

Re: johnreed take 1

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-04/msg00788.html>

- *From:* randamajor@xxxxxxxxxx
 - *Date:* 11 Apr 2005 14:01:15 -0700
-

> > are told that they are fundamental aspects of the universe. The most recent additions are the logical result of an unquestioned, never verified, one hundred year old seminal assumption***** Colored quarks > > have no real existence in the universe, yet, > > Hold on. Why do you say that? At the turn of the century the existence of atoms was questioned. Then Einstein and others were able to decibel Brownian motion using the atomic hypothesis that count not be explained any other way.

jr writes>

I have no problem with atoms as an ultimate constituent of matter. Brownian motion does not describe the structure of matter, however.

From that point on few physicists questioned the existence of > atoms – and for good reason. The same with quarks

jr writes>

This is one hell of a jump Bill.

– just like atoms since

> we have no theory that can explain the facts without then the only > reasonable thing do is assume they exist.

jr writes>

I would have no problem with this if physics was merely another version of philosophy. But physics is our crowning scientific field. When the physicist speaks, the world listens. The listening world includes other scientific fields that predicate their approach based on the laws of physics.

Now enter the photon. A fine mathematical device if ever there was one. It is not worth a damn to explain vision, however, altho' it purports to be. Physiology now explains vision in terms of photons. So much for

Re: johnreed take 1

our medical knowledge. Will it advance beyond this inadequate notion or will it wait for physics to properly limit the photon's function?

And sure enough in recent times
> we can actually photograph individual atoms.

jr writes:

Yes, the tunneling microscope is a marvel (the name has no relation to the QM phenomenon) however even the detection of a point like object inside an atom does not translate to colored quarks with fractional charges.

But such did not create a

> revolution because the evidence of their existence was simply too strong.

>

>

>> today the academic

>> humanist must reason from a theoretical reality, composed of colored

>> quarks, joined together with gluons, within a time dilating, curved

>> space universe. Why? Because mathematics has something to do with the

>> real world.

>>

>> * A simple example of an economic or least action function, in terms of

>> its form, is a Euclidean circle. The circumference is the shortest line

>> length to contain the greatest area. ** The Earth attractor is the

>> phenomenon that we presently call gravity, our feel force. *** The

>> Earth attractor does not act on mass during free fall acceleration,

>> during orbit, or during escape velocity from the Earth. ****# Emily

>> Noether concluded that space was symmetric with respect to rotation and

>> that this guaranteed that the law of conservation of momentum would

>> hold everywhere.****See Takes 2, 3 and 4 for discussions on mass.

>> The assumption was that the electron manifests as a particle inside the

>> atom.

>

> I find what you wrote above basically unintelligible gibberish. But hey

> that may be because I am dumb.

jr writes>

Yes. I wrote this post originally some 6 years ago. I am not happy with it today, although 6 years ago it represented a concept that I still support. I wanted it accessible to me so I imported it here. The Noether footnote addition marks an area I plan to expand on.

Re: johnreed take 1

>
> Bill

.

- **References:**

- ◆ **johnreed take 1**
 - ◇ From: randamajor
- ◆ **Re: johnreed take 1**
 - ◇ From: Bill Hobba

- Prev by Date: **Re: Aberration re stars**
- Next by Date: **Re: Einsteins 1905 Papers – Questioned**
- Previous by thread: **Re: johnreed take 1**
- Next by thread: **8192 DIMENTIONS * 8 = IS WHAT ANOTHER TIME TRAP!**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **Date**
 - ◆ **Thread**