

## Re: Preferred frame of reference

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2004-06/1532.html>

---

**From:** Perfectly Innocent ([perfectlyInnocent\\_at\\_as-if.com](mailto:perfectlyInnocent_at_as-if.com))

**Date:** 06/05/04

Date: 4 Jun 2004 22:11:43 -0700

Bjoern Feuerbacher <[feuerbac@thphys.uni-heidelberg.de](mailto:feuerbac@thphys.uni-heidelberg.de)> wrote in message news:<[c9pj9k\\$131\\$1@news.urz.uni-heidelberg.de](mailto:c9pj9k$131$1@news.urz.uni-heidelberg.de)>...

>

> *Nevertheless, GR \*also\* has a principle of relativity, which \*can\**  
> *be still applied even in non-flat spaces – and that shows quite clearly*  
> *that still no frame of reference is preferred (in the sense in which*  
> *one originally meant "preferred frame" – i.e. the laws of nature in it*  
> *are somehow different).*

\*Obviously\* the principle of relativity for GR is only applicable locally, not globally, so that tidbit is irrelevant. However, I see the humor in declaring the laws of nature to be frame-independent and then defining the laws of nature in a "preferred frame" to be frame dependent. It's a clever contradiction.

Eugene Shubert

<http://www.everythingimportant.org>