

## Re: Tom Roberts, M-Max, Hobba

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2004-10/1218.html>

---

**From:** Pax ([pax1\\_at\\_whitesweb.com](mailto:pax1_at_whitesweb.com))

**Date:** 10/04/04

Date: Mon, 04 Oct 2004 13:45:11 GMT

> "xxein" <[xxein@bellsouth.net](mailto:xxein@bellsouth.net)> wrote in message  
> news:[cce403e3.0410031029.7da0bab9@posting.google.com](mailto:cce403e3.0410031029.7da0bab9@posting.google.com)...  
>> "eleaticus" <[eleaticus@bellsouth.net](mailto:eleaticus@bellsouth.net)> wrote in message  
>> news:<[Yxz7d.94155\\$as2.88181@bignews3.bellsouth.net](mailto:Yxz7d.94155$as2.88181@bignews3.bellsouth.net)>...  
>>> "xxein" <[xxein@bellsouth.net](mailto:xxein@bellsouth.net)> wrote in message  
>>> news:[cce403e3.0410020540.1da025ec@posting.google.com](mailto:cce403e3.0410020540.1da025ec@posting.google.com)...

>>> xxein: You can lead a horse to water but you can't make them drink it. It seems they prefer the Kool-Aide.

>> I'm not sure what your viewpoint was here but I am sure I am not sure about what I said above. It is the idea of a preferred frame true zero absolute velocity that the c+v model and MMX show not demonstrable should it exist.

> xxein: That's ok with me. I have almost become resigned that the universe has to be tricked into revealing what it does. The reasoning is that the universe is not something that can be torn apart – it is continuous with itself, no matter how we try to exploit it. Tit for tat.

Very true!

> LET has more of a true-basic handle on things, but it does not incorporate well with gravity. GR(-SR) does well with gravity, but in a fashion that substitutes gross ideals for basic reality. Q's cannot break from points to broader mixed fields (too cumbersome). These three majors are simply spotty on the broad spectrum presented to us by the universe.

>

> As I have dabbled, I have increased my awareness of these issues to the point of not being afraid to speculate with some confidence.

>

> An ether frame, absolute frame or preferred frame can certainly exist. It depends on the view-scale. If gravity did not exist, the universe would not hesitate to expand because it has no

apparent outer boundary. But gravity does exist so that matter can not feel THAT free to expand. Gravity aside, entropicism is the rule if there are no bounds.

>

> *We only think that we circumscribe scale and do not know with any certainty that other (separate) universes exist or whether they might be interacting with us. We also don't know the super-fine structure of this universe. We don't even know why gravity exists (let alone how it does what it does).*

>

> *As GR may suggest, a non-point frame is dynamic within itself and depends on the distribution matter. But it is a miserable failure beyond that (seemingly lofty) idea. We have to think beyond a restricted scale at this point and try to gain a better perspective.*

>

> *I certainly did not use GR as a model to my thinking, but both exemplify the same basic structure of the dynamics involved. Unfortunately, there are three separate mechanisms for gravity that we should peruse ---- not two. GR uses a bent spacetime, and there is the classic attractiveness. But there is another. It is simply a propinquity of scale interaction and phase transition.*

>

> *Protons (or quarks) did not invent themselves out of nothingness – per se. They are made of the same primordial energy, but it seems that irregularities can allow pairings and such. So maybe some are brief and others just happen to pair again with other brief pairings to form a more stable, longer lasting, form that is more immune to the more basic fluctuations that formed them in the first place.*

>

> *Progression continues until these self-lumps of energy happen to form an "iron" of stability which allows us to measure them as objects of mass-energy. But this progression also must obey the entropy laws. As it concentrates energy into its lumps, it not only requires more energy to maintain, but makes its environment more rarified.*

>

> *The gross energy field must continually adjust to try to achieve equilibrium. That may be the genesis of "gravity" because it reforms position within the fields according to the "drain" localities. It is a dynamic energy-field that has its expansion abated by the voids within.*

I love thought experiments! :)

Gravity. It seems everyone holds to a beginning for our Universe that incorporated a period when everything was in a state similar to that of a singularity. Why do the vast majority then ignore that as if such a state were a one-time thing whose properties

said nothing about forces that must certainly have existed prior to the creation of our Universe and, as a result, continuously influence the structure of our Universe as long as it exists?

The BB was not a "normal" explosion. We can't divorce the continuing entanglement of the elements that came after from the forces that came first as we do where a normal explosion is concerned. The very act of expansion is a fight between those earliest forces, and those forces are at the "end" of expansion as well as at its beginning, rather like an ouroboros, because they are all there really is.

We try to place gravity in the same group as the effects it causes, but I think it's part of the highest order of forces from which all lower order effects, such as mass and space, arise. We can't subject it to the same group of laws which govern the lower order effects because it is, for want of a better way to phrase it, "external" to them. In other words, gravity is one of the "makers" of the laws which govern our Universe.

Gravity is part of the light outside the cave that shapes the shadows on our walls, it is not one of the shadows; it is the origin of part of the light reflected around the shadows, therefore we place it in the same group as the shadows. A mistake. Gravity is not a property of mass, mass is one of its lower order manifestations. Gravity is a "supraforce".

> *The question of the origin of positive and negative charges is not beyond my speculation with regard to the above either, but it is still new for me, although promising. Another time perhaps.*

If there had been only one supraforce, our Universe could never have come into existence. Only through a "warring" of similar supraforces could the disturbance that is our Universe be created. More, those supraforces could not be stationary wrt each other. Their motion manifests within our Universe as spatial dimensions and time. Only a small step further is needed to extrapolate charges. A flow of force in one direction is +, a flow of force in the opposite direction is –.

As far as magnetism goes, if you picture in your mind's eye the flow of charges, it's easy to see why likes repel and opposites enmesh. That reasoning is not so readily visualized on a particle level, however... unless you picture the flow of charge from the center of the particle outward and then looping back toward the center.

> *So, in the near–run, LET has to get a dynamic ether frame, GR(–SR) has to get more real, and the Q's need to expand up the scale of the spectrum (plus a little down).*

>

> *It's sort of like describing a hog. LET does not recognize the need for blood flow, GR(-SR) expects the hog to live a math, and Q's cannot identify that it is a hog.*

>

> *Scale (properties associated) and spectrum need to be investigated to more completeness. If all we can do is imagine, let's imagine something that leads/ties to the broad spectrum of reality instead of wishfulness.*

As for aether, it is my deduction that aether is photons, just as the ocean is water. Waves are a disturbance of the medium and made up of the medium, but their motion is through the medium, which remains relatively stationary.

> *It is not for the weak mind to contemplate and attempt to understand. In its completeness, it would describe why she said that in relation to the BB. I would be happy to settle why a ball falls from a description of energy in space.*

>

> *Still, I am open.*

>

> *Have fun with it.*

That was fun. :) Wonderful collection of thought experiments.

Be well – Pax

.~\*~.~\*~.~\*~.~\*~.~\*~.~\*~.~\*~.~\*~.~\*~.~\*~.~\*~.~\*~.~\*~.~\*~.~\*~.~\*~.~\*~.

I am enough of an artist to draw freely upon my imagination. Imagination is more important than knowledge. Knowledge is limited. Imagination encircles the world. – Albert Einstein

As far as the laws of mathematics refer to reality, they are not certain; and as far as they are certain, they do not refer to reality – Albert Einstein

I don't believe in mathematics. – Albert Einstein