

Re: Nobel Prize for David Thomson?!

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-01/4932.html>

From: Ranando King (rk_at_magictouchcorp.com)

Date: 01/24/05

Date: Mon, 24 Jan 2005 17:49:03 -0600

"David Thomson" <news5@volantis.org> wrote in message
news:t71Jd.2323\$L92.25692@news.uswest.net...

> *"Ranando King" <rk@magictouchcorp.com> wrote in message*

> *news:41f15324_1@news.vic.com...*

>> *Until now, your "theory" (read "hypothesis") has been that mass somehow*

>> *warps space-time without producing a gravitational field, and that light*

>> *is*

>> *not affected by gravity but rather by this warped space-time.*

>

> *Where do you come up with this crap? You really have no clue what I have*

> *been saying.*

This is what it appears you've been saying. If this is not what is meant by
your model, then please elaborate more.

>> *I dare say*

>> *that this contradicts the "proven facts." Now while I don't disagree*
that

>> *there is probably a better explanation than the existing ones out there,*

I

>> *don't agree that yours is among the better ones.*

>

> *Is this a hypothesis, theory, or fact? Sounds like opinion to me. How*

> *would you know what my theory says?*

Once again, it's all based on the information you've been presenting for our
review in this newsgroup. Your arguments against those of us discussing this
with you are believed to be representative of the model you wrote about in
your book. As such, I and others are judging your model based on your words
in here.

>>> *The pinch is temporary, just as nuclear binding is temporary. Nuclear*

>>> *binding only remains until a greater force comes along to tear it*
apart.

>>

>> *I'm quite thankful that no "greater force" has come along to tear the*

>> *nuclear binding of this planet apart, not to mention that of my own*

body!

>

> *If you had a good understanding of the strong force you would know that the*

> *force is vector dependent. The reason some isotopes are easier to pull*

> *apart than others is because the total number of protons and neutrons, based*

> *on a consistent structure of Aether, determines how the protons and neutrons*

> *are magnetically aligned with each other. It works the same as with regular*

> *magnets. If you change the angle of one magnet to another the binding force*

> *between the two increases or decreases accordingly.*

One thing I fail to understand is your continual references to the strong force when the conversation is about gravity. What connection is there between the strong force and gravity such that it is relevant to our conversation? Is gravity a product of the strong force? Does the strength of the strong force affect the strength of gravity? From what you said, both gravity and the strong force derived from this "GForce". Indeed, that does make them 2 different portions of the same thing, but since you have yet to define **how** gravity is derived from this "GForce", then cannot even begin to discuss gravity's relationship to the otherwise unrelated strong force... unless you are saying that gravity and the strong force are 1 and the same.

> > *As for the straight line, we are not at the location of your imaginary*

> > *endpoint. We are at a place fairly close to the pinch. So we do see a*

> > *curvature caused by the pinch.*

> >

> > *Even from a position fairly close to the pinch you end up seeing the line*

> > *first bend towards and then bend away... a temporary curvature at best.*

>

> *But it bends, right?*

Only in the middle. The starting and ending points remain the same as if there had never been a pinch.

> > *And the rubber sheet is merely a visual aid.*

> > *It is not the theory itself.*

> >

> > *Understandable, so use a better visual aid.*

>

> *I do, in the book. In fact, we hired Jon Lomberg to do the graphic work for*

> *us. You want to see the graphics that we paid several thousand dollars for?*

> *Buy the book. Otherwise, visualize a rubber sheet.*

If the rubber sheet image is as close as you can get to the conceptual model used in your book, then I am left with the disturbing image that any gravitational field... sorry... force will invariably stress the aether to an unnerving degree in a fashion not consistent with Newton's laws.

> > > > *Wrong.*
> > > <snipped>
> > > > *The angular momentum of light travels through each Aether unit from*
> > > > *its*
> > > > *origin until it is absorbed by another atom. The Aether keeps the*
> > *speed*
> > > > *of*
> > > > *light constant.*
> > > >
> > > *ok... First, it isn't a matter of "particulate" vs. "gaseous" but*
> > > *rather*
> > > *"solid" vs "gaseous". Even your variation of the "gaseous" theory*
> > > *still*
> > > *amounts to a particulate theory.*
> > >
> > > *No, it doesn't. Once again, "gaseous" is merely a visual aid. It is*
> > > *not*
> > > *the theory. The Aether is not a gas. The Aether is a fabric of*
> > > *quantum*
> > > *rotating magnetic fields.*
> > >
> > > **Sigh**
> > >
> > > *"quantum rotating magnetic fields"*
> > > *If the aether is a "fabric" of these qrmfs, then I should be able to*
> > > *isolate*
> > > *1 quanta from the fabric. If that's not possible then you need to ditch*
> > > *the*
> > > *term "quantum" and stop calling your "theory" (read "hypothesis")*
> > > *"discrete".*
> > >
> > > *What makes you think you can isolate a quantum Aether unit? You can't*
> > > *even*
> > > *isolate a quantum electron or photon. How would you measure a quantum*
> > > *unit*
> > > *when the media used to record the images is made up of large quantities of*
> > > *these quanta? How would you measure a quantum of rmfd without filling it*
> > > *with electrons or protons?*

Simple... but I'm afraid your answer can be found in a question. How do you isolate a hydrogen molecule (H₂)? Believe it or not, everything follows from answering that question. The bottom line is that a known quantity of any substance can be isolated if the substance is quantifiable. As far as the single quantum of rmfd goes, I'd measure it by filling it then emptying it.

sci.physics.relativity: Re: Nobel Prize for David Thomson?!

