

Re: Corresponding with an old IITKGP friend, re "modern physics"

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2005-02/1126.html>

From: Last Timer (*dakshing64_at_yahoo.com*)

Date: 02/02/05

Date: 2 Feb 2005 08:12:27 -0800

Thanks for posting an interesting discussion. It seems to me sun is acting like an optical lens to collect all the star light. The so called fusion is all about intermixing light of various wavelengths/frequencies so much of it comes out in the visible range. Ancient Indians considered sun as a planet (at least in the navagraha stotram). If you assume planets as perfect spheres you end up with the $g=0$ in the core which is a fallacy. Floating at the core seems so unreal. Why don't the physicists dig a tunnel to the core instead of building accelerators orthogonal to the radius? It seems a majority of physicists are skeptical about the spherical earth. They are afraid by building a tunnel to the core they will end up creating catastrophes on the surface. The oil companies in their exploration have gone closer to the core than the physicists. That's why they are so well rewarded with rich oil and gas to supply the energy needs of the growing world. Now the speculators will say that the earth is running out of oil reserves. And we have to quickly find a way to generate energy cheaply possibly using sun light. I tend to think that the oil not in the core speculators are causing political shifts to jinx the scientific progress.

Arindam Banerjee wrote:

- > *Note: This is the bulk of some correspondence I have had this January*
- > *with an old friend from IIT Kharagpur, my wingmate, mentor and*
- > *companion in RP Hall from 1973-78. Since he now holds a very*
- > *distinguished position in one of the largest computer companies in the*
- > *world, I have suppressed his identity. With his permission, and for*
- > *general interest, I release the following material for popular*
- > *consumption*
- > *Arindam Banerjee.*
- >
- >
- > *AB: Thanks, I will only put in my inputs and maybe some lines from*
- > *you, without referring to you in any way, and only describing you as*
- > *an old friend. I don't know when I will do that, maybe after my*

visit

> to NZ.

>

> As for antennas, it was my misfortune say to travel over 250 kms

every

> day for many days per year – in a horrid 4wd – in the 8 years of my

> life as an antenna engineer, going from Ghaziabad to Sohna day after

> day, where we have the largest antenna test site in India. I was in

> direct charge of testing many antennas, all of which I modified and

> quite a few of which I fully developed myself. A large part of

> antenna performance is impedance matching – meaning that it has to

> radiate out the power that is sent to it from the source (klystron,

> whatever). Usually, a lot of it is sent back, and it is only over

> some band of frequencies that it radiates more than half the power

> sent to it. Thus, the measurement of "return loss" is a key issue,

> and done using VSWR meters, network analysers sweeping over a range

of

> frequencies, etc. Then, of course, there is the radiation pattern

> measurement. Even with that most expensive apparatus, it is

difficult

> to get exactly the same pattern with repetition. Conditions simply

> changed from one time to another. It was not enough to have a

> controlled environment at your test site, and you cannot control the

> outside. So, we often prayed that we'd get the okay charts when we

> took the inspectors. The latter fact shows how sceptical I as a

> practical engineer am about claims from theoretical physicists that

> they can measure anything in far outer space upto so many points of

> decimals... Anyway, so far microwave antenna radiation is concerned,

> there is absolutely no question of electrons jumping from one energy

> level to another and emitting a quanta corresponding to the frequency

> – the main issue is the length of the dipole (it should be totally

> half wave, or full wave length) for proper tuning. Horn antennas

have

> larger bandwidth, as a waveguide is flared out – there the issue is

> the interface between the coaxial and the waveguide, a lot of

> empirical work has to be done. As you know, microwave frequencies

are

> much lower than light frequencies, and Einstein explained the

> photoelectric effect (light waves involved, not microwave) with

> quantum theory. But at which frequency did quantum theory "stop"?

Is

> it valid for light frequencies, and not valid at lower? If so, it is

> not a very sound theory, is it? Now, when manufacturing has

> progressed to such an extent that they can radiate light frequencies

> using very small dipole antennas, surely there is no need for that

> theory? I hope this explains my statement that perplexed you.

