

Re: "Evidence of the Existence of the Aether"

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2007-10/msg00558.html>

- *From:* "Gerald L. O'Barr" <globarr@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 09 Oct 2007 15:00:05 -0700
-

Subject: "Evidence of the Existence of the Aether"

"Doof" <d...@xxxxxxx> wrote:

"Evidence of the Existence of the Aether"
.....

O'Barr comments:

H.E. Retic (Doof in this post) has been on this net, he says, since 1997. I have been on the net since 1994. I have articles written since 1962.

Let me take his last posting, and go through one or two points. It is important that we are able to properly note what it is that he is trying to establish (that is, what are the facts that are important to his theory) and the logic he uses to arrive at or to conclude that these facts are correct. Both set of points are important. But we must also know that the most important thing is to arrive at the correct final conclusion. The logic of getting there could even be faulty. But it is the correctness of our final decision that is the most important achievement. And so what I want to do is to clearly find out what the final decisions are, and the logic of getting to these final decisions are not nearly as critical.

To do this, let me outline H.E. Retic's last article:

START OF RETIC's ARTICLE, AS INTERPRETED BY O'BARR:

(This means that I have added a word or two, and I received no permission to do this. Please forgive me if I make too many mistakes!)

Evidence of the Existence of (free-space) Aether

1. The ether exists (and it exists everywhere):

Justification:

a. Free space has, at every point, the same dielectric constant and permeability factor.

This shows that space is not empty. At least on the level at which these factors are measured, space can not be totally empty.

b. Light has a velocity independent of all sources.

First of all, just to have light to have a wave velocity requires there to be an ether, and this ether must be everywhere where this kind of a velocity exists. But to also have the velocity of light to be independent of its source, this also shows that there must be an ether everywhere so that light can enjoy a common reference with respect to all other light, and a velocity that is independent of all sources.

c. QA requires an ether.

Dirac's "sea of negative energy pervading all of space" shows that space is not empty.

To have forces, "virtual particles" (e.g.– virtual photons, gravitons, gluons, etc.), must pop into and out of existence continuously. This shows that space is not nothing. It cannot be nothing if particles can come from it, it cannot be nothing while all these particles are existing, and it cannot be nothing if particles can disappear back into it.

d. Attractive forces requires there to be an ether.

A boomerang returns to the thrower because it exchanges momentum with (its) medium (air). If space were empty (no Aether), such a momentum exchange cannot occur and the virtual particles could only produce a repulsive force.

O'Barr comments:

The at theory is able to show how momentum is exchanged with the ether to produce the appearance of attraction. This is a most important achievement,

Re: "Evidence of the Existence of the Aether"

and it must be considered in any thinking that is done in this area of the existing of an ether. (The at theory also explains the minimal degree of drag that is experienced in the ether. That is, why there is no first order ether wind, etc.)

H.E. Retic's Other statements:

Present Interpretations of QM:

a. parallel Universes coexisting in the same space as our own that are created every time that a particle makes a "quantum choice".

B. Another interpretation of Quantum Theory requires that quantum effects propagate at an "infinite" velocity.

Experiments have shown that the polarization of "paired photons" is coupled so that changing the polarization direction (the quantum number) of one causes the polarization direction of the other to change in correspondence. In addition to demonstrating this polarization coupling, experiments performed in the '80s have also shown that the polarization coupling propagates at least 4 times the velocity of light and perhaps at an infinite velocity.

Another H.E. Retic statement:

If one examines both the Special Theory of Relativity (STR) and the Lorentz–Contraction Aether Theory (LCAT), he finds that they are actually the same theory in that they are cross derivable. (LCAT) is actually a special case solution of (STR) and cannot be disproved without disproving (STR) as well.

O'Barr comments:

And this is all important: SR and LET are certainly the same theory in terms of their math, and thus in terms of their predicted measurement results. And since modern day physics seems to be hooked to this concept that it is only measurements that are important, then this makes these two theories to be identical.

But of course, physically, they are not the same theory. SR is only a math theory. Being only math, then SR can be interpreted in any way the math allows it to be interpreted. And mathematically, there are certainly a multitude of ways in which this SR math

Re: "Evidence of the Existence of the Aether"

can be interpreted.

But LET is a physical theory. Its interpretation is fixed by its physical base. In LET, one is not verifying the math, they are verifying the physical base upon which the math is based. And for this reason, LET is established with no exceptions allowed and with no questions left unanswered.

H.E. Retic wrote:

An objection to the existence of the Aether has been raised. This objection is that if the Aether exists, "absolute time" would also have to exist. The idea of absolute time has, however, been abolished in (SR) theory. Unfortunately, its rejection did not result from physical observation or from logical deductions based on previously proven facts. It is based solely upon a consensus viewpoint. In other words, that rejection is based upon an unproven (and probably unprovable opinion) rather than upon fact. The motivation for this opinion would seem to be an overwhelming urge on the part of physicists to consider space and time to be aspects of the same structure, spacetime, as viewed from different reference frames so as to make their mathematical treatment "elegant". Nature doesn't care about what we would like to be true and there is no objectively valid reason to accept the viewpoint.

It is claimed that the concept of spacetime rather than space and time as separate entities yields a simpler solution and, according to the principle of Ockham's Razor, must therefore be the correct one. It is true, mathematical solutions employing the spacetime concept are much simpler than solutions involving the Aether, but the solutions are not simpler with respect to reality. As Dr. Einstein, who maintained a belief in "absolute time" for 25 years after the publication of Special Relativity exclaimed, the "concept of spacetime requires an infinite number of Aethers" as indeed it does. Once one realizes this, Ockham's Razor would lead any reasonable man to the Aether and not to the concept of "spacetime" as a single entity.

And H.E. Retic says:

... Modern Physics seems to have been taken over by mathematical idiot savants who lack an appreciation for the implications of mechanism and strive to suppress the contributions of those who

Re: "Evidence of the Existence of the Aether"

would dare to say "Hey, wait a minute"

O'Barr comments:

I well understand his feelings. There really is full justification for what this man feels!

H.E. Retic says:

EVERYTHING WHICH WE ACCEPT AS TRUE MUST BE
CONSISTENT WITH EVERYTHING ELSE WE HAVE ACCEPTED AS
TRUE, . . .

O'Barr's way of saying this is:

All truth testifies of all other truths!

H.E. Retic's way is better than O'Barr's way, in that it is obviously true on its own. But my way is with power, and it is made to be correct by the power of the intellect.

H.E. Retic's home page:

<http://einsteinhoax.com/postinglog.htm>.

His E-mail:

einsteinhoax...@xxxxxxxx

Remove ...

Thanks for reading.

Gerald L. O'Barr

My e-mail:

<globarr...@xxxxxxxxxx>

Remove ... for e-mail.

.