

Re: Gravity?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2004-07/5197.html>

From: V ertner Vergon (*vergon_enterprises_at_highstream.net*)

Date: 07/26/04

Date: 26 Jul 2004 14:35:59 -0700

dh_ld@nomail.com wrote in message news:<vap8g01qrehq99lpqnb1hh23ljo195qinq@4ax.com>...

- > A guy was discussing his theory of "gravity" with me today.
- > He believes that it is not a force, but an effect. He believes
- > that what we interpret as gravity is really the effect of
- > sub-atomic particles on larger bodies. They exert force on
- > larger bodies. Those which bombard us without first passing
- > through a larger object like a planet, have a greater effect
- > on us than those which do first pass through a larger object.
- > The effect is that they push us onto the larger object. He
- > believes that is why some gravitational theories don't work
- > for sub-atomic particles. Is it a possibility?

VERGON:

Christopher startd this thread with:-

In reference to that interesting recent thread called 'Is There a Force of Gravity?' and the various interesting explanations regarding the sub atomic forces that stops my arse from going through this seat cover, and my feet remaining flat on the floor when I walk.

Id like to know can gravity ever be cancelled out or reversed by the use of acting on these sub atomic forces by disrupting the force i.e like like pole to a magnet so a device or a device built inside a craft could float and hover in the earths gravity well, OR if its repelling gravity be able to lift the craft into space and clear out of the Earths or a planets 'gravity well'?

I realise it'll require a better understanding of the physical sub atomic forces and a possible new type of physics, but perhaps it'll be possible one day, or maybe a day somewhat closer.

How about today?

"When you can measure what you are speaking about and express it in numbers, you know something about it." Lord Kelvin (1824-1907)

Re: Gravity?

Does it make sense that the entire universe is composed of only *one* type of particle? And that the particle, in a fractal manner, is the building block of a complex system?

Consider the following closely.

Assume a basic sub-particle particle (as we know them).
This basic sub-particle, let's call it Q, has 5 characteristics.

(1) It is spherical.

(2) it is composed of a material "substance" that is extremely tenuous or rare (in the sense of high altitude atmosphere),
this substance has mass.

(3) It is perfectly elastic, meaning it has no internal friction.

(4) It continually expands and contracts at c velocity

(5) It has spin and angular momentum.

These Q can be assembled like an Erector Set to form a model of the universe as we see it on an observable scale.

Because of their tenuousness, they can be co-spatial up to a point where the density becomes too great and then they exhibit the well known principle that two bodies cannot occupy the same space at the same time.

In the co-spatial mode --- and if traveling in tandem they are EM radiation.

If in a concentric mode, they form particles (electrons, protons and neutrons).

In this mode the Q are dispersed evenly, each expanding and contracting in its turn. Each cycle of this pulsation registers as an element of frequency. Thus a particle of n frequency will be composed of n Q.

Calculations show that such particles, so composed, will exhibit a fall off of density as the 4th power of the distance from the center.

Thus --- the same as we regard astro bodies --- the particle will react as though all the mass were at the center. Therefore the observation has been that the particles are mass points (except for cross sections in collisions).

The same is true for charge. Electrostatic charge is the manifestation of the pulsation (expansion/contraction) and thus manifests outward from the center.

Electromagnetism is the manifestation of the spin — which is orthogonal to the polar vector of electric charge.

With this theory, I was able to advance an equation for the strong force that fits exactly the best experimental quantification of the variation in attractive force — including the point of repelling.

I was also able to show *why* the charge on the electron and proton are equal (though opposite) despite a huge disparity in mass. (See <http://www.wbabin.net>)

The theory also includes a cause and effect (mechanical) explanation for gravity that dispels the *illusion* of action at a distance. It also demonstrates the how and why of gravitational force.

This individual sub-particle has a mass of 7.372039×10^{-48} gr. Take the frequency (each oscillation being one particle) of the electron and multiply it by that figure — and you get the mass of the electron.

Take the frequency of a photon, multiply it by that figure — you get the mass of the photon. Then multiply that result by c — and you get the momentum of the photon, which is equal to $(h \nu/c)$. And of course, if you multiply it by c^2 you get the energy of the photon — equal to $(h \nu)$.

Next, take the frequency of a proton, go through the same procedure and you get the mass of the proton.

So we see that photon, electron or proton — we have the manifestation of $E = mc^2$. Or, put another way, for all three particles $h \nu = E = mc^2$.

All of the above demonstrates that matter is not made of photons — but
PHOTONS AND MATTER ARE MADE OF SUB-PARTICLES I CALL QUANTA.

NOW GRAVITY

We here discuss the gravity force. It will be found to be related to the strong force inasmuch as the vortical force of fermions comes into play.

There is a major difference. Whereas in the case of the strong force

the
vortical force draws in whole particles, in the case of gravity it
draws
individual quanta. But we are getting ahead of ourselves.

VORTICLE FORCE

Since particles consist of concentric spinning quanta, the inner
quanta are spinning faster due to the conservation of angular
momentum. This creates a vorticle force.

SUBLIMATION OF MASS

Consider the hypothesis that not all quanta in a material body are
confined,
and that some escape to be free, radiating outward in all directions
at the
speed of light.

We may consider this as analogous to the sublimation of solids (ice
for example).

It is yet to be determined whether this process is affected
quantitatively
by extremes of temperature. Beyond that we may assume that all matter,
regardless of physical or chemical composition, emanates individual
quanta
at the same rate, viz., the emanation is a function of fermion
particles
regardless of how they are grouped. Further, the rate of emanation as
a
certain percentage of the total mass, is constant. [Be aware that this
is
an assumption. It may well turn out that there are conditions of state
of
matter, temperature or massiveness, that alter this rate -- and in
turn
alter the force of gravity. However, for the present, we proceed on
this
assumption.]

In summation we assume that a portion of a given mass is radiated in
all directions as solitary "gravity quanta" and that the portion is
constant. Collaterally we also assume that all grouped quanta (atoms)
in a body simultaneously absorb all available free quanta arriving in
their vicinity due to their vorticle force. (Recall that free quanta
have a diameter of one light second.)

We now consider the absorptive process. "Absorption" is not a wholly
accurate
term because by the present hypothesis the free gravity quanta are not

absorbed

so much as they are drawn into the body with such great rapidity as to also draw the absorbing body toward the quanta, which is in the same direction as the emitting body. Since this process is mutual, there appears what is interpreted as a "mutual attraction" and "action at a distance".

The question arises, what is the nature of this drawing force? In the case of the strong force it was demonstrated that due to their spin protons and neutrons developed a vorticle force that mutually drew neighboring nuclei together. It is this same vorticle force that draws ambient quanta into the nuclei. One observes this centrally directed force in a cyclone. As all nuclei draw simultaneously the more nuclei present the faster ambient quanta are ingested.

Let us now quantify the gravitational process.
(temporarily setting general relativity aside)

V. Vergon