Re: Dayton Miller's Data have no Real Signal

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005−12/msg01057.html

- *From*: Joe Fischer <efischer@xxxxxxxxx>
- *Date*: Mon, 12 Dec 2005 14:53:59 −0500

On 12 Dec "David Thomson" <google@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

>Joe Fischer wrote:
>> And I told you I can't download pdf at the moment,
>> I think I need to remove and reinstall Internet explorer.
>> Can't you just create a download link by html?
>
>There is a .doc format at:
>www.16pi2.com/files/A_New_Foundation_of_Physics.doc
>
>If the link doesn't work, remove the underscores in the filename.

Right, I knew that, your web site manager makes
too much available.

>> In think it would be a favor to you if I don't comment,
>> I am extremely predjudiced toward a particular physical model.
>
>That doesn't matter, I am not. I don't let the prejudices of others
>get in the way from speaking my mind and staying focused on the topic.

What I meant was, I can't be both honest and kind.

My definition of "speaking in tongue" where physics
is concerned is "putting words that are not related in the
same sentence, and those words should not even be on
the same page".

>You would actually be doing me a favor if you could find a true
>weakness in the theory.

I just stated why I don't. :−) Sorry.

> I would love to bury this idea if it is no good.

If you have to completely rewrite physics, it _is_
no good. From what little I saw, you propose changing
everything, even down to basic units and measurements.
Every American mechanic curses the metric system

because they all had to completely replace their tools,
even if there was a good reason to accept your ideas,
it would not be good.

>The problem I am facing is that the math all works out perfect,
>the theory is solidly based upon empirical data, and the theory
>actually solves problems that other models cannot. I cannot let this
>idea go until it has been thoroughly examined and either found to be
>based on error or proven to be correct.

Fine, but in my opinion, it is an error to even think
that there is any field or force other than what is well
studied in physics and chemistry.

>> >You talk about the many
>> >scientists who are forced to accept Relativity theories today or face
>> >professional censure,
>>
>> No, I have never said that, I said they must avoid certain
>> things to avoid public ridicule.
>
>That is the same thing. Scientists must avoid mentioning anything that
>contradicts Relativity theory to avoid public ridicule. Public
>ridicule is essentially the same thing as censure since a ridiculed
>scientist is not hired by anybody. It will be interesting to see if
>the Maryland university professor looses his job over the Scientific
>American article.

He may already have tenure.

>> >but what about those scientists who continually
>> >find evidence of the Aether's existence and continually expouse its
>> >many uses in physics?
>>
>> I am not aware of any physicist that would give as
>> much time as Tom Roberts has, even if you payed him
>> the fees of an expert witness.
>
>What does that have to do with the question?

The idea of an aether is the problem, if you were
to use the word "empirical" in your book, it would almost
certainly be a falsehood in my opinion.

>The purpose of science is
>not to advance a particular political view, but to discover the truth.
>The truth appears to be that the Aether exists, is quantifiable, and
>has uses in physics. Paying people like Robert Shankland and Tom
>Roberts to focus only on cynical responses to a particular physics
>theory just to keep Relativity propped up doesn't sound like a rational
>response.

There are a million physicists that would give anything
to be able to make a major discovery.
But they would need experimental results that would
support their contentions.

>> >I have completely quantified the Aether as a fabric of quantum rotating
>> >magnetic fields, which fully explains exactly what electric and
>> >magnetic fields are.

That is what I mean by words that are not related.

>> I am not interested, but I am convinced you are
>> not only way over your head, but also treading where
>> there is no reason to go.
>
>Well, at least you admit to your prejudice, which is admirable. You
>have a right to hold whatever thoughts you choose. As for me being
>over my head, aren't we all when it comes to new discoveries? The
>trick is to learn to reach new limits of understanding, not give up and
>drown. I'm not ashamed of my humble education background or my lack of
>professional experience. When I look at the communications skills of
>the so−called professionals and experts on these newsgroups, I actually
>feel quite good about myself.

What do you mean, there are only a couple of
regulars here that even have a BS.

The rest are BS, including me.

>> >The theory further demonstrates that strong
>> >charge, which mediates the strong force, is orthogonal to mass.
>>
>> I don't know what that means, isn't orthogonal a term
>> meaning a direction? I thought the strong force was from
>> within mass/matter.
>
>Yes, orthogonal means from a different direction, but the direction
>need not be limited to just the length dimensions. Imagine a stop sign
>has being strictly two dimensional. The surface of the sign has
>dimensions of length squared, but if you turn the sign 90 degrees, the
>same sign appears to have a single dimension of length and appears as a
>line. The orthogonality of charge and mass works in the same way.

More words that don't fit in the same sentence?

