

Re: Naturally, there can be no "aether"; Special Relativity Lecture by Michael Fowler

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2005-09/msg02054.html>

- *From:* "platopes" <platopes@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 25 Sep 2005 12:34:11 -0700
-

Traveler wrote:
[snip]

> ... the notion
> that only relative motion exists that is complete devoid of meaning.
> In fact, it is stupid. Why? Because, in a system where every
> motion/position is relative to every other motion/position, one ends
> up with having every motion relative to itself. IOW, a
> self-referential system. There are more equally valid reasons but this
> one is sufficient. It should be a crime to teach young people that
> only relative motion/position exists. It should be punishable by
> flogging. Truth is, only the absolute exists. The relative is abstract
> and non-existent. Get a clue.

>
Isn't "the absolute" self-referential? How can one be sure that
"self-referential" is "not allowed" outside human logic, or for that
matter, *within* human logic?

<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/logical-constants/>

"...there is little philosophical consensus about the basis for the
distinction between logical and nonlogical expressions."

p

.

- *Follow-Ups:*
 - ◆ ***Re: Naturally, there can be no "aether"; Special Relativity Lecture by Michael Fowler***
◇ *From:* Traveler
- *References:*
 - ◆ ***Naturally, there can be no "aether"; Special Relativity Lecture by Michael Fowler***
◇ *From:* Sam Wormley

Re: Naturally, there can be no "aether"; Special Relativity Lecture by Michael Fowler

◆ *Re: Naturally, there can be no "aether"; Special Relativity Lecture by Michael Fowler*

◇ From: Traveler

- Prev by Date: *Re: Naturally, there can be no "aether"; Special Relativity Lecture by Michael Fowler*
- Next by Date: *Re: Naturally, there can be no "aether"; Special Relativity Lecture by Michael Fowler*
- Previous by thread: