

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

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

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2007-07/msg00658.html>

- *From:* shuba <tim.shuba@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sat, 07 Jul 2007 12:09:01 -0500
-

Dono wrote:

On Jul 7, 8:36 am, shuba <tim.sh...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Dono wrote:

The "object contraction" from Lorentz 1904 paper has been falsified by several experiments:

Naw, the object contraction is completely unobservable and cannot possibly be falsified by any experiment that is not at odds with special relativity.

Hmmm, how do you explain these experiments:

1. ^ Trouton F. T., Rankine A. (1908). "On the electrical resistance of moving matter". Proc. Roy. Soc. 80 (420).
2. ^ Carl T. Chase (1927). "The Trouton-Noble Ether Drift Experiment". Phys. Rev. 30 (516): 516-519.
3. ^ R. Tomaschek (1924). "The conduct of light of extraterrestrial light sources". Annalen der Physik 73: 105-126.
4. ^ R. Tomaschek (1925). "Attempt at the locating of the electrodynamic effect of earth movements at high altitudes I". Annalen der Physik 78: 743-756.
5. ^ R. Tomaschek (1926). "Concerning an experiment on the location of electrodynamic effects of the movement of the Earth at high altitudes II". Annalen der Physik 80: 509-514.
6. ^ R. Tomaschek (1927). "Comments on my tests on the detection of electrodynamic effects at high altitudes". Annalen der Physik 84: 161-

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

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

162.

Are any of them in conflict with special relativity? If not, they cannot be in conflict with the unobservable length contraction of Lorentz. Essentially, proponents of "physical contraction" elevate one member of an equivalence class of inertial frames to the "physically correct" one, without providing any justification for the uniqueness of that frame.

---Tim Shuba---

.