

alt.sci.physics.new-theories

toroidal OR poloidal OR "F = G Search this gr Search Gro

The Aether Question.

Options

★ Messages **26** - **50** of **326** - [Expand all](#) - [Report discussion as spam](#) [< Older](#) [Newer >](#)

Dirk Van de moortel "MarkK" <markkett...@hotmail.co> Apr 21 2002, 11:11 am

➤ **Bob Kolker** MarkK wrote: > And how do they manage to Apr 21 2002, 1:49 pm

Patrick Reany - Hide quoted text -- Show quoted text -l Apr 21 2002, 2:31 pm

Paul Stowe In article <3CC2BC89.BB336...@asu.edu>, Apr 21 2002, 3:54 pm

Paul Stowe [View profile](#) [More options](#) Apr 21 2002, 4:07 pm

In article <3CC2B55C.DA0EC...@attbi.com>, Bob Kolker <bobkol...@attbi.com> wrote:

>MarkK wrote:

>> And how do they manage to stay at c ? Or are you saying they do
>> because they do and that's that?

> A fact is a fact whether or not one knows a cause for it. Science is
> ultimately based on facts.

No, science is ultimately about explaining & quantifying the world we inhabit.

> We will never know the ultimate WHYs of Nature. It is well if we know
> some of the HOWs.

OK, let's rephrase the question,

How does nature regulate light's speed? The FACTS ARE, ether theory does provide answers within its framework for both the its local invariant and global 'observed' variations...

Paul **Stowe**

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#) [Report spam](#)

Discussion subject changed to "You people treat ether like the next best thing"

Paul Stowe [View profile](#) [More options](#) Apr 21 2002, 4:14 pm

In article <3CC21FD0.9CEE0...@asu.edu>, Patrick Reany <re...@asu.edu> wrote:

[- Show quoted text -](#)

OK, here's the deal. You give us 'proof' of let's say the Higgs, lay it all out in a logical manner and provide the experimental evidence for same. I will then do the same for the aether. Thus we can then compare the proofs and see which one holds more water. You're right, this ought to be good...

[- Show quoted text -](#)

I didn't dodge anything, I actually answered your question. You just seem to dense to 'get it'...

> I don't give a damn either way about an ether. It's all imagination
> anyway.

Discussions

[+ new post](#)

[About this group](#)

[Subscribe to this group](#)

This is a Usenet group - [learn more](#)



View this group in the [new Google Groups](#)

Sponsored links

[Give Your Life Meaning](#)

Personal & Spiritual Development
Mystical and Psychic Study
[www.yourwayforward.co.uk](#)

[De nieuwe BMW M5](#)

Bekijk de nieuwe BMW M5 vanuit alle hoeken met het 360° aanzicht!
[www.bmw.nl/nieuwe_M5](#)

[Free Predictions for 2012](#)

A professional astro-clairvoyant reveals your future in a reading!
[AboutAstro.com](#)

[See your message here...](#)

Ultimately, that the nature of human beings. But the question really is, is what we perceive independent of what our minds imagine...

> So, where's the PROOF you said you'd give?

Define proof :)...

Paul **Stowe**

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#) [Report spam](#)

hansonthat's why you should change the re: of tl Apr 21 2002, 4:42 pm

Discussion subject changed to "The Aether Question." by Bob Kolker

Bob Kolker [View profile](#) [More options](#) Apr 21 2002, 5:17 pm

[- Show quoted text -](#)

Two things. Aether has not been detected by experimental means (choose the aether of your liking other than spacetime) and theories that do not assume aether predict successfully, so who needs aether?

How does aether account for the predictions made by the various flavors of quantum theory?

No aether theory ever predicted anti-particles. But Dirac was able to do so by modifying Schroedinger's equation and taking into account relativistic effects.

Aether does not predict the photo electric effect. You need particles for that. Maxwellian waves carry their energy in the amplitude, not the frequency.

Aether does not predict the violation of Bell's Inequalities. Quantum theory does.

and so on....

Aether is a lot of gas.