>

> Ether – an universal massless infinitely elastic all pervading medium

> – *has* to be there for the propagation of radio waves, for any kind

> of wave motion requires a medium. But, according to the accepted

> analysis of the Michelson–Morley experiment, it does not. In one of

sci.physics: Re: Corresponding with an old IITKGP friend, re "modern physics"

> my papers published on Internet, I have shown that the results of the
> Michelson Morley experiment have been wrongly analysed, giving wrong
> inferences. No one has challenged my paper with success or
> conviction. So, that experiment does not disprove ether theory.
> $E=mc^2$ was developed to explain the energy from the sun – 100 years
ago
> that was a great mystery – exactly why was the sun so hot? Now we
> think that is because of fusion of H to He at the extremely hot core
> of the sun – but then again, why should the core of the sun be
> extremely hot? From the pressure of the mass above it? Yes, a few
> hundred kilometers under the crust the pressure is very high, for the
> value of g is still high, meaning there is still a lot of earth below
> the magma level. So, since there is a lot of earth diameter causing
> high g still left, the rocks can crush against each other, creating
> high temperature and melting. But as we go more and more down to the
> core, there is less and less earth below, and more and more thousands
> of kilometers of earth on top, that unlike in the magma forming case
> are now pulling the crushing rocks "up" with gravity pull a lot more,
> creating thus less net pressure as we near the core. At the core, g
> is zero, that we learnt even in school. So, though there are
> thousands of kms of rock on all side, the these thousands of
> kilometers of rock do *not* press upon any surface that has say tens
> of thousands of kilometers of radius behind it. See what I mean?
> Like, the core of the earth or sun could easily be a hollow space,
and
> we could float there nicely! The gravitational forces within the
> earth could take the shape of such lines that can quite circumvent
the
> core. For example, if you keep a hollow steel ball within a rubber
> ball, and press the rubber ball with all your might from all sides,
> you won't affect anything within the steel ball, right? This is just
> an analogy. With a bit of maths, and using the most basic formulas
> relating to gravity as taught by Newton, we can make all this very
> clear in a simple Excel sheet.
>
> As for the famous experiment which apparently "proved" the general
> theory, let us see it in a bit more detail. Einstein's theory was
> that a large body, such as the sun, acts as a gravitational lens,
> which can thus bend light like any normal lens. So positions of
stars
> were taken at night (no sun) and at the same place, in day at total
> eclipse. Then, voila! At eclipse time all the stars were out of
> their place – they behaved as if the sun was like a convex lens
> bending the light. So, this was experimental proof of general
> relativity – the sun did act as a gravitational lens, as predicted.
A
> huge effort of media work, popular science, popular science fiction,
> movies etc. have convinced the population now. But, to me, there is
a
> more mundane explanation about the bending of light. The sun *did*
> act as a lens, but not as a gravitational lens. It simply acted as

an

> *optical lens. As we know now, around the sun there exists all sorts
> of solar flares and eruptions, where masses are forced out from the
> surface for many hundreds of thousand of miles. Of course, the
masses
> return to the sun because of the gravity, but in the process they
> create a sort of atmosphere around the sun. Now, this only means
that
> light from the sun refracts through this higher medium, and accounts
> for the positional displacement found for the eclipse. I now
suspect,
> Einstein and his backers knew this would happen, they very cunningly
> did a hoax to convince people of the merits of relativity.*

>
> *As for magnetism in fluids, that is a new thing. I have a physics
> book on Electricity and Magnetism, I will look it up. Let us see.
> While ions can circulate in heated spaces, and cause electricity and
> thus magnetism, I cannot think how ions are naturally formed in the
> earth's core, as the density is so high. Ions are formed from
gaseous
> states naturally, where electrons are rubbed off from collision.
> Usually, the density of ionic matter is very low, but who knows what
> may happen below us in the earth!*

>
> *As for software storage, thanks to your initiative perhaps yesterday*

I
> *bought a 256MB USB memory stick for \$49. Looks nice on my key chain,
> but no doubt it will be very useful.*

>
> *Best of luck,
> Arindam.*

>
> *Sent: Wednesday, 12 January 2005 10:23 AM
> To: Banerjee, Arindam
> Subject: RE: Happy New Year with Arindam's Laws of Motion*

>
> *Arindam,
> feel free to post the notes chain on an appropriate newsgroup*

or
> *mailing list if you feel like. I don't expect to be flamed for
staying
> within the lines even if you don't remove my name, but please do so
> anyway since I am using my work email address.*

>
> *Regarding quantum theory and the design of antennas, I understand
next
> to nothing about the first and nothing about the second, so can't
> understand the statement "In fact, they have made antennas at light
> wave frequencies, and that if nothing else should debunk quantum
> theory." However regarding Einstein's theories in general, numerous
> experiments to prove the bending of space-time due to the*

sci.physics: Re: Corresponding with an old IITKGP friend, re "modern physics"

