

# O'Barr's comments on SR and LET.

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2007-06/msg00705.html>

---

- *From:* "Gerald L. O'Barr" <[globarr@xxxxxxxxx](mailto:globarr@xxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Tue, 05 Jun 2007 08:08:59 -0700
- 

O'Barr's comments on SR and LET.

This is an important post. For some days now, I have posted several articles on SR and LET. Let me put some of these thoughts into one post.

We, as scientists, really do have a serious problem in terms of SR and LET. They are always presented as being two different theories, even being complete opposites of each other. SR is usually presented as a theory that says there is no absolute frame (at least it is said, that an absolute frame is not necessary), and LET is presented as an absolute reference frame theory, actually being derived by assuming and using such a frame.

However, they really do make the same math predictions. This has been explained that this is due to the fact that they both use the same math. They both use Lorentz transforms. And for this reason, a scientific choice becomes difficult. We cannot, it seems, as yet, find a simple test that can scientifically decide for us which one is correct. My solution is simple: they are both correct. And my solution works. What might indicate the correctness of my decision? Let us just look at a few facts.

My solution explains why we cannot find a test to distinguish between these two theories. If SR really is the correct math, and LET is the correct physics upon which the math is correctly based, then it would be impossible to find any test that could show them to be different theories. This is an important accomplishment of this approach.

SR says (in free space) that the speed of light is a constant  $c$  in all inertial frames. LET says that the actual speed of light is  $c$  only in the rest frame of the ether. So let us see how these two theories can be united in this area. Yes, in LET, the actual

speed of light is  $c$  only in the ether frame. And in all other frames, it is not  $c$ . But, in LET, it is shown that when any inertial frame use their rulers, which have been properly shortened, and their clocks which have the proper slower rates, and they do an SR synch, LET shows that the speed of light in that frame will be measured to be  $c$ .

Therefore, what SR says, and finds to be true, can be explained by LET. And since LET is the more basic theory, we see that LET has the power to explain SR, but SR, just being math, has no power to explain LET. Again, we see that this statement that LET is the correct physics, and SR is the correct math, makes perfect sense. And it is specifically confirmed by these simple facts.

Let us look at some more facts. LET says that the speed of light is only  $c$  in the rest frame of the ether. But of course we do not know where this frame is, and we have no reason to expect any one frame to be at rest in the ether. In the world as we know it, almost all objects are in motion in one way or another. Whether we are in our own solar system, or in a galaxy, all objects appear to not only be in motion, but to be constantly changing their motions. Therefore, even if a frame were at rest with the ether, it sure would be for only an instant, and then it would almost instantly lose its state of rest. So in LET, one could well say that if we were able to make a true velocity of light measurement, it would seldom if ever be exactly  $c$ .

Now LET knows that SR frames that are not at rest in the ether do not make true velocity measurements. But LET does know that the measurements that are made are often close to being correct. And LET knows that SR frames will be able to tell (measure) that light is not going at  $c$  in other frames around them. So when we look at what SR frames do measure for the speed of light, relative to any frame outside its own frame, sure enough, we see that SR frames confirm what LET knows to be correct.

In fact, anyone who says that SR requires the speed of light to be  $c$  in all reference frames is not telling the complete story. If any unbiased analysis were made of SR data, taking all SR data that can theoretically exist, and use such data to make a decision as to what the actual speed of light might be in any one frame, the decision might not be exactly known, but one conclusion has to be for sure, the actually velocity was not  $c$ .

The preponderance of the decisions, the vast majority of the SR measurement data, from all the

O'Barr's comments on SR and LET.

frames that exist, shows that the actual velocity of light in any one frame is not  $c$ . And all those frames that show that it is not  $c$  also shows us why it is measured to be  $c$  in the frame where it is measured to be  $c$ , because the clocks and rulers were not correct. And all this is exactly what LET also says. Again, LET is confirmed to be correct, especially by SR math. LET is able to explain what is measured in SR. SR is not even able to explain itself.

I know that the facts are endless in support of LET. All presently known facts show that LET is able to explain SR, and SR is not able to explain LET. And we, as scientists, cannot ignore these relationships. I have personally witness the fact that on this net, the ignoring of these facts is common. This does not speak well of anyone on this net. I suggest that those on this net begin to make a sincere effort to reconsider their position. To actually ignore these facts is not being scientific. To refuse to acknowledge them is actually an unscientific act, and this cannot be tolerated.

Please, let us all respond in a civil manner. And let us be more scientific, and at least acknowledge the facts as they really are, and not as we are use to saying them.

Thanks for reading.

Gerald L. O'Barr <globarr...@xxxxxxxxxx>  
\*\*\*\*\*Remove ... for e-mail.

P.S. I know that most on this net could, if they wanted to do it, rewrite what I have said above in a more acceptable way. Please feel free to do so. There is no one being excluded in this effort. And we should all make sure that the best way of saying these things are achieved.