

# Re: The differences between LET, SRT and IRT

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2008-04/msg01551.html>

---

- *From:* PD <TheDraperFamily@xxxxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Sat, 19 Apr 2008 14:48:04 -0700 (PDT)
- 

On Apr 19, 9:09 am, kenseto <kens...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Apr 18, 5:23 pm, PD <TheDraperFam...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Apr 18, 2:41 pm, kenseto <kens...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Apr 18, 2:20 pm, PD <TheDraperFam...@xxxxxxxxxx>  
wrote:

On Apr 18, 9:45 am, kenseto  
<kens...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Apr 17, 1:32 pm, PD  
<TheDraperFam...@xxxxxxxxxx>  
wrote:

It's not. I don't know where you get the idea  
that it is.

Sure it is. You and I are standing side by side with no  
relative  
motion between us. Relative motion between us can occur  
only if:

1. I started moving individually.
2. You started moving individually.
3. both of us started moving individually.

## Re: The differences between LET, SRT and IRT

That's not the case. Note that you and I could BOTH be moving side by side with no relative motion. Then relative motion can occur if:

1. You changed either the magnitude (either up or down) OR direction of your motion.

Hey idiot this means that I started moving individually.

No, you were moving before. It could mean that you STOPPED moving. Notice that either would result in nonzero relative motion. Moreover, there's NO WAY to determine from what you did that you are now moving or not moving.

2. I changed either the magnitude (either up or down) OR direction of my motion.

Hey idiot this means that you started moving individually.

No, you were moving before. It could mean that I STOPPED moving.

3. You and I changed both changed either the magnitude OR direction of our motions, just not in the same way.

Note that there's no way to tell from relative motion which one of these occurred.

SO what? It still means that one of us have to move individually in order to have relative motion between us.

No, you have to ACCELERATE or DECELERATE. Notice that you have no way of telling in either of those cases whether the result is motion where before there was no motion, or no motion where before there was motion. All you know is acceleration or deceleration (and in physics, both are accelerations).

## Re: The differences between LET, SRT and IRT

There's not a single paradox that stems from relativity. What paradox do you have in mind? Keep in mind what a paradox is. A paradox is NOT something you do not understand. A paradox is something that looks to be self-contradictory. Now, what do you think is self-contradictory in relativity?

The paradoxes are:

1. From the GPS point of view the ground clock is approx 7 us/day running fast.

Sorry, what's self-contradictory about that?

It is self contradictory because SR claims that from the GPS point of view the SR effect on the earth clock should be 7 us/day running slow but it is not.

SR does NOT claim the earth clock should be 7 us/day running slow. Where on earth did you get the idea that SR claims the earth clock should be running slow?

The SR effect on the earth clock is approx. 7 us/day running fast.

2. The twin paradox.

That's a teaching puzzle. There's no paradox. What's self-contradictory in the twin paradox?

It's not a teaching puzzle. It is a real paradox.

Sorry, where's the contradiction?

3. The pole and the barn paradox.

That's another teaching puzzle. There's no paradox. What's self-contradictory in the pole and barn paradox?

It's not a teaching puzzle. It is a real paradox. SR claims that nothing happens to the pole physically and yet at the same time it can be fitted into a shorter barn physically is a paradox.

That is not a contradiction. Notice that SR does not claim that something physical has to happen to the pole for it to be physically shorter. That is YOUR insistence, and it is wholly outside of SR, and moreover it is WRONG. There is no SELF-contradiction here. There is only something that conflicts with your common sense (and your common sense tells you that something physical has to happen to the pole for it to be physically shorter) — and your common sense here is simply wrong.

But the rules he discovered  
requires physicists to  
modify the  
measuring units to fit those  
rules.

It required no such thing. Relativity would  
be alive today if the  
definition of the meter had never changed.

Re: The differences between LET, SRT and IRT

It would not be alive if the physical meter length is used to measure the one-way speed of light directly.

You have zero evidence of that.

The evidence is that you physicists refuse to determine the one-way speed of light directly even though SR is based on the postulate that the one-way speed of light is isotropic  $c$ .

Ken, they also refuse to send cameras to Venus to see if there are purple Venusian elephants with guns pointed at us. The fact that they refuse to do so does not prove that there are purple Venusian elephants with guns pointed at us.

However, the standard for the meter suffered already from the difficulties of not being as precise, as durable, or as replicable as was required.

Any theory that posits that the one-way speed of light is isotropic  $c$  and refuse to measure the one-way speed of light directly is questionable.

I disagree. It's been demonstrated that measuring isotropy and 2-way speed of light is sufficient and that measuring the one-way speed of light is therefore unnecessary and squandering of valuable resources. You are free to squander as you wish.

Disagree all you want. There is a reason why physicists refuse to make any attempt to test the one-way speed of light directly.

Yes, and I've already told you the DOCUMENTED reason. It is a \*waste\* of a substantial (more than \$100,000) amount of money.

Re: The differences between LET, SRT and IRT

## Re: The differences between LET, SRT and IRT

For that matter no two way speed of light had been measured directly with physical ruler.

That's because using a physical ruler produces too many sources of experimental error. Let's have a contest, Ken. We'll get two USGS landmarks, and you'll measure the distance with a physical ruler, and I'll measure with optical survey equipment, and we'll see who gets the more accurate distance.

You have NO IDEA how to manage experimental sources of error. People who are experimentalists do. This is why they choose ways of doing things that are different than the bonehead way you would go about them. Your way would produce crappy results full of experimental error.

Besides, a clock second to measure the speed of light is a rubber second. It has different duration in different frames.

Yes, and there's nothing wrong with that. The kinetic energy of a bullet is different in different frames. That doesn't mean there's anything wrong with the definition of the joule.

Sure there is something wrong with that. It means that different observer using different standard for time.

The standard of time is only defined for local usage. Says so in the manual. There is nothing wrong with it.

You may DESIRE that all observers use a common standard of time, but to do so turns out to be counter to the laws of physics. There is a tire salesman who visits this group who claims that there ought to be a way to design a clock synch procedure that DOES produce a common standard of time, but he's yet to make it work. If you can make it work, then do it, and win a Nobel prize. But you have to do it.

Re: The differences between LET, SRT and IRT

Ken Seto