> gravitational force of large bodies, and thus the bending of light
> when passing close to large bodies, have apparently been demonstrated
> with astronomical observations of distant galaxies. E.g., see this
> picture showing gravitational lensing
> (<http://antwrp.gsfc.nasa.gov/apod/ap990601.html>). Off the top of my
> head, I cannot recollect how space–time continuum and its warping due
> to large bodies is related to $e=mc^2$, but in any case, by discounting
> entire bodies of work such as relativity theory in one swell foop,
you
> are taking on more and more challenges to explain with alternate
> points of view. Granted that even Einstein said "God does not play
> dice" and discounted quantum theory, as do a whole boatload of string
> theorists, so I agree that there is no absolute knowledge yet. On the
> other hand, a bunch of quantum computer theorists, including some
> IBMers at the New York research lab I think, are capturing attention
–
> so it is hard to tell what is real and feasible for a neophyte like
> me.
>
> Regarding the magnetism article, I thought he said that electrical
> charges flowed in the hot liquid, causing a current and thus the
> magnetism, which does not contradict the fact that permanent
magnetism
> disappears at higher temperatures. Need to go reread it more
carefully
> I suppose.
>
> Back to more mundane storage software architecture issues
>
> Regards.
>
>
> AB: I read that explanation of the magnetic field, but he does not
> show how a very hot core can support magnetism. He is simply saying
> that there has to be some source for the magnetism, that is all. I
am
> saying that too. But I am also saying that going by our experience
on
> the surface of the earth, what we do know is that magnetism does not
> exist with high temperature. What we learnt in school was that if
you
> heat a permanent magnet, it loses its magnetism, as the heat causes
> random changes in the dipole structures within the magnet. The
> earth's rotation may give some order to the hot fluids inside it,
like
> it does with the trade winds.
> That in fact may be the biggest reason for the magnetism, like some
> orientation is given to the fluid motion and maybe that results in
the
> magnetic field, with conventional thinking. But as you note his
ideas

sci.physics: Re: Corresponding with an old IITKGP friend, re "modern physics"

> are purely hypothetical, and essentially follow from the fixed notion
> of a hot core. Why the hot core? Because we have magma, under the
> earth's crust, and we know that continents drift on the magma. Now
> this magma is caused by the pressure from the kilometers of rock,
> which melts it, and on this melt the crust rests in sections. All
> this is known. What is believed and taught in schools is that the
> pressure keeps on building up, creating more heat and the core is
thus
> extremely hot. This I dispute. At the centre of the earth, or at
the
> centre of any large body, the net pressure is actually zero, for any
> body placed there is pulled equally by all sides. So what we have is
> pressure building up as we go to the core from the surface, peaking a
> few hundred kilometers from the surface (creating the seas of magma)
> but then diminishing to zero from the further thousands of kilometers
> down to the core. Thus, below the sea of magma, as the pressure
> diminishes, the rock hardens and also thus insulates the
> superconducting core from heat from the magma (which mainly flows out
> to outer space via the surface, more surface area there on the outer
> side). What little energy goes to the core, is somehow converted to
> the electric current and keeps it going, and also keeps the magnetic
> field going. This is thus an admirable steady-state system, which is
> beyond the scope of time – it can always exist the way it is. If you
> posited a very hot core (why?) to begin with, then with conventional
> thinking it must cool with time. But it has not – the existence of
> life on earth billions of years ago shows that the temperature on the
> surface was the same as it is now.
>
> I hope you find my ideas interesting and challenging. I am thinking
> of founding a new society of radical physics, though perhaps I'll be
> the only member! Well, let's see. I will try to contact Debu. He
> was more interested in my Bengali translations than my new physics,
> when he visited me. But, apart from my other activities, I have used
> my knowledge of small power tools (picked up when I was developing
> radar antennas for BEL) to make what I believe is the world's first
> space-raft. Meaning, a device which could move in outer space with
> internal force. Unfortunately, its performance on Earth is as a
> beached whale, friction effects are too much. But this wooden
device,
> is the best I could do with purely my own time and efforts and very
> limited money. Also, the device did not work as I expected it to,
but
> led me to newer concepts involving far more complicated maths. So, I
> need to do more experiments and I will do more modelling work later.
> Still, all this is an exciting ongoing part of my life. As my wife
> and family tolerates it, I can do it!
>
> I certainly believe my ideas are much more correct than the present
> ones. Entropy is a wrong idea, and a bad one that came without a
> proper understanding of the nature of energy, and the theories of
> relativity and quantum are absolutely junk. I have been an antenna

sci.physics: Re: Corresponding with an old IITKGP friend, re "modern physics"

