

Re: Ether and Maxwell's Permittivity

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2004-06/5238.html>

From: N:dlzc D:aol T:com \ (dlzc\) (net_at_nospam.com)

Date: 06/27/04

Date: Sun, 27 Jun 2004 09:10:34 -0700

Dear Australopithecus Afarensis:

"Australopithecus Afarensis" <fossil.lucy@cox.net> wrote in message news:8zuDc.8553\$6r1.7668@fed1read06...

> *So, GR is not based on Newtonian ideas. That means without Newton's influence or prior discovery.*

Then I'd have to disagree, since Newton provided (in some sense) the foundation of calculus. But Newton's assumptions (stated or not) are different than that of GR.

> *Einstein and his cohorts such as Grossmann,*
> *Hilbert, Minkowski can easily come up with GR. Wait! Did I not see the*
> *term in one of the many solutions to GR described as*
>
> *** G M / r*
>
> ?

A solution derived from the same simplifying assumptions that Newton made, yes. Whoa big surprise! GR contains Newton. In order to contain something, you need to go deeper and go wider. GR does that.

> *Don't tell me the advancement in Iron Age did not have any input from the*
> *Bronze Age. Or are you going to tell me the people of Iron Age looked at*
> *the technology of the Bronze Age and say they did not have any influence*
> *from the Bronze Age?*

Smelting techniques were completely different. The implements, to be useful, had to be hot worked. The only thing they had in common was fire, and sweat. The iron age proved the end of the bronze age, even though bronze is still in use in naval applications.

> *Therefore, the technology of Iron Age is not based on*
> *the Bronze Age. Or is that Einstein being just more special than any?*
In
> *his case, he did not need any inputs from the previous studies such as*
> *Newton, Maxwell, Lorentz/Poincare. He was like a god. He knew exactly*

what

> *to throw together and come up with the best thing ever. Yeah, right.*

This has never been claimed, and is unsupported by fact. His mind found the single question that had never been asked, and his teachers succeeded in giving him the ability to develop the answer. No big revelation there.

> *Einstein stole Lorentz/Poincare/FitzGerald/Larmor/Michelson/Morley's works*

> *in math and sugar-coated with his wordings.*

Now you are picking a fight. You don't have a clue what really happened, even though the truth is public record.

> *Thus, whenever a problem comes*

> *up, Einstein and Lorentz can always give the same answer regardless of whose*

> *description you choose. Yet, somehow, Lorentz is always wrong, and Einstein*

> *is always right case after case. What is wrong with this picture?*

That you don't seem to recall that Einstein and Lorentz were in agreement. Because someone today doesn't believe in an unobservable aether (namely Lorentz's), doesn't make them wrong. It simply make them pragmatic.

> *Or just*

> *hind sights are always 20/20. Or everybody has been defending the Emperor's*

> *clothes for so long?*

You are really very bored, to come up with the same old refuted "gunny sack" full of tripe.

> >>"...quit waiting for Version 32, and learn version 2..."<<

>

> *Sure, Dave, I am not holding my breath for version 32. However, I do think*

> *version 3 is right around the corner. Please don't hold your breath for*

> *version 4.*

I am inhaling as much of version 2 as I can, until I can afford to go back to school. Then it will be my meat and potatoes. As for version 3, it will come from some flavor of string theory, which you will like even less. Unfortunately, they are tweaking the models against the predictions of GR, so once they quit that BS, you might like the resulting flavor a little better. Probably not though.

> >>"Einstein was not a crackpot. Newton was not a crackpot. Pythagoras

> *turned into a crackpot. If what you said was "not every voice is that of*

a

> *crackpot", I agree."*<<

- >
- > *A crackpot is subjective. Is Aristotle a crackpot? Then and during the*
- > *Dark Ages, he wasn't.*

Actually he was even then. Political favor does not make one less of a crackpot.

- > *I guess today he would be considered as one. A*
- > *crackpot today may not be one tomorrow. Some one who is not a crackpot*
- > *today maybe one just like Aristotle. I disagree with you in this case.*

OK.

- > >>...and learn version 2"<<
- >
- > *Right, did you? Does that mixing of inertial coordinates sound fishy to*
- you*
- > *on the calculation of Mercury's orbital precession? Did you actually go*
- > *through it thoroughly?*

To my satisfaction, for now, yes. I will be reviewing it again. As far as "mixing inertial coordinates" goes, you'd need to spell out what you mean by this. The analyses I have seen don't do anything untoward.

...

- > *I still maintain that GR is based on Newtonian concept. In the future,*
- we*
- > *may regard Einstein as a crackpot just like the Inflation Theory, the*
- String*
- > *Theory, the Brane Theory, the parallel universes, Aristotle, and many*
- > *others.*

Your "maintainance" aside, it is your opinion, is not based on the easily presented facts (other than calculus), and is your problem. If you wish to chew bark in the darkness, that is also your problem, and your choice. You are welcome into the light, anytime you wish...

David A. Smith