

Re: A little challenge for relativists.

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-11/msg00834.html>

- *From:* John Kennaugh <JKNG@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 14 Nov 2005 20:16:49 +0000
-

Bilge wrote:

While I would be happy to explain it to someone who is really interested in such an answer, neither you nor mr. kennaugh are such persons. You see, before mr. kennaugh could be interested in such an answer, he would first have to realize the rest of his post in which he tries to find some reason to reject relativity, is silly.

My interest is in the history and the underlying natural philosophy of 'relativity' rather than the maths. I can do enough of the maths to satisfy my curiosity but there is no point it taking it further as there is nothing I need it for. OTOH the maths is the only thing which interests you. You and I therefore have very little (zero) common ground on which to have meaningful discussion however I have to correct you inaccurate statement.

I do not reject the Maxwell/Lorentz/Einstein ether theory (commonly referred to as relativity) but I am very reluctant to accept it because it is an ether based theory and I am prejudiced against the concept of the ether. I accept that this is prejudice on my part and that there is a great deal of evidence supporting it.

I would be less reluctant to accept the Maxwell/Lorentz/Einstein ether theory if I was certain that the alternative no ether, source dependent option had