

Re: So... Lerentz Contractions are *physical* not observed?

Re: So... Lerentz Contractions are *physical* not observed?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2007-07/msg00657.html>

- *From:* "kenseto" <kenseto@xxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sat, 7 Jul 2007 13:20:51 -0400
-

"jem" <xxx@xxxxxxxx> wrote in message [news:i8Mji.6075\\$Oz7.610@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:i8Mji.6075$Oz7.610@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

kenseto wrote:

"jem" <xxx@xxxxxxxx> wrote in message
[news:JAqji.565025\\$6P2.366932@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:JAqji.565025$6P2.366932@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

kenseto wrote:

"Jem" <xxx@xxxxxxxx> wrote in message
[news:6oNii.8415\\$Zt6.7938@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:6oNii.8415$Zt6.7938@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

kenseto wrote:

"jem"
<xxx@xxxxxxxx>
wrote in
message
[news:iEMii.8412\\$Zt6.3916@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:iEMii.8412$Zt6.3916@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

Duh! Didn't I just tell you
that SR says it /isn't/ able to
fit
through? Are you working
on your Space Cadet

Re: So... Lerentz Contractions are *physical* not observed?

Re: So... Lorentz Contractions are *physical* not observed?

certification, or what?

Duh....didn't Roberts and you say that you can rotate a rod to fit

through

the door way? Now you are saying that a circular plate can't rotate and

fit

through the door way. Does that mean that the SR concept of rotation (geometric projection) is a bunch of bull shit? BTW the SR mutual time dilation and mutual length contraction are derived from the same SR

bull

shit of geometric projection.

Get a 4 year-old to explain to you why a jar's contents can be extracted with a spoon, but not with the jar's removable top.

So are you saying that the SR concept of geometric projection is valid

only

for skinny rods and not for objects that are 3 dimensional?? Don't you

see

how stupid such assertion is?

What's the matter, Seto, couldn't you find a 4 year-old? There is *no* way to rotate a circular disk so that it rigidly fits through a circular hole when the diameter of the hole is less than the diameter of the disk (i.e. *every* geometric projection of the disk overlaps

Re: So... Lorentz Contractions are *physical* not observed?

Re: So... Lorentz Contractions are *physical* not observed?

the hole).

In the context of Relativity, there's no orientation at which your metal plate can approach the circular doorway without at least one of the disks diameters being perpendicular to the direction of travel, and there's no length contraction perpendicular to the direction of travel. Get it?

Hey idiot that's the point. The concept of geometric projection is bogus because it only work for skinny rods and not for all objects. Therefore we need to find a different concept to explain the apparent length contraction. The new concept is that the physical length of a moving rod remains the same physical length no matter who is look at it. However different observer will see different light path length for the same moving rod. This new interpretation is universal and have no problem with any object. IRT includes such interpretation and IRT is complete and it includes SRT and LET as subset. Also IRT in valid in all environments including gravity:
http://www.geocities.com/kn_seto/2007IRT.pdf