

Re: The Relativity of Motion in Space

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2007-10/msg00781.html>

- *From:* NovaJoe <relativetheorys@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 16 Oct 2007 13:07:08 -0000
-

On Oct 15, 8:07 am, "harry" <harald.vanlintelButNotT...@xxxxxxx> wrote:

"NovaJoe" <relativetheo...@xxxxxxxx> wrote in message

news:1192422352.548579.218410@xx

The relativity of motion in space relative to the inertia phenomena is a subject that no one can seem to agree upon. It seems no one can make up there mind either. But, if we all we to take a deep breath, and approach this difficulty by thinking "out side the box," we would find there is a easy way to go about this difficulty. Lets go back to the basics and see what we can come up with. Assuming motion cannot exist without reference, the first thing that needs to be done is we need to define motion relative to the inertia phenomena. Let us simplify this statement by saying, "We need to define motion in space relative to space" (spatial reference) If we imagine the universe in a perpetual orbit, from the perspective of watching the univers from outside the universe, how are we to know if the universe is spinning in perpetual orbit, or are we orbiting the universe while the universe stands still? There is no motion to define here relative to a orbital motion without a third body of reference. The only motion that can be defined under these conditions is the motion of the expansion of the universe. Now were begin to get the picture. How are we to modify a postulate for the functionality of the inertia phenomena by using this deduction. Let us assume that inertial mass and gravitational mass are equivalent.

That reflects a common misunderstanding: originally (and there is no reason to change that), "mass" was postulated to be something physical and not merely a constant in an equation. To claim about something physical that it is "equivalent" to itself when measured with different methods is meaningless.

Re: The Relativity of Motion in Space

Inertial mass is relative to velocity in space, thus,
gravitational mass is relative to motion in space as well.

Perhaps you meant that "mass is RELATED to velocity (speed) in space"?
Indeed, relativistic mass $m = \gamma m_0 = f(v)$ with $v =$ relative to any
inertial frame of choice – incl. "space" if you so desire.

Go to relativetheorys.com blogs and quotes page for more...

Sorry but... too many colours, underline etc. That gives a BAD first
impression!

Cheers,
Harald– Hide quoted text –

– Show quoted text –

inertial frame of choice – incl. "space" if you so desire.
To claim about something physical that it

is "equivalent" to itself when measured with different methods is
meaningless.

Yes, mass is what I mean when I speak of inertial and gravitational
mass and yes, to state two different measurements of the same thing
(mass measured either with inertia, or gravity) are equivalent is in
itself meaningless. But this seemingly meaningless statement is
fundamental to the point I am trying to convey.

Perhaps you meant that "mass is RELATED to velocity (speed) in
space"?

Indeed, relativistic mass $m = \gamma m_0 = f(v)$ with $v =$ relative to any inertial frame of
choice – incl. "space" if you so desire.