

Physics wrong turns – nearly everything learned over the past 100 years is wrong

Physics wrong turns – nearly everything learned over the past 100 years is wrong

Source: <http://sci.tech–archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2006–07/msg00704.html>

- *From:* franklinhu@xxxxxxxxxx
 - *Date:* 6 Jul 2006 22:38:29 –0700
-

Where physics took a wrong turn

What is with the Alice in Wonderland state of physics? It may explain the results of some experiments, but none of it makes any intuitive sense. Furthermore, it seems that in the last 100 years, we have not made any substantial progress. We are nowhere close to being able to figure out some fundamental problems like what gravity is. Pretty much, the same theories that were worked out 100 years ago are the still the same ones being used today.

Now it could be that the apparent lack of progress is because we have totally figured everything out and there is nothing more significant to be learned. Or, physics has ground to a halt because it has taken some really bad turns and we are at a dead end.

From what I have researched, I am finding that physics has indeed taken

some really bad turns which have completely hindered any further significant progress in the field. I'm not talking about some minor error that requires a slight adjustment, I'm talking about 'Earth is the center of the universe' type of wrong. In fact, I'd say that almost everything that serious physicists take as dogma over the past 100 years is wrong. The only reason why it succeeds as much as it does is because it is almost completely backwards.

Just like scientists used to think the Earth was the center of the universe, current physics has got the frame of reference for how things work completely wrong. And just like the theory that the Earth was the center of the universe, this backwardness allowed the scientists of the day to accurately predict the movement of the stars, but in a way that didn't make any intuitive sense. They had to invent things like 'epicycles' to explain the retrograde movement of the planets and had charts showing how the planets moved in corkscrew patterns for no apparent reason.

Of course, the theory must be correct, it makes correct predictions

Physics wrong turns – nearly everything learned over the past 100 years is wrong

Physics wrong turns – nearly everything learned over the past 100 years is wrong

they would exclaim. It doesn't matter that it doesn't make any intuitive sense, it must be so. And so current physics similarly exclaims that their theories must be correct because they make such accurate predictions.

As is with the case of the Earth centered universe, current physics can make accurate predictions because they are basing the results on a real phenomenon, but are looking at it from a completely wrong angle. They get the right answer for the wrong reasons. So where did physics take a wrong turn, let me count the ways:

Wrong turn #1 – There is no aether

This has got to be the biggest and most fatal error of physics to prematurely reject the hypothesis that all of space is filled with a substance. If I am right, this will go down as even a bigger blunder than the Earth centered universe. This has totally halted significant development of electromagnetic theory by removing the medium by which waves are carried through space.

Now if there is no aether, then there is nothing for waves to travel on and therefore no waves are really possible. This means that everything has to be particles. All interactions now have to happen through particle exchange through the void of space. So light is particles, gravity is particles, strong force is particles and so on.

However, the view is absurd. How can two objects exchanging particles possibly cause an attractive force? It is often described as two basketball players exchanging a ball which each other and the faster they do the exchange, the more attracted are the two players. How ridiculous! Any such exchange would cause a repulsion, not an attraction. There is no way this particle exchange can work! How can serious physicists possibly take this seriously? This makes NO intuitive or logical sense.

We get into other problems because we observe a lot a wave phenomenon, so we say light can be both wave or particle depending on the experiment. Now how logical is this argument – something completely changes its nature depending on how we are looking at it. It is sheer lunacy to think subatomic particles care what we are doing in the macroscopic world and change their behavior to suit us.

We get into all of these problems because we refuse to believe in an aether. If we believe in an aether, then the world is a very simple place. All interactions happen via waves propagated in the aether. There are no particle exchanges required to transmit forces. It has been shown that phased wave interactions can create attractive and repulsive forces – objects emitting in phase waves repel, while out of phase attract. There is no spooky 'action at a distance'. The only way particle A can affect particle C is if goes through particle B. A most sensible chain of cause and affect.

