

Re: Nobel Prize for David Thomson?!

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.particle/2004-12/0330.html>

From: Bill Hobba (bhobba_at_rubbish.net.au)

Date: 12/27/04

Date: Mon, 27 Dec 2004 11:53:11 GMT

"David Thomson" <news5@volantis.org> wrote in message
news:YVJzd.31\$rx4.4162@news.uswest.net...

> "Franz Heymann" <notfranz.heyman@btopenworld.com> wrote in message

> news:cqnen0\$t5\$3@titan.btinternet.com...

>> *Your understanding of gravitation is at least as flawed as your*

>> *understanding of the rest of physics.*

>> *Guess what! The gravitational force acts on energy.*

>

> *Your understanding of energy is at least as flawed as your understanding
of*

> *the rest of physics. Guess what! Energy is merely a unit of work.*

Learn some 20th century physics – energy is the conserved Noether current
associated with time symmetry. See

<http://www.mathpages.com/home/kmath564/kmath564.htm>.

> *There*

> *is nothing for gravitational force to act on. You might as well say that*

> *force acts on velocity and resistance.*

First gravity is not a force – it is space–time curvature. Secondly who
said it acts on anything? – light is 'curved' by gravity for precisely the
same reason it travels in straight lines in an inertial frame.

>

> *The gravitational force can act only on mass.*

>

Assuming by acts you mean it follows a curved path when gravity is present
then experiment shows it does.

> *Now, even according to your*

> *understanding of physics, the photon has zero mass. If the photon has
zero*

> *mass, then it has zero energy, because energy is equal to mass times the*

> *speed of light squared, as you see it.*

See

http://math.ucr.edu/home/baez/physics/ParticleAndNuclear/photon_mass.html.

In units $c = 1$ $E^2 = M^2 + P^2$. Now when $M = 0$ what does that make E ? – even an idiot like you should be able to figure that one out – but judging from what you write maybe not.

>

> > *Now if you really*

> > *wanted to know how light bends around massive objects, you might ask*

> > *me for the answer, because I have it.*

> >

> > *Too late. I already know that light travels along a geodesic.*

>

> *No you don't. Your physics has denied the existence of Aether. There is*

> *nothing for you to call a geodesic.*

I guess the principle of maximal time is all in physicists imagination then – even when it is simply a generalization of Newton's first law. Hey David why do free particles move at constant velocity in an inertial frame? – is that because of your marvelous aether as well? – after all there is nothing compelling it to do that is there? something must cause it? – so I guess classical mechanics is up the creek as well. We are obviously in a real bad way – or maybe, just maybe, here is a wild idea – you have no idea what you are talking about.

Bill

> *But if you are going to accept the*

> *geodesic, then you have to accept the full quantification of the Aether*

and

> *the laws of physics that results from it. In that case, I have the*

correct

> *explanation for how the geodesic forms.*

>

> > *As for dark matter, it exists mainly near massive objects. There is*

> > *more*

> > *dark matter near Earth than there is in the emptiness of space. But*

> > *it*

> > *can't be detected because dark matter exists outside of the Aether.*

> > *The*

> > *Aether is what gives structure to the angular momentum of dark*

> > *matter by*

> > *imparting the qualities of charges to it.*

> >

> > *You don't know what you are talking about.*

>

> *You just enjoy knocking people. How many times have you told someone that*

> *they didn't have a theory until they could quantify it? Now that I have*

> *presented a fully quantified Aether Physics Model, why don't you take the*

> *time to read it?*

>

sci.physics.particle: Re: Nobel Prize for David Thomson?!

> *Dave*

>

>