> *I had to deduce the quanta of the Aether from the measurements of the
> electrons and protons that fill the Aether units, and the forces imparted
by
> the Aether to the electrons and protons.*

So you deduced the nature of an aether unit by it's aparent effect on other, more tangeable things? That's good science. No different than people comming to an understanding that air is a real substance by studying how wind moves things.

> *I'll continue to call my theory "discrete" because that is exactly what it
> is. The theory accurately predicts observed properties of the subatomic
> particles and goes as far as to describe their precise geometry.*

Please. First, until the newer concepts in your idea are tested and proven rigorously by others in the scientific community, it would suit you better to use the term hypothesis or model. Your conjecture is not yet a theory.

Second, does your model accurately ****predict**** or accurately ****calculate**** those properties? The difference is subtle but important. Prediction requires foreknowledge. Since the data you speak of your model being able to "predict" already exists, all you're actually doing is calculating. For example: Newton's and Einstein's equations predicted the possible existance of black holes. Eventually, someone found some.

> >> *There are several faults in your reasoning. First, a photon is not its
> >> energy. Energy is a quality of a photon. Energy doesn't strike
> >> anything,
> >> photons do. Energy does not cause matter to move, photons do. The SM
> >> does
> >> not quantify photons, but the APM does quantify photons.
> >
> > What!?!?!?!
> >
> > <http://dictionary.reference.com/search?q=photon>
> > *pho-ton Audio pronunciation of "photon" (P) Pronunciation Key
(ftn)
> > n.
> >
> > 1. The quantum of electromagnetic energy, regarded as a discrete
> > particle
> > having zero mass, no electric charge, and an indefinitely long lifetime.
> > See
> > table at subatomic particle.
>
> *Don't feed me this nonsense.*
<snipped to preserve the appearance of a sane argument...>**

If you consider this to be nonsense, then supply a new definition. No matter how you choose to use science, you end up falling back on words to explain yourself and your concepts to others. If you use a word in a way someone

else is not familiar with, then you will fail to make yourself clear.

- > > *The long and short is that a photon is a discrete packet of*
- > > *electromagnetic*
- > > *energy. So indeed, a photon IS energy. This is high school physics.*
- >
- > *So sayeth who? Einstein? I could care less what your religious beliefs*
- > *are. Let's talk science, as in real data and real measurements. Quantify*
- a
- > *photon and leave out the poetry.*

So sayeth quantum physics, the model of which you have yet to depreciate in this discussion.

- > > <http://dictionary.reference.com/search?q=kinetic%20energy>
- > > *kinetic energy*
- > > *n.*
- > >
- > > *The energy possessed by a body because of its motion, equal to one*
- half
- > > *the mass of the body times the square of its speed.*
- >
- > *That's a lame definition, don't you think? I mean, what is "half the*
- mass?"
- > *Mass is just a dimension. There is no mass to take half of. And what is*
- > *this nonsense about the square of speed? If you square speed, it's no*
- > *longer velocity. In reality, the kinetic energy is equal to half the*
- force
- > *applied to a body times the distance the force was applied for.*

If you did your homework back in highschool physics, you'd realize that the equation you described is actually the equation for ****WORK****. Work energy is the energy expended supplying something else with energy or converting something's energy between kinetic and potential. In other words, work is the energy required to change something else's state by a fixed amount. Kinetic energy is the energy something has because it's moving. Motion is energy. 0 motion means 0 kinetic energy.

Now do you see the importance of words? Without them we can't even communicate ideas properly. So if you don't agree with the definitions I've supplied, then write up the definitions implied by your model.

- > > *If something gains energy, it will either store it (potential energy) or*
- > > *move (kinetic energy). This is again high school physics. If you refute*
- > > *this, you need to provide entirely new definitions for energy!!*
- >
- > *It's not new. High school physics also teaches that energy is equal to*
- > *force times distance. The so-called "stored energy" is really energy that*
- > *is converted to a force. For example, if you pick up an object off the*
- > *floor, you are using the kinetic energy of your body to increase the*
- amount

> *of distance the gravitational force can act on the object. There's nothing new about this at all.*

Exactly, except that your wording is wrong. You did **work** lifting the object. You **converted** the *kinetic energy* of your arm into *potential energy* in the object. Now here's where I ask a critical question, but first, the setup. As long as you continue to hold that mass, you continue to do work because gravity is continually pulling on the mass. If you moved to a higher elevation, say the top of Mt. Everest, then the amount of work you're doing to hold that mass would be less. So what in your model explains why acceleration due to gravity (the force of gravity) keeps getting less the higher up you go?

