

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/msg00742.html>

- *From:* jem <xxx@xxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 08 Jul 2007 09:32:06 -0400
-

kenseto wrote:

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

kenseto wrote:

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

kenseto wrote:

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

kenseto
wrote:

"jem"
<xxx@xxxxxxx>
wrote
in
message

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

news:iEmii.8412\$Zt6.3916@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

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

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

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

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 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.

No, it works for more than just skinny rods. As long as the hole in the doorway is not skinny, or the motion is in the vertical direction, with the light path length of the moving rod the same as the volume of the metal plate so that the geometric projection of the rod equals the geometric projection of the doorway, which is why it's not bogus.

Therefore we

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

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

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