

Re: Quantum Entanglement and FTL information transfer

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2004-06/1082.html>

From: Bill Hobba (bhobba_at_rubbish.net.au)

Date: 06/04/04

Date: Fri, 04 Jun 2004 00:46:10 GMT

"Greysky" <greyskynospam@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
news:qILvc.4791\$rn1.3841@newssvr27.news.prodigy.com...

>

> "Bill Hobba" <bhobba@rubbish.net.au> wrote in message

> news:wOCvc.3766\$rz4.2033@news-server.bigpond.net.au...

>>

>

> [...]

>

>> *The double slit experiment has been performed many times and found in*

> *every*

>> *case to conform to standard QM see*

>>

>

<http://physicsweb.org/article/world/15/9/1>.<http://physicsweb.org/box/world/15/9/1/bologna-image>

>

> *Great article. This link has pictures taken directly from a monitor of the*

> *Bologna experiment:*

> <http://physicsweb.org/box/world/15/9/1/bologna-image>

>

> *The Hitachi experiment is more sensitive and shows more electrons*

> <http://physicsweb.org/box/world/15/9/1/single-electron-image>

>

> *The experiments I did was not to seek interference patterns, but to record*

> *the timing of the actual events themselves. The above experiments were not*

> *done to record event timing, but would have shown the proper results if*

> *they*

> *had been. It is much easier today to do these experiments using hall*

> *effect*

> *sensors mounted along the parallel resistance branches of an electrical*

> *circuit. Using high voltage electrons in current densities of a few*

> *femtoamps, and continuous monitoring of the setup with a computer, it is*

> *possible to get nice results, provided all parallel branch detectors are*

> *synchronized to a good atomic time source. Many times, there are multiple*

> *events registered – equivalent to measuring the same electron in more than*

> *one of the parallel branches, at the same time.*

And again how did they contradict QM? Specifically how does this disprove the Copenhagen interpretation? Details please.

>

>>

>>>

>

> [...]

>

>> *probabilities.*

>>

>> *So $-i\hbar$ in front of a complex function always yields an imaginary result?*

>> *Go back to kindergarten twerp.*

>

> *You are again bringing up irrelevancies to the discussion.*

You claimed and I quote: "The Schrödinger equation is completely imaginary – we must resort to the artifice of squaring it to get real probabilities.". The fact is the Schrodenger equation is not completely imaginary – it has both real and imaginary parts – it is a complex function. It is obvious you have no idea what your talking about if you do not understand the difference between a purely imaginary function and a complex function – purely imaginary means it only has a complex part – complex means it has real and imaginary parts.

>

>>

>>> *Don't square it. You remember that lecture in University? No,*

>>> *because there never was one.*

>>

>> *Yeah right – it was all a figment of my imagination.*

>

> *Now you are catching on.*

Yep – that you live in a dream world.

>

>>

>>> *Yes, you do live in the real world, and that is*

>>> *why you can't grasp what I am saying.*

>>

>> *From the mouth of babes – incerease your meds.*

>

> *Perhaps you would care to let me try a few of the ones you currently take?*

> *But, from the degeneration of your replies, I think they are not working*

too

> *well for you, Bill.*

Unfortunately they are not strong enough for you. I occasionally take Avanza for depression but not being able to sort reality from imaginings requires stronger medication. I suggest Trifluoperazine.

>
> >
> > > *It's okay, though. This attitude*
> > > *reflects more than ever precisely why "publishing in a refereed journal'*
> > > *would be the wrong thing to do at this time.*
> >
> > *Not to mention the waste of time it would be for the people reviewing it.*
> > *But you underestimate yourself – laughter has its uses.*
>
> *Yes a good socratic dialogue always includes laughter along with the tears.*
> *I had no realization Ancient Grecian philosophy was one of your interests.*
>
> >
> > >
> > > >
> > > > *So you tell me: is*
> > > > *an imaginary 5 miles per hour faster or slower than a real 5 miles*
> *per*
> > > > *hour?*
> > > > *If you say this example is hogwash, then you're waffling.*
> > > >
> > > > *You have the audacity to ask 'imaginary 5 miles per hour faster or*
> > *slower*
> > > > *than a real 5 miles per hour' and accuse me of waffling?*
> > >
> > > *You didn't answer the question. OK, I'll make it easier: which is*
faster
> > *i5*
> > > *Km/s or i6 Km/s??*
> >
> > *The complex field has no defined order relation idiot.*
>
> **BINGO*!!! You finally say something relevant and meaningful. It shows*
you
> *still are capable of learning new concepts. Now, apply this new-found idea*
> *to probability waves (psi and not psi-squared) and you are halfway toward*
> *understanding what a P2 Remnant wave is, and how it allows for meaningful*
> *superluminal communication.*

And this is an insight that is supposed to revolutionize our view of the world?

