

Re: SR cannot determine Contraction

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2008-02/msg02755.html>

- *From:* PD <TheDraperFamily@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 29 Feb 2008 10:22:22 -0800 (PST)
-

On Feb 29, 11:40 am, Dono <sa...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Feb 29, 8:38 am, Tom Roberts <tjroberts...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Dono wrote:

On Feb 26, 8:06 pm, Tom Roberts
<tjroberts...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Dono wrote:

In other words, do you ,
Tom Roberts, believe that
uniform relative
motion makes objects
shorter?

That's your confusion. This is phrased so
poorly that no answer is
possible. Your phrase "makes objects
shorter" implies a change to the
object, but observations made from another
frame cannot possibly affect
the object itself.

Correct. But this is exactly what the paradox states, that ,
from the
barn frame, the pole becomes magically shorter, by virtue of
relative
motion.

Re: SR cannot determine Contraction

You insist on using loaded words. This is not "magic", this is GEOMETRICAL PROJECTION. When you approach a doorway with a ladder, in some orientations the ladder fits through, and in other orientations it doesn't. THIS IS THE SAME PHENOMENON, but it occurs in the X-T plane, not the X-Y plane like the ladder's rotation. Relative velocity is a (hyperbolic) ROTATION in the X-T plane.

Actually the analogy would be better if one considered moving the doorway around the ladder, leaving the ladder fixed. But common experience does not include either moving doorways or poles moving at 0.8 c.

All this, while the contraction is "stressless".

Of course there is no stress — what stress is induced in the ladder when you rotate it? Or rather, when you look at it from another angle?

Then you are stuck with answering the following:

Would you care to show how?

—while in the proper frame S_0 : $\sum (F_{\text{internal}}) = 0$

—in a frame moving with v wrt S_0 $\sum (F'_{\text{internal}}) = 0$ (where F'_i is the Lorentz transformation of F_i) and that, somehow, magically, the atom sizes or the lattice spaces between atoms have Lorentz contracted. I think Lorentz spent a good 10 years of his life trying to prove that and it amounted to nothing.

It's not that complicated. One *measures* the rod to be of shorter length. One *measures* the rod to have no fewer atoms strung end-to-end — or at least finds no evidence of some atoms being ejected from the length. One *measures* that there is no stress in the rod — or at least finds that there is no evidence of any stress. One therefore concludes that the interatomic spacing has also contracted. Then one slaps oneself on the forehead when it occurs that there is no reason why an atom should be any more inherently absolute in dimensions than a rod and somehow resist the effect of contraction.

Re: SR cannot determine Contraction

I know that you can calculate very well, so , I'd appreciate some math

To make things even more interesting, if the measurement methodology is switched to marking the pole endpoints simultaneously in the pole frame, this results into length dilation.

That's completely irrelevant -- no measurement does that. To measure the length of a moving object you CLEARLY must mark its endpoint simultaneously IN YOUR FRAME. No other approach can possibly be said to measure its length IN YOUR FRAME.

You are missing the point (perhaps intentionally), I was showing you that the notion of contraction is tied with the measurement methodology, so, it is not INTRINSIC to the relative motion as YOU claim.

The whole point is the interpretation of length contraction: real vs. imaginary. You seem to believe it is real, Michael Janssen points the other way.

Stop using such loaded and ambiguous words -- they merely confuse you and your reader: "real" means many different things to many different people. Discuss MEASUREMENTS, not what someone happens to think is "real". There is no doubt that MEASURING the length of a moving pole will obtain a value smaller than its proper length. And if your measurement includes rapidly opening and closing doors, the pole can fit inside a barn that is shorter than the pole's proper length. <shrug>

All right , let's make it even less ambiguous, look here:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Length_contraction#A_trigonometric_effec...

What in the Roberto Torretti statement " Relative motion will not make a solid body shorter in the way that, say, heat makes it larger." don't you understand, Tom?

Re: SR cannot determine Contraction

That's right, it isn't the same process. The shortening of the rod should in no way be confused with what happens when a rod is cooled.

