can't measure it, doesn't mean it isn't real, either. I mean, if you doubt that reality unmeasured exists, then surely even your own measurements are at risk? If you measure a length as 30cm, is your ruler right? Better measure that with another ruler. Ultimately you arrive at the question of life. Some idiots like George Hammond end up believing they are figments of their own imagination, flying in ever tighter circles of logic until they disappear up their own a---, but the rest of us realise that there is an external reality. Cogito ergo sum. We may not be able to tie down the infinities of it but that which we experience holds together by consistent rules which we may as well call reality because that's as real as we're ever going to get. Otherwise we face the George Hammond pit of non-existence. This is like that question, If a tree falls in the forest alone, does it make any sound?

One cannot prove it – by definition of the question – yet it takes a special leap of faith to believe it would behave differently just when we weren't there. A statement of so-called belief which can be guaranteed not to be applied in practical life, every time you open the fridge door expecting your food to still be there, instead of seeing if it is.

It's like a child hiding behind their fingers and thinking that we cannot see them, just because they can't see us.

Nope, it's clear the more logical (and universally acted upon) view is that reality exists the same whether or not we measure it or not.

Lump me in the crank pool again. Sorry!!

- **Follow-Ups:**
  - ◆ **Re: Two photons... relative distance question**  
◇ From: N:dlzc D:aol T:com \((dlzc\)
  
- **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
  - ◆ **Re: Two photons... relative distance question**  
◇ From: N:dlzc D:aol T:com \((dlzc\)
  
- Prev by Date: **Re: Length "contraction" and time "dialation" bad language.**
- Next by Date: **Re: Help locating SRT experiement articles**
- Previous by thread: **Re: Two photons... relative distance question**
- Next by thread: **Re: Two photons... relative distance question**
- Index(es):
  - ◆ **Date**
  - ◆ **Thread**