

Re: SR cannot determine Contraction

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2008-02/msg02767.html>

- *From:* PD <TheDraperFamily@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 29 Feb 2008 12:36:59 -0800 (PST)
-

On Feb 29, 12:45 pm, Dono <sa...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Feb 29, 10:22 am, PD <TheDraperFam...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

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

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

Dono wrote:

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

Dono
wrote:

In
other
words,
do
you
,
Tom
Roberts,
believe
that
uniform

Re: SR cannot determine Contraction

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.

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

Re: SR cannot determine Contraction

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.

Re: SR cannot determine Contraction

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.

I never said that, so please abstain from constructing strawman. Be a little more respectful and less condescending.

One *measures* that there is no stress in the rod -- or at least finds that there is no evidence of any stress.

How? I asked you to calculate and you are responding with prose:

It's not a matter of calculation. There is no evidence of stress in fast-moving objects. There is evidence of contraction. The properties of nucleus-nucleus collisions at RHIC are consistent with their being "pancaked" but show no evidence of any additional stress in the nucleus as a result of being so pancaked.

Would you care to show how?

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

-in a frame moving with v wrt S_0 $\Sigma(F'_{\text{internal}})=0$ (where F'_i is the Lorentz transformation of F_i) and , YET 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.

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

One therefore concludes that the interatomic spacing has also contracted.

Please show some calculations.
Would you care to show how?

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

-in a frame moving with v wrt S_0 $\Sigma(F'_{\text{internal}})=0$ (where F'_i

Re: SR cannot determine Contraction

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.

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

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.

You are being condescending again. You have no proof of the above (neither theoretical nor experimental)
Besides, some published authors will sharply disagree with you.

What, that Lorentz contraction requires a stress? Which ones?

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>

Re: SR cannot determine Contraction

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?

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.

So what part in what I have been telling you: " Relative motion will not make a solid body shorter in the way that, say, heat makes it larger."

don't you understand, Paul? I have been telling you the same exact thing.

And it has nothing to do with Lorentz 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.

Not if " Relative motion will not make a solid body shorter", so you are still short of a valid explanation in the barn frame.

I agree with Tom, you are using loaded terms like "make a solid body shorter", as though that necessarily implies a physical process (like heating or applying stress) to the body.