>
> >

>>>
>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> *If you haven't read the website, or have no intention of reading it,*
>>> *then*
>>>> *I*
>>>>> *will summarize my method for you. The "transmitter" is a device*
> *that,*
>>> *like*
>>>> *a*
>>>>> *normal AM transmitter, allows you to modulate a carrier wave. At*
> *this*
>>>> *point*
>>>>> *you have a complex signal comprised of real and imaginary*
> *components.*
>>> *Both*
>>>>> *the real and imaginary parts of this complex signal are identical,*
>>>> *including*
>>>>> *the information you put onto them. The signal is stripped of its*
> *real*
>>>>> *component which gets left to warm the unit, in the DMC which is*
>> *modeled*
>>>>> *after a single slit diffraction grating, because that is what it*
>>>>> *essentially*
>>>>>> *does. A DMC can be as simple as a triode vacuum tube set at some*
>>>>> *particular*
>>>>>> *potential voltage – the electron either will or will not be*
stopped
> *by*
>>> *the*
>>>>> *mesh. You have therefore created a simple quantum decision making*
>>>> *circuit.*
>>>>> *What you get left with is an imaginary probability. More*
> *importantly,*
>>>> *you*
>>>>>> *now have an 'imaginary signal' that is modulated with your*
>>>>> *information.*
>>>>> *You*
>>>>>> *need to do this because imaginary signals have no real noise and*
>>>>> *will*
>>>>> *not*
>>>>>> *collapse the pipeline you have established between the DMC in the*
>>>>>> *transmitter (which is analogous to the mixer stage in a radio*
>>>>>> *transmitter)*
>>>>>>> *and the RLB –reintegration logic block– in the 'receiver' which*
>>>>>>> *performs*
>>>>>>> *the*
>>>>>>>> *same function as a detector in a radio receiver, in reversing the*
>>>>>>>> *process*
>>>>>>>>> *and putting the signal back together again.*

>>>>>
>>>>> *That's why I am so strong in my argument that what I have done*
> *doesn't*
>>>>> *change any physics you know. It sidesteps most of the issues.*
> *That's*
>>> *why*
>>>>> *I*
>>>>> *go to so much trouble tearing into the single slit experiment on*
my
>>> *site –*
>>>>> *every quantum decision, natural or man made, has a superluminal*
side
>> *to*
>>>>> *it.*
>>>>>
>>>>> *That is only one possibility.*
>>>>
>>>> *True, but it is the only possibility that fits what I observe.*
>>>>
>> *What you observe is irrelevant – what can be observed in reproducible*
>> *experiments is.*
> *Though the process is painful and high energy, I am teaching you new*
things
> *without the benefit of your 'peer reviewed', 'officially sanctioned',*
> *conventional method. Also, the experiment I outline above is highly*
> *reproducible for anyone who cares to bother.*

Typical crackpot conspiratorial rant – they claim to have seen through the 'establishment'. Except of course they usually provide no actual evidence the establishment is incorrect – just vague claims of 'teaching you new things' when an examination reveals they are saying either gibberish, buzzwords string together from popularizations, misunderstandings or rubbish phrased in such a way as to say precisely nothing.

>
>>
>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>> *Quantum mechanics absolutely requires FTL signaling or it can't*
> *work.*
>>>> *And*
>>>>>> *there is no cosmic censor making sure man made*
> *information –meaningful*
>>>>>> *information– is eliminated from the equation. The universe doesn't*
> *care*
>>>>> *a*
>>>>>> *whit.*
>>>>>>
>>>>>> *So Einstein was a fool when he admitted defeat in not being able to*
>> *refute*
>>>>>> *the Copenhagen interpretation? You have seen what he and Bohr was not*

