

Re: O'Barr: Modifications of SR have begun.

## Re: O'Barr: Modifications of SR have begun.

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2007-06/msg01443.html>

---

- *From:* "Gerald L. O'Barr" <[globarr@xxxxxxxx](mailto:globarr@xxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Mon, 11 Jun 2007 07:09:17 -0700
- 

Subject: Re: O'Barr: Modifications of SR have begun.

Ref:

<1181472860.199178.248000@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

<1181354092.012640.50260@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

<1181389260.154530.287290@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

<1181425458.365805.172760@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

PD <[TheDraperFam...@xxxxxxxx](mailto:TheDraperFam...@xxxxxxxx)> wrote:

Gerald L. O'Barr" <[globarr...@xxxxxxxx](mailto:globarr...@xxxxxxxx)> wrote:

Subject: Re: O'Barr: Modifications of SR have begun.

O'Barr comments:

What a perfect post you wrote. Thank you!

It was way too long. So I am breaking your post into part A and part B.

Part B:

Let me begin by restating some of my thoughts:

- 1) SR is the correct math for our reality!
- 2) LET is the correct physics for our reality.
- 3) With the acknowledgement of 1) and 2), then we must accept these two theories as being the same theory. And everything good about SR math is due to LET. Everything that is correct about SR math is due to LET. And if you ever find me making any remarks that could be considered to be against SR math, please correct me. Since SR math comes from LET, then there cannot be anything wrong with SR math unless there is also something wrong with LET. And there cannot be anything good about SR math, unless there is the same good in LET.

These above comments should be read both before and after I make any response to your post.

Re: O'Barr: Modifications of SR have begun.

Re: O'Barr: Modifications of SR have begun.

PD <TheDraperFam...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

2. What is MEASURED to be true in nature is obviously physically possible.

O'Barr wrote:

Not since the MMX experiment!

PD <TheDraperFam...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

That is incorrect. You are taking the perspective that, since the MMX, science has abandoned the reliability of measurements and has instead relied on the logic of the mind to be able to determine reality. There could be nothing further from the truth.

O'Barr comments:

It depends on the theory you are using. In LET, it says that there is an absolute frame in which all clocks and rulers are perfect, and thus their measurements are perfect. And thus, these measurements can be fully and completely trusted. But in all frames that have motions in the ether, their rulers and clocks are not perfect, and thus we end up with this SR type of reality.

SR assumes that all SR measurements are direct reflections of reality. But LET, of course, knows that these SR measurements are not telling us the full and complete story about our reality.

O'Barr wrote:

Once we observe that our tools are changeable tools, the rulers can change their lengths, and clocks can change their rates, then you would have to be stupid to think that what we measure can be directly trusted. No thinking individual would dare say what you have just said. And this is where SR experts are the most stupid. They often say and think that their measurements are what is. But we now know that this is not possible!

Re: O'Barr: Modifications of SR have begun.

Re: O'Barr: Modifications of SR have begun.

When you have changeable tools, then you cannot be sure of getting correct answers. You would have to be insane to think like these SR experts.

PD <TheDraperFam...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Thus, by measuring it to be the case, we have allowed nature to demonstrate what is impossible and what is not.

O'Barr wrote:

You are funny. No! With changeable tools, what is measured is no longer what is real. Nature, as determined by changeable tools, cannot really be our reality.

PD <TheDraperFam...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

And if there is no way to determine reality except through checking with measurement, where does that leave you?

O'Barr comments:

Do not play games. In LET measurements are an absolute necessity. But they are not king. The king is man, and his intellect. We know what is going on, and we know how to properly interpret what is measured. If man is not able to properly interpret his measurements, then these measurements are useless. No measurement can have any meaning exact as man learns to properly consider them.

O'Barr wrote:

Any and every thinking individual now knows this. Where have you been?

PD <TheDraperFam...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

We do not get to decide that for nature.

O'Barr comments:

Re: O'Barr: Modifications of SR have begun.

Re: O'Barr: Modifications of SR have begun.

Absolutely correct! Nature is nature, and does what nature requires. But we are scientists, and we have a brain, and we have the ability to figure out what nature is doing. And we have figured it out. And we now know exactly how nature is acting, in order for us to measure what is measured.

O'Barr added comments:

In no way do I wish to infer that we are able to figure out everything. But nothing should prevent us from understanding at least the basic nature of our reality so that we can be at ease with what is seen.

PD <TheDraperFam...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

What you may be confused about is how it is \*algebraically\* possible that this happens.

O'Barr comments:

I am sorry. LET is algebraically perfect. There are no math mistakes in LET!

PD <TheDraperFam...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

I wasn't talking about LET. I'm talking about the "vector addition" you refer to below.