>Think of the surface of the sign as being charge squared, but when you
>turn it 90 degrees you see the linear dimension of mass. This is how
>mass is orthogonal to charge. Charge is actually a line of mass moving
>a velocity through a quantum Aether unit. Charge exists as a line of
>mass scanning an area.

>
>As strange or different as this may sound at first, the concept is
>fully quantified and modeled. In fact, it is precisely because mass
>and charge are orthogonal to each other that subatomic particles can
>appear as both a particle (mass) and wave (charge), depending upon how
>you look at it. The fact that a subatomic particle is a line of mass
>scanning an area in a quantum moment also explains why the position of
>the subatomic particle appears to be a probability function, rather
>than a discrete location when trying to pinpoint it in 4D space−time.

Sorry, I am not even going to load MS Word to look at
your papers, and Wordpad would not load any of them.

>> Well, that is close to what I believe, I think if the strong
>> force were not quite as strong as it is thought to be, then
>> maybe gravity would result. But I may be thinking of something
>> else.
>
>It is a different concept in content, but similar in form. You do see
>a relationship between the strong force and gravity, and that
>relationship is quantified in the Aether Physics Model.

I really haven't studied it that close, it may be the
weak or em, or even van de Waals.
But I don't believe in any forces or fields other than
what is in mainstream physics with gravity omitted.

>> >In Einstein's GR, the tensors are space−time curvature (whatever that
>> >is) and mass/energy (whatever that is). In the Aether Physics Model
>> >the tensors are the electrostatic charge of the Aether (electrostatic
>> >charge is well−known) and the electromagnetic charge of matter (fully
>> >quantified within the theory and understandable).
>>
>> That is all just meaningless words to me, while I have
>> a deep interest in gravity, I do not study current theory that much,
>> and I don't study aether at all.
>
>It is meaningless to a lot of people who don't read General Relativity
>theory. And I can't blame them. GR theory is presented in such a
>loose and vague manner, with a new dictionary of terms, that few people
>have the time in their graduate program to put up with it. PhD
>physicists that I have talked to almost brag that their 8 years of
>University physics education makes them qualified to state that they
>don't understand it. Nevertheless, they know what they need to know to
>pass the class and produce the numbers they are required to produce. I
>don't claim to fully understand the logic of General Relativity theory
>as it is presented, but I can follow the underlying physics and its
>importance.

I have been reading it since about 1953 when the
books that were removed from libraries in WWII were being

replaced, some with pages missing.

>> >One of the most pressing problems for Einstein was finding the Unified
>> >Force Theory, which he thought would be an important discovery for
>> >physics.
>>
>> Not unified force, it was unified field, simply meaning
>> a continuous entity rather than a discrete or quantity in steps,
>> like the photons of light or the defined bundles of energy of
>> quantum theory.
>
>It has been called many names; Grand Unified Theory, Unified Field
>Theory, Unified Force Theory, and probably others. The forces are
>spread out as fields, so a Unified Force Theory is also a Unified Field
>Theory and it is Grand in the sense that it unifies all the known
>forces. Fields are fields of force.

There are no forces acting at a distance, that is
the essence of General Relativity.
During the era that he lived, it was common to
think new forces or fields would be discovered, because
they had just implemented wireless radio by WWI, and
doctors had desktop x−ray machines with no shielding
at all, and received major injury from using them.
Gravity was still considered to be a force, only
Einstein wanted it it be a local force, as a part of a
unified field, which I assume must have meant just
gravity−electromagnetic field.

I think the field ideas have diminished, and
now it is geometry with no force acting for gravity
unless there is contact.
I have a different view of this than formally
educated people because I devised my own Principle
of Equivalence of surface gravity and acceleration
years before I ever heard GR was a gravity theory.

>> But geometry can likely only be a continuous entity.
>
>At the quantum level, this is true.

At the level is where everything is, there are no
extend fields except the electromagnetic spectrum,
and it is not a force spectrum, it is a heat energy
spectrum.

>In each quantum unit of Aether,
>geometry is a continuous entity. The space−time physicist work with,
>however, is a fabric of Aether. In order to understand how the
>geometry of the fabric works, we must understand the function of the
>quantum unit from which the fabric is made. Space−time, as the space

>and time we live in, is a complex structure, just as are the physical
>objects we see existing in space−time. If we are to understand the
>physics of space−time, we must first quantify its quantum state.

Maybe Ken Seto would be a better person to discuss
this with, I don't know what a quantum state is.

