

Re: Is there length contraction in SRT, uncle Ben?

Re: Is there length contraction in SRT, uncle Ben?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2008-07/msg02976.html>

- *From:* xray4abc <lemhenyil@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 30 Jul 2008 15:29:49 -0700 (PDT)
-

On Jul 30, 12:30 am, "Ben Bean" <ken_scrapthis_vi...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote:

xray4abc wrote:

What SRT does say about length contraction?
Consider a rod along OX axis be resting in IRF K and
moving in frame K .
Consider 2 observers in the 2 frames, measuring the
length of the rod, setting up measurements at their will,
where they localize the endpoints in a simultaneous
manner, each in his frame.
...
...
3. Now, what can I say, this is what results from the LT which are
the very basics of special relativity theory, aren t they?
Or not?

Best regards.LL

I'm lost when you ignore the infamous Relativity of Simultaneity. You used the term
"in a simultaneous manner" and from there on out it's a blur, sorry. There are
countless seeming paradoxes one can recite: the barn door and pole paradox, and I
heard one about a bug being squashed or not by a shortened moving thing uh I forget.
So what's the dang point I ask?? No sense wading thru all your raucous formulations
when the premise itself is misstated.

In short, and obvious, is the fact that

Relativity stands up to every scrutiny. It's essence is the denial of the feasibility
of a God's-Eye View of our universe. The universe can truly BE very different, from
differing perspectives. The mastery of EM signals over our mortal concoctive chicanery
is rather manifest. Ah, but I wax poetic.

Hi

You seem to be offended! I am sorry, it was not at

Re: Is there length contraction in SRT, uncle Ben?

Re: Is there length contraction in SRT, uncle Ben?

all

my intention. I have stated before (in your thread) that I am not against

Relativity Theory. What I think that is there, is a more complex situation

then the current view of SRT.

This results considering the 2 factors, mentioned by Tom Roberts in your earlier thread : relation with the reference frame and the measurement

process itself (using limited speed signals).

I tried to illustrate the ideas I came upon, that SRT holds true but this truth is slightly different from what is perceived commonly.

In the given example, L and L'

appear to have a similar relationships but different operational values in the 2 frames.

Now, really, many physical parameters differ from one frame to another. Why would we stick then to the idea that the x, x' set of coordinates

is an invariant for 2 IRFs? And from there... the L and L' set.

Relationships could be similar, but why exactly the same??

A physical law can not really be *exactly* the same (similar, yes) in 2 IRFs for

a given phenomenon, as the initial conditions can not be the very same,

in most cases.

We are talking science not religion, don't we ?

Best regards,LL

.