

Re: Are SR effects real or not? Simplified case.

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2008-07/msg01720.html>

- *From:* Uncle Ben <ben@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 17 Jul 2008 19:24:27 -0700 (PDT)
-

On Jul 17, 8:44 pm, Tom Roberts <tjroberts...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

PD wrote:

On Jul 16, 8:24 pm, Tom Roberts <tjroberts...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

PD wrote:

To put Tom's point more colloquially, an given ruler at any given moment has got thousands of physical lengths, [...]

I wouldn't say that, either. To virtually everybody, "physical length" means "proper length", and that's not what you mean.

Say "measured length", because that's what it is. And don't worry about whether or not it's "real" — that's hopelessly ambiguous, and is never needed.

Well, with all respect, I disagree. The problem philosophically and pedagogically with assigning "physical length" to "proper length" is that it singles out a reference frame.

No. It "singles out" the PHYSICAL OBJECT.

But you missed my point: don't use the phrases "physical length" or "real length", because they will be confusing to many readers. Sa