>> >The Aether Physics Model I present has a mathematically
>> >correct, very simple Unified Force Theory, complete with a full set of
>> >force laws for each force. Modern physics cannot do this, but an
>> >Aether theory can. This is significant.
>>
>> Then somebody who knows math shorthand will
>> be able to tell more than I can.
>
>It is interesting that you think I am in above my head, but you don't
>think you can do simple algebra.

I can do simple algebra, but I have never done anything
where I needed it or where it was useful.

>This is not meant as a slight on your
>character, because as I said, we all have different strengths. All
>that is necessary is to replace the variables with the proper values
>and dimensions and then do the simple algebra. If you take the time to
>write the problem out on a piece of paper, you will be surprised at how
>easy it is to do. All the variables are properly identified in the
>paper and in the book.

Sorry, I will not be able to, blame it on a complete
lack of interest in any theory where entities other than
physical objects can be observed and measured.

>> >My feeling is that
>> >all the old science needs to be continually proven with each new
>> >student and subjected continually to rigorous critical analysis.
>>
>> There are some things that need improved or added to,
>> but I don't know if anything needs to be continually subjected
>> to analysis, unless just to give the undergraduate something
>> to do.
>
>It is important for the student to have instilled into him or her that
>he or she is allowed to question authority. Nobody should ever be told
>that they must accept an idea because it has already been proven to be
>true. Making mistakes and experiencing failure during the learning
>process instills appreciation for the successes that make science
>useful.

All I can suggest is don't order a second printing
until the first is sold out.

>> >As for the Aether and its perfect inelasticity, that only applies to
>> >its surface area.
>>
>> I don't see how there could be a surface for a medium.
>
>This is where the tools of geometry become useful. We can
>mathematically determine the geometry of quantum Aether by observing
>the structures of the subatomic particles that reside within it. We
>can independently confirm this geometry by analyzing the force
>constants.

Well, Tom is your man then, he has lots of experience
with subatomic particles.

>> >The actual, individual Aether units are capable of
>> >changing shape without changing surface area.
>>
>> Then they couldn't be inelastic then, could they?
>
>You are right, there are limits to the elasticity of the Aether. Even
>though it appears near perfectly inelastic during our everyday
>experiences on the surface of the Earth, there are several extreme
>instances where the Aether can be stretched and compacted. Thus
>gravity waves are possible, space−time can stretch, and matter can
>implode into a black hole.

Maybe in your book, not in mine.

>> >The Aether units have a
>> >toroidal type of geometry so that the small radius can shrink while the
>> >large radius grows, thus allowing a certain amount of "springiness,"
>> >which manifests as the inseparable functions of permeability and
>> >permittivity.
>>
>> That is fine maybe for electromagnetism in vacuum,
>> but useless and meaningless for gravity.
>
>Not true. Gravity is due to spin direction of the subatomic particles
>within the Aether unit. Just as mass is orthogonal to charge, gravity
>is orthogonal to electromagnetism, which is why gravity is such a weak
>force. We will learn a lot about gravity by examining this quality of
>the Aether and understanding the mechanics.

Gravity squeezes energy out of matter in stars,
gravity and inertia are essentially two aspects of the
same attribute of matter, without external forces or
fields, why would a medium be needed, there are
no forces without contact, that is mechanics, it is
not aether and it is not force fields.

>> > String theory also predicts this type of behavior with
>> >regard to strings.
>>
>> I have read string theory since the 1960s, and
>> found nothing worth remembering.
>
>I didn't think so, either, until I saw what the equations could do. It
>seems at least some of the equations of string theory are directly
>applicable to the Aether Physics Model. The equation structures share
>certain similarities.

Math is precise if applied properly, else it can
give any results wanted.

>> >Also, the Aether units are capable of folding over
>> >on to each other, which is what causes the phenomenon of pairing in
>> >quantum and atomic bindings. Further, each quantum unit of Aether is a
>> >rotating magnetic field and is capable of moving against adjacent
>> >Aether units like perfect ball bearings (which is the reason objects
>> >move so easily through space−time). So although the Aether is
>> >perfectly inelastic with regard to its surface area, it is quite
>> >flexible and moveable, like a perfect fluid and gas. In this way,
>> >Aether acts as a perfect solid, fluid, and gas, simultaneously.
>>
>> Do all, be all, huh?
>
>It would have to in order to be the proper explanation for how the
>Universe works, wouldn't it?

No, most of current accepted theory is just fine,
I have nothing to offer outside gravity.

>> >To address your concerns, the Aether is fully quantifiable and an
>> >extremely useful tool for modern physics.
>>
>> A lot of people would have to be convinced for
>> anthing to come of it, and I don't know of any way to
>> even get very many scientists to even read about it.
>
>You are correct in that a tremendous amount of effort has been
>expended in keeping the Aether out of physics by the Relativists.

