

Re: Dayton Miller's Data have no Real Signal

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-12/msg01330.html>

- *From:* Joe Fischer <efischer@xxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 15 Dec 2005 15:38:45 -0500
-

On 15 Dec "David Thomson" <google@xxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Continued II.

>Joe Fischer wrote:

>> 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.

>

>If that is your criteria, you should be satisfied with my theory. That
>is exactly what my theory is based upon, the known forces.

All known forces are short range, so what needed to be
changed or added to?

>> 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.

>

>Fortunately, your opinions do not matter.

I assumed they matter to those who ask for them.

>The data are what the data

>are, and the math is what the math is. If it works, it must be true.

Data can be misinterpreted and math is only
correct if it is applied properly to correct data.

>> 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.

>

>Those physicists who take the time to study the APM, particularly in
>the beginning, will have plenty of opportunities to make major
>discoveries. I have already made dozens, and I have a rudimentary
>understanding of physics.

Re: Dayton Miller's Data have no Real Signal

I will look up the definition of rudimentary.

>> >> >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 see your words, but I don't understand your complaint.

I will try to explain it.

>The math

>clearly shows that the Aether is a quantum unit of rotating magnetic
>field.

Maybe I had the wrong idea of what quantum means, assumed it meant things like 0, 1, 2, 3.....

>The quantum rotating magnetic field is shown to have sub
>properties of magnetic and electric fields. This is easy to understand
>and born out through the simple mathematics. Since I have presented
>the math and even extended the math to its geometrical equivalent, all
>that is necessary on your part is the willingness to understand it.

I doubt if I will be able to understand the math.

>> >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.

>

>Are you admitting that the opinions of the so-called experts are
>meaningless?

I don't know of any experts except Bilge and Tom Roberts,
John Baez and a couple of teachers. There may be more that
I don't know about.

>> The rest are BS, including me.

>

>Many of my conversations on these newsgroups have been with nuclear and
>lab engineers. I don't doubt that you may only have a BS,

I did not say I have a BS, and I do not have a BS,
I said I am BS.

> but some of

>these guys have flashed their credentials a few times over the years.

Re: Dayton Miller's Data have no Real Signal

Re: Dayton Miller's Data have no Real Signal

Some very talented people have said my ideas are insane.

I had a very good friend that was a Pentagon Colonel, and on a visit to me he said "there is no way a ship or aircraft can't be seen on radar".

I was too sick to drive at that time, and he took me to my post office box where I picked up the D2 document of allowance for my patent which withheld issue until the secrecy order was removed.

Lockheed did not get allowance on their F-117 "vehicle" patent until 6 years later.

>But in the end, what does a degree mean? It's the math and the data
>that determines the science, not the credentials of the person
>presenting it.

A BS means the rudimentary knowledge has been demonstrated, but there is a wide range of talent that will be needed to use that knowledge.

>> >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?

>

>If you can't understand orthogonality, that is a limitation of your own
>intellect.

I suppose, except it doesn't seem to say much relative to a spherical structure.

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

>

>What kind of educated person doesn't have access to a Microsoft
>document reader?

><http://www.winfield.demon.nl/>

I also am careful about what sites I visit. :-)

>> >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.

Re: Dayton Miller's Data have no Real Signal

- >> But I don't believe in any forces or fields other than
- >> what is in mainstream physics with gravity omitted.
- >
- >The strong force and gravity are both mainstream physics.

The strong force is not even inter-molecular,
as far as I know.

- >> There are no forces acting at a distance, that is
- >> the essence of General Relativity.
- >
- >That is a philosophy.

No, it is an empirical measurement, demonstrated
by the difference between charged objects and non-charged
objects in the presence of gravity.

- > Unfortunately, physics is not a philosophy, it
- > is a science.

Wrong, physics is an art, math is the only science.

They may have been designated differently a long
time ago, but no reason to change the title of degrees.

- > If the math, particularly when it is dimensionally
- > based, shows that forces act from between similar dimensions of mass
- > and charge, then that is what happens. No amount of wishing can change
- > that fact.

There are no forces of gravity that act differently
on objects in freefall, no matter what the material, charge,
orientation, electrification or magnetization.

- > Notice that I quantify the Aether as quantum units of rotating magnetic
- > field?

0, 1 or 2?

- > Notice that I show the origins of these quantum rotating
- > magnetic fields? If the Aether is a fabric of quantum rotating
- > magnetic fields, as it is easily quantified to be,

0, 1 or 2?

- > then there is a
- > scientific basis for what appears to us humans as force at a distance.

I will believe it when I see it.

- > The Aether is not the static space-time of chalkboard coordinate

Re: Dayton Miller's Data have no Real Signal

Re: Dayton Miller's Data have no Real Signal

>systems, it is a real and dynamic foundation of physical reality.

So are ghosts, spirits and the tooth fairy,
hasn't everybody found the quarter under their pillow?

