

Re: O'Barr>Reality!

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2006-01/msg02244.html>

- *From:* "Gerald L. O'Barr" <globarr@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 28 Jan 2006 18:17:34 -0800
-

In <1138472012.083677.291750@xx>

oriel36 <geraldkelle...@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

>I thought I got rid of the bogus history surrounding
>the linking of aether with Newton's absolute space
>and the so-called mmx.

>

>Few have a problem comprehending Newton's explicit
>rejection of an aether * in 1704 which is why most
>of the old guys here look around to present
>relativistic concepts in other ways and without
>success. Without Newton, relativity is just another
>pathetic attempt among many to try and get around
>the Newtonian Dystopian creation, the can of worms
>inside a bigger can type thing.

>

>Want to know what Newton really meant with absolute
>space and why it is a pathetic attempt to understand
>the methods of heliocentric astronomers ?.

>

>"The fictitious matter which is imagined as filling
>the whole of space is of no use for explaining the
>phenomena of Nature, since the motions of the
>planets and comets are better explained without it,
>by means of gravity; and it has never yet been
>explained how this matter accounts for gravity. The
>only thing which matter of this sort could do, would
>be to interfere with and slow down the motions of
>those large celestial bodies, and weaken the order
>of Nature; and in the microscopic pores of bodies,
>it would put a stop to the vibrations of their parts
>which their heat and all their active force consists
>in. Further, since matter of this sort is not only
>completely useless, but would actually interfere
>with the operations of Nature, and weaken them,
>there is no solid reason why we should believe in
>any such matter at all. Consequently, it is to be
>utterly rejected." Optics 1704

Gerald L. O'Barr <globarr...@xxxxxxxx> comments:

Re: O'Barr>Reality!

What a joy to read. Some actual thinking going on in this post! Some actual physics! Too bad we had to go clear back to Newton to get it.

I do not care if Newton might have been the smartest of us all, we do know more than what Newton knew. We know about light, and that it has a very interesting velocity. And we, today, are forced to consider the ether.

Let us assume your quote is correct. Yes! It is a problem if ether is normal matter, for it would act to bring a cooling action, and it would slow the motions of planets and stars. It would not be good for all of these reasons, which Newton probably well knew and understood.

Well, guess what! There is an ether. It is even composed of normal matter. So how is this possible? It is possible for there to be an ether because, even though it is normal matter, it does not bounce like normal matter. An object moving through the ether does not have to push its way through it. The ether spalls right through any matter that hits it, and imparts zero momentum in the interaction. Now in actual or specific hits, it is zero only when the spall produced is a perfect match to the mass of each ether particle. Perfect matches are not too common, although they do occur. But any error in momentum transferred cannot be any more than the difference in this lack of perfection in having a perfect mass match.

And thus, the potential momentum transferred in the motion of any particle through the ether is orders of magnitude less than the actual momentum in the ether itself. But it is even less than this!

When the match of the mass is greater, and when it is less, results in either a gain or loss, and thus as these gains and losses are averaged out, we get even less of a net momentum transfer. What we get is only a second order transfer, and it is thus really really small. And whether it ends up being positive or negative depends on the amount of these imperfections, as it might compared with the imperfections being seen from the opposite direction. These directional variances can be much larger than the velocity variances that might be present. We now understand why the ether is so invisible. Invisible both by sight, and by feel, and by effects. And yet for the effects needed, it is there to provide the primary QM effects that are everywhere.

Thank you for having something meaningful to say.
Gerald L. O'Barr <globarr...@xxxxxxxxxx>

Re: O'Barr>Reality!

Remove 3 dots for e-mail.

• *Follow-Ups:*

◆ ***Re: O'Barr>Reality!***

◇ *From:* oriel36

◆ ***Re: O'Barr>Reality!***

◇ *From:* Hexenmeister

• *References:*

◆ ***O'Barr>Reality!***

◇ *From:* Gerald L. O'Barr

◆ ***Re: O'Barr>Reality!***

◇ *From:* oriel36

• Prev by Date: ***Re: What is LET? --- BULLSHIT, Just like ROBERTS, SR and GR.***

• Next by Date: ***Re: What is LET?***

• Previous by thread: ***Re: O'Barr>Reality!***

• Next by thread: ***Re: O'Barr>Reality!***

• Index(es):

◆ ***Date***

◆ ***Thread***