

## Re: Comparisons between SR and LET.

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-05/msg00394.html>

---

- *From:* [dubious@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:dubious@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx) (Bilge)
  - *Date:* Fri, 06 May 2005 21:42:07 GMT
- 

Gerald L. O'Barr:

>In <slrnd7grpc.t2e.dubious@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

>Bilge <dubi...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

>> What's your point, o'barf?

>

>O'Barr comments:

> I made my point several times: I was not and I am

>not the one who said that the Dirac theory was based

>on SR. Therefore, if you want to know about the

>Dirac theory, then ask TC.

Then I take it your point was to evade the question.

>Bilge wrote:

>> I know you didn't.

>

>O'Barr comments:

> Good. Then ask TC. Don't ask me if you want to

>know something about the Dirac relationship!

I don't want to know about the dirac equation. I want to see you support your assertion about it being derivable from LET along with your interpretation of it.

>

>Bilge wrote:

>> If you had, I wouldn't have said anything. Since

>>you are too stupid to read what you've written, let

>>me repeat it for you, even though it's just above:

>>

>> ``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."

>

>O'Barr comments:

> And what I said here is of course obvious if these

>two theories are the identical theory.

Re: Comparisons between SR and LET.

Then, obviously the two theories aren't identical, since you apparently can't obtain the same results.

>They both end  
>up with the same math, the same math transforms, the  
>same math predictions, the same results! Thanks for

Apparently they don't, otherwise you could show that the two theories give the same result. The fact is, you have no idea what the math is, so your assertion that it's the same is nothing but hot air.

>repeating all this. If it gets said often enough,  
>then most will begin to see the true situation that  
>we face today! Thanks again, Bilge. Maybe you can  
>say it a third time! The third time is always the  
>charm time, isn't it?

>  
>Bilge wrote:  
>>And I said:  
>>  
>> If it's obvious, let's see you derive dirac theory  
>>using LET.  
>  
>O'Barr comments:  
> Using SR is using LET! All that LET does is to  
>show us how to get SR by using a physical base. QED.

>  
>  
>O'Barr wrote:  
>>>And I have no intentions of saying this. This is  
>>>TC's comment, and if you want to know how SR  
>>>supports Dirac's theory, ask him anything you want.

>  
>Bilge wrote:  
>> I already know how to use special relativity to  
>>get the dirac equation and I understand dirac's  
>>theory.

>  
>O'Barr comments:  
> Great! Then you know how LET does it also. As  
>was said, LET shows us how to get SR, and once you  
>have SR, then everything done with SR is due to LET!  
>I am sure glad you are getting this point down,  
>Bilge. We all need to hear it again and again!

>  
>  
>Bilge wrote:  
>>I asked \_you\_ to support \_your\_ assertion that you  
>>could ``obviously" derive it using LET. Do yourself

Re: Comparisons between SR and LET.

>>a favor. Find a retirement home and play bingo. Just  
>>don't talk too much, since you have a lot of  
>>difficulty following the logical structure of  
>>anything.

>

>O'Barr comments:

> I never said I could do anything in terms of  
>Dirac! What I said was that anyone who uses SR is  
>using LET. And if anything was done using SR, then  
>they did it by using LET. Surely you see the logic  
>of this. If LET derives for us the math of SR, if  
>LET even explains why the math forms are the same,  
>then that is sufficient for me or anyone else to say  
>what was said. You would have to be nuts if you are  
>not able to see and to understand these simple  
>relationships.  
> Bilge, I really do not know what your problem is?  
>Do you not understand how SR does something? Or is  
>it you do not understand how LET derives SR? Or do  
>you not understand what I said? Or do you not  
>understand what TC said? You really have a problem,  
>if you think there is a problem with me. I have said  
>nothing that is not obvious and agreed to by all!  
>Please re-read what has been done in these posts.

>

>Thanks!

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

>+ Remove 3 dote for e-mail.

>

.

---

• *Follow-Ups:*

- ◆ ***Re: Comparisons between SR and LET.***  
◇ *From:* Gerald L. O'Barr

• *References:*

- ◆ ***Re: Comparisons between SR and LET.***  
◇ *From:* Bilge
- ◆ ***Re: Comparisons between SR and LET.***  
◇ *From:* Gerald L. O'Barr
- ◆ ***Re: Comparisons between SR and LET.***  
◇ *From:* Bilge
- ◆ ***Re: Comparisons between SR and LET.***  
◇ *From:* Gerald L. O'Barr

- Prev by Date: ***Re: Bending of light not well authenticated***
- Next by Date: ***Re: Two photons... relative distance question***
- 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*