PD <TheDraperFam...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

You have it in your head that if some object (a photon or not) is moving at some speed  $v$  relative to some inertial reference frame, and that if another reference frame is moving at speed  $u$  along the same axis relative to the first frame, then the speed of the object relative to the second reference frame MUST be  $(v \pm u)$ .

O'Barr comments:

Re: O'Barr: Modifications of SR have begun.

Re: O'Barr: Modifications of SR have begun.

Well, let me tell you what I believe. If all your observations are in the same frame, using the same tools, velocities all add up in a vector fashion. Do you disagree with this?

PD <TheDraperFam...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Yes, I do. It is counter to experiment. We have long believed that velocities simply add like vectors. We have believed this because, for nearly everything we applied it to for hundreds of years, it seemed to work. However, it is WRONG. Velocities do not add like vectors. The prescription to add them like vectors is an excellent \*approximation\* as long as the vectors are small compared to the maximal velocity,  $c$ . But it is an approximation only.

O'Barr comments:

O.K. Just so we understand each other a little better, let us take Einstein's train example. This train, in the frame of the track, is going at a velocity of  $v$ . Light in the frame of the train, going in the same direction as the train, is going past the train at a velocity of  $c-v$ , according to those in the frame of the track. Are you saying that this velocity of light relative to the train, as measured in the frame of the track, is not exactly  $c-v$ ? If it is not exactly  $c-v$ , please tell me the exact velocity. Thanks!

PD <TheDraperFam...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

What is foolish is to insist that velocities MUST be vectors because the mind feels comfortable treating them as vectors. This is precisely the kind of thing where the mind is happy to lie and deceive, and where without reference to measurement, you are no longer doing science but religion.

O'Barr comments:

In LET, in the rest frame of the ether, where every ruler is exactly correct in length, and every clock runs at the exact correct rate, and a true absolute sync is able to be obtained, all absolute velocities in this frame add up perfectly in simple vector form. And with such a perfect way, there are

Re: O'Barr: Modifications of SR have begun.

Re: O'Barr: Modifications of SR have begun.

never, in this frame, which is the physical frame for all objects, even moving objects, there are never any breaks in symmetry, or jumps in times, or any of the things that are found in SR measurements (because the physical frame is never exchanged for any other physical frame.) And there is no religion needed to understand and to appreciate all of this.

<deletes by O'Barr>

PD <TheDraperFam...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Well as for this, it seems to me a rather stupid thing to question why the laws of physics should be simple. You on the other hand, in order to preserve the vector addition of velocities, want to say that as a result the math forms of the laws of physics should be complicated, and that the speed of light is different in all frames, and that IN ADDITION there is an artifice, an effect on measurement, to give the APPEARANCE that the speed of light is the same in all frames and that the laws of physics are the same in all frames. Think about this: In order to protect the vector nature of velocity, you are willing to say that the laws of physics are IN REALITY complicated and frame-dependent, but that there is an EXTRA effect on measurements that not only completely masks that complex reality, but does it in EXACTLY the way necessary to make the laws of physics appear simple.

O'Barr comments:

What a mouth full. I am glad that you let it all come out.

Let me say it just a little bit more correctly:  
(I am only going to present the simple kinematics)

In terms of the physics, you have an ether. This ether forms for us an absolute reference frame. In this frame, all photons move at  $c$ . In this frame, the rates of clocks and the lengths of rulers (in their direction of motions) follow these SR relationships, where  $v$  is the absolute velocity in the ether's rest frame:

- 1)  $t_v = t_o (1 - (v/c)^2)^{.5}$
- 2)  $L_v = L_o (1 - (v/c)^2)^{.5}$

This is the full physical set of laws that are used in the ether. No one should call any of this

Re: O'Barr: Modifications of SR have begun.

Re: O'Barr: Modifications of SR have begun.

complicated or a problem in any way. All these relationships are actually very normal for what we now know.

What might become complicated are the measurements made when we observe that the tools (the clocks and rulers) also follow these same laws. And thus, all measurements become affected by not only the real changes going on with the objects being measured, but also by the changes in the tools doing the measurements. All these things are complicated when you do a full analysis of what is going on. But after it is all over with, you find that the final results end up being the simple relationships seen in SR. So in the end, it really does end up being very simple, but to explain it, it really gets messy. So the complications are not in the physics. The physics is simpler than it is in SR. But the explanations can become a nightmare. But it is a nightmare only to our minds, it is never a problem physically. Please do not make more out of this that you should.

What you said above is not fair, it is not very correct, and you ought to reconsider how you should say it. If you take the simple physics, as presented above, you will get SR math. No one could ask for more simplicity than this.

Thanks for reading.

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