> > *Second, subatomic particles are the manifestation of angular momentum acting through Aether units, not on Aether units. The subatomic particle is both the angular momentum and the charge imparted to it by the Aether.*
> >
> > *Small difference. Possibly negligible save for the sake of terminology.*
> > *Care to provide a visual model for clarification's sake?*
>
> *Yes, it's in the book. At our considerable expense and commitment of time we have made available to you, and others, a very understandable visual model to clarify the precise structure of subatomic particles.*

By "visual model" I mean conceptual model. See what can happen if words aren't used properly? I ended up getting a reference to pictures in your \$50 book instead of a short snippet of text describing the above.

> > *Otherwise I'm left with the image that a "particle" is energy applied to aether units, and the properties of the particle are the effects of the energy interacting with the properties of the aether.*
>
> *This misperception is due to being educated solely in the Standard Model and not being educated in the Aether Physics Model. You can only think in the mass/energy paradigm because that is all you have learned.*

Wow. Very bold assumption on your part. I actually think in terms of energy and fields. My view is that mass is an illusion caused by slow-moving energy. In this view, gravity is the side effect of pressure in space caused by other forces. For the sake of those who choose to buy your book to see your model, I hope your assumptions are more well founded than the ones you've just made of me.

sci.physics.relativity: Re: Nobel Prize for David Thomson?!

- > *To think in the*
- > *Aether paradigm you need to read a textbook that specializes in the*
- > *quantification of Aether and the subatomic particles. As far as I know,*
- the*
- > *only book in existence on this topic, so far, is Secrets of the Aether,*
- > *which I happen to be co-author of.*

How about if I think in terms of an aether paradigm that disagrees with you, fits the data available, and doesn't require re-defining all of the terms used to describe physics currently?

- > > *Third, Aether is the structure in which subatomic particles move and*
- > > *exhibit*
- > > *the quality of energy. No energy is collected. Subatomic particles*
- are*
- > > *angular momentum, not energy. Photons are angular momentum times*
- > > *velocity,*
- > > *not energy.*
- > >
- > > *Force is required to alter something's "angular momentum". Force*
- requires*
- > > *energy.*
- >
- > *Says who? Force is primary to energy. Energy only comes about when force*
- > *is applied to something and causes it to move a distance. There is a*
- reason*
- > *why Einstein was determined to find a single force, which unifies all the*
- > *forces. There is a reason why force acts over a distance. There is a*
- > *reason why even the SM traces the whole Universe back to a Big Bang,*
- whether*
- > *such a thing ever occurred or not. In the beginning there was dark matter*
- > *and Gforce. From these two, all physical existence arose.*

Whoa!!!! You're twisting cause and effect aren't you? Under conventional physics, energy is required to apply a force. The way you're talking, force is required to supply energy. If you're correct, then what force supplies the background radiation of the universe and why is this energy not accelerating? Somehow I think I know what your answers will be... something related to "GForce," but be prepared to provide a conceptual model in your response (not a reference to your book) for how this "GForce" creates this energy.

- > > *So how is it that all this "angular momentum" is moving around*
- > > *without any exchange of energy? The way you're wording things, it*
- appears*
- > > *you're going to have to provide a new definition of what energy is in*
- > > *reference to your "theory" (read "hypothesis").*
- >
- > *No, all I need to do is use the old definition of energy. Energy is work.*
- > *It is your "new" definition of energy as an objective form of existence*
- that*

Re: Nobel Prize for David Thomson?!

> *is in error and needs to be forgotten.*

Energy is not work. Work is energy. That's a very popular logical fallacy. You basically said all fruit are oranges. Obviously absurd even though it is true that all oranges are fruit. So, as I said, you need to supply a new definition for energy because it appears you're trying to do away with potential and kinetic energy. Without changing the definition of energy you can't do this.

You're going to find it hard to redefine all energy as work without redefining work as well. If work is force applied for a distance and force is accelerating mass, then work is accelerating mass for a distance. If you've got a mass not experiencing any forces and not accelerating, but rather moving at a constant velocity v , then how much work is the mass doing? Pick your own values for mass, distance and time. It won't matter. No work is being done. No acceleration = no work. And yet, the mass has kinetic energy.

> > *Fourth, you are correct that movement of subatomic particles equate to*
> > *the*
> > *movement of Aether units, but the photon is an expanding electron. In*
> > *this*
> > *case the photon moves through the Aether, but it does not move the*
Aether
> > *itself.*
> >
> > *You just defeated yourself. Check the logic. If moving a subatomic*
> > *particle*
> > *means moving aether units, and subatomic particles are themselves*
> > *quantized,*
> > *then the aether must also be quantized. As such, your "gaseous" aether*
> > *model*
> > *is a particulate model with limited structure.*
>
> *I've been saying all along that the Aether is quantized. That doesn't*
> *defeat my argument, it bolsters my argument. If a quantum particle*
exists,
> *and it exists in only one space and time, then the space and time must*
also
> *be quantized. And, in fact, I fully explain the quantification of the*
> *Aether. That's why the book title is "Secrets of the Aether" and the*
theory
> *is called "Aether Physics Model."*

Didn't you say 2 posts ago that your model is ****NOT**** a particulate model?

