

Re: Sliding Rod Experiment [PD investigates]

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2009-01/msg00303.html>

- *From:* "Strich.9" <strich.9993@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 6 Jan 2009 11:08:43 -0800 (PST)
-

On Jan 6, 12:04 pm, PD <TheDraperFam...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Jan 6, 10:31 am, "Strich.9" <strich.9...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Jan 6, 11:23 am, papa_r...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

On 6 ene, 11:55, "Strich.9" <strich.9...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

A meterstick is in isolation. What is its length?

Simple...and PD has answered several times that.

An object in total isolation, meaning without observers, rulers, or clocks (in other words without a reference frame), does not have a defined length.

Miguel Rios-

The sidekick attempts to help his fallen boss.

Ah, now let's recall that YOU invited others to respond to your question. Now that you have an independent response, you believe that

Re: Sliding Rod Experiment [PD investigates]

we are in cahoots.

But please, it's YOUR bonfire of your vanities, please chuck whatever additional kindling onto it that you need.

Miguel, the stick had a length when I observed it. Does its length disappear when nobody is looking? Does the stick disappear when nobody is looking?

Ladies and gentlemen, these are the simple contradictions that relativists are faced everyday. The disappearing length and stick...

Now, now, nobody said the length disappears. The contradictions are only in your own statements, which is not uncommon for relativity hacks.

Let me get this straight (as you say):

- 1) The stick does not disappear.
- 2) The length does not disappear.
- 3) The stick has a length.
- 4) The stick is in a reference frame.

Let's add my condition:

- 5) The stick is in isolation.

Now are you ready to answer the question:
For the meterstick in isolation, what is its length?

.