

Re: Ultimate Reality is both simple and complicated!

Re: Ultimate Reality is both simple and complicated!

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2008-06/msg00478.html>

- *From:* "harry" <harald.vanlintelButNotThis@xxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 11 Jun 2008 15:18:58 +0200
-

"Gerald L. O'Barr" <globarr@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:927c5b86-c7cc-4fcd-a567-81fa47bc014f@xx

The Vision of our reality!

Preliminary introductions:

Is there anyone who would like to understand our reality? Of course, any physicist would love to understand the base to our reality. And right here, in this very article, you are going to have the base to our reality presented to you. Will anyone believe it? No one has yet!

But this is a good question. Why am I not believed? I have a past history that should allow you to believe what I say.

That depends on what you say ;-)

I am even a West Point graduate. Why would anyone think that I would not want to know the truth and tell the truth? I have a Master's degree in Physics, and a minor in Math. I might not know everything, but at least I do understand the basics. And all the things I present here have been verified by computer calculations using the math equations that come from the assumptions being used in this article.

I was a physicist for General Dynamics for 29 years. Should I say I have never made a mistake in physics for all these 29 years? Well, in full honesty, I cannot say that. There was one time when I held up a test for several hours because we were receiving some unexpected data. I assumed that this unexpected data was due to an error in the test equipment, and I would not allow the tests to

Re: Ultimate Reality is both simple and complicated!

Re: Ultimate Reality is both simple and complicated!

continue until these errors were corrected. But the error was actually due to improper test conditions, and when the proper test conditions were achieved, everything was perfect.

So it was my error in attributing the incorrect data to a failure in the test equipment, and not to the test conditions. And it took me a few hours before I came to realize this error. So I have at least made one mistake in my life.

But you better also believe that I was most often correct. Not only correct, but I have 5 patent disclosures that General Dynamics was willing to accept. Now the only reason to actually mention General Dynamics, they thought enough of me and my ideas on this subject (which had nothing to do with their direct interests), that they prepared a report for me to publish this work, but no one would even read it, let alone publish it. Isn't that interesting! And it was a professionally prepared paper, with full internal reviews! And not one single thing has been in need of being changed since it was approved.

You trust the peer review process too much...

Now no matter what I say, such talk is not and should not be convincing to anyone. Talk is just talk. The only facts (or data) really needed are those that are found in the presentation itself, and in any direct check of the work being presented. And today, with our modern computers, anyone who can compute will be able to make direct confirmations to their heart's content.

Formal Introduction:

The very base to our reality is, in one sense, very simple: Our reality is the simplest possible reality, consisting of only matter and space.

IMHO that's already too complex: the simplest reality consists of only ether (or "space"), with matter some kind of wave phenomenon that takes place in it. And nothing guaratnees that our reality *must* be the simplest possible – probability law allows for the possibility of something existing that is slightly more complex than the simplest option imaginable.

Thus, already your first sentence I don't believe! And that you are a physicist doesn't give you the authority to tell us what is behind our observations.

Re: Ultimate Reality is both simple and complicated!

Re: Ultimate Reality is both simple and complicated!

[snip spall theory]

In conclusion: I may agree with your title but not with the contents.

Regards,
Harald

.