

Re: Article: A Century of Einstein

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2004-08/9332.html>

From: RP (*no_mail_no_spam_at_yahoo.com*)

Date: 08/30/04

Date: Mon, 30 Aug 2004 07:36:32 -0500

Bill Hobba wrote:

> "RP" <*no_mail_no_spam@yahoo.com*> wrote in message

> *news:2pfjlaFkfpdlU1@uni-berlin.de...*

>

>>

>> Tom Roberts wrote:

>>

>>

>>> RP wrote:

>>>

>>>

>>>> Let me put it this way, [...]. If the PoR is to be strictly

>>>> maintained, then frames won't enter into the laws of physics. By this

>>>> I mean, "no transformations".

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> Sure. That's what we do in modern physics. The equations of all modern

>>>> fundamental theories of physics are completely independent of "frame"

>>>> (i.e. coordinates).

>>>>

>>>> Perhaps you should put down your comic books and actually LEARN some

>>>> modern physics....

>>>>

>>>> Transformations between coordinate systems only arise when

>>>> one considers tensors projected onto specific coordinate

>>>> systems. But the equations of the theory relate the tensors

>>>> themselves, not their components projected onto some

>>>> coordinates (though some older treatments did so -- there is

>>>> an equivalence here, but it hides the underlying structure).

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>> IOW, if you have valid laws of physics, then you will never perform a

>>>>> transformation between frames, you'll simply plug in the values that

>>>>> are frame invariant. Covariance doesn't cut it.

>>>>>

>>>>>

sci.physics: Re: Article: A Century of Einstein

>>>*Sure. You can do that. But usually one uses rulers an*