> > *able*
> > > *to*
> > > > *see – a logical problem with the Copnhagne interetation that demands*
> > *FTL?*
> > > > *Mind filling us in oh great one.*
> > >
> > > *Einstein should have lived longer. I really think towards the end of his*
> > > *life, he was just too tired to keep arguing with the young kids. He*
> > *couldn't*
> > > *come up with unification for the same reason the scientists today can't*
> > *come*
> > > *up with it. Incomplete information. I sure wouldn't have minded if*
> > *Einstein*
> > > *had become a member of my FTL working group. Based on my work, I think*
> > *he*
> > > *would have come to one major conclusion: "motion" is inconsequential*
> > *when*
> > > *propagation is instantaneous. It doesn't matter if the transmitter and*
> > > *receiver are both stationary, or that one or the other is moving, or*
> > *that*
> > > *both are moving. He would also have predicted that quantum theory sets*
> > > *precedence over relativity theory, but would also admit to a chain of*
> > > *irrefutable logic which would have silenced Bohr: just as Newton was*
> > *more*
> > > *correct than Galileo, and as his own theory was more correct than*
> > *Newton's,*
> > > *coming from the other direction, since I have demonstrated in detail*
> > *our*
> > *mis*
> > > *conceptualization of the single slit experiment (the heart and sole of*
> > *QM),*
> > > *that the main body of work that the Copenhagen interpretation is based*
> > *on*
> > *is*
> > > *not complete, that quantum theory as we know it today is also not*
> > *correct.*
> > *A*
> > > *more complete interpretation of quantum theory *must* admit that*
> > > *instantaneous action at a distance is a natural consequence of any*
> > *quantum*
> > > *decision. Without it, the wave function would never collapse. The*
> > *universe*
> > > *would always be in a superposition of infinite states and totally*
> > *chaotic.*
> >
> > *The audacity of crackpots never ceases to amaze.*
>
> *Your words exactly (typos included): "You have seen what he and Bohr was*

- > *notable to see – a logical problem with the Copnhagne interetation that*
- > *demands FTL? Mind filling us in oh great one."*
- >
- > *I did what you asked, once I figured out what you were trying to say*
- through
- > *the froth, and you think I am audacious for answering your question? Now*
- > *that's *Bodacious*...*

Mind refreshing my memory and detailing exactly why QM must be non local in violation of the Copenhagen interpretation which says there is no reality 'out there' in the usual sense to be non local?

- >
- > >
- > > >
- > > > *Strangely enough, this is exactly the conclusion others, such as*
- Hawking
- > > *and*
- > > > *Feynman, have reached.*
- > >
- > > *Reference please*
- > >
- > > > *Feynman's sum over histories approach requires the*
- > > > *use of imaginary time to allow quantum decoherence ...*
- > >
- > > *Reference please.*
- > >
- > *Well for starters. Look up how to solve QM using Feynman's*
- > *sum-over-histories method.*

Been there done that. Have got Classical Mechanics, Quantum Mechanics and Field Theory by Amnon Katz. He goes into the detail of the Feynman sum over history approach and it has nothing to do with 'imaginary time'; basically it is based on a wonderful mathematical technique called saddle point integration that explains the connection between variational principles and QM. Now again I ask you for a reference.

- > *If you really need to read something, offhand I*
- > *would refer you to Hawkings popular book, "A brief History of Time".*

So that is were your getting you buzz words from. References require more detail than popular writing by an author that proudly proclaims that every equation he put in the book would reduce its sales by half. So again I ask for references giving the technical detail of your claims.

- > *There*
- > *are so many versions, but in the first hardbound edition printed in*
- America
- > *look up 'imaginary time', page 134. Then there is also a June 13, 1988*
- > *article in Newsweek, pg. 59. There are also numerous places you can look*
- at

- > *on the web. Use Google.*
- >
- > *A couple of the more interesting places:*
- >
- > <http://library.thinkquest.org/27930/time.htm>
- >
- > <http://www.specularium.org/imaginary.html>
- >

I ask for references and he gives me popularizations of dubious actual merit. Hey Gresky have you actually read a proper physics book? It usually has a mathematical analysis of things. Such as the standard reference Weinberg – The Quantum Theory of Fields. Take a look at pages 475 – 476 where what is called Wick Rotation is discussed. It is a mathematical technique of contour integration (part of complex analysis – you know that area where 'We don't even have maths that work on imaginary variables') that allows us to mathematically handle certain integrations. It is a mathematical trick and is what is meant when imaginary time is mentioned in connection with the sum over histories approach. It has absolutely nothing to do with time being imaginary or anything like that. And of course nothing to do with standard QM being part of QFT. But of course it is doubtful you would even understand what contour integration is because it is obvious all you doing is stringing together buzz words from popularizations and claiming them as physical insight.

Bill

- >
- > > *which is getting back*
- > > *to what I have been saying concerning the nature of quantum processes.*
- > > >
- > >
- > > *Let us see what the references have to say shall we?*
- > > *Bill*
- > >
- > *Have a blast....*
- >
- > *Greysky*
- >
- > www.allocations.cc
- > *Learn how to build a FTL radio.*
- >
- >
- >
- >