

## Re: How many dimensions are there?

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2007-11/msg01070.html>

---

- *From:* "paparios@xxxxxxxx" <paparios@xxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Thu, 15 Nov 2007 17:55:21 -0800 (PST)
- 

Well Mr. O'Barr, I'm sorry your are so confused about how these things in science are done.

Also, when you are so easy in despise SR in favor of LET, when both theories are just models that try to model the way nature works, and while, of course, during over 100 years SR has been successful in been accepted by the scientific community as a better model than LET, that is very peculiar since you, in addition, are saying that those scientists are not only wrong (without any proof) but guilty of lying to the world?

On 15 nov, 20:41, "Gerald L. O'Barr" <glob...@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

Subject: Re: How many dimensions are there?

papar...@xxxxxxxx <papar...@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

You say that while SR, GR and LET have the correct math, only LET has the correct physics....  
How can it be? How can SR math "be correct" AND besides that "be the correct math for our reality", but not represent the correct physics of our reality?  
Again you are confusing models of nature with nature. Neither SR, GR OR LET are nature...they are models that try to adjust to observations of how nature works.

Now models can be as abstracts as one wishes them to be. It is just a matter of convenience in the task of getting useful results.

O'Barr comments:

These differences between just a math theory, and in a theory based upon a physical base, is important. They are important in order to have within the theory a high degree of causes and effects. With power to

Re: How many dimensions are there?

control the meaning of the math, with limits to the math, the limits that are important and necessary. LET does all this with the math of SR. It gives limits to the math of SR, the correct limits. It gives definition to the math. It makes SR correct, and understandable, and meaningful. And thus, LET is superior to SR, specifically because of its physical base.

Nothing of what you say here is a proof of anything. Have you studied in deep LET and SR theories to be so conclusive in expressing LET superiority?

papar...@xxxxxxxx <papar...@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

For instance, if you measure with an oscilloscope the voltage at your home you will see a signal  $x(t) = A \cos(\omega t)$ . We can agree that what we see at the screen is a representation of reality that is close at what we would see if we could, somehow, test with our body senses the same voltage (without being hurt). Ok, according to you anything that goes far from this  $x(t) = A \cos(\omega t)$ , is no longer representing the physics of the voltage. So, mathematical representations of  $x(t) = A \cos(\omega t)$  like the analytic signal, complex envelope or Hilbert transform to you are correct math but no correct physics...and so they are not science.

Amazing

O'Barr comments:

In your math model, where the electrical potential is shown to be a smooth cosine function, that is a lie. If you had the power to measure with sufficient response times, etc, you would see the potential function bouncing around with each passing electron,

Re: How many dimensions are there?

Re: How many dimensions are there?

etc. It might average out to be a nice cosine wave, but it would not be the math that you gave that would explain the actual science. It is the physical model that can do these kinds of things.

And I do not have to tell you or anyone else any of these things. Only a fool would not understand the differences between a physical model and a math model. And you better repent. No one is saying that either model has to be perfect. But any fool knows which model is the most perfect, and presents the better science.

\*\*\*\*\*

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

Well, obviously you know nothing about electrical engineering, and all the electrical mathematical models that allowed the developing of the technologies, those that give you the possibility of participate in this forum with all your nonsense.

The only thing I want to enfasize is the fact that, in electrical engineering, mathematical models work and they represent reality with a high degree of accuracy, even if they include complex numbers, multiple dimensions and random processes and, in general, very high level math.

Subject: Re: How many dimensions are there?

...

... since SR is GR, and GR is SR, in the domain where SR applies, and mathematically, LET is SR in this domain, then yes, both SR and GR have to be as perfect as LET in this domain. They all have the same math.

In their proper domain, SR is the correct math for our reality, and LET is the correct physics that goes with the correct math. We should all be able to properly appreciate all this, whether we are talking about GR, or SR, or LET.

But physics cannot be just 'interpretation,' no matter how 'daunting' it might be, or how 'glorious,' or how 'divine.' Physics requires testing, testing that can be definitive. And no such testing is available when it comes to your multiple

Re: How many dimensions are there?

dimensions.

Yes, any theory can propose any number of dimensions

that you might care to consider, but you better not call it science until you have test results to support it. To say that SR has shown that 4-D exists is not science, and those who try to infer such junk should be disbarred from all scientific positions.

....

Thanks for reading.

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

It is you who should study your own qualifications, and verify if those qualifications allow you to lower and despise the whole scientific community without any proof. May be you should be the disbarred person instead.

Miguel Rios

.