What in the paper by Redzic don't you understand, Tom?

I know that these references are kind of new but you need to keep up.

Uniform motion makes objects be measured to be shorter than when they are at rest.

Correction:

Depending_on_the_measurement_technique_uniform_motion_MAY_return_shorter_or--_LO
the _measured_object.

No. The "technique" you mentioned does not measure the length of a moving object.

The technique I mentioned shows that "length contraction" is not an INTRINSIC property, it depends on the choice in simultaneity.

The "model" predicts shorter, which is correct. But you don't know if the object becomes shorter because there is no experimental confirmation.

Again, stop using loaded and ambiguous words -- "becomes" has the same ambiguity as "real". What SR unambiguously predicts is that a MEASUREMENT of the length of a moving pole will give an answer shorter than the pole's proper length. Yes, at present there is no direct experimental confirmation of this prediction, but given all the other confirmations of SR predictions, it would be perverse to deny this one.

But this is not (and has not been) the point of the discussion. The point of the discussion has been whether or not the barn doors will clip the rod.

Re: SR cannot determine Contraction

And that is a *measurable* result. The answer that observers in *all* frames will agree is that, no, the barn doors will not clip the rod. Different observers will have different accounting for *why* that is the case, but they will all agree on that.

In order to become shorter you's have to ascribe to the theory that the "atoms_are_becoming_shorter" or that "the_interatomic_spaces_are_becoming_shorter". All this without any increased internal stress.

Again, stop using such loaded words. All that is happening is that the "stationary" observer is LOOKING AT the moving pole differently from a co-moving observer. OF COURSE this induces no stress in the pole, OF COURSE the pole can look different, OF COURSE the effect on the atoms is the same as on the pole, OF COURSE the effect on interatomic spaces is the same as on the pole. Because this is simply geometric projection, not anything more complicated (and not anything simpler).

No one has seen it in practice. Because it comes with the "stressless contraction", a phenomenon never observed and never explained theoretically.

Nonsense. Looking at an object cannot possibly produce stresses in the object. This is COMPLETELY explained theoretically.

Remember how the length of a moving object is measured: its front and rear locations are marked SIMULTANEOUSLY in the measuring frame,

Yes, I know that very well. Problem is, if you mark the ends of the

Re: SR cannot determine Contraction

object in the object's frame you get length...dilation.

That is not any common type of measurement, and it does NOT measure the length of a moving object.

Kind of
disturbing, wouldn't you agree?

Only about your personal mental state. This is YOUR problem, not any problem with SR, or with anybody else.

See my description of the gedanken without accelerations, and my solution to the problem you posed.

Yes, I saw it. What if the effect is not the "physical" contraction?

What if your aunt had wheels — would she be a teacart?

You use loaded words like "real" and "physical", without specifying PRECISELY what you mean by them. Discuss MEASUREMENTS, not such loaded words. Then everything works out and the ambiguities and confusions disappear.

We agree on this. The problem still stands: is length contraction a physical or a geometric effect?

It is most definitely a geometric effect. But geometric effects can affect physical results. The ladder fits through the doorway only in some orientations, because the GEOMETRIC PROJECTION of the ladder's

Re: SR cannot determine Contraction

length onto the plane of the doorway differs. The length of a pole is measured to be shorter in a frame relative to which the pole is moving because the GEOMETRIC PROJECTION of the pole's endpoints onto the frame is different.

You seem to believe that it can magically shrink the 50 foot pole to fit inside the 30 foot barn

There's no "magic", just simple, basic, GEOMETRICAL PROJECTION.

The measurement of the length of moving objects is nothing more than an exercise in projective geometry. Depending how you do the projections, you get a DIFFERENT result.

Right. But there's only ONE WAY to project the length of a pole onto a frame -- mark its endpoints simultaneously in that frame. That method makes it be measured to be shorter in a frame relative to which it is moving, than in a frame relative to which it is at rest. <shrug>

Tom Roberts– Hide quoted text –

– Show quoted text -- Hide quoted text –

– Show quoted text –