Bob Kolker

[- Show quoted text -](#)

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#) [Report spam](#)

Paul Stowe [View profile](#) [More options](#) Apr 21 2002, 5:58 pm

In article <3CC2E64B.36E6C...@attbi.com>,
Bob Kolker <bobkol...@attbi.com> wrote:

[- Show quoted text -](#)

Oh, I think Maxwell's aether has been quite detected. BTW, Maxwell's aether was never refuted by any observation or experiment. Further, as you should be aware, Maxwell's aether is also space-time's aether.

> ...and theories that do not assume aether predict successfully, so who
> needs aether?

Anyone who ever really wants unification...

> How does aether account for the predictions made by the various flavors
> of quantum theory?

Easily. All one needs realize is that Planck's constant is the aetherial 'kinetic action' parameter. Next, they need to recognize that all material manifestations are interactions of Maxwell's vortices...

> No aether theory ever predicted anti-particles. But Dirac was able to do
> so by modifying Schroedinger's equation and taking into account
> relativistic effects.

Dirac was a closet aetherist. As for anti-particles, they're in Maxwell's model...

> Aether does not predict the photo electric effect. You need particles
> for that. Maxwellian waves carry their energy in the amplitude, not the
> frequency.

Wrong, all you need is quantized interactions for that.

> Aether does not predict the violation of Bell's Inequalities. Quantum
> theory does.

Really? That somehow just seems a natural extension ...

> and so on....

> Aether is a lot of gas.

Go ahead, believe what you want, I somehow think unfolding history will prove otherwise.

Paul **Stowe**

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#) [Report spam](#)

Dirk Van de moortel [View profile](#) [More options](#) Apr 21 2002, 6:07 pm

[- Show quoted text -](#)

http://groups.google.com/groups?as_umsgid=3838AC00.87B78...@lucent.com
http://groups.google.com/groups?as_umsgid=3838A801.AB5B6...@lucent.com
http://groups.google.com/groups?as_umsgid=3838AA2A.829F4...@lucent.com

Dirk Vdm

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#) [Report spam](#)

Bob Kolker [View profile](#) [More options](#) Apr 21 2002, 6:10 pm

Paul **Stowe** wrote:

> > the aether of your liking other than spacetime) ...

> Oh, I think Maxwell's aether has been quite detected. BTW, Maxwell's
> aether was never refuted by any observation or experiment. Further, as
> you should be aware, Maxwell's aether is also space-time's aether.

Complete with the rollers and the idler gears?

See - Physical Lines of Force - by James Clerk-Maxwell

> > ...and theories that do not assume aether predict successfully, so who
> > needs aether?

> Anyone who ever really wants unification...

> > How does aether account for the predictions made by the various flavors
> > of quantum theory?

> Easily.

Cite please. Show where. Show how based on experimentally confirmed data and rigorous mathematical derivation.

> All one needs realize is that Planck's constant is the aetherial
> 'kinetic action' parameter. Next, they need to recognize that all material
> manifestations are interactions of Maxwell's vortices...

Maxwell knew nothing of Plank's constant although he was getting easy

about the equipartition of energy. He know something was wrong with statistical mechanics, but he did not know what. Show where aether was specifically used to derive Planck's Constant. A citation to a real honest to god journal will do just fine.

> > No aether theory ever predicted anti-particles. But Dirac was able to do
> > so by modifying Schroedinger's equation and taking into account
> > relativistic effects.

> Dirac was a closet aetherist. As for anti-particles, they're in Maxwell's
> model...

Cite Please. Maxwell did not even know about electrons when he was alive.

> > Aether does not predict the photo electric effect. You need particles
> > for that. Maxwellian waves carry their energy in the amplitude, not the
> > frequency.

> Wrong, all you need is quantized interactions for that.

> > Aether does not predict the violation of Bell's Inequalities. Quantum
> > theory does.

> Really? That somehow just seems a natural extension ...

Seems. Prove that Aether does predict the violation of Bell's Inequalities. Just tell us what aether is first though.

> > and so on....

> > Aether is a lot of gas.

> Go ahead, believe what you want, I somehow think unfolding history will
> prove otherwise.

I am interested in experimentally established facts, not hopes about what history will bring.

Bob Kolker

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#) [Report spam](#)

Paul Stowe [View profile](#) [More options](#) Apr 21 2002