

# How scientific are SR experts?

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2007-05/msg04371.html>

---

- *From:* "Gerald L. O'Barr" <[globarr@xxxxxxxxx](mailto:globarr@xxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* 26 May 2007 09:36:09 -0700
- 

O'Barr comments: How scientific are SR experts?

Let us be just as scientific as possible.

The state of our science is this:

(The following comments assume that we are using the required LET or SR measurement format, which consists of simple rulers and synced clocks placed in simple free space, space that is totally unaffected by these clocks and rulers and their motions.)

1) We find that the measurements we make of our reality are physically impossible. We find that the velocity of light that we obtain remains a constant no matter how fast of an inertial frame we might enter.

This certainly is not physically possible. It violates all concepts of causes and effects. Anyone who places themselves into a fast moving frame has to expend a great deal of energy into the motions they need to enter that frame. And then after doing this, after spending all this energy into entering into these fast moving frames, they find no change (they find zero change) in their motions compared to the same photon, and this is truly unscientific. Cause and effects have been totally lost. Everything about it is just scientifically wrong.

2) We find that the rates of clocks that we measure change with their velocities. And they change even though we do not see anything that is directly affecting them.

We do see and we do experience all these things.

3) We at present are told that we have only one formally accepted explanation for all these things: There is a 4-D spacetime continuum that makes all this happen. Not only are we told that we have only

## How scientific are SR experts?

one explanation, any other explanations that might be mentioned are specifically shunned and are never presented in a positive manner.

I hope that with these statements, everyone on this net can agree. I have tried to be just as fair and honest as I can be up to here. But now let me continue:

4) To the best of my knowledge, the concept of a 4-D spacetime continuum is not based upon anything physical. There is no physical test that shows such a thing independently exists. It is only a math construct that properly relates the space and time variables that are involved. All these variables can be related to each other in several other formats, but they are certainly relatable to each other in this specific math construct. So this 4-D format is accepted because, why? Because it works! And because it shows the correct relationships between these variables of space and time, it then becomes the cause of the physics for this science.

Now let us look as honest as we can at these points. Certainly this 4-D math construct does work and it works perfectly. But if it is acceptable simply because it works, please note the following: All the other ways also work. If any other way works, then it has to be accepted as the cause just as much as any other way, if that is the base for your act.

Also, anyone who knows math, knows that as you include higher and higher dimensions to your math, then more and more things can be explained or related. Why shouldn't 4-D math be able to handle a simple set of space and time variables? How could that be so surprising? Shouldn't that happen whether or not there was anything real involved?

Well, let me tell you, to have a science such as SR, that relies totally upon a math construct to be the cause of our reality, and specifically shuns all other approaches, is the most sick thing I have ever seen.

There is absolutely no direct evidence for one single thing that is assumed in SR. In fact, you will never have one single evidence for it, because it is physically impossible for there to be a 4-D. Back in the 1960's, a group of professors, at a large conference, got together, and decided to do a

## How scientific are SR experts?

test. They knew that people in general did not and would not accept anything like a 4-D reality. They thought that a test would be interesting. What if they taught everyone as if it were true, right from the start. Would they then believe it?

So among themselves, they decided to see if people could be made to believe such a thing. And guess what, some of you have been made to believe. I feel sorry for you all. It is a shame that the human mind can do these things, but it seems as if people have always been able to be made to believe wrong things.

Let me tell you that we do face a problem. To see or measure what we see and measure is a problem. What we see is not possible. So what should intelligent people do about such a problem? Let me tell you what we do not do. When we find something that is impossible, we do not take something that is impossible to explain it. What do we do? We take real objects, and what real objects can do, and only what real objects can do, and see if any of this can explain it. That is what you do. And this is what Lorentz did. He took real objects, and what real objects could do, to see if there were a way in which what occurs could be explained.

This is what science is all about. And anyone who does not do it right, then the only way you can defend your way is to resist all others who might be doing it in a more correct way. And that is what is being done right here on this net.

You people are all sick. You are not scientific. If you were scientific, you would have (you would demand) that the very best alternant approaches were clearly and correct presented and understood. You would insist that the best alternant would be presented just as positive as possible. You would make sure that the weaknesses of the presently accepted approach were carefully and fully presented. But you make no effort to do any of these things. They actually seem to be unthinkable for you to do these things.

Never have I been more ashamed. How can you ignore the weaknesses of SR? There is nothing wrong with tooting the strengths of SR. That is scientific. But to admit that there are other approaches that also are just as perfect in their predictions is a scientific requirement. To understand that there are no tests in evidence that presently invalidates certain other approaches is a scientific requirement. To explain that math is not

## How scientific are SR experts?

physical is a requirement.

If people cannot physically construct an ether, certainly that is a weakness for LET. But cannot someone also point out that the inability to also physically construct this 4-D spacetime continuum might also be a weakness for SR? And which one of these two acts might be the most possible, or the most realistic? These kinds of questions and presentations are what are really needed if we are to be scientific. And on this net, I do not see such things being done by those who support SR.

And who is going to start to change some of these things? Who is going to do these good things? Who is going to really be scientific?

Thanks for reading.

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

Remove ... for e-mail.

.