Re: Faster than Light?

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2008−07/msg02895.html

- *From*: "Ben Bean" <ken_scrapthis_vicki@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
- *Date*: Tue, 29 Jul 2008 10:17:09 −0400

"Peri of Pera" <riedt1@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:8103906d−0ef8−4e26−aea8−19219807a2c4@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

> Faster than Light?
>
> The theory of relativity claims that the motion of physical objects
> cannot exceed a speed of 300,000km/sec. However, we know from
> experience (e.g. equatorial rocket launchings, multistage rocket
> vehicles etc) that the final velocity of objects is their starting
> velocity plus their own velocity.

"Their OWN velocity"?? What the heck is meant by that, pray tell! No mister, an object's final velocity is clearly NOT what you formulate. An object's OWN velocity equals precisely ZERO −− that much is obvious. It's obvious because "space" is a non−existent (imaginary) substrate. An object "in space" has no velocity *relative* to said "space", because "space" is not a THING, but rather it is the ABSENCE of any thing.

So the answer to the quandary lies in identifying what an object's velocity is AS ASSESSED from another observation platform. That ALONE has any substantive meaning! So all motion of material objects IS relative. No object can move at or above light speed AS ASSESSED from another observation platform. It's childish fiddle−faddle to think that an object has some real value for its velocity relative to space itself; as that notion was disproven ages ago, by indisputable reckoning of top−notcch physicists.

.