

Re: No Such Thing as a Particle?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-01/0527.html>

From: Harry (harald.vanlintel_at_epfl.ch)

Date: 01/03/05

Date: Mon, 3 Jan 2005 12:03:57 +0100

"Emwizsoon" <emwizsoon@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:1104713172.602046.302850@c13g2000cwb.googlegroups.com...
SNIP

> *In 1905, Einstein shows that there are particles.*

Not so – it is also wrong but more correct to say that in 1904 Lorentz showed that there are no particles, but that everything is made up of waves!

Harald

> *100 years*

> *later, who knows.. someone may show they are not actually*
> *particles. Are we going to crucify Einstein. I'm just kidding. :)*

> *Let's celebrate his 100 years anniversary by taking a closer*

> *look of the opposite, that there may be no particles at all*

> *but just complex standing wave composing platonic solids, etc.*

> *It would be easy to debunk the new hypothesis though. I'm*

> *still looking for that one argument that can permanently put*

> *it in the archive of crank dot net.*

>

> *Emwi*