

# Re: O'Barr: The end of SR!

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-06/msg01425.html>

---

- *From:* "Gerald L. O'Barr" <[globarr@xxxxxxxxx](mailto:globarr@xxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* 13 Jun 2005 10:37:26 -0700
- 

In <d8joi601dbi@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>  
Daryl McCullough <stevendaryl3...@xxxxxxxxx> wrote:  
>Gerald L. O'Barr (globarr) wrote:  
>> ...

<deletes>

O'Barr wrote:

>> ...  
>> So let us see you try! Let us see you show us  
>> and explain to us, in a direct physical way, this  
>> simple physical 4-D reality!

Daryl McCullough wrote:

>Mathematics is the most direct way of explaining  
>physical reality. If that isn't enough for you,  
>then too bad.

O'Barr (globarr) comments:

Math is very useful. But math is only a man made tool. Math by itself has no power at all to do anything.  
You seem to be a very slow learner, Daryl. Let us look at some science that is well known! Take Newton's law of gravity:  $F = G * M1 * M2 / r^2$ . This law is not perfectly correct, but it is adequate for most normal purposes. It is only math! Being only math, it cannot and it does not tell us one actual thing as to why or how gravity works. It is only a math theory. Newton's law of gravity is not a physical theory. Being only a math theory, then Newton's law of gravity is a weak theory, not having the power to explain or describe the cause or provide to us the why's or how's of nature in creating these gravity forces. Math is thus unable to do such things! All that math can do is to provide to us a calculated result, but with no physical understanding at all as to the science.  
Now let us take the kinetic theory of gases. This

theory begins with a physical assumption as to the science. And upon these physical assumptions, the math is then developed. In this theory, with a physical base, then understanding of the why's and how's is there, and when we use the math:  $PV = nRT$ , we know the why's and how's, we understand the meaning and nature of this physics, and the limitations and boundaries where it applies. As you can see, math is not enough. SR math is not enough to understand SR. SR is a weak theory and it is a failure in that it is not able to tell us what is actually occurring. We must have more. And LET gives us the more that is lacking in SR.

O'Barr wrote (about physical 4-D):

>> I do get carried away, don't I! But no science  
>>has yet shown that it is physically possible. The  
>>only thing that science supports is 3-D.

Daryl McCullough wrote:

>That's not true. The science supports the 4-D  
>picture of relativity.

O'Barr comments:

Science has never supported physical 4-D. Since all the math of SR is fully and completely supportable with the simplest of physical 3-D, then anyone who is thinking will stay with the simplest. Only fools would want to imagine something more complicated than what would be necessary. To imagine something more complicated than what was necessary would be unscientific. No one would do such a silly thing unless they were forced to do this. And there is so far not one single experiment that would force anyone to do such a stupid thing! So let us be scientific. Tell me, Daryl, the science that forces us to accept this physically impossible 4-D spacetime continuum! Tell us all! Tell us what this stupid step is all base upon! Thanks!

Daryl McCullough wrote:

>>>No, your retina is essentially a 2-D surface. What  
>>>you see is 2-D. That's what makes realistic  
>>>photographs possible. You (or your brain, I should  
>>>say) infer a third dimension by computing  
>>>differences between the left image and the right  
>>>image.

O'Barr wrote:

>> Well, you seem intent in pressing a point. . . .

Daryl McCullough wrote:

>Yes. The point is that 3-D is an inference made  
>from observations, it isn't something that we  
>know directly.

O'Barr comments:

You seemed to have deleted too much. After the 'inference' of hundreds of independent confirmations, it becomes something more than just an inference. And 3-D is now of this status, of being an accepted fact. Any thinking person knows this.

Daryl McCullough wrote:

[description of 3-D vision deleted]

O'Barr wrote:

>>And if this is inferring, then it is  
>>inferring, but it is 3-D that must be there even in  
>>order for the 'inferring' to be done.

Daryl McCullough wrote:

>I would say the same thing about 4-D. We  
>infer it.

O'Barr comments:

I know you say certain things about 4-D, and as I have been pointing out to you, you are wrong. There has never been one scientific test where 4-D is unambiguously shown. SR can not show that a 4-D interpretation is necessary. There has never been one single scientific experiment where 4-D is a required interpretation.

And let me tell you something. If it were true that you SR experts were honest enough to admit that you were just inferring it, this would be fine. Any person is free to infer anything they want. But you do not say that you are just inferring it. What do you say? This is what you say:

You say that 4-D is the way things are. You do not say that you just infer it. You therefore lie! You say that SR proves that there is 4-D. You relish in all this. You lie and you lie, and you lie until everyone believes you. And you talk as if the math is the physics. You are not scientific in any of this. You are all liars. You are forcing things to be the exact opposite of what they are, just because you want to believe what you want to believe. There is zero science to back your selves up, and these acts are going to end! They have ended. And you will be the laugh of the whole world because you were

fooled by such silly thinking.

Thanks for reading.

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

P.S. Let us be sure to understand what is going on. There used to be people who believed the world was flat. We do, at times, laugh at those who used to have such beliefs. But we know why people thought the earth was flat. We can, being human, excuse such beliefs. But in terms of SR, we now know that there was a specific effort made, by people who can now be identified, to force our belief in 4-D. This belief in 4-D was a planned effort. It was not a scientific effort. It was pure bull, done just because they had the power to do it. They will forever be held up to scorn, for such a misuse of public trust!

---

• **References:**

◆ ***O'Barr: The end of SR!***

◇ From: Gerald L. O'Barr

◆ ***Re: O'Barr: The end of SR!***

◇ From: Gerald L. O'Barr

◆ ***Re: O'Barr: The end of SR!***

◇ From: Daryl McCullough

- Prev by Date: ***Re: Uncertainty and Continuity?***
- Next by Date: ***Re: O'Barr: The end of SR!***
- Previous by thread: ***Re: O'Barr: The end of SR!***
- Next by thread: ***Re: O'Barr: The end of SR!***
- Index(es):
  - ◆ ***Date***
  - ◆ ***Thread***