

# Re: The Measurement of Contraction

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2008-02/msg01185.html>

---

- *From:* Eric Gisse <[jowr.pi@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:jowr.pi@xxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Tue, 12 Feb 2008 20:02:55 -0800 (PST)
- 

On Feb 12, 4:38 pm, Peri of Pera <[rie...@xxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:rie...@xxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

On Feb 11, 3:55 pm, Bryan Olson <[fakeaddr...@xxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:fakeaddr...@xxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

Peri of Pera wrote:

"jeckyl" wrote:

[...]

.. That is what Einstein was talking about.  
That contraction .. the shorter  
measurement of length .. is real. The object  
\*really does\* take up less  
physical space at a given time in the  
observer's frame of reference .. and  
that is what we are talking about when we  
talk about measured length.

Jecko,  
you have no arguments only assertions: Yes it does, No it  
doesn't – ad  
nauseam.

Well, no... you are missing it. Jeckyl is offering \*explanations\*.  
One could assert they are arguments or argue they are assertions, but  
either of those misses the real... uh... explanation.

Peter, what you've been writing about SR has been nonsense. (If you  
think asserting that arbitrarily, just look up our recent discussions;

## Re: The Measurement of Contraction

I worked through the details, even the math.) Jeckyl is trying to clue you in.

Lorentz contraction hypothesis states that bodies moving through space contract along the direction of motion. Einstein adopted this position. This is Let and SR.

And that is part of what Jeckyl is emphasizing. As he wrote, "The object \*really does\* take up less physical space at a given time in the observer's frame of reference."

Jeckyl also said "There is no change to the proper length and time of a body when an observer is moving relative to it." To understand this bit, you need to understand "proper length" and "proper time". These are \*not\* vague/ambiguous hand-waves. These are precise, specific terms. You could look them up.

Your denial of this fact is just childish. But worse is the number of times you repeat it.  
Peter Riedt

Peter, you claimed, "This aura of complexity and difficulty is maintained by using ambiguity and vagueness in describing and defining the theory and defending it with even more ambiguity and vagueness against logic." No, you are wrong on that. The theory is definite, precise. Jeckyl's explanations of length or time "in the observer's frame of reference," and his references to "the proper length and time" are neither vague nor ambiguous. Furthermore, the two measures are not the same thing; the "proper" measure is not the same thing as the measure in a different "observer's frame of reference."

You will not and cannot understand relativity, nor any other significant theory, if you are unwilling to accept that it may go beyond what you already know, or think you know. Terminology is not ambiguous simply because you personally do not know what it means, and scientific questions do not remain open just because you refuse

## Re: The Measurement of Contraction

to learn the answers.

--  
--Bryan

Bryan,  
we are stuck in semantic games. Jecko keeps talking about what the observer in another frame may measure. I am not concerned what the observer rightly or wrongly can or cannot see. To me it is more important what actually happens to the moving object regardless if it can be measured or not either locally or from an external position.

Therein lies the problem. Well, one of them.

What "actually happens" is an irrelevant question since what "actually happens" depends on how the looking is done.

Does it contract or does it not? Lorentz says it does and AE accepted that. Jecko sidesteps this fundamental question and you throw more confusion on to it. As I said, ambiguity and vagueness is used by the supporters of SR. You will not answer a simple question.  
Peter Riedt

It is only ambiguous and vague to those who are unwilling and/or unable to take the time to learn the terminology as well as the theory described by the words.

Since so few physicists have trouble with either the theory or the words, you might want to consider that the problem is at /your/ end.