

Re: Geometrical interpretation of c^2

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2008-05/msg00942.html>

- *From:* srp2inc@xxxxxxxxxx
 - *Date:* Mon, 12 May 2008 13:56:32 -0700 (PDT)
-

On 12 mai, 13:13, cjcountess <cjcount...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Hell this is Conrad

Andre

that was very enlightening I learned a lot from your response. Still, what some may call mistakes or what I would call alternative manipulation of variables aside, we both arrived from different direction at moving from energy to rest mass smoothly along the same EM spectrum.

Yes. You intuitively grasped the geometric implications.

This validates to me that the matter wave emerges from the EM wave at critical frequency of, ok I will use (mc^2) instead of c^2 . This can't be just a coincidence. Especially if you consider the fact that the geometrical interpretation of c^2 or (mc^2) , as the conversion frequency at which energy turns to matter because it becomes circular or spherical frequency and it matches precisely the revelation of $E=mc^2$ that c^2 is conversion factor of energy to matter. I am tempted to rest my case but I am willing to discuss it further if anyone still has doubts but I do not.

I looked up dimension analysis and got this from "wikipedia"

"Only like-dimensioned quantities may be added, subtracted, compared, or equated. When unlike dimensioned quantities appear opposite of the "+" or "-" or "=" sign, that physical equation is not plausible, which might prompt one to correct errors before proceeding to use it."

That's exactly what I meant when I wrote:

"Understanding how to deal with dimensions is so important that the slightest error invalidates completely any attempt at explaining."

If one adheres strictly to this you are all correct about my methods although my outcome was the same as yours and the end may justify the means in this case.

Re: Geometrical interpretation of c^2

Not really. Your geometry is fine, but your math description is not ok.

But let me attempt here to justify my means.
When one considers the unity of the constants and again use those constants as fundamental unites, one can transcend this dimensional analysis rule.

I am afraid not. I have explored this possibility also. I found that there is no way to circumvent correctly dealing with dimensions.

Because one can equate different diminsions such as the mass and charge of electron as well as $c = h = g$ and so on. I can understand why a lot of physicist do not see this because some have not understood this unity and even if they had they might be reluctant to change just as we in the US were reluctant to change from units of (inches, feet, and yards) which do not seamlessly fit with each other, to the metric system,

In my opinion, the English system is perfectly fine for macro treatment and totally self consistent. Just a different convention.

which does and is easier. $c = h = g$ (g) is quantum gravitational constant not Newton's big G and is base on $(e=hf) = (M=hf)$ or energy/matter equivalence, with (h) as constant, and inertial/gravitational mass equivalence; which also makes (h), the quantum gravity constant.

Well, I really suggest you try to master the basics of physics. If you can get hold of an old Halliday & Resnick PHYSICS and dig in until you understand all of it, you will see things quite differently on this issue.

First I equate the constants ,and than use them as a natural unites system. I understand that most equate $c = (h/2\pi) = (G)$

Well, no. They don't.

Too complex to explain until you master the real basics of physics.

Re: Geometrical interpretation of c^2

Re: Geometrical interpretation of c^2

but I equate

$(c^2) = (h/2\pi) = (G)$ because all seem to refer to rest mass. I also equate $c=h=g$ as I stated above for other reasons which I will post. But the proof of the pudding is in the tasting and proof of my work is in the results. And if one considers using the natural systems of $c = h = g$ as well as $(c^2) = (G) = (h/2\pi)$, I am sure the rule of dimensional analysis although useful on macro level may not be as much on quantum level.

You are mistaken. even if you don't believe me.

As a matter of fact I have often heard it said that at the highest energies the forces are unified. I believe that the forces and the constants are all unified around the velocity of light.

A good stable reference indeed.

I want to correct myself on one issue. I stated that "one dimensional length unites do not occur in nature" in last post. Let me restate that and say that this seems to be the case on the high energy small length scale, but something resembling a 1 dimensional line may represent the (long end/low energy wave) of the EM spectrum, where a wave is so long it just may resemble a one dimensional line as in string theory. I just wanted to say that. And one more thing I want to put out there.

I wrote, Sylvester James Gates, after seeing him on Nova's "Einstein's Big Idea" and following his online chat afterwards back in Dec of 2006 and got an interesting response

Re: New interpretation of $E=mc^2$
Monday, December 11, 2006 1:55 PM
From:
"Sylvester James Gates Jr." <gat...@xxxxxxxxxxx>
To:
"Conrad Countess" <cjcount...@xxxxxxxxxxx>
Dear Conrad,

Dear Sylester James Gates Jr., Ph.D.

Please call me `Jim' as I don't stand on formalities.

Re: Geometrical interpretation of c^2

My name is Conrad J. Countess and I am an independent amateur scientist or at least I like to think so.

It is nice to meet you here in cyberspace.

I saw the Nova program, "Einstein's Big Idea" and found it very interesting.

