

Re: Comparisons between SR and LET.

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-05/msg00062.html>

- *From:* dubious@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx (Bilge)
 - *Date:* 02 May 2005 09:58:52 GMT
-

Gerald L. O'Barr:

>In <1114741160.533796.144470@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
>TC <tcla...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

>TC wrote:

>>No. That is not what it means. It means the
>>situation is complicated. Dirac's theory depends on
>>SR but also includes more physics than is in SR,
>

>Gerald L. O'Barr <globarr...@xxxxxxxxxx>

> I am sure it is complicated if you cannot see how
>SR was necessary. And it also seems to be too
>complicated for you to see that since LET explains
>SR, then obviously anything that SR is able to do is
>able to be done by LET.

If it's obvious, let's see you derive dirac theory using LET.

>Let me repeat this! Any and
>everything done by SR is also able to be done by LET,
>or else these two theories are not equivalent.

They aren't equivalent. You're an idiot who needs to move into a rest home so you'll have some people to play bingo with, at least until they decide you're just a loudmouth crackpot.

• *Follow-Ups:*

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

◇ *From:* Gerald L. O'Barr

- Prev by Date: ***Re: Comparisons between SR and LET.***
- Next by Date: ***Re: How do you know that acceleration is absolute? <eom>***
- Previous by thread: ***Re: Comparisons between SR and LET.***
- Next by thread: ***Re: Comparisons between SR and LET.***

Re: Comparisons between SR and LET.

- Index(es):

- ◆ *Date*

- ◆ *Thread*