

Re: Charge

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2005-05/msg02629.html>

- *From:* Traveler <traveler@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 19 May 2005 13:16:19 -0400
-

In article <1116521701.598618.167540@xx>, franklinhu@xxxxxxxx wrote:

>Since there is no concensus on what actually causes "charge", let me
>suggest you read:

>
><http://historical.library.cornell.edu/cgi-bin/cul.math/docviewer?did=02780002&seq=&view=50&frames=0&pagenum>

>
>This describes the Bjerknnes Forces which says that if two spherical
>objects pulse in phase in a non-compressible medium, they attract. If
>they pulse out of phase, they repel. It has also been shown that in a
>compressible medium, the actions reverse and in phase will repel while
>out of phase will attract.

>
>If you consider electrons and protons like little bells which are
>ringing at the same frequency but out of phase, then you can imagine
>how the attraction of charges work through the interaction of the
>>waves. Electrons ringing in phase will repel each other, as will
>protons with the same phase. But electrons and protons ringing out of
>phase will attract.

>
>I would think that the source of energy for the ringing comes from the
>ambient thermal energy and acts like a clapper on a bell. No matter how
>randomly or frequently the bell is rung, it will always ring out the
>same frequency and will attain a maximum intensity. So the random
>thermal energy is converted into a very specific frequency and phase
>and serves as the energy source for the attraction between charged
>particles.

>
>To directly address your question, a charge on an object is the result
>of it radiating a wave in a compressible medium which is at a very
>specific frequency and phase. Protons and electrons emit opposite phases
>of the same frequency which causes the attraction/repulsion.

>
>I believe that this is the fundamental mechanism for force attraction
>between charges, and since real scientists don't have the answer, it's
>as good as any.
>fhucharge

Re: Charge

This is, of course, unmitigated crackpottery. It is certainly not as good as any. It's crap. At least the bozos in the physics community admit that they don't know (what makes them bozos is that they don't care to know.)

First off, nothing can pulse in a non-compressible medium for obvious reasons. Second, in a compressible medium, pulsing requires a constant input of energy. Where is the energy coming from? Ambient thermal energy, you say? What a crock! To extract thermal energy there must be a difference in temperatures. And one more thing, what is your magical medium composed of? Go back and rethink your dumb theory and come back when you have something that does not sound like it was cooked up in pre-K.

Louis Savain

The Silver Bullet: Why Software Is Bad and What We Can Do to Fix it
<http://users.adelphia.net/~lilavois/Cosas/Reliability.htm>

- **Follow-Ups:**

- ◆ **Re: Charge**
◇ From: Mitch Perkins
- ◆ **Re: Charge**
◇ From: franklinhu

- **References:**

- ◆ **Charge**
◇ From: Robert Chug
- ◆ **Re: Charge**
◇ From: franklinhu

- Prev by Date: **Re: Attn: Quantum Vacuumists & Enhanced Aetherists**
- Next by Date: **Re: What's Inside A Neutron???**
- Previous by thread: **Re: Charge**
- Next by thread: **Re: Charge**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **Date**
 - ◆ **Thread**