Re: Can Light Propagate without Space??

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2005−03/3394.html

---

From: jahn (*susysewnshow_at_yahoo.com.au*)
Date: 03/06/05

Date: Sun, 6 Mar 2005 14:54:40 −0500

"Lefty" <Ye@h.Right> wrote in message news:SeednUE2jKLx07bfRVn−1w@comcast.com...
>
> *"jahn" <susysewnshow@yahoo.com.au> wrote in message*
> *news:390reuF5tf5rdU1@individual.net...*
> >
> > *"Lefty" <Ye@h.Right> wrote in message*
> *news:o9WdndJXgvPdr7bfRVn−uw@comcast.com...*
> > >
> > > > *Hi Lefty,*
> > > >
> > > > *A related PoV*
> > > > *http://departments.weber.edu/physics/schroeder/mrr/MRRtalk.html*
> > > > *Remember, EM waves don't propagate like water waves.*
> > > > *They share a few mathematical properties tho.*
> > > > *The buching effect of traffic signals creates waves just*
> > > > *like a klystron but knowing the traffic signals have 100 watt*
> > > > *bulbs isn't much help calculating the energy released*
> > > > *by an automobile collision when a phase error causes*
> > > > *standing waves of traffic.*
> > > >
> > > > *Sue...*
> > > >
> > >
> > > *Amazing stuff.*
> > >
> > > *I like to speculate about these things. Obviously − this leads me into*
> > > *territories which may not jive at all with currently accepted models,*
> *but I*
> > > *dont have a career in academia and so I think that I have an advantage*
> > > *because there is no reputation to be ruined by discussing new or strange*
> > > *ideas.*
> > >
> > *Not quite true... One can earn reputation in short order.*
> > *But the only stupid question is still the one that goes*
> > *unasked.*
> >
>

> I'm not a trained physicist, but find that my suspicions regarding spherical
> waves coincide exactly with Milo Wolff − on a philosophical level. I suspect
> that he may have had mathematical reasons or substantiation for his ideas.

As I recall problem with his sphericl wave is that the magnetic component
can't do that. However there is good reason to believe that the
electric component can. I haven't read his "living papers" lately.
>
>
> > > I think that it might be possible that light is actually propagating in
> a
> > > manner which is quite different than what we are capable of observing.
> >
> > You mean the way a charged comb attracts bits of paper?
> > Even in a vacuum... so I hear.
>
>
> What I meant by that,..... if a portion of the photon which we are
> observing

The two particles... yes

exists in a different dimension,

they are in the same 3 dimensions I live in, and no one is complaing
of crowding.

relative to us, then we really
> cant observe it properly. Sort of like an iceberg. Just imagine that it is
> absolutely impossibly for you to go underwater. There is no scuba tank, no
> submarine. You cannot put a camera on a pole and plunge it underwater. You
> are stuck with a silly rule which makes it impossible for you to get beneath
> the surface regardless of the method.

Indeed nature hides some things from us.

> You still have the tip of this iceberg sitting there − and you must
> explain it somehow. You can conjecture things about buoancy, but cant prove
> it because you're ability to observe has been restricted to things above
> water. Your physical models would be impacted by this. Man might not even
> have the concept of buoancy at all. All you can see is this big chunk of ice
> which seems to move around on the surface of the water − as if by magic.

Yes attractive combs and paper seem like magic. But artificial
and inaccessable dimensions are created when we want to hide
something, not when we want to expose it.

> It's movements seem to create patterns, but knowledge of underwater currents
> is unavailable to you, and so it remains an enigma.
> One day, a smart guy comes along and describes the whole thing
> mathematically and everyone is impressed. He also says that you can know

> *it's location but not where it's going. This becomes known as the IUP, or,*
> *iceberg uncertainty principle, and nobody can quite figure out why it is*
> *true.*

Thus far I'm getting by best with the three spatial dimensions I have
access to. Antimatter might be a reason to add on a room but I
haven't thrown in the towel on that yet.

Sue..

>
>
> > > *If*
> > > *dimensionality of spacetime is relativistic, then many things will be*
> > > *completely hidden away in another dimension. I think this may also have*
> > > *something to do with HUP.*
> >
> > *Well... your're over my head there.*
>
> *Then we're equal.*
>
>
> > *I always thought HUP was just the mathematical consequence of*
> > *determining the fundamental components of compound units.*
>
> *I think that the principle was derived based on observations, and then it*
> *was incorporated into the math. I could be wrong on this −*
>
>
> > > *Yeah − I know. It's fantasy. But I cant get this thing out of my head.*
> *It's*
> > > *weird.*
> >
> > *BTW... the way we observe light is always the motion of one*
> > *particle causing the motion of a particle at a distance.*
> >
> > *Sue...*
> >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > >
>
>