Physics wrong turns – nearly everything learned over the past 100 years is wrong

The only serious experiment indicating particle nature of light is the photoelectric effect. However, I feel this can be easily explained if you think that light is generated in specific wave packet quanta. This would have the exact same effect as if a fixed sized particle hit a surface – but it is created by a strictly wave phenomenon. By far the larger experimental evidence shows that light is a wave. We only need the medium (the aether) to make it work.

Since we think that the aether doesn't exist, we make no attempt to detect it directly or to determine its properties or how it could be manipulated. Instead, we spend billions trying to detect particle force carriers and can only guess at the particles shooting out of these collisions. Seems we've spent billions on accelerators, and what do they have to show for it – a few pictures of squiggly lines – perhaps a newly discovered particle here or there. We're never going to be able to figure out how to neutralize gravity with science like this. We are barking up the wrong tree – there are no exchange particles, we should be studying the subatomic interactions of electromagnetic waves through the aether.

Wrong turn #2 – The Michaelson/Morely MMX experiment disproved the existence of the aether.

Always cited as the premier reason why we don't believe in the aether is the MMX experiment. This results of the experiment have been grossly misunderstood. If you read the original paper, they do not conclude that the aether doesn't exist – only that it is moving much slower than the orbital speed of the Earth. The experiment, did in fact return a small positive result and the authors suggested further research. This further research was conducted by Daton Miller who concluded that the aether could be detected. Daton Miller was a professor of physics and would not be likely to make experimental errors or wrongly deduce that his result was not within experimental error. His experiment which was carried out over 20 years under a much better environment was completely ignored in favor of the new 'whiz bang' relativity theory of Einstein apparently that didn't require an aether.

Bottom line, the MMX experiment did not disprove the existence of the aether – although everyone thinks it did. At best, it indicated that the aether (if it exists) moves relatively slowly on the surface of the Earth. This would be like trying to disprove the existence of air by measuring the airspeed while you were inside of an airplane. You say that you expect the airspeed to be 100 mph, because you know the airplane is going 100 mph. You measure nothing inside the airplane, therefore you disprove the existence of air. Of course, this makes no logical sense at all and neither does the MMX experiment.

Wrong turn #3 – The Rutherford atomic model

Physics wrong turns – nearly everything learned over the past 100 years is wrong

Physics wrong turns – nearly everything learned over the past 100 years is wrong

We are all familiar with the model of the atom as an extremely compact nucleus containing protons/neutrons surrounded by a cloud of electrons. The reason why we think this is because of the Rutherford experiment of bombarding helium nucleus against a very thin film of gold. Rutherford concluded that the nucleus of the atom had to contain all of the positive charge and had to be incredibly small. Well everyone just fell in loves with this theory since it reminded us of how the planets orbit the sun. Cute, but fatally wrong. The experiment done by Rutherford is an extremely indirect method of probing the atom and he made a number of assumptions that fundamentally did not need to be true. His initial assumption was that the atom was the 'plum pudding' model of an amorphous blob that wouldn't put up much resistance to a helium atom. I'd say he proved that that isn't the case, but he did not rule out other possible structures that could reproduce the scattering pattern that he observed from his experiments. All his experiments could show was that the area that had to be solid was extremely small, but that isn't to say that he proved it all had to be in the same place. It could have been spread out into even smaller dots. My own experimental calculations show that the scattering pattern could be reproduced by an octagonal shaped atom and assuming that the atom is solid only along the atoms axis.

The reason why the interpretation of this experiment is so fatal is because it has totally hindered the development of an atomic model that makes any physical sense. For example, it makes no sense that all of the protons could be crammed together in compact nucleus. So what does this mean? It means we have to come up with some new "strong" force to keep it together. In reality, this strong force doesn't exist and doesn't need to exist and the evidence for it is rather weak and circumstantial. Due to the dimensions involved, we will never be able to directly measure the "strong" force. But yet we spend untold millions looking for it

