

Re: Problem with Einstein's Train Thought Experiment

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2009-05/msg00161.html>

- *From:* jryskmpr@xxxxxxxxxx
 - *Date:* Sun, 3 May 2009 16:28:16 -0700 (PDT)
-

On May 2, 6:53 pm, "Sue..." <suzysewns...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On May 2, 9:41 pm, jrysk...@xxxxxxxxxx wrote:

On May 2, 10:10 am, "Sue..." <suzysewns...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On May 2, 11:53 am, jrysk...@xxxxxxxxxx wrote:

I agree that M and M' cannot be the same point in three dimensional space because M is on the embankment and M' is on the train.

But that doesn't tell us what is occurring when a lightning strike occurs at both A and A' and a second lightning strike also occurs at B and B'.

Simultaneity of Relativity does.

Re: Problem with Einstein's Train Thought Experiment

The answer to this is simple: there is no A' or B' in the train experiment. Don't rewrite Einstein. The problem with a lot of commentators on the train experiment is that they rewrite it, trying to correct for an error which they sense is there, but cannot identify.

That is what you are doing. Stick STRICTLY to the terms of the experiment. And don't say you are doing so, because you are the one who inserted A' and B', when they are nowhere to be found in the train experiment.

Go back, think carefully, and you will see that I am right.

And also, what exactly do you think Einstein is trying to DO in the train experiment. I think YOU think Einstein is trying to present an argument with logical content, because I think YOU want an argument with logical content.

Well, welcome to the world of "practical geometry" (constructivist mathematics), in which the authors arguments do NOT want to present arguments with logical content, because they believe such argument only lead to paradox.

So watch out for this. You are trying to defend Einstein from a charge which he would ADMIT.

Re: Problem with Einstein's Train Thought Experiment

Indeed your observations have some support.

http://books.google.com/books?id=-r5IGSTJVPcC&pg=PA4&source=gbs_selec...

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Metaphysics>

Sue...

I suggest, to get a better grasp of the history of mathematics out of which relativity emerges, you go back over Einstein's "Geometry and Experience" essay, and also read a wonderful book, A Garciadiego, BERTRAND RUSSELL AND THE ORIGINS OF THE SET-THEORETIC 'PARADOXES.'

To say that the relativity of simultaneity lacks logical content, is merely to say what Einstein himself believed. My only contribution is to say WHERE the logic of the argument falls down. Just look at the train experiment again, without changing it, and you will see that I am obviously right. I mean, come on, the geometry isn't clear enough to you? and the arbitrary insertion Einstein makes isn't clear enough to you? What is this? Just wake up.— Hide quoted text —

— Show quoted text — Hide quoted text —

Re: Problem with Einstein's Train Thought Experiment

– Show quoted text –

These sources don't really reflect an understanding of "practical geometry."

Did you miss the metaphysics URL?

And they don't pinpoint the central logical problem.

You said Einstein pinpointed it. And he did.
And the source says he did.

That's my little accomplishment. No one has noticed it before. I am sure that the reason is, almost everyone shares Einstein's constructivist mathematical orientation. Fine. Share it. But don't share it and then come back and say the relativity of simultaneity has logical content, because it doesn't. Either sign on to logical content or leave Einstein alone.

Einstein said it is not based on logic.
Is your birth certificate older than his?

I think that, unconsciously, scientists do NOT support constructivist mathematics. However, if you weren't able to locate the constructivist import into the relativity of simultaneity, what else could you say but that, for all you knew, it did have logical content.

You are now reading minds. Also illogical.

But it's all over now. The more you think about "natural" coincidence and the role it plays, the further you will distance yourself from past ideas and intellectual orientations. Let's fact it: Brouwer, Cantor, Godel and the rest of the gang notwithstanding, people were, sooner or later, going to get fed up with the complete nonsense which is constructivist mathematics, and start rooting it out of theory. "Outing" "natural" coincidence is a start. Hooray!!

Re: Problem with Einstein's Train Thought Experiment

<<Torsion balance, measuring acceleration of different masses towards the earth, sun and galactic center, using several different kinds of masses

difference is less than a few parts in a trillion
>>http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Equivalence_principle

O frabjous day! Callooh! Callay!
Let the "outing" begin.

Sue...– Hide quoted text –

– Show quoted text –

Wow! You REALLY are out of your mind. Suicide for you, dog.