- > *engineer for the first 8 years of my life, and I don't see how quantum*
- > *theory works with practical antennas. In fact, they have made*
- > *antennas at light wave frequencies, and that if nothing else should*
- > *debunk quantum theory.*
- > *Electromagnetic theory answers everything.*
- >
- > *Why, it has been fine talking to you. If you permit me to, I will*
- > *post my communications to you to Usenet (keeping your name out of the*
- > *picture, of course.)*
- >
- > *With best wishes to you and your family, and do keep up the yoga. I*
- > *go to the gym as regularly as possible.*
- >
- > *Arindam.*
- >
- >
- > *Sent: Wednesday, 12 January 2005 1:35 AM*
- > *To: Banerjee, Arindam*
- > *Subject: Re: Happy New Year with Arindam's Laws of Motion*
- >
- > *Hello Arindam,*
- > *it is quite fascinating and encouraging to find that you are*
- > *exploring so many interesting (and controversial) ideas in science,*
- > *pursuing your love of literature, have taken up acting, are taking*
- > *good care of your family, and all of this while successfully pursuing*
- > *a full time career in a technical field. Quite amazing in fact. I*
- > *personally find it quite a challenge to just keep up with the (rather*
- > *heavy*
- > *technical) demands of my job as a software architect, spend some time*
- > *with my wife and kids, do some exercises regularly (yoga for the last*
- > *26 years, walking, etc.), and play the piano every day if possible,*
- > *which I have been learning formally for the last 4.5 years and tried*
- > *on my own for the 3 years before that. Though you do not need my*
- > *encouragement to explore life to the hilt (its in your genes no*
- > *doubt), you still have my wholehearted support. As we, the class of*
- > *78, approach the half-century mark soon, it would be too easy to get*
- > *bogged down by the thoughts of "old age" and the need to slow down.*
- > *Examples like yours, and on a lighter vein, the image of Timir Ghosh*
- > *dancing for hours in parties :-), should spur the rest of us on to*
- > **not* slow down.*
- >
- > *Regarding your ideas in physics, if you are rejecting the last 200*
- > *years of western physics, then indeed understanding your proposals*
- > *will require radical rethinking. You must have run them by Debashish*
- > *Guha ?*
- > *Though I don't know him much, he had a reputation as a radical*
- > *thinker.*
- > *As for my comments on your book on the Web, I would (time permitted)*
- > *first try to understand what the late Prof. Feynman had to say about*
- > *Newton's laws of motion, then read your repudiation of those laws,*

and

> *then get back to you with my thoughts. Since that approach presumes,*
> *implicitly, that Feynman's understanding and analysis of Newton's*
laws
> *are reasonable, perhaps it is flawed (in your opinion), but in any*
> *case, that is all I can offer.*

>

> *Regarding earth's magnetic field (and that of some of the other*
> *planets), here is a brief explanation by a traditional*
(geo)physicist:

> <http://www.madsci.org/posts/archives/dec99/944316318.As.r.html>

> *Given that I have spent the last 24+ years immersed in software, and*
> *have forgotten even my EE, let alone the physics I studied, it would*
> *be hard for me to find flaws in his theories. Even he admits that*
many

> *of the phenomena are unproven hypothesis and not everything is well*
> *understood. However, the theories of how circulating currents exist*
in

> *the presence of hot, fluid, planetary interiors, spurred on by the*
> *earth's rotation, seem reasonable based on my quick reading and my*
> *lack of deep knowledge of physics.*

>

> *More later on your other theories not sure how much later. So*
> *many deadlines, so little time :-(*

>

> *Regards.*

>

>

> *AB: Take as much time as you wish. I am writing down my new ideas in*
> *brief, below. Basically I am saying that:*

> *1. the earth, sun, Jupiter have constant (on the average) magnetic*
> *fields. (fact) 2. As per current knowledge of physics, you cannot*
have

> *a constant magnetic field without a permanent magnet or an constant*
> *electric current. (fact).*

> *3. The current or the magnet must be contained within the magnetic*
> *field (fact).*

> *4. So there has got to be a permanent magnet or permanently*
> *circulating constant electric current within the earth (near the*
core,

> *say).*

> *(inference)*

> *5. Permanent magnetism cannot exist with high temperature – the*
> *magnetism is lost. (fact).*

> *6. Constantly circulating currents need very cold temperatures – the*
> *superconductivity phenomenon. (fact).*

> *7. So, the core of the earth, sun, Jupiter has to be very cold to*
> *support either permanent magnet or superconducting current*
> *(inference).*

