

Re: Aether is the empty space in which the Universe sits

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2004-07/3914.html>

From: Bill Hobba (bhobba_at_rubbish.net.au)

Date: 07/21/04

Date: Wed, 21 Jul 2004 00:37:24 GMT

"Ole D. Rughede" <ole.rughede@privat.dk> wrote in message
news:40fd173e\$0\$297\$edfadb0f@dread11.news.tele.dk...

>

> "Bill Hobba" <bhobba@rubbish.net.au> skrev i en meddelelse
> news:sb1Lc.8453\$K53.4548@news-server.bigpond.net.au...

>>

>> "Laurent" <cyberdyno5@netzero.net> wrote in message
>> news:zNOdnZOS_YPiEmHdRVn-iQ@comcast.com...

>>>

>>> "Bill Hobba" <bhobba@rubbish.net.au> wrote in message
>>> news:Wm%Kc.8342\$K53.2136@news-server.bigpond.net.au...

>>>>

>>>> "Laurent" <cyberdyno5@netzero.net> wrote in message
>>>> news:WvCdnZt6vvAO5GHdRVn-qA@comcast.com...

>>>>>

>>>>> "Bill Hobba" <bhobba@rubbish.net.au> wrote in message
>>>>> news:UEJKc.7253\$K53.5623@news-server.bigpond.net.au...

>>>>>>

>>>>>> "Paul Stowe" <ps@acompletelyjunkaddress.net> wrote in message
>>>>>> news:o59mf053tj17iklnhi4bt0elto5hvvm5ie@4ax.com...

>>>>>>> On Mon, 19 Jul 2004 01:20:23 GMT, "Bill Hobba"

>>>>>>> <bhobba@rubbish.net.au>

>>>>>>> wrote:

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>> "Paul Stowe" <ps@acompletelyjunkaddress.net> wrote in
>>> message

>>>>>>>>>> news:dpbkf01futr6ead3fj2nr7u1vb1g0m3a0@4ax.com...

>>>>>>>>>>> On Sun, 18 Jul 2004 01:25:06 GMT, "Bill Hobba"

>>>>>>>>>>> <bhobba@rubbish.net.au>

>>>>>>>>>>>> wrote:

>>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>>>>> "Paul Stowe" <ps@acompletelyjunkaddress.net> wrote in
>>>>> message

sci.physics.relativity: Re: Aether is the empty space in which the Universe sits

>>>>>>>>>> >news:hfmif0tn9dof3h23u2lgv1baqvr2i10srk@4ax.com...
>>>>>>>>>> >> On Fri, 16 Jul 2004 08:29:02 GMT, "Bill Hobba"
>>>>>>>>>> <bhobba@rubbish.net.au>
>>>>>>>>>> >wrote:
>>>>>>>>>> >>
>>>>>>>>>> >>
>>>>>>>>>> >> "mountain man" <hobbit@southern_seaweed.com.op> wrote
>>>> in
>>>>> message
>>>>>>>>>> >> >news:FcjJc.1497\$K53.780@news-server.bigpond.net.au...
>>>>>>>>>> >> "Bill Hobba" <bhobba@rubbish.net.au> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>> >> > in message
>>>>>>>>>> >> > news:un3Jc.373\$K53.4@news-server.bigpond.net.au...
>>>>>>>>>> >>
>>>>>>>>>> >> [snip]...
>>>>>>>>>> >>
>>>>>>>>>> >>>> Has Dayton Miller's experiment been repeated using the
>>>> same
>>>>> apparatus
>>>>>>>>>> >>>> with perhaps a modern optical imaging recorder? If not
>>>> you
>>>>> have NO
>>>>>>>>>> >>>> valid argument. Data is data interpretation of same is
>>>>> solely a
>>>>>>>>>> >>>> human endeavor. There is a saying, figures never lie,
>>>> but
>>>>> liars
>>>>>>>>>> >>>> figure...
>>>>>>>>>> >>>>
>>>>>>>>>> >>>> We have no reason to a-priori suppose that further
>>>>> experiments may
>>>>>>>>>> >>>> detect an aether ...
>>>>>>>>>> >>>>
>>>>>>>>>> >>>> By your Platonic 'logic' as long as we 'believe' in our
>>>>> interpretation
>>>>>>>>>> >>>> we have no reason to do any contrasting experiments.
>>>>>>>>>> >>>>
>>>>>>>>>> >>>> I did not say we should not do the exprimnets - I leave
>>>> such
>>>>> choices to
>>>>>> thos
>>>>>>>>>> >>>> einterested in such. I simply cliam until they are done
>>>> and
>>>>> ogve a
>>>>>>> postive
>>>>>>>>>> >>>> result nonoe can make the claim the aether has been
>>>> detected.
>>>>>> Thart is
>>>>>>> very
>>>>>>>>>> >>>> simple logic.
>>>>>>>>>> >>>>