> *And if you took the time to read the book, and took the time to reflect on*
> *the meaning of "quantum rotating magnetic field," you would understand how*
> *the Aether can exist as a quantum of non-material, physical reality.*

sci.physics.relativity: Re: Nobel Prize for David Thomson?!

I understand the concept of a distinctly isolated and finite (quantum) rotating magnetic field even without reading your book. That's not the issue in question. All matter and energy in the known universe is little more than energy applied to a rotating field. That's why at some scale, everything has angular momentum. That's also the core basis of your model, though I doubt you'd put it that way.

> > *First, my own viewpoint is that much of physics as we know it is, at best,*
> > *mistaken. Second, since in order to study the aether, which cannot*
> > *presently*
> > *be observed directly, we must study its effects on the "material*
> > *Universe,"*
> > *it becomes quite hard to "understand the Aether" until someone provides*
> > *a*
> > *model that consistently explains **ALL** of the data currently collected*
> > *in*
> > *terms of the aether's effects.*
>
> *Gosh. Why don't you just break down and contribute to my research and*
> *read*
> *my book? I agree that modern physics is mistaken, and I provide a valid*
> *alternative. I agree that we have to observe the Aether indirectly by its*
> *effect on physical reality, and it will never be observed directly.*

If you were to more carefully examine my arguments with you, you'd realize that this is exactly what I've been trying to do. I like the direction you've chosen to go, but the particulars of the path you took leave much to be desired. Your use of certain key terms in physics prevents your model from being understood by anyone, at least by the way you've been presenting it here. If you'd try actually responding directly to the questions raised instead of blythly dismissing them (admittedly, you have in a few cases, thus raising other questions), then you'll be prepared for the far more estute arguments that are going to be laid on you by professional physicists who chose to read your book.

> *As for explaining *ALL* the data currently collected, be reasonable.*
There
> *is an awful lot of data out there. That data has been accumulated over a*
> *hundred years by perhaps a million scientists at the cost of billions of*
> *dollars.*

I'm aware of this. When QM came out, it was supposed to explain the universe from the macroscopic scale down... but it didn't. Looking at the universe through QM, things become increasingly complex. When (Super)String Theory came out, the same thing happened. If your model is the right one, then it will explain *all* of the data. You may not, however, be the one to realize that it does. If you've got the right model, things will become increasingly simple when looking through the model.

I'm sorry if you thought I was implying that you as the (co)author had to understand that your model explains all of the data. Such an expectation would be at best foolish.

- > *If one person comes along and says, "Hey, I found the foundation*
- > *for the new physics you're looking for," don't unreasonably expect this*
- one*
- > *person to answer every question under the Sun. If this person can provide*
- a*
- > *mathematically correct Unified Force Theory, that is worthy in itself for*
- > *being evaluated. But I go further than that and provide a complete*
- > *structural system for all subatomic matter that fully agrees with the*
- > *empirical data. I make a correction to the Casimir equation and point out*
- > *an error in the presently accepted neutron magnetic moment and neutron*
- > *g-factor. I show the geometrical cause for the electron and proton*
- > *g-factors. I show the geometrical cause for the fine structure constants.*
- > *I show an equation that quantifies the neutron as a binding of an electron*
- > *and proton.*
- >
- > *That's enough for a first step in the right direction. If you want to see*
- > *this theory fully developed to explain ****ALL**** the known data, then help*
- > *develop the theory. The SM was not presented in a single paper by a*
- single*
- > *scientist and that contained all the answers to all the questions ever*
- > *asked. Why would you place such outrageous demands on me?*

Not on you, your model... and the demands aren't outrageous. I don't make the requirement that you have to understand everything your model implies and explains. That takes lots of research.

- > *Look, just break down and read the theory. There is a reason why it is*
- > *presented in over 200 pages in book form. It is graphics intensive, full*
- of*
- > *equations, full of descriptions, and is well footnoted. No, I don't*
- predict*
- > *the shape of an ant's butt, but I do present at least a dozen significant*
- > *quantum physics breakthroughs.*

How do you know if they're breakthroughs if they're not proven yet?

- > *I admit openly that I'm self-educated in physics. I'm not ashamed of*
- that.*
- > *In fact, I attribute my ability to present a completely different physics*
- > *model to the fact that I wasn't indoctrinated in the SM. I did ,and do,*
- > *read many books and research papers. I'm learning as I go. Is that a*
- > *reason to throw out my research?*

Oh hell no. Personal experience shows that self-educated people often learn their subject better and faster than they could going through 4+ years of college. The problem isn't to be found in how you came across your info, but rather in the terms you use to present your info, and how you define them.

sci.physics.relativity: Re: Nobel Prize for David Thomson?!

- > *My biggest stumbling block is my lack of access to the data I need. If you*
- > *have access to data, you could apply the Aether Physics Model to that data*
- > *and make your own discoveries. There is no need to wait for me to get*
- > *around to it.*
- >
- > *The Aether Physics Model is truly a valid system of physics. You really*
- > *need to look at it before trashing it any further. Who knows, maybe I did*
- > *make a mistake. Then you could be the first to point out its error(s).*
- > *That should be worth the \$50 right there.*

If you do accept the possibility that you have made a mistake, then review all of the arguments again, and this time take a close look at what I'm actually telling you.

