

Re: The Paradox No Relativist Can Weasel Out Of

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2004-09/8897.html>

From: Dirk Van de moortel (dirkvandemoortel_at_ThankS-NO-SperM.hotmail.com)

Date: 09/23/04

Date: Thu, 23 Sep 2004 17:13:25 GMT

"Nth Complexity" <spam@this-dot-instead.no-spam.invalid> wrote in message news:41521bf4_1@127.0.0.1...

> > *Russell Blackadar* wrote:

> *Dirk Van de moortel* wrote:

> >

> > [snip]

> >

> > *Well, it's easy to prove that the combination is not L,*

> > *and that $L_x L_y$ is not the same as $L_y L_x$.*

> >

> *Even his example of two successive L's in the same spatial*

> *direction is wrong, and for the same reason. Yes it yields*

> *a Lorentz transformation (as does *any* composition of boosts)*

> *but it's not the transformation for $v_1 + v_2$.* [/quote:02411abd1d]

>

> *You are completely missing the point. The point is not whether*

> *the product of boosts $L_x L_y = L_y L_x$, the point is that there is no*

> *boost equal to that product $L_x L_y$.*

If that is your point then you should have said it like that.

But instead you said:

"Note that the product of L_x and L_y is not the same as L ."

If the product $L_x L_y$ is not the same as $L_y L_x$, then neither one of them can be the same as L , by symmetry.

Now that you know that there is no boost for $L_x L_y$, you suddenly claim that *that* was your point.

Gee, you are a dishonest person.

And stupid.

Dirk Vdm