

# Re: How many dimensions are there?

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2007-11/msg01101.html>

---

- *From:* "Gerald L. O'Barr" <globarr@xxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Fri, 16 Nov 2007 11:26:40 -0800 (PST)
- 

Subject: Re: How many dimensions are there?

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

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

....

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

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?

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

Please do not misunderstand me. SR math is one of the greatest math theories that have ever existed. I do not know of any math theory that has been so accurate and covers such a large range as is covered by SR. And there are tons of books in every library that provides data to support these points. There are no lies being said when people talk this way about SR. But as soon as any scientist begins to say that SR proves that there physically is a 4-D spacetime continuum, and it is because of this 4-D reality, man becomes unable to understand things that happens in our reality, and that we begin to have back in time, and other such things, then the lies really do begin.

## Re: How many dimensions are there?

These are scientific lies, these are not personal lies. Most of the people saying these lies are not physicists. They are merely repeating what they have been taught. But it is wrong. And it is going to end. And you, if you are smart, you will also understand what is really going on.

Be sure to understand, that Einstein did not derive SR by using any 4-D. Einstein did not need 4-D to derive it! And neither do we! And before we accept 4-D, there ought to be some kind of a science to this act. And there is no science to this act.

It was done only as a mathematical act, not by science. And it is junk. It is pure junk. And any thinking person can see that it is pure junk. And we are going to end this unscientific junk. It can no longer be allowed.

In simple LET, where everything done and predicted in SR is also done, there is nothing that is hard to understand. There are never any real jumps in times, or back in times, or breaks in symmetries, or any of the mysteries that are presented in SR. None! And LET is understandable on the physical level. While SR cannot even tell us what really happens, only what will be measured to have happened. SR is sick. But LET is superior in terms of its explanation powers. It has causes and effects. SR has none! In all ways, LET is superior!

Miguel Rios <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?

O'Barr comments:

Since SR is only math, it has no physical base to represent the correct physics. Why even when a change in physical length occurs, you don't accept it. In SR you do not really know that a change in length is even possible. To you, it is just a change in perspective. To you, there are never any real changes. You are a fool to accept a theory where you do not even know what is physically happening. All you know in SR is what is going to be measured to have happened, you do not know what actually happened in order for you to get what you

Re: How many dimensions are there?

Re: How many dimensions are there?

measure.

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

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.

O'Barr comments:

We know that math models are never a model of nature. But physical models might be very close to being a model of our nature. We are smart enough to know the value of a good physical model, versus a model that is only math. We know, for one good example, that Newton's model of gravity cannot possibly be the real model, but LeSages approach could have been, if we could only find a way to make it work. It is obvious that some models are better than other models, and I am not talking about how accurate they might be.

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

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 wrote:

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 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.

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

Re: How many dimensions are there?

Re: How many dimensions are there?

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?

O'Barr comments:

I am sorry, Miguel. It does not matter what I know, or what I do not know. What matters is, what do you know? So you tell me, what is it specifically that you do not understand?

Do you not understand the difference between math and physics? Do you not understand LET? Do you not understand that Einstein, in 1905, did not use 4-D?

Do you not understand how SR and LET makes the exact same predictions? Do you not understand anything?

What I am saying is not really new. It is not really difficult. It is simple and straight forward.

There are no physical tests to confirm the presence of 4-D in a physical sense. Therefore, there is no present-day science for 4-D. It is only a math aid, a math aid that works, but it has no substance to it in terms of our actual reality. And I do not need proof of this. It is you who have to have proof (or good strong evidence) if you are going to say that our reality is a 4-D reality. If this is what you are believing, then it is you that needs the proof, not me.

And since there is no such thing as a real 4-D, then you do not have any evidence at all, and you never will have any evidence. That is the way of science, and I know and I do understand science.

<deletes by O'Barr>

O'Barr wrote:

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, 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

Re: How many dimensions are there?

Re: How many dimensions are there?

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.

Miguel Rios <papar...@xxxxxxxxxx> 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.

O'Barr comments:

Look, Miguel, my million dollar education certainly included the science of electrical engineering. I bet you yourself do not know if the generator that provides your home with electricity is either a delta or a "Y" generator? What country do you live in? But you see, we are not talking about what I knew. I am the least on this net, and no one should care about what I know. What do we know, as a science, about our reality? We have no evidence that our reality is 4-D. That is a fact that can no longer be hidden. And we are going to do something about it. Not because I know anything. We are going to do something about it because that is what the science demands that we do, and it demands that it should be done now.

O'Barr wrote:

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

Re: How many dimensions are there?

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  
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.

....

<many deletes by O'Barr>

Thanks for reading.  
Gerald L. O'Barr <globarr...@xxxxxxxxxx>

.