

Re: Relativity: Einstein's lost frame

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2007-06/msg02580.html>

- *From:* Tom Roberts <tjroberts137@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 21 Jun 2007 18:21:49 GMT
-

Surfer wrote:

On Wed, 20 Jun 2007 12:24:28 -0700, harry <harald.vanlintel@xxxxxxx> wrote:

On Jun 20, 9:48 am, Surfer <sur...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Which leads me to think that absolute motion, special relativity effects and Lorentz symmetry might all be compatible.

That is correct and all well-informed people here know that: it has been discussed and re-explained for years (are you really new here?).

But then, this "absolute motion" is completely unobservable, and the "compatibility" is only for theories that are essentially useless and FAR more difficult to work with than SR (in which you can select any convenient inertial frame, not just the "one, true, frame").

In particular, this "absolute motion" that is compatible with SR is not at all the "absolute motion" of Newton or Maxwell. Beware of PUNs.

I have tended to neglect relativity in favor of QM. So it is a very interesting learning experience.

SR is a piece of cake compared to QM (though it's not trivial, as the many people around here display daily). GR is a rather different story....

Tom Roberts