

Re: lorenz transformation and spped of light

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2007-09/msg01693.html>

- *From:* "JM Albuquerque" <jmDOTa2@xxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 20 Sep 2007 19:56:44 +0100
-

"PD" <TheDraperFamily@xxxxxxxx> escreveu na mensagem
<news:1190313918.758640.271960@xx>

On Sep 20, 9:18 am, "JM Albuquerque" <jmDO...@xxxxxxx> wrote:

"Jeckyl" <no...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> escreveu na
mensagem <news:13f3hjam4810218@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

"Chrisd5000rouge"
<christian.d...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> escreveu na
mensagem
<news:1190239831.214123.110060@xx>

Two spacecrafts running at
opposite directions at 0.8c
each, the
lorenz transformation says
that their relative speed
perception is $u =$
 $(0.8c + 0.8c) / (1 + (0.8c * 0.8c / c^2)) =$
0.975c.

It not a "perception" .. it IS their relative speed (ie the speed
of
the
second spaceship in the iFoR of the first). SR doesn't talk
about
optical
illusions :)

That's completely nonsense.

Re: lorenz transformation and speed of light

Of course it's a perception, since the problem starts saying:
Two spacecrafts running at opposite directions at $0.8c$ each.
Why cannot the reality be that of two spacecrafts running at
opposite directions at $0.8c$ each?

We build two spacecrafts, we place them back-to-back,
and we fire them with a program that guarantees that in
a given time and a given distance, both will be running
at $0.8c$.

So we know what the reality is.

That's what it is in one frame of reference. What you apparently
assume, but haven't convincingly argued is:
– that if they have a relative velocity of $1.6c$ in one frame of
reference, then this must be the relative velocity in any other frame
of reference;

No.

One has to account for direction.

I cannot say they have a relative velocity of $1.6c$, because I'm
in the center and they got opposite directions.

I cannot sum their velocities because the right result will be:

$$0.8c + (-0.8c) = 0$$

and/or

– this is the frame of reference that determines what *reality* is,
and if other frames of reference do not result in the same number,
then those cannot be ascribed to *reality*.

Many realities I presume.

Each observer has its own "reality" with it.

And we cannot get out of that circular reasoning to say
who's got the supreme reality.

.