>> I think the field ideas have diminished, and
>> now it is geometry with no force acting for gravity
>> unless there is contact.

>

>You make it sound like physics is entirely a mental exercise devoid of
>real existence.

That pretty well describes the gravitational field.

>The laws of physics are discovered, not invented. We
>must follow the data and the equations to find the truth, not pick and
>choose philosophies.

No, the laws are written by man.

>> 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.

>

>Good, another open-minded thinker looking to nature, rather than
>textbooks, for the correct explanation of physics. I admire that.

And you don't admire Einstein, Hawking, Wheeler?

>> >> But geometry can likely only be a continuous entity.

>> >

>> > At the quantum level, this is true.

At any level, unless it is marbles being counted.

>> 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.

>

>Heat is nothing more than distributed velocity between objects.

Close enough, and the only long range forces that
exist are those that can change those velocities,
But it isn't a single effect, some frequencies will
affect some things different than others.

> In other words, heat is the distance and rate of vibration between
>objects. The objects, ultimately, are protons and electrons.

Re: Dayton Miller's Data have no Real Signal

But molecules are what we usually see affected by heat, notice I do not say magnetic fields are like heat.

- >In order
- >for protons and electrons to experience heat, they must have a discrete
- >geometry, which sets the boundaries between them and determines their
- >physical behavior.

QED?

- >The protons and electrons are precisely quantified
- >as continuous geometrical structures within a discrete but flexible
- >Aether unit.

In what model?

- >They are continuous in the sense that as toroids and
- >spheres, they have no sharp boundaries other than their surfaces. That
- >continuous geometry ceases to exist outside of each quantum proton and
- >electron. Due to the quantum structure of the Aether, the distance
- >between each subatomic particle is governed by a quantum distance,
- >which is then discrete and not continuous.

I don't know much about that subject, I did hear about eighteen years ago that IBM wrote their logo on something with single particles or molecules.

Not that i do not specify atoms because a single atom can be a molecule.

- >> Maybe Ken Seto would be a better person to discuss
- >> this with, I don't know what a quantum state is.
- >
- >A quantum state refers to a quantum property of an object.
- ><http://www.answers.com/topic/quantum-state>

Is this right?

[QUOTE]

quantum state

"A quantum state is any possible state in which a quantum mechanical system can be. A fully specified quantum state can be described by a state vector, a wavefunction, or a complete set of quantum numbers for a specific system. A partially known quantum state, such as a ensemble with some quantum numbers fixed, can be described by a density operator."

[UNQUOTE]

Should I look in your paper for all of those values?

- >> I can do simple algebra, but I have never done anything

Re: Dayton Miller's Data have no Real Signal

Re: Dayton Miller's Data have no Real Signal

>> where I needed it or where it was useful.

>

>Where is the logic in your statement? Either you know algebra or you >don't.

Ok, then I don't. But then I haven't seen much algebra posted here by anybody.

> The theory I presented is an instance when you need to use >algebra to prove the theory right or wrong. You can't prove the theory >wrong by using ignorance.

Or math.

>> 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.

>

>This theory is based upon empirical data. How can you say it does not >apply to physical objects that can be observed and measured?

On the jpg of a flourescent tube and two ball bearings?

Was there a ballast, transformer or ignition coil connected to the other end of the coil?

Note that a flourescent tube will light with a high voltage coil secondary wound around it, even if it won't light in a fixture.

The gas is conductive or inductive or something.

>> >Not true. Gravity is due to spin direction of the subatomic particles >> >within the Aether unit.

And you have an experiment that shows that?

>> >Just as mass is orthogonal to charge,

Please ask Tom Roberts to explain that to me, you are not being descriptive enough for my level of understanding.

>> >gravity

>> >is orthogonal to electromagnetism, which is why gravity is such a weak

>> >force.

Which direction is electromagnetism?

>> >We will learn a lot about gravity by examining this quality of

>> >the Aether and understanding the mechanics.

Re: Dayton Miller's Data have no Real Signal

I wish I could learn more about gravity.

- >> Gravity squeezes energy out of matter in stars,
- >
- >You just said you don't believe in anything other than physical objects
- >that can be measured.

Sunlight must be physical, it is really needed.

- >Correct me if I am wrong, but you nor anybody
- >else has ever measured an object of gravity or energy.

Watt?

- >Gravity is a
- >real force, energy is merely the unit of work. You can't bottle
- >gravity or a unit of work.

I have lots of batteries. I don't like capacitors though, they bite. And I never connect too many batteries in series.

- >> gravity and inertia are essentially two aspects of the
- >> same attribute of matter,
- >
- >Attributes of matter include length, frequency, mass, charge, and
- >curvature. Not among the attributes of matter are gravity.

Maybe that is what I want to do, assign an attribute of matter that causes the effects called gravity.

- >Mass **is**
- >the measurement of inertia, so it goes without saying that inertia is a
- >property of matter.

Right.

- >Even if you could quantify gravity as an attribute of matter, you would
- >still have to explain how gravity interacts with other matter at a
- >distance.

