

Re: Errors being made by SR experts.

## Re: Errors being made by SR experts.

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2007-08/msg00688.html>

---

- *From:* "harry" <[harald.vanlintelButNotThis@xxxxxxx](mailto:harald.vanlintelButNotThis@xxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Wed, 8 Aug 2007 10:33:06 +0200
- 

"Jeckyl" <[noone@xxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:noone@xxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message [news:f9b28n\\$nfms1@xxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:f9b28n$nfms1@xxxxxxxxxxx)

"harry" <[harald.vanlintelButNotThis@xxxxxxx](mailto:harald.vanlintelButNotThis@xxxxxxx)> wrote in message [news:1186504779\\_139@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:1186504779_139@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

"PD" <[TheDraperFamily@xxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:TheDraperFamily@xxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message [news:1186495902.842445.217240@xx](mailto:news:1186495902.842445.217240@xx)

On Aug 7, 3:08 am, "harry"  
<[harald.vanlintelButNotT...@xxxxxxx](mailto:harald.vanlintelButNotT...@xxxxxxx)> wrote:

"PD" <[TheDraperFam...@xxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:TheDraperFam...@xxxxxxxxxxx)>  
wrote in message

[news:1186436838.043558.159550@xx](mailto:news:1186436838.043558.159550@xx)>

On Aug  
6, 3:38 pm, "Gerald L. O'Barr"  
<[glob...@xxxxxxx](mailto:glob...@xxxxxxx)> wrote:

[...]

What fun (don't people ever read?!):

And I know  
what I can  
and what  
I cannot  
measure.  
And I know  
that I can  
measure the  
relative

Re: Errors being made by SR experts.

velocity of  
any light or  
any radio  
signal or  
any other  
such signal  
as it might  
be going  
past me,

Yes.

or a train, or  
a plane or a  
moon or a  
planet or a  
star or any  
other  
inertial  
reference  
frame.

No. You can deduce it, but  
you must use the proper  
prescription for  
deducing it. If you use a  
prescription that relies on  
subtracting or  
adding two displacements  
and a common time, then  
you are assuming  
that  
the velocities combine as  
 $c+v$  or  $c-v$ , and that is  
simply wrong.

These  
things are  
possible,  
and I know  
that my  
measurements  
(I am not

Re: Errors being made by SR experts.

sure about  
your  
measurements),  
but my  
measurements  
will be SR  
correct,

Not the way you've  
described them, they won't.  
If you end up with  $c+v$   
or  $c-v$ , that is not "SR  
correct".

That happens to be a literal part of Einstein's  
SRT derivation.

I am completely familiar with that paper, both in English and  
in  
German. I am not implying that the 1905 paper is incorrect.  
I'm  
implying that some people do not understand what they are  
reading.

There is no reason to think that O'Barr means anything else than Einstein  
did when he wrote the same in 1905.

Its how he is using that .. he is deliberately misrepresenting and  
misinterpreting it to try to show that SR is wrong in what it says about  
the speed of light. That is where the dishonesty comes in. He tries to  
use that to say that every observer, other than us, gets a different  
figure than  $c$  for the speed of light in our frame, so therefore by  
majority rule, the speed of light in our frame cannot actually be  $c$ . That  
is a nonsense conclusion, as the closing speed in some other frame is a  
different beast to the speed of light in our own frame .. and if those in  
other frames actually did observer what we would measure in our frame  
correctly (by looking at the closing speed AND the tools we would be  
measuring it with), they would also agree that we would see the speed of  
light as being  $c$ .

I'm quite sure that he debates metaphysics (as usual), but I must admit that  
I haven't followed the discussion.

Cheers,  
Harald

Re: Errors being made by SR experts.

Re: Errors being made by SR experts.