

## Re: SR Postulate on Speed of Light

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-05/msg01713.html>

---

- *From:* [dubious@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:dubious@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx) (Bilge)
  - *Date:* Mon, 23 May 2005 02:35:48 GMT
- 

Curious:

>Look, to you Tim, and David Smith – you're still misunderstanding me.  
>Probably becuse I mixed two thoughts.  
>1. 'Reality' as opposed to perception: If we cannot tell whether the  
>'real' speed of light is constant (or even if there is such a thing as  
>a 'real' speed of light), this doesn't remove the question from  
>physics. It just removes the answer from physics. For now. In future we  
>may be able to answer this in some way by physics. If you had asked a  
>caveman how far away the stars are, would he have been able to tell?  
>But if we had left curiosity about this question up to philosphers  
>alone we would never have answered it. So all I'm saying is, there is no  
>wall dividing questions up between philosophy and physics. They rather  
>co-operate on the question. But perhaps you misunderstand what I mean  
>by philosophy. I don't mean airy-fairy wonderings about angels on pins.  
>I thinking of the great philosophers who have analysed the science of  
>logic and enhanced our ability to use the power of reason to deduce  
>correct conclusions and detect false ones. Which leads me to my other  
>thought: about paradoxes.

>2. A theory has to be logical.

A theory has to agree with nature. If your concept of logic doesn't agree with the logic that nature follows, your logic needs modification. Nature isn't going to change.

>Not common sensical. Just logical.  
>That's all I'm saying. SRT/GR may be logical. I personally have my  
>doubts, not because of time dilation in itself, but because of the  
>paradoxes – if they are indeed there.

Since the explanations of relativity you find most compelling are those given by people who don't understand it, you will undoubtedly never resolve the so-called paradoxes. However, the contradictions you believe exist boil down to not accepting that two different paths through the same two points can be different lengths. If there is a logical flaw in relativity, the same logical flaw would require you to insist every path between any two points must be the same length.

## Re: SR Postulate on Speed of Light

>But if I can see how my  
>(currently tentative) opinion might be wrong I'll change it quicker  
>than greased lightning. But at the end of the day if a theory's  
>predictions \*don't\* make sense, if the theory does indeed predict  
>paradoxes, then putting the paradoxes into the philosophy section  
>doesn't save it. But you probably agree with me there.  
>And for the record, just because thousands believe it doesn't make it  
>right. Look how many people 'knew' the world was flat (because  
>otherwise you would fall off.)

And some people are still committed to that idea, despite the evidence against it. Here's an explanation of michelson and morely's experiment as ``scientific evidence" for a flat earth:

[http://www.alaska.net/~clund/e\\_djublonskopf/Flatearthsociety.htm](http://www.alaska.net/~clund/e_djublonskopf/Flatearthsociety.htm)

They also cite a number of ``paradoxes" associated with a round earth.

>Sometimes the pressure of not seeing any  
>other option, or the love of an elegant lateral thought, or a long-held  
>allegiance that takes a life of its own, or peer pressure alone, can  
>cause large numbers of people to hold to a group opinion. I don't think  
>I'm clever than them all – just more arrogant.

---

### • *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***  
    ◇ *From: Curious*
- ◆ ***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: shuba*
- ◆ ***Re: SR Postulate on Speed of Light***  
    ◇ *From: Curious*
- ◆ ***Re: SR Postulate on Speed of Light***  
    ◇ *From: shuba*
- ◆ ***Re: SR Postulate on Speed of Light***

Re: SR Postulate on Speed of Light

◇ *From:* Curious

- Prev by Date: ***Re: Lorentz contraction.***
- Next by Date: ***Re: SR Postulate on Speed of Light***
- Previous by thread: ***Re: SR Postulate on Speed of Light***
- Next by thread: ***Re: SR Postulate on Speed of Light***
- Index(es):
  - ◆ ***Date***
  - ◆ ***Thread***