

Re: Comparisons between SR and LET.

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-04/msg01652.html>

- *From:* dubious@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx (Bilge)
 - *Date:* Fri, 29 Apr 2005 19:40:47 GMT
-

Harry:

>
>"Llanlan Klazmon" <Klazmon@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
>news:Xns964792E00D882Klazmonllurdiaorbgo@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
>> "Gerald L. O'Barr" <globarr@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in
>> news:1114650102.388185.269750@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx:
>>
>>> Comparisons between SR and LET.
>>>
>>>
>>> Statement now accepted by SR experts:
>>> SR and LET are scientifically equivalent theories.
>>>
>>
>> Which one has the least assumptions?
>>
>> Klazmon.
>
>That depends how you count it: as long as it's understood that SRT as used
>by O'Barr doesn't contain the assumption that space-time exists, SRT has
>less assumptions than SRT-Lorentz ("LET"), by the simple fact that "LET"
>adds an explanation to SRT.

By comparison, if you include your silly notion that the assumption that ``spacetime exists" should count as a postulate, you have to replace it by three silly postulates for LET: (1) space exists, (2) time exists, (3) a postulate that explains why the two should be related.

>Note that some geometers claim that Spacetime exists (for which extension we
>might use the label "SSR"), and that form of SRT has therefore the same
>number of assumptions as "LET".

You are a complete buffoon.

.

Re: Comparisons between SR and LET.

- **References:**

- ◆ **Comparisons between SR and LET.**

- ◇ From: Gerald L. O'Barr

- ◆ **Re: Comparisons between SR and LET.**

- ◇ From: Llanzlan Klazmon

- ◆ **Re: Comparisons between SR and LET.**

- ◇ From: Harry

- Prev by Date: **Re: Postulates of Relativity and The Cosmic Background – Question**

- Next by Date: **Re: Theory of Relativity**

- Previous by thread: **Re: Comparisons between SR and LET.**

- Next by thread: **Re: Comparisons between SR and LET.**

- Index(es):

- ◆ **Date**

- ◆ **Thread**