

# Re: SR fundamental contradiction

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2006-10/msg02122.html>

---

- *From:* "Dirk Van de moortel" <[dirkvandemoortel@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:dirkvandemoortel@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Thu, 26 Oct 2006 19:33:27 GMT
- 

"Brian Kennelly" <[bwkennelly@xxxxxxx](mailto:bwkennelly@xxxxxxx)> wrote in message [news:9370h.145\\$U%2.62@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:9370h.145$U%2.62@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

Dirk Van de moortel wrote:

<[mluttgens@xxxxxxxx](mailto:mluttgens@xxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
[news:1161882075.107780.195740@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:1161882075.107780.195740@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

[snip]

SRists seem to ignore the meaning of inertial frames when they consider that the road is moving relative to a car, or that the Earth is moving relative to a spaceship, etc. I don't.

What you don't, is "understanding what you are dealing with". That, Marcel, is the only important thing that you don't :-)

I think you are right about him. two steps forward, and three steps back....

Indeed, it's been like that since a good part of a decade. While some of us advanced quite a few miles by honing our explanations to sheer objective irresistibility, our friend gladly and open-mindedly took giant leaps and joyfully ran the other way.

A retrograde Echernach procession ;-)

Dirk Vdm

.