> *8. If the core of the sun or any star is cold, it is not hot!*

> *(inference).*

sci.physics: Re: Corresponding with an old IITKGP friend, re "modern physics"

- > 9. *If it is not hot, the energy of the sun is *not* caused by fusion*
- > *as per modern physics theories of relativity (inference).*
- > 10. *But the sun is very hot, and gives out lots of energy. (fact) 11.*
- > *How and why does the sun give out lots of energy? (Question) 12. From*
- > *Arindam Banerjee's mathematical derivation for unlimited energy.*
- > *(Answer)*
- >
- > *If you retain your interest after the following, then I will send you*
- > *some articles by me elaborating the above points. They prove that*
- > *the*
- > *results from the Michelson–Morley interferometry experiment were*
- > *analysed wrongly, and do not disprove the existence of ether. The*
- > *theories of relativity are thus complete nonsense, and the quantum*
- > *theory is unnecessary along with the second law of thermodynamics*
- > *(entropy is a useless and meaningless concept). Basically, I am*
- > *saying that the entire physics of the last 200 years is wrong, and*
- > *that is so because 200 years ago they did not make the mathematical*
- > *derivation for unlimited energy.*
- >
- > *Professional physicists (in my mind, by far the greatest evils on*
- > *this*
- > *planet) consider me a crank. There is no more communication with*
- > *them, as they reject me flatly without any explanation. All my papers*
- > *have been rejected without ceremony.*
- > *So it takes not a little courage to be by my side, in this all*
- > *important matter. However, my family and also extended family and*
- > *quite a lot of other people support me to the best of their ability,*
- > *and I am very happy about this.*
- > *What I am trying to do is to make something move with internal force*
- > *(without friction, gravity, that is). I have done experiments in*
- > *this*
- > *line, and they are quite promising. I need lots more help in this,*
- > *though – the whole thing is much more difficult than I thought*
- > *earlier.*
- >
- > *Kindly think over the above points, and do consult as many physicists*
- > *as may be interested. I hope they have more curiosity in US than in*
- > *India and Australia. Here, they think that whatever happens in the*
- > *US*
- > *is the ultimate, so there! Lousy colonial mentality.*
- >
- > *Anyway, best of luck and with lots of good wishes, Arindam.*
- >
- > *PS Sorry I could not contact Sumanta, will do as soon as I can. Will*
- > *be going to NZ on a holiday from 14–28 Jan.*
- >
- > *Arindam,*
- > *I took a sneak peek at your Web site and skimmed through some*
- > *of*
- > *the chapters, but did not do justice to the material (I am after all*
- > *at work, so have to limit extra–curricular activities :–)). You have*

sci.physics: Re: Corresponding with an old IITKgP friend, re "modern physics"

- > *indeed been quite active, and in more areas than I suspected ! I will*
- > *certainly take a look at the material in more depth (including the*
- > *math in the*
- > *Appendices) at a later date. Unfortunately the career path I have*
- > *chosen calls for a fair amount of work outside the normal 40 hour*
- week
- > *(is there such a thing any more ?), and so understanding and*
- > *critiquing your ideas will take some time. I hope you have/will run*
- it
- > *by mainstream physicists also. I myself enjoyed physics in school and*
- > *college, and have started (and restarted) reading Feynman's lecture*
- > *notes in physics more than once, but alas not completed even Volume*
- I.
- >
- > *Its also great to hear that you have branched out into acting, and*
- > *have a very supportive family and community around you. What else*
- does
- > *one need ?*
- >
- > *Regards.*
- >
- >
- > *In the meantime, if you can access our adda website:*
- >
- > <http://www.users.bigpond.com/adda1234/index.htm>
- >
- > *You can get some fair idea of what I have been up to recently (till*
- > *2001 that is) in the realm of physics, family and writing. There is*
- > *no one whose opinion I will value higher than yours. I humbly*
- > *remember how your notes were like mother's milk to me, back in the*
- IIT
- > *days. Also, you were the one who kindly wrote the Bengali script for*
- > *the essays and stories that I won prizes for, as I could not write*
- > *Bengali properly then as now. But, that has not prevented me from*
- > *translating the sonnets of Shakespeare, the first 89 plus one extra.*
- > *You can see them if you go to google groups, and put in such keywords*
- > *as Arindam Banerjee Translation of Shakespeare's Sonnet # then you*
- > *should get the whole lot in Roman script. I was helped in doing that*
- > *by my new-found acting ability, thanks largely to my wife and other*
- > *dedicated amateur Bengali theatre people here.*
- >
- > *Looking forward to hearing from you, and with the highest regards,*
- > *Arindam.*