

## Re: Comparisons between SR and LET.

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-05/msg00436.html>

---

- *From:* "Gerald L. O'Barr" <[globarr@xxxxxxxx](mailto:globarr@xxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* 6 May 2005 22:43:28 -0700
- 

In <slrnd7nruq.5c.dubious@xx>

Bilge <dubi...@xx> wrote:

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

>> ...

Bilge wrote:

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

>

O'Barr wrote:

>> 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.

Bilge wrote:

> Then I take it your point was to evade the

> question.

O'Barr comments:

Take it any way you want. I did not bring up

Dirac. I did not say or base anything upon Dirac.

If someone said that SR was used to bake a cake, I would have said, then LET could be used to also bake a cake. It does not mean anything more than this.

SR and LET are the exact same theory, as far as the math goes. And anything done by one can be done by the other. This is why you have a scientific problem, and this is why you are a liar. You refuse to see that LET is the correct physical base to SR, and this is why they therefore have the same math, and this is also why what I say is correct.

>Bilge wrote (about me not saying anything about Dirac):

>>> I know you didn't.

>

O'Barr wrote:

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

>>know something about the Dirac relationship!

Re: Comparisons between SR and LET.

Bilge wrote:

> I don't want to know about the dirac equation.

O'Barr comments:

Then stop asking about it!

Bilge wrote:

> I want to see you support your assertion about it  
> being derivable from LET along with your  
> interpretation of it.

O'Barr comments:

As has been said from the beginning, I have never said that I had an interpretation of Dirac. My point was a very simple point: if SR supports Dirac equations, then so does LET. You cannot prevent this from being true. I am sorry for you that you seem to believe otherwise. But if you want to take it further than this, then please do. But you do not need me to do this. Help yourself as much as you want. This is free America. Do your own thing. But do not expect me to take a position that has nothing to do with what I said. I have no interest in Dirac. Perhaps you would like to consider precessions? This is a relativistic effect? Or how about a million other things? But none of these things are necessary for us to consider in order to know that LET is the physical base to SR math!

<deletes by O'Barr>

O'Barr wrote:

>> And what I said here is of course obvious if  
>>these two theories are the identical theory.

Bilge wrote:

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

O'Barr comments:

It does not matter what I can't do, Bilge! You are being totally unscientific. You seem to have the attitude that these are two different theories, and each have to follow a different process to establish each prediction of reality. Therefore, to you, if one theory does something, you have no assurance that the other can do it until it is done. But this is not what is being said. These two theories are now said to be the identical theory. If one does anything, then so can the other. Thus, if you say that they cannot both do the same, when they are the

## Re: Comparisons between SR and LET.

same, then the burden is on you, not me, to show that they cannot do the same.

It is impossible for two theories to have the same math, the same predictions, and not have the same results, or predictions. Therefore, you are insisting on something that makes no sense.

These two theories are the same theory as now accepted by a large number of people. It is really obvious, since these two theories have the exact same math, the same math transforms, the same predictions. There has never been, in these last 100 years, any test that has been able to distinguish between them. And yet you want to use me as the reason to make a decision. Well, I do not think I qualify, and you are only looking for an excuse.

If you really believe that the Dirac approach can show a experimental difference, be my guest. You would go down in history! You are going down in history one way or another, either as being too dumb to understand LET, or either proving it to be different from SR. Take your pick. You know what I think is going to happen!

O'Barr wrote:

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

Bilge wrote:

> 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.

O'Barr comments:

My only 'assertion' was that if SR were the base to Dirac's equations, then so could LET be considered to be the base. I in no way suggested that SR was the base, or that I or anyone else could show any of this. Therefore, you are a liar, just as you have shown yourself to be in every post you have been making. By the way, the Dirac approach is not the only approach. And you seem to want to make inferences that might be hard to make, if you really want to get serious.

In the at theory, the spin of a particle (such as an electron) is a very complicated and involved accomplishment that requires a balance between translational forces and drag forces. None of these relationships have yet been presented. Therefore, I

Re: Comparisons between SR and LET.

find it a waste of time to discuss Dirac's equations for these obvious reasons. And there is no reason for me to do so. You will just have to wait, or do it yourself.

O'Barr wrote:

>> Thanks for  
>>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:

>>> 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.

<deletes by O'Barr>

O'Barr wrote:

>> . . . 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!

>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. . . .

Re: Comparisons between SR and LET.

Thanks!

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

+ Remove 3 dots for e-mail.

---

• *Follow-Ups:*

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

◇ *From:* Bilge

• *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

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

◇ *From:* Bilge

• Prev by Date: ***Re: O'Barr comments (globarr):***

• Next by Date: ***Re: Bending of light not well authenticated***

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

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

• Index(es):

◆ ***Date***

◆ ***Thread***