

# Re: johnreed take 13 – 2005 first draft

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-06/msg00191.html>

---

- *From:* "Bill Hobba" <[bhobba@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:bhobba@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Thu, 02 Jun 2005 05:24:59 GMT
- 

<[randamajor@xxxxxxxx](mailto:randamajor@xxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
[news:1117663020.312722.45030@xx](mailto:news:1117663020.312722.45030@xx)

>

>

> Bill Hobba wrote:

>> <[randamajor@xxxxxxxx](mailto:randamajor@xxxxxxxx)> wrote in message

>> [news:1116963658.733574.143030@xx](mailto:news:1116963658.733574.143030@xx)

>>>

>>>

>>> Bill Hobba wrote:

>>>> <[randamajor@xxxxxxxx](mailto:randamajor@xxxxxxxx)>

>>>> "The question does arise, " Does the earth attractor act on each  
atom of

>> the

>>>> gold chunk, or does it act on the specific mass of each atom?"

>>>>

>>>> Since the mass of an atom is an intrinsic property the question is

>>>> meaningless.

>>>>

>>>> Bill

>>>>

>>>> What you are saying then is: Since we have no way to distinguish

>>>> between the two, we regard them as intrinsically the same.

>>

>> No. I am saying that mass is a property matter has

>

> jr writes>

> Yes, and this property of matter, mass, we believe is the property of

> matter that generates our "feel" of attraction to the earth. Which we

> assign to the entire universe as a controlling force. But, if the

> proportional aspect of the attractor focus is on stable states of

> matter, and not on the "mass" of stable states of matter, it changes

> our entire paradigm. What we have now is a 50-50 chance either way, as

> I see it.

The property of mass has nothing to do with the concept of a systems  
stability.

- >
- > like electric charge –
- >> uncharged particles have a charge of zero
- >
- > jr writes>
- > Stable elements with all electrons intact also have a charge of 0. Only
- > when the electron is removed do we have a charge. This speaks to, again
- > as I see it, the electromagnetic formation of matter.

I fail to see your logic.

- > A stable element
- > will be attracted to either a large atomic aggregate or a one with a
- > random major (see take V.1) core.
- >
- > – massless particles have a mass
- >> of 0. Why do particles have this property?
- >
- > jr writes>
- >
- > Here are you referencing theoretical particles like the neutrino and
- > photon? Or are you referencing something more tangible.

Photons and Neutrinos are about as tangible as you can get.

- >
- >
- > In the case of mass we think
- >> the Higgs field has something to do with it – in the case of charge
- >> according to Kaluza Klein theory it depends on its initial velocity in
- the
- >> 5th dimension.
- >
- > jr writes>
- > I see three space dimensions and one time dimension. Some mathematical
- > use can be derived from the combination that at least retains a
- > connection to reality however obscured. But when you interject 5, 6, 7
- > etc etc and etc dimensions, just because you can algebraically, as
- > elegant and effective as it may appear to be, in terms of numbers, it
- > is an indiscriminate use of mathematics to foist a picture of reality
- > from it, onto the rest of humanity.

Any theory in accord with observation is as good as any other – regardless of what you think of its assumptions.

Thanks  
Bill

- >
- > But you really have not progressed much beyond saying it is
- >> simply a property particles can have.

>  
> jr writes>  
> Well Bill, an expansion of take 6 will clarify the nature of particles.  
> Anyone can do this in terms of the "chrome ring" structure. It does not  
> require me any more. I have to focus on the foundational errors we  
> retain to insure that the entire field is covered. Only when I am  
> satisfied that enough information has been made available will I return  
> to expand on this area. Suffice it for now to say that those particles  
> created and released by the elements are fundamental. The rest are  
> largely rubble.  
>>>  
>>> What I said previously was: We can perform no experiment that can  
>>> differentiate between the atom and its mass, such that we can tell  
>>> which is being acted upon by the earth attractor.  
>>  
>> John statements of this nature – like discussing the number of angels  
that  
>> can dance on the head of a pin – is a dead end. If you think otherwise  
try  
>> making a prediction that can test it.  
>  
> jr writes>  
> Uh? I think that was my original point Bill. Since none exists we have  
> a 50–50 chance of being wrong. Isn't this worth investigating?  
>>>  
>> Bill  
>>  
>>>  
>>> You wave away the difficulty in a similar fashion as did Newton with  
>>> regard to planetary matter. He said, "Since it is true for all matter  
>>> we can experimentally verify, it is true for all matter whatsoever."  
>>> (paraphrased)  
>>>  
>>> But Newton had no further evidence before him. Dante's Inferno defined  
>>> the inner workings of the earth at the time and atoms were still a  
>>> notion of the ancients.  
>>>  
>>> I suppose it relates in some manner to the idea of experimental  
>>> verification being required for any avenue of thought. Since we cannot  
>>> tell the difference between the two experimentally, they are the same.  
>>>  
>>> It is often the case that we just don't accept the result from  
>>> experiment at face value. Free fall, escape velocity and orbit  
velocity  
>>> all show that mass does not enter into the earth attractor  
mathematics.  
>>> So what do we have left for the earth attractor to act on?  
>>>  
>>> Where you would wave it away, I instead developed a system from it.  
And  
>>> my system leads to all kinds of non–contradictory rational

explanations

>>> that assimilate anomalies (sp?) and conundrums that arise from the  
>>> mainstream view.  
>>>  
>>> I have yet to get to most of them. I keep coming back to the problem  
of  
>>> mass. I think I will push on with other aspects of it, its just hard  
to  
>>> discontinue arguments that challenge gravity, because gravity is the  
>>> cause of all our esoteric mathematics.  
>>>  
>>> johnreed  
>>>  
>

---

• *Follow-Ups:*

◆ *Re: johnreed take 13 – 2005 first draft*

◇ *From:* randamajor

• *References:*

◆ *Re: johnreed take 13 – 2005 first draft*

◇ *From:* randamajor

- Prev by Date: *Re: relativistic rotational kinetic energy*
- Next by Date: *Re: the basis of relativity*
- Previous by thread: *Re: johnreed take 13 – 2005 first draft*
- Next by thread: *Re: johnreed take 13 – 2005 first draft*
- Index(es):
  - ◆ *Date*
  - ◆ *Thread*