I am very happy to hear this as I know from working with the producer, Gary Johnstone, quite an effort went to create an accessible and entertaining video presentation.

I even tried to get on line the next day to chat with you but could not get through.

I am sorry to hear that. The entire transcript of the chatroom is available if you wish to see it. Unfortunately, it is filled with my spelling and grammatical errors which occur whenever I type fast in the attempt to answer the most inquiries I could.

I've written one book in which relativity plays a big part and which also mentions Einstein and a lecture that I attended at your place of work, University of Maryland, years ago as I was living in Baltimore at the time but now reside in Columbia just down the road. Go to www.cjc123.net and hit browse book if you like to see it.

Congratulations.

But let me get to the point at hand now. I think that I have enough evidence to confirm that c^2 in the equations $E=mc^2$, $M=E/c^2$ and $m=Ec^2$ is not just a mathematical conversion factor of energy to matter but is an actual frequency at the high end of the electromagnetic spectrum where energy turns to matter and has a geometrical circular or spherical structure such as a standing spherical wave.

When my scientific career began about thirty years ago, I could not imagine it would place me in a role

Re: Geometrical interpretation of c^2

of directly informing the public about developments in mathematical and theoretical physics that have been my chosen fields of effort.

Most recently, I have completed my first solo effort in the realm of presenting frontier science to the public. It is described at

<http://www.teach12.com/teach12.asp?ai=16281>

you can see there an announcement for a collection entitled, 'Superstring Theory: The DNA of Reality.' This was released by The Teaching Company (TTC) in October and has been their 'fastest selling offering' with 'extraordinary sales' according to what I have been told.

One person who reviewed it said,

"At times, you will feel like a tourist in a dark magnificent cavern, whose guide shines a light at one spectacular sight and then another before you can catch your breath again,"

and they are talking about the MATHEMATICS which anchors the presentation but in a way I have never seen done before.

One lesson I have learned from all of this is that a tremendous number of people are interested but have not understood how theoretical physics is done. I spoke a bit about this in the chatroom.

One would literally have to be smarter than Einstein to be successful at what you purport...without formal training to present advances in physics. Even he first got a Ph.D. in physics before he was able to present his amazing discoveries. No one without the mathematical training similar to what he undertook has ever made any substantial contribution to theoretical physics.

Absolute agreement. You must master the proper math, including the dimensional aspect before you can even describe correctly what you geometrically understand.

The simplest explanation is that the angular momentum of the frequency equals and balances the speed and momentum of light along the linear path for a balance of

Re: Geometrical interpretation of c^2

centrifugal and centripetal forces resulting in a closed loop of rotating energy. A more detailed explanation is available at

www.cjc123.net/review

I've tried to take this idea to its logical end and so a lot of what it contains may be speculative or inaccurate, but the main idea I just mentioned I am sure of and I have logical, mathematical and geometrical evidence to back it. Due to the efficiency of the Internet and search engines the evidence is piling up and I do think there is no way around it.

There is plenty of collaborating evidence. It would be a great honor for me if you would review this paper and evidence, especially the idea just mentioned. Imagine a new breakthrough on this subject after 100 years. It is bound to generate much excitement and get more people interest in the sciences. $E=mc^2$ tells us that a lot of energy is trapped inside of matter and that they are one related by that formula. But up till now I have not heard anyone explain how. This explains it so simply that even a child can understand it. The implications are far reaching. Among other things it will show a more direct relationship between relative and rest mass, waves and particles, energy and matter, relativity and quantum mechanics.
SEE FOR YOURSELF – IT WOULD BE A GREAT HONOR FOR ME.

CJCountess
e-mail-cjcount...@xxxxxxxxx

I must decline.

Due to some previous experiences and on advice of counsel, I now operate under policies that require contractual arrangements before I discuss scientific issues with someone who does not hold a recognized scientific affiliation.

The rate for the consultation is \$500/hr. or any

Re: Geometrical interpretation of c^2

fraction thereof. There are also forms requiring waiver of rights, copyright agreements, a statement of indemnification, an agreement regarding billable hours, etc. and a security deposit of a minimum of \$1,500.00 non-refundable made prior to any such consultation to be paid via a secured financial instrument. If you wish for my attorney to send you a complete detailed set of such documents, please indicate to what address a C.O.D. package may be sent.

I do wish you are able to find what it is that you are seeking.

Sincerely,

Jim

+++++

S.J.Gates, Jr.
John S. Toll Professor of Physics and
Center for String and Particle Theory Director

University of Maryland Tel: 301-405-6025
Physics Department Fax: 301-314-9525
Rm. 4125 E-mail: gat...@xxxxxxxxxxx
College Park, MD 20742-4111 ...

plus de détails »

You say at the top of this post that you learned a lot from my responses.

I don't know if you can trust me further, but if you do, my one recommendation is to invest the energy and time required to master the real basics of physics. Then we may discuss further what you apparently understand geometrically if I am still around.

André Michaud

.