Not the attribute I have in mind, but that is why some talented people think I have insane ideas. :-)

- >Inventing non-existent and non-observed particles such as
- >gravitons would go against your principle of acknowledging only those
- >physical things that are measurable.

They sure as hell would.

Re: Dayton Miller's Data have no Real Signal

>> without external forces or
>> fields, why would a medium be needed,
>
>The medium is where the force originates.

In your mind, you have repeatedly stated.

>> there are no forces without contact, that is mechanics
>
>Then how do you explain objects that fall from the sky before they
>contact the Earth?

I thought i stated that, the surface of Earh expands outward with a velocity near escape velocity, plus a small acceleration. Freefalling objects are in inertial motion.

>How do you explain magnets that pull toward each
>other before they contact?

Much different than I explain gravity, and totally unrelated.

>How do you explain magnets that repel each
>other and never contact?

The same as magetic attraction, only reversed.

>You are ignoring the facts of nature in order
>to create a non-existent fantasy.

I have never proposed an aether.

>> Math is precise if applied properly, else it can
>> give any results wanted.
>
>Math without dimensions can give any result wanted, but math with
>dimensions can only give a specific result.

Correct dimensions with correct interpretation.

>If you divide velocity by
>length you get frequency and nothing else.

I am six feet long, and laying in bed, does that mean my frequency is zero?

>That is why I only use
>dimensional math in my work. Like you, I don't accept anything that
>cannot be derived from physical measurements.

How long is the aether?

Re: Dayton Miller's Data have no Real Signal

Re: Dayton Miller's Data have no Real Signal

>> >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,
>
>LOL. You are a riot.

No, most people find me boring. But thanks anyway.

>> >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.
>
>Obviously you are wrong.

Sure, the videos by Neumann of his rotating
coils activated by a permanent magnet generator
set in rotation by his arms lit a number of fluorescent
tubes for a couple of minutes.

>My experiment showing that there are two
>distinct manifestations of charge resulted in mathematical structure of
>the Aether, subatomic particles and the force laws. You won't even
>take the time to read it. Your small minded comments have absolutely
>no substance.

My small mind really restricts my ability.

>> >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 hobbist
>> hobba calls me idiot, and Tom calls me insane, and you
>> think I am a stalwart of current thought?
>
>Your blind support of physics, which you have never questioned, is what
>puts you in the category of being part of the system, not your
>reputation among the eCowboys.

I am not part of the system, but I do have some
very useful devices that system has created, I have seen
just about everything from the largest telescopes to the
inside of reactor cores.

I have a cell phone base station, chances are
nobody here even knows what that means.
I use an LCD monitor, a 24 inch plotter/cutter,

Re: Dayton Miller's Data have no Real Signal

Re: Dayton Miller's Data have no Real Signal

a 24 inch printer, and multiple external Firewire enclosures,
can your technology produce anything I might want?

>> >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 have, and others have replicated it. There truly are two distinct
>manifestations of charges.

I saw the plastic sewer pipes and the arc, I will
have to read the description before commenting.

>> >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.
>
>Here is a photo taken by a physicist in South America, who replicated
>the experiment.
><http://www.coe.ufrj.br/~acmq/tesla/2sparks1.jpg>

In resent you posting such a silly thing.

>Here is the actual experiment I did:
><http://www.tesla-coil-builder.com/images/chiron01twosparks.jpg>
>
>No, I haven't made a video. But you are right, I should put together a
>formal presentation of the experiment.

I can't be that difficult, most still cameras now will
do short videos and they can be assembled with an editor.

>> Convert the video to mpeg or wmv, and make it available
>> to document your work.
>
>Sorry, but I wouldn't take the time to make the file easily available
>just for you.

Thanks anyway, but if anybody looks at it, it would
be for you.

>You asked me to produce the PDF file in a format you can
>read, and then when I present the DOC format, you arrogantly said you
>weren't going to try to read it.

Re: Dayton Miller's Data have no Real Signal

Right, not if I have to run MS Word.

>> If that doesn't work, take up gardening as a hobby.

>

>I have a beautiful organic garden.

How do you control the bugs? I have grown to hate bugs, the Box Elder and Lady bugs have turned me against them, not to mention the crickets, grasshoppers and misquitos that get in the house too.

>> And all I am looking for is a mechanism for gravity,

>> a mechanical one.

>

>Unfortunately, nature wasn't designed for humans to determine how it >works.

Who said I was human, didn't I mention Vulcan ears?

>You have to follow the data and equations and accept the

>simplest explanation of what is revealed.

>Dave

I will, but I may interpret it differently than others.

I may have to print out the pdf to study it properly, is that ok?

Joe Fischer

.

• *Follow-Ups:*

◆ **Re: Dayton Miller's Data have no Real Signal**

◇ *From:* David Thomson

• *References:*

◆ **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

◆ ***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: ***Re: Twin Paradox Question***
- 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***