

Re: A challenge to Tom Roberts re LET,SR and an alternative.

## Re: A challenge to Tom Roberts re LET,SR and an alternative.

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2007-11/msg01932.html>

---

- *From:* oriel36 <kelleher.gerald@xxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Mon, 26 Nov 2007 09:18:18 -0800 (PST)
- 

On Nov 26, 3:38 pm, "harry" <harald.vanlintelButNotT...@xxxxxx>  
wrote:

"kenseto" <kens...@xxxxxxxx> wrote in message

[news:474ae283\\$0\\$28820\\$4c368faf@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:474ae283$0$28820$4c368faf@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

"John Kennaugh" <J...@xx> wrote in  
message  
[news:jdPKP9ChiqSHFwTw@xx](mailto:news:jdPKP9ChiqSHFwTw@xx)

The reason I am aiming this post at Tom is that I know that  
he is one of  
the few people on this NG who has actually studied Lorentz  
Ether Theory  
from the mathematical PoV.

My understanding – from a previous post of Tom's – is that  
in LET what  
you do (in theory) is apply the Lorentz transforms to and  
from the  
aether FoR. The fact that it is impossible to identify the  
aether frame  
is less of a problem than it would seem because the Lorentz  
transforms  
are such that you can arbitrarily choose any FoR as the aether  
frame  
without affecting the answer.

Re: A challenge to Tom Roberts re LET,SR and an alternative.

I am not concerned here with the intellectual route which led to SR or the intellectual differences between SR and LET merely in mathematical terms how the two theories are related. In LET one can arbitrarily choose any FoR as the ether frame so the option is open to always choose the observer's FoR as the ether frame. Mathematically SR is the equivalent of doing just that which is why SR and LET are mathematically equivalent.

[...]

In LET the observer assumes that he is at rest in the ether frame and the LT is derived based on this assumption.

It has been long clear that you don't understand SRT. Here you demonstrate that you don't have a clue about "LET". But that was to be expected: as SRT follows from "LET", it's rather hard to understand "LET" but still not understand SRT.

Harald– Hide quoted text –

– Show quoted text –

Anyone who understands how Albert managed to dump aether on Isaac as 'absolute space' is in for a treat –

" In order to be able to look upon the rotation of the system, at least formally, as something real, Newton objectivises space. Since he classes his absolute space together with real things, for him rotation relative to an absolute space is also something real. Newton might no less well have called his absolute space ``Ether"; "Albert

Every Tom,John and Harry can now understand that Isaac would be livid that his followers lost the plot even when the guy goes out of his way to tells you what he thinks of an aether never mind associating it with 'absolute space' –

"The fictitious matter which is imagined as filling the whole of space is of no use for explaining the phenomena of Nature, since the motions of the planets and comets are better explained without it, by means of

Re: A challenge to Tom Roberts re LET,SR and an alternative.

gravity; and it has never yet been explained how this matter accounts for gravity. The only thing which matter of this sort could do, would be to interfere with and slow down the motions of those large celestial bodies, and weaken the order of Nature; and in the microscopic pores of bodies, it would put a stop to the vibrations of their parts which their heat and all their active force consists in. Further, since matter of this sort is not only completely useless, but would actually interfere with the operations of Nature, and weaken them, there is no solid reason why we should believe in any such matter at all. Consequently, it is to be utterly rejected."  
Optics 1704 Newton

Isaac rejects an aether but his followers in the early 20th century won't let him and invent an aether to dump back on Newton so they can reject it all over again under new terms. This used to be called a mental illness but instead is celebrated as a supreme human achievement otherwise known as the theory of arbitrary choices, oh, I mean, the theory of relativity.

Galileo had a comment to make on such fine people as do and believe these things –

"The same thing has struck me even more forcibly than you. I have heard such things put forth as I should blush to repeat—not so much to avoid discrediting their authors (whose names could always be withheld) as to refrain from detracting so greatly from the honor of the human race. In the long run my observations have convinced me that some men, reasoning preposterously, first establish some conclusion in their minds which, either because of its being their own or because of their having received it from some person who has their entire confidence, impresses them so deeply that one finds it impossible ever to get it out of their heads. Such arguments in support of their fixed idea as they hit upon themselves or hear set forth by others, no matter how simple and stupid these may be, gain their instant acceptance and applause. On the other hand whatever is brought forward against it, however ingenious and conclusive, they receive with disdain or with hot rage—if indeed it does not make them ill."  
GALILEO

Being ill with rage by arguing with a person is far more preferable than being ill through indoctrination, most here suffer from the latter .