

Re: SR Postulate on Speed of Light

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-05/msg01586.html>

- *From:* "Curious" <anthonyroseuk-curious@xxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 21 May 2005 11:18:24 -0700
-

Big help, Harry, thanks!! Very well put.

>The diplomatic answer is that physics is about measurements, it's not
>intended to cover such "philosophical" matters.

Yep, I've seen that time and again. Shoving it over into philosophy as if it doesn't matter is a bit of a cop-out I think.

When we are measuring *something*, it's a bit cowardly to dogmatically avoid attempting to derive or even discuss its absolute attributes independent of our measurements. Physics was borne out of a desire to understand our universe, not just to handle it. If our experimental evidence leads us to a paradox in an absolute frame, I'd rather keep travelling until we do understand it, than settle down with the irrationality of believing (simply because our theory can't handle the alternative) that everything is relative to everything else (and our universe is relative to what? ad infinitum), and that logical thought, philosophy, (because it causes problems for us) is not important or relevant.

.

- *Follow-Ups:*
 - ◆ ***Re: SR Postulate on Speed of Light***
◇ *From:* harry
 - ◆ ***Re: SR Postulate on Speed of Light***
◇ *From:* Dirk Van de moortel
- *References:*
 - ◆ ***SR Postulate on Speed of Light***
◇ *From:* john_doe_ph_d
 - ◆ ***Re: SR Postulate on Speed of Light***
◇ *From:* Harry
 - ◆ ***Re: SR Postulate on Speed of Light***
◇ *From:* Curious
 - ◆ ***Re: SR Postulate on Speed of Light***
◇ *From:* harry

Re: SR Postulate on Speed of Light

- Prev by Date: *Re: why people pretend that the moon landing was for real*
- Next by Date: *Re: relative motion and aging*
- Previous by thread: *Re: SR Postulate on Speed of Light*
- Next by thread: *Re: SR Postulate on Speed of Light*
- Index(es):
 - ◆ *Date*
 - ◆ *Thread*