Nonsense, the smallest success in any experiment
would allow any supported premise to be big news.

>You are a prime example of the fruits of their efforts. You are
>a part of their system and speak as though you cannot break
>away from it or you will fail.

Now you are hallucinating, even the physics hobbiest

hobba calls me idiot, and Tom calls me insane, and you
think I am a stalwart of current thought?

>In fact, you seem to believe the whole system will fail if the
>Aether is mentioned. Fear of failure or being expelled from the
>community keeps many people from studying the Aether, today.

I think ether is flammable. :−) And it has a distinctive
odor, that is all I remember from the last time I saw it used.

>But like so many issues where outcasts invade the system and become the
>norm (anti−slavery, freedom, children without marriage, the earth is
>round, etc.), time is the medium of change, not scientists. Science
>would be so much stronger if it would be perfectly elastic in its
>reception of new ideas. We should build into our system of science a
>process where anybody can present a new idea, regardless of how
>ridiculous it is, and have the full privilege of failing under a fair
>and truly scientific review.

Do the experiment, nothing else will help.

>> I feel like you have invested time and money
>> that may never be recouped.
>
>That is a foregone conclusion. But it isn't about time or money, it is
>about the pursuit of truth and the happiness that comes from doing your
>own part in the greater scheme of things. I don't need fame or
>fortune. A satisfied conscience will suffice.

Then be just as satisfied with clearing the confusion
as you would with success.

>> Without a physical experiment or so to demonstrate
>> something, there is no hope at all of convincing anybody.
>> Math won't do it, and words won't do it.
>
>The truth is, I have the experiment, the math, and the data. I have it
>all.

Do you have a video of the experiment, the specifications
and the goal met, and is it repeatable? If so, you don't need
me or anybody else.

>The philosophy is merely the culmination of all of these things.
>The Aether Physics Model did not exist until I performed an experiment
>with high potential, high frequency coils, which clearly produced two
>distinct manifestations of charges. The Aether Physics Model is the
>unintended result of seeking to quantify these two observed
>manifestations of charges. The experiments have been replicated by
>several others using different types of apparatuses.

Convert the video to mpeg or wmv, and make it available
to document your work.
If that doesn't work, take up gardening as a hobby.

>> Is there some reason you haven't quoted the most
>> believable paragraphs from your paper in this forum?
>
>I have on many occasions. But the paper is not something that can be
>reduced to a single paragraph, otherwise I would have saved a lot of
>time and wrote only one paragraph. The theory is broad in its scope.
>Not only does it unify the forces, quantifies matter, quantifies
>space−time, and quantifies the two different types of charges, it also
>reveals errors in our systems of units with regard to charge,
>quantifies the neutron as a compound particle, corrects the Casimir
>equations, corrects the neutron g−factor, and dozens of other important
>important discoveries. In fact, the 27 pages white paper is a highly
>condensed version of the book. The book explains many more
>discoveries. This is no ordinary model I'm presenting. It is a
>completely new foundation for physics; something that never existed
>before. There is a tremendous amount of knowledge in this theory, and
>much more waiting to be discovered.
>Dave

And all I am looking for is a mechanism for gravity,
a mechanical one.

Joe Fischer

.

- ***Follow−Ups***:
  - ♦ ***Re: Dayton Miller's Data have no Real Signal***
    - ◊ *From:* David Thomson
  - ♦ ***Re: Dayton Miller's Data have no Real Signal***
    - ◊ *From:* Harry

- ***References***:
  - ♦ ***Dayton Miller's Data have no Real Signal***
    - ◊ *From:* Tom Roberts
  - ♦ ***Re: Dayton Miller's Data have no Real Signal***
    - ◊ *From:* demeo
  - ♦ ***Re: Dayton Miller's Data have no Real Signal***
    - ◊ *From:* Tom Roberts
  - ♦ ***Re: Dayton Miller's Data have no Real Signal***
    - ◊ *From:* demeo
  - ♦ ***Re: Dayton Miller's Data have no Real Signal***
    - ◊ *From:* Joe Fischer
  - ♦ ***Re: Dayton Miller's Data have no Real Signal***
    - ◊ *From:* David Thomson

- ***Re: Dayton Miller's Data have no Real Signal***
  - *From:* Joe Fischer
- ***Re: Dayton Miller's Data have no Real Signal***
  - *From:* David Thomson

- Prev by Date: ***Re: Twin Paradox Question***
- Next by Date: ***The Properties of the Aether***
- Previous by thread: ***Re: Dayton Miller's Data have no Real Signal***
- Next by thread: ***Re: Dayton Miller's Data have no Real Signal***
- Index(es):
  - ***Date***
  - ***Thread***