

Re: Are *observed* SR effects real?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2008-07/msg00465.html>

- *From:* PD <TheDraperFamily@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 7 Jul 2008 06:06:40 -0700 (PDT)
-

On Jul 5, 8:18 am, Shubee <e.Shu...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Geometry is the study of invariants. Sadly, physicists believe that special relativity is the study of frame-dependent quantities. <shrug>

Physics in general is the study of quantities, some of which are frame-dependent and some of which are not.

Velocity, electric field, momentum, kinetic energy are examples of quantities that are.

Acceleration, invariant mass, spacetime interval are examples of quantities that are not.

So then insisting that length be frame-independent in some underlying reality is to either
a) say that the underlying reality is unmeasurable,

That would be my preference.

And this is scientifically valueless.

or
b) define length in a self-contradictory way, making it a one-word oxymoron.

No thank you. I reject Einstein's self-contradictory, oxymoronic emphasis.

Re: Are *observed* SR effects real?

Shubee<http://www.everythingimportant.org/relativity/special.pdf>