Re: Aether is the empty space in which the Universe sits

> > >
> > >
> > > *EM fields obey Nature's laws. There are several working theories*
> > > *that describe EM field behavior, all mathematically correct. There*
> > > *even are non-working theories which are also mathematically correct.*
> > >
> > > *I have no material proof, nobody does, but its reality can be*
> > > *deduced by logic. For example, an aether is the only logical way to*
> > > *satisfactory explain action at a distance and quantum non-locality.*
> >
> > *Such is obviously false as the existance of theories in full accord with*
> > *exprimnet that do not assume it proves.*
> >
> > > *How else can you logically explain the EPR experiment results or the*
> > > *Schroedinger's cat paradox? How about inertia?*
> > >
> >
> > *Both EPR and the Schrodingers cat paradox are explainable by a number of*
> > *means – none of which require an aether. My favorite is quantum state*
> > *dissuasion at the plank time scale – see*
> > *<http://www.hpl.hp.com/techreports/2001/HPL-2001-7.pdf>. Another*
> > *possibility*
> > *is that objective reality does not exist – all that exists is the result*
> > *of*
> > *observations – that immediately cuts the assumptions of Bells inequality*
> > *right from underneath it ie observables do not have values until they*
> > *are*
> > *observed in which case there is nothing to be non local or collapse –*
> > *see*
> > *<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/kochen-specker/>. But in your case you*
> > *probably do not even know what assumptions went into its proof. As is*
> > *usual*
> > *cranks confuse their ignorance of physical theories with how nature*
> > *works.*
> >
> > *Bill*
>
> *Bill, You have not the faintest idea about what you are*
> *talking about. Try and understand the references you*
> *sling around to stiffen your tottering intellect!*

Look who is talking Mr. the aether must exist and anyone who believes otherwise is a fool.

>
> *It is assumed in Maxwell's theory that a volume in which*
> *the field is different from zero contains a certain amount*
> *of energy U and momentum. The density of momentum*
> *is assumed to be $1/c^2$ times the energy passing through*
> *unit area per unit time.*

Nope – the energy it has is from Noethers theorem applied to the EM lagrangian $F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu}$ and its density is $E^2 + H^2/2\pi$ (page 75 – Landau – Classical Theory of Fields).

- > *Therefore the universal space of*
- > *free EM–energy is for short called *Aether*, and the*
- > *first theoretical attempts to evaluate the energy and*
- > *temperature of the aether dates back to 1948–50,*

Since your assertion above is not correct the conclusion you inferred is obviously erroneous – even if your logic was correct – which I doubt.

- > *when*
- > *Gamov, Alpher and Herman estimated T to about 50 K,*
- > *which was in no way verified, neither by the findings of*
- > *Penzias and Wilson, nor from COBE results interpreted*
- > *by Mather et al. who I gave the first correct theoretical*
- > *deduction of $T(\text{Aether}) = T(\text{CMBR}) = 2.692064 \text{ K}$,*
- > *well within the errors of the experimental result, even*
- > *before the final interpretation.*

The COBE results are fully consistent with the assumption that during the big bang the photons, that obey Bose–Einstein statistics, could be modeled as a black body problem and gave a black body radiation spectrum. Such a spectrum is fully derivable from and explainable by photons acting as a gas that obeys Bose–Einstein statistics and has nothing to do with an aether.

