

Re: .Simple SR question...

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2007-02/msg00025.html>

- *From:* "PD" <TheDraperFamily@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 31 Jan 2007 19:09:51 -0800
-

On Jan 31, 2:31 pm, asleep@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx (Dark Energy) wrote:

On 30 Jan 2007 15:12:41 -0800, "PD" <TheDraperFam...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Assuming it means to assert that it is the case,
regardless whether it is measured.

It cannot "be the case" until it is measured, Dummy.

Sorry, Brian, but that's not so. You are assuming that every assertion in physics is the result of a measurement, and that is simply not the case. There is not a single measurement that demonstrates the existence of a particle's probability wavefunction, and yet its *assumed* existence accounts for experimental results very well. You may wish it to be the case, but it just isn't. That's not how science works.

Here is a definition of the word "postulate":
Something that is assumed to be true and that
is used as the basis of an argument or theory.

Precisely. Note the word "assumed". Here is another definition of postulate, very closely related, which says it just a bit more clearly:

"a proposition that is accepted as true in order to provide a basis for logical reasoning"

Note also the definition of "assumption":

"The act of taking for granted, or supposing a thing without proof; supposition; unwarrantable claim."

Now in your case, you simply will not entertain the supposition. That's your choice of course, but it removes you from science or from

Re: .Simple SR question...

the bulk of logical thinking, for that matter.

In physics, "to be true" means "happens experimentally."

No, that is not the case. Physics uses experimental evidence to provide support for assumed postulates for which it has no direct evidence. So does all of science, for that matter. Darwin postulated that there was some mechanism for the passing of inherited traits, though he had absolutely no experimental evidence of that mechanism, which wasn't discovered until nearly a century later. This postulate in no way diminishes the theory of evolution by natural selection, and in fact the theory was well confirmed even without direct evidence of the mechanism itself.

Translation for Dummy:

If the second postulate of special relativity is to be scientific, then it MUST pertain to the result of some physical experiment where light's one-way speed is found to be the SAME in all inertial reference frames.

Again, no. You are simply unaware of how science is done. I'm aware that you would very much like it to be different than the way that it is, but that simply will not make it so.

You can sputter and spout your doubletalk all you want, but that won't change the simple facts about postulation.

Well, I think that a glance at the dictionary will help dispel your misconceptions about "postulation", Brian.

.

Re: .Simple SR question...