

## Re: Comparisons between SR and LET.

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-04/msg01598.html>

---

- *From:* "Gerald L. O'Barr" <[globarr@xxxxxxxx](mailto:globarr@xxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* 28 Apr 2005 14:41:17 -0700
- 

In <1114718858.774293.131400@xx>

TC <tcla...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

>Gerald L. O'Barr <[globarr...@xxxxxxxx](mailto:globarr...@xxxxxxxx)> wrote:

>> .... if SR

>> has found any support that indicates that it might  
>> be correct, then LET has that same support, to the  
>> exact same degree. . . .

TC <tcla...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

>This may have been true in 1905.

>

>The success of Dirac's relativistic theory of the  
>electron in predicting the existence of the positron  
>can be counted as support for SR.

>

>However, I know of no LET-based theory that explains  
>the positron so I don't see how the success of the  
>Dirac theory can be counted as support for LET.

Gerald L. O'Barr <[globarr...@xxxxxxxx](mailto:globarr...@xxxxxxxx)> comments:

Tom! Thanks for reading.

Very interesting that you use the words, 'can be counted as support for SR.' Does this mean that you do not have to use it for this support? And you did not show how LET could not be used. Wouldn't it be nice if you showed how SR was used, and then how LET could not be used? Or is this too hard to do?

What was really true in 1905 has to still be true today. What LET will do for a person is this. LET starts out on a deeper scientific level than SR. LET does not assume the facts that are assumed in SR. LET assumes that there is an ether, and with the ether, then the absolute speed of light is a given, not just an assumption. And LET assumes in this ether that lengths of rulers and rates of clocks are functions of their absolute velocities. And by using these more basic sets of assumptions, then the Lorentz transforms are derived.

## Re: Comparisons between SR and LET.

And once this is accomplished, then in LET, it can be shown that all measurements of the velocity of light will be a measured constant, even if you were in a frame moving in this ether. And so LET explains why in SR you can start out with this assumption that light has a constant measurement velocity of  $c$ . Do you not see all this? LET tells us why SR works! And because of the form of the math in the Lorentz transforms, then in any frame in the ether, the same math forms appear. And thus, LET also explains why in SR you are allowed to assume that the math forms must all be the same form. So you see, LET fully and completely explains SR. So if you think that SR does something, then since LET is what explains SR, t