- >
- > *The present empirical result is now belived to be some–*
- > *where between 2.7249 and 2.7251 K from the most*
- > *delicate experimental finesse. Not astonishing a little*
- > *higher than the theoretical value masked by our local*
- > *higher aether density in cosmic space.*
- >
- > *From my theoretical result I have been able to obtain*
- > *the most precise theoretical value of Newtonian G ever*
- > *seen, a physical quantity which is extremely difficult to*
- > *measure by experiment. – But how these results were*
- > *found and by which validity of theoretical consideration*
- > *has not been of least interest to you. You simply believe*
- > *you already have the stones of wisdom from skating*
- > *the internet and a little bit study here and there, including*
- > *a course in ...communication!*
- >
- > *Your bad scientific attitudes and general lack of manners*
- > *is exorbitantly demonstrated in your postings.*

Your proclaiming as fact beyond question rubbish like 'The density of momentum is assumed to be $1/c^2$ times the energy passing through unit area per unit time' when in fact it is well known the energy an momentum of EM fields comes from applying Noethers theorem to the EM lagrangian labels you

sci.physics.relativity: Re: Aether is the empty space in which the Universe sits

as the crackpot and crank you obviously are. I OTOH can cite standard references to back up the refutations of the drivel you write. I suggest it is you who has the bad manners and lack of a scientific attitude; a conclusion I believe anyone with a brain who reads the incoherent drivel you write will quickly reach.

- >
- > *You are not even able to distinguish between consistent*
- > *scientific theories and utterly mad delusionary conclusions*
- > *based on the misinterpretations of empiric results to fit*
- > *what you call "theory" but is nothing but wild speculations*
- > *adapted to unexpected experimental evidence presented*
- > *horribly insane as selfverificating "predictions".*

It is easy to see those that claim scientific falsehoods as if they were fact beyond question is the one not practicing science.

- >
- > *You have no scientific training in research or experimental*
- > *work and your logic reach the level of an uneducated child*
- > *unaware of the differences between objective, normative,*
- > *and subjective statements.*

So the honors degree I have in science is all in my imagination then. As well as the masters research I did on linking distribution theory and non-standard analysis. I have also worked with a PhD candidate on data analysis. You sir have absolutely know idea what my background is.

- > *You probably not even know*
- > *that true conclusions may result from false premisses but*
- > *can be shown to be logically false arguing. Your use of the*
- > *word "poof" indicates you have no knowledge whatsoever*
- > *about Gödel's scientific work but believe science is some*
- > *thing like "proving" undergraduate math, QED.*

You believe science is making assertions not backed up by anything. I believe science is being able to back my statements with citations to standard literature.

- >
- > *Your lack of critical sense prevents you from seriously*
- > *evaluating scientific proposals and arguments and make*
- > *you believe whatever you think are scientific facts to be*
- > *parroted like religious mantras.*
- >
- > *Therefore it has no meaning to discuss with you, which*
- > *you are well aware of, why you fall back to pumping noise,*
- > *naughtiness and obscenity you call "typos" into your*
- > *disorderly postings as rubbish of higher orders.*
- >
- > *Find a better pastime and a more cultured approach to*

Re: Aether is the empty space in which the Universe sits

sci.physics.relativity: Re: Aether is the empty space in which the Universe sits

- > *people you would like communicate with. You are no*
- > *pretty ornament to the news groups with your shameful*
- > *belligerent style and childish slander, not to speak of your*
- > *"quantum state dissuasion at the plank time scale" ??? !!!*
- >
- > *Good Max Planck would turn in his grave crying Hobba*
- > *to hell instead of Archimedian heureka, dissuading you to*
- > *ever touch physics science and quantum mechanics.*

Typical crank rantings.

Bill