Something else that doesn't make sense is how chemical bonds could form from blobs of electron clouds. How does each electron know to stay in its energy level and how do the chemical bonds know to recognize only the electrons from a specific energy level. It doesn't seem possible. It would seem to be an incredibly chaotic situation where it is a wonder why anything bonds with anything at all. And how do the p, s, and d orbitals form with their balloon and doughnut and dumbbell configurations form? This simply defies any explanation. Yet we are stuck with this because we totally believe in the Rutherford atomic model. If you want more evidence of what atoms really look like, we have much more precise methods such as scanning tunneling microscopes. If you look at some of the latest pictures of the surface of a silicon crystal, these atoms do not look like blobs. In fact, they look like hard little lego bricks. Current quantum atomic theory can in no way explain how such a sharp feature could occur. This is a far better picture of an atom than Rutherford could ever dream of. What are we to believe – an indirect 100 year old experiment, or our own eyes looking

Physics wrong turns – nearly everything learned over the past 100 years is wrong

at a direct scan of an atom.

My own research shows that an atomic model built out of alternating protons and electrons which form an octagonal shaped atom can reproduce the scatter results and the apparent electron energy levels observed in real atoms. This model requires no "strong" force and chemical reactions are logically formed by natural docking ports created by the exposed vertice of the atoms. Note that this isn't a random 'plum pudding' model. Atoms take on a specific octagonal shape as they grow larger. It is interesting to note that most large atoms like gold, form octagonal crystals and the macroscopic crystal shape reflects the subatomic shape of the individual atoms. It makes perfect sense. Atoms are space filling and the electrons and protons are evenly spaced throughout the atom in a balanced network. The electrons do not orbit outside of anything, in fact, they do not in any way form a cloud around the atom. They are embedded within – which brings us to the next wrong turn.

Wrong turn #4 – The Bohr interpretation of the hydrogen spectrum

Bohr's original interpretation of the motion of an electron around the atom was that it was orbiting the nucleus. Even the modern quantum mechanical explanation has the electron surrounding the nucleus in some sort of undefined cloud. However, the whole idea that an electron is in any kind of motion around the nucleus is completely wrong. In reality, when an atom is in the ground (or unexcited) state, the electrons all fall back into the nucleus of the atom (which is large) and stay there in a static position. The only time they leave the atom is if they are given enough energy from the outside to be ejected from the atom. This happens when you do spectrum experiments where you zap hydrogen gas with enough electricity to make it glow. What is happening at this point is that the electrons are being kicked out of the hydrogen atoms and are bouncing around the protons like little bouncy balls in some totally random pattern. There is no orbit, and there is no cloud either. The only reason why quantum mechanics succeed is because it is based on harmonic motion – which is the type of motion that the 'bouncy' electron balls are taking.

The reason why specific spectrum of light is produced is a result of the aether which defines the minimum amount that an electron can move in space. Just like a block of sugar in a box of sugar cubes can only take specific positions in the box, the electrons can only take fixed positions away from the proton. This controls the the specific amount of energy that an electron can take when it returns back to the nucleus. It appears that when the electron drops and then bounces back up, this is when the energy from its fall is released. The higher the fall, the more energy is released in the form of higher wavelength electromagnetic energy. Since the height of the drop can only come in fixed increments, this also fixes the frequencies which can be released and this is what we observe in the hydrogen spectrum experiments.

Physics wrong turns – nearly everything learned over the past 100 years is wrong

These are just some of the wrong turns that physics has taken. There are more:

Wrong turn #5 – Gravity is a different force than the electrostatic force – it is not.

wrong turn #6 – The Earth's magnetic field is not caused by internal forces, but by the weather

Wrong turn #7 – The big bang theory – can't explain the bubble structure of the universe or dark energy/matter.

Wrong turn #8 – The orientation of the magnetic field around magnets – got this backwards.

Wrong turn #9 – Almost everything Einstein said from a model perspective, right math, wrong model.

Wrong turn #10 – The source of global warming and the predicted result – ice age, not flooding

Wrong turn #11 – Quarks do not exist – everything is made up of positrons/electron combinations

I may describe these in a future post, but for now, four wrong turns should be enough for now. Most of what I have stated is described in detail in my theory of everything which can be found at:

<http://www.geocities.com/franklinhu/theory.html>

fhutoe

.