- > > *Further, given the current definition of*
- > > *energy, it doesn't matter how many dimensions you work with, any and all*
- > > *changes in inertia require application or removal of energy. That means*
- > *if*
- > > *"angular momentum" is moving around, it's either gaining or losing*
- > *energy*
- > > *in*
- > > *the process. There's no way around this save to change the definition of*
- > > *energy.*
- >
- > *You're coming from a paradigm where the Universe is assumed to be created*
- > *in*
- > *a state of motion. It wasn't. The Universe was created in a state of*
- > *force. It turns out that dark matter, while encapsulated by Aether,*
- > *provides something for this force to act on. As the force acts on the*
- > *subatomic particles they begin to move and the movement manifests as work.*
- > *There is no need to redefine energy, and there is no need to make energy*
- > *into something it is not. It is only necessary to understand the true*
- > *ontology for the creation of the physical Universe.*

Actually, I make no assumptions of how the universe was created. My view of things merely tries to explain how things are, not how they got that way. That's an exercise for later when the current state of things is fully understood. I suggest you do the same as a starting point.

- > > > *Gravity is one manifestation of the Gforce acting on subatomic*
- > > > *particles.*
- > > > *The Gforce is the source of the gravitational force, electromagnetic*
- > > > *force,*
- > > > *and electrostatic force. It is as though subatomic particles were a*
- > *kind*
- > > > *of*
- > > > *prism that refracts the Gforce into three distinct manifestations.*
- > >
- > > *... and the source of this Gforce is... what?*
- >

sci.physics.relativity: Re: Nobel Prize for David Thomson?!

- > *The source of the Gforce is the same source of length, frequency, mass, and*
- > *charge. At this point, who cares? The physics clearly show exactly what*
- > *Einstein was looking for, a Unified Force Theory where all forces trace*
- > *back*
- > *to a common force. Let's just take things one step at a time.*

All forces are actions, all actions have causes. If you cannot identify the cause, you do not have a force. Suggestion: Trade your "GForce" for a "GField" and re-examine your model. Doing such will give you a potential explanation for how the 3 forces are derived. And since a field can exist without necessarily having a cause, you're clear of the problem.

- > >> *Your explanation of Gravity is merely the observation of two*
- > >> *coincidental*
- > >> *facts. GR does not present any mechanism for how curved space-time*
- > >> *could*
- > >> *produce gravity, or vice versa.*
- > >
- > > *For once we agree. GR does not provide a functional conceptual model for*
- > > *gravity.*
- >
- > *We might agree on much more if you actually took the time to understand*
- > *the*
- > *Aether Physics Model. It is incredibly coherent.*

I would like to believe so, except your use of various terms is somewhat baffling. That's why I keep mentioning a need to redefine things. Your uses deviate from the currently defined meanings.

- > > *Given that most gravitation effects are measured as the result of a*
- > > *massive*
- > > *body having a discernable surface area, and that the effects are usually*
- > > *measured outside of that surface, radius as defined as an orbital*
- > > *distance*
- > > *from the center of gravity of a massive object will suffice quite*
- > > *nicely.*
- > > *In*
- > > *other words, the two terms are interchangeable in this context. Now quit*
- > > *worrying about this particular straw man and move on to more important*
- > > *points.*
- >
- > *We're talking about science. You're picking at my theories, I'm going to*
- > *pick at your understanding of the SM. The gravitational force law is*
- > *based*
- > *on distance, not radius. Most gravitational effects, if you are looking*
- > *at*
- > *the big picture, have nothing to do with a massive body and a small body*
- > *on*
- > *its surface. Most gravitational effects are huge bodies in space that*
- > *don't*

- > *touch each other. It's only your limited human perception that causes you*
- > *to believe that most gravitational effects have to do with the Earth in*
- > *particular and objects on its surface. The fact is, the gravitational*
force
- > *law could care less whether we are talking about bodies in space or small*
- > *bodies on the surface of larger bodies. In all cases the only true*
equation
- > *depends on distance, and has nothing to do with radius except by*
- > *coincidence.*

The fact that we both just made the exact same argument shows that the terms are interchangeable. You should note that Newton's gravitational force equation as commonly written is $F = Gm_1m_2/r^2$ where r is the orbital radius of the center of mass of m_1 around the center of mass of m_2 . Notice there's no mention of objects in contact or how big r is or how massive m_1 and m_2 might be. The reason radius is a better term in this context is that radius implies circle to most people, and anywhere along the circle defined by the location of the center of mass of m_2 and the radius r , F will be the same for a given mass m_1 .

Radius is a measure of distance. Newton's formulas all begin with the basic assumption that the actual volume of the massive object is irrelevant. So why you think I'd care about the volume of the object and/or it's surface is quite beyond me. So are we done discussing this irrelevant point?

- > > > *Also, it is the force that varies, not a "field."*
- > > >
- > > > *Are you sure about that? Newton's gravity has a "force" acting*
between
- > > > 2
- > > > *masses. So the "force" of gravity varies with the masses of the*
objects
- > > > *and*
- > > > *inversely with the square of their distance apart. However, that same*
> > > *concept has a "field" of effect surrounding only 1 mass who's*
strength
- > > > *varies*
- > > > *in the same way as the "force".*
- > > >
- > > > *Yes, I'm certain that the force varies and not the field. The field is*
> > > *the*
- > > > *total of all the force measurements at all the distances. The force is*
a
- > > > *specific force at a specific measured distance. Also, the force is*
real,
- > > > *the field is imaginary.*
- > >
- > > *Wait a second, you just stated that:*
- > >
- > > *"The APM sees fields as primary to, and more real than matter."*
- > >

sci.physics.relativity: Re: Nobel Prize for David Thomson?!

- > > *So if forces are real, fields are imaginary, and matter is less real than*
- > > *fields, then what the heck is causing all of this force?*
- >
- > *At this point in our discussion, who cares? What the heck is causing all*
- > *this matter? It's there. The force laws all share the same structure and*
- > *are fundamental to physics.*

By this it seems like you should've said "The APM sees forces as primary to..." instead of fields. If that is truly the case, then the related questions I posted last time are quite irrelevant.

- > > *If a massive object*
- > > *is always assumed to be stationary, and there are no other massive objects*
- > > *around, does it still apply a gravitational force?*
- >
- > *The object never applies the gravitational force in the first place. That*
- > *is one of the great errors of the SM and relativity theories. Objects are*
- > *the things the force acts upon, they do not supply the force that acts upon*
- > *themselves.*

Agreed! However, I do believe that they are the cause of the force being supplied on them. Mass somehow displaces the aether, somehow causing a return pressure on the mass itself from the aether... but that's just an idea of mine.

- > > *On what?*
- >
- > *The Aether applies the force.*

Again we agree. It is these points that would lead me to believe you are on the right course. Please review previous arguments and give them a more serious look over.

- > *The force is fundamental, even more*
- > *fundamental than the subatomic particles which the forces act upon. The*
- > *subatomic particles are formed from dark matter and Gforce. Both dark*
- > *matter and Gforce pre-exist the physical Universe because subatomic*
- > *particles are the beginning of the physical Universe. If the physics shows*
- > *that force pre-exists matter, then that what it is. Don't fault me for*
- > *discovering this, find fault with the physics and point out the errors.*

I know it's difficult at best not to see it that way, but rest assured, I've been faulting your presentation of your model. If the presentation you've been making is representative of your model, then your model is indeed faulty. If the model is faulty, then the physics on which the model depends must also be faulty.

sci.physics.relativity: Re: Nobel Prize for David Thomson?!

- > > *Force*
- > > *accelerates mass, classic definition. If the afore mentioned massive*
- > > *object*
- > > *is not accelerating and there's no other mass around, then there's no*
- > > *force.*
- >
- > *Since when does a definition, classic or otherwise, determine the laws of*
- > *the Universe?*

Words don't define the universe. Words define human understanding of the universe. Example. If I told you to go to the store and buy some "eau de toilette," what I meant was go buy some "toiletries," those things that belong in a bathroom, not "toilet water" as a direct translation would imply. Effectively, to someone who doesn't know enough French, I didn't say what I meant, but to those who do understand, what I meant was perfectly clear.

The problem we're having is much the same. The way you're using some terms defies their commonly known definitions. So what you're saying likely doesn't appear to be what you're meaning to those of us who don't understand your particular use of those terms.

- > *What makes you think that the only thing force does is*
- > *accelerate mass? Certainly it is an effect of force to accelerate a mass,*
- > *but what else can force do? Also, keep in mind that force only works at the*
- > *quantum level.*
- >
- > > *So how does this force suddenly pop into existence when another mass*
- shows
- > > *up?*
- >
- > *Force was there before the subatomic particle was there. How do subatomic*
- > *particles suddenly pop into existence with the Big Bang? My physics model*
- > *shows how. Dark matter is absorbed into Aether. Aether is itself a*
- > *manifestation of Gforce. Let's figure out the physical Universe before we*
- > *try to figure out the non-material existence that preceded it.*

If force precedes mass then what does the force act on? $F=ma$ would no longer apply. Thus you'd need a new definition for force.

- > *The SM does not explain how mass, length, frequency, and charge came into*
- > *existence at the same time as the Big Bang.*

... nor can it.

- > *The dimensions are taken for*
- > *granted in the SM. That's actually quite understandable because the*
- > *dimensions are themselves non-material qualities that give rise to*
- material
- > *qualities. Physical science can only go as far as physical existence.*

What

- > *preceded physical existence is necessarily beyond the scope of the physical sciences.*

Your point? You lost me on that one.

- > *So Gforce, dark matter, and Aether are in the same category as the dimensions. They can be quantified but they have non-material existence.*
- > *Until we develop a non-physical system of physics, we have to accept them as*
- > *givens.*

So you're actually increasing the number of "givens" to make your model work? That doesn't bode well for your model. The more axioms in your model, the more likely it is to be proven incorrect.

- > > *As you correctly stated, fields are primary. The gravitational field is*
- > > *real. The gravitational force is conceptual. Watch those contradictions.*
- >
- > *I stated that the forces were primary, not the fields. You got to watch*
- > *those confusions. The gravitational force is real, the gravitational field*
- > *is conceptual.*

Look at your reply to me on 1/20/2005 in this thread. You'll see that I wasn't the one confused. Remember typing this?

- > *According to your understanding it would seem falacious. You can't judge*
- > *the APM by SM concepts. If you want to understand the Aether, you must*
- > *study it as it is, not as a preconceived concept you have about gasses.*

The

- > *Aether exists in five dimensions of space-resonance, the SM never goes*
- > *beyond four dimensions of space-time. Further, the SM considers fields to*
- > *be mathematical constructs. The APM sees fields as primary to, and more*
- > *real than matter. The APM shows a non-material reality that gave rise to*
- > *a*
- > *material Universe, which is even what the Big Bang boils down to. Only in*
- > *the case of the APM, the non-material reality is quantified.*

As you can see. I wasn't confused.

- > > *That's nice too, but for the majority of this conversation I've been*
- > > *speaking of gravity, not the strong force. So unless the strong force is*
- > > *relevant to causing gravity, it has no place in this discussion.*
- >
- > *I believe this conversation evolved from a discussion of GR. As I pointed*
- > *out, GR is a mistake in that it confused the effect of the strong force*
- > *for*
- > *the gravitational force. So as long as you continue to discuss gravity in*
- > *relation to GR, it is fair for me to continue to correct this*

> *misunderstanding.*

So it is your assertion that the strong force is responsible for causing matter to attract matter in such a weak fashion?

> > *So do tell, how exactly in your experimenting did you notice the*
> > *immeasurable, non-directly observable aether had such a large,*
> > *non-gravitating mass? What experiment did you run to note that charge is*
a
> > *property of these aether units rather than the subatomic particles?*
>
> *SRT is based on perception, i.e. seeing through the senses. My theory is*
> *based on logic, i.e. examining the data and deducing first principles.*

Ouch! That lends you to creating a theory that matches the data but not reality. Actually SRT is based on mis-applied logic against data and formulas that were themselves based on empirical observation... not too terribly different from what you're doing.

> > > *When an object is moving, especially at*
> > > *relativistic speeds (which light always is),*
> > >
> > > *What is a "relativistic speed?" Do you mean the speed of light? What*
is
> > > *so*
> > > *relativistic about the speed of light?*
> >
> > *Please try not to be obtuse. Just in case you weren't joking:*
> >
> > *Relativistic speed: linear velocity such that measurable effects*
predicted
> > *by the theory of relativity can be observed.*
>
> *You're the one being obtuse. If you're talking about an object moving at*
> *the speed of light, or near the speed of light, say so. The predicted*
> *effects you speak of are optical illusions. Nothing really happens. The*
> *term "relativistic" has no scientific meaning except when describing*
optical
> *illusions. Once again, I'm interested in real science only, not imaginary*
> *scenarios where the optical illusion is taken as an actual occurrence.*

I agree with you as to the nature of the effects, but unfortunately, the term is very much valid within the realm of science. You can accept this or not. That does not, however, invalidate its use.

> > > > *You do realize that a) moving objects act like they have more mass*
> > > > *than*
> > > > *their stationary equivalents,*
> > > >
> > > > *You realize that this is just an illusion seen by an outside*
> > > > *observer. The*

sci.physics.relativity: Re: Nobel Prize for David Thomson?!

> >> >> *mass itself sees no change at all.*
> >> >
> >> > *Yes, but that illusion also comes with an increase in gravitational*
> >> > *effect*
> >> > *as seen by the outside observer. While that too is likely an illusion*
> >> > *due to*
> >> > *the speed of the object, it doesn't change the observer's*
measurements.
> >>
> >> *LOL. That was a joke, right? A measured illusion?*
> >
> > *Yes. We measure illusions constantly. There aren't any actual letters on*
> > *your screen.*
>
> *Exactly, and these letters don't bite me when I touch the screen either,*
or
> *remain younger than me because the electrons that make them travel at the*
> *speed of light. You can't build a speed of light spaceship that will make*
> *the traveler age less than those on Earth. You can't increase mass to*
> *infinity. You can't increase mass at all. Other than entertainment, who*
> *cares whether time has the illusion of passing slower from some observer.*
> *Just as surely, time appears to pass faster for an observer in the path*
the
> *rocketship is heading in. So what? How does that change reality for*
those
> *on the ship or those observing?*

We do agree that SRT is flawed. We do not agree, however, on your particular use of certain terms.

> > *All you're looking at right now is a series of closely spaced*
> > *red, green, & blue colored phosphors which are either being illuminated*
or
> > *ignored by a stream of electrons passing by at high speed. Those "dots"*
> > *aren't even continuously on like they appear to be. They fade out, but*
are
> > *soon struck and re-illuminated again.*
>
> *And? What does that have to do with Special Relativity Theory? What is*
the
> *effect of SRT? I can understand the effect of language, alphabets,*
electron
> *beams, colors, etc. But I don't understand what SRT has accomplished.*
SRT
> *doesn't describe a real process, it doesn't carry or reveal real*
> *information, and it doesn't describe a real thing. SRT has no more value*
> *than supplying fantasy material for comic books and movies.*

Keep in context. This is all part of answering how we measure illusions.

- > > *The ground you're standing or sitting*
- > > *on isn't really continuously solid. It's 95% empty space! If you were in*
- > > *physical contact with the ground as you would appear to be, then the*
atoms
- > > *in your foot or shoe would be fused with the atoms of the ground. The*
- > > *contact you appear to have is the point where the force of repulsion*
from
- > > *the electrons & protons surrounding from atoms on the floor and the ones*
- > > *from the atoms on your feet or shoes balances the force of attraction*
- > > *between you and the earth. There are many such illusions.*
- >
- > *Your definition of illusion differs considerably with that of even your*
> *peers.*

Agreed. In this use, I took away the assumptions that normally come with the term.

- > *The interaction of the forces to produce the appearance of standing*
> *or sitting is considered by most to be "reality." Illusion applies to*
those
- > *things which seem real but are later found to not truly exist. I don't see*
- > *how your observation that solids are not truly solid translates to being*
an
- > *illusion.*

Does that not apply to the "solidity" of mass? Surfaces were once thought solid and continuous along their length. After gaining an understanding of the nature of atoms and matter, it was later learned that this "continuous solidity" was not real as over 90% of the material is massless space.

- > *I think you are confusing preconception with illusion. We might*
- > *imagine something is 100% solid, but that is just our preconception. When*
- > *we find out it is really only 5% solid, that does not take away from the*
- > *reality of the object, it only modifies our conception of the object.*

...and in the process, we change our definitions. Today, any educated person understands that solids are more than 90% empty space. However, if you try convincing someone who is not familiar with science of that fact, they will likely believe you insane, until they are taught otherwise.

- > *In the case of SRT, there is no mass increase and no time dilation, even*
> *though it appears that way to an observer. The mirage of water on hot*
sand
- > *does not give rise to actual water. The mirage of time dilation does not*
- > *give rise to actual time dilation. The illusion of mass increase does not*
> *give rise to actual mass increase.*

Agreed, but along with those illusions comes certain effects that increase the believability of the illusion.

sci.physics.relativity: Re: Nobel Prize for David Thomson?!

- > > *Too many to name.*
- > > *But we accept them all the same and measure them.*
- >
- > *You're wrong with respect to SRT. There is nothing is SRT for you to*
- > *measure. Don't confuse a measurement with a calculation.*

Ok. Challenge. Explain what throws off quantum clocks that are synchronized on earth, one taken to space, then brought back and found to be out of sync by a highly predictable amount? I agree that time didn't slow down, but can your model tell why the clock did?

- > > > > *and b) light never sits still, don't you?*
- > > > >
- > > > > *If you realize that light never sits still, then how can you be sure*
- > > > > *it has*
- > > > > *a rest mass?*
- > > > >
- > > > *I never said it did. I said it has a "relativistic mass" and that*
- mass
- > > > *also*
- > > > *has gravity.*
- > > >
- > > > *You just said light has a zero rest mass. Which do you believe? You*
- > > > *can't*
- > > > *have it both ways. Also, gravity is not a property of mass. Gravity*
- is
- > > > *a*
- > > > *force that pertains specifically to the mass in the unit of angular*
- > > > *momentum. The object being acted upon cannot be the same thing as the*
- > > > *action acting upon it.*
- > >
- > > *Again. I never said that light has a "rest mass." Seeing as how light*
- > > *never*
- > > *"rests" it cannot ever have a "rest mass."*
- >
- > *Then why do you refer to the rest mass of a photon?*

Quote me where I have. I haven't, to my knowledge, ever stated that a photon has a rest mass. If I have, then either I made a mistake or the comment was taken out of context.

- > > *However, light ****DOES**** have a*
- > > *"relativistic mass", and it is this "relativistic mass" that allows*
- light
- > > *to*
- > > *interact w/ gravity.*
- >
- > *Your physics doesn't even quantify light or a photon, so how can you tell*
- > *what its mass is, rest, relativistic, or otherwise?*

Study QM. Photons are indeed quantified. And it's not my physics.

Re: Nobel Prize for David Thomson?!

sci.physics.relativity: Re: Nobel Prize for David Thomson?!

- > *Here we go again with the illusions. The "relativistic mass" of the light*
- > *is an illusion, and yet you say it interacts with gravity. You can't*
- drink
- > *the water of a mirage any more than the illusory effects of light can*
- > *interact with something real. Gravity is a force law that requires two*
- > *masses. Light has zero mass, therefore zero gravitational force can act*
- > *upon it.*

Gravity is also a field law. Remember this? $g=Gm/r^2$ defines the strength of a gravitational field around a point of mass m at radius r .

- > > *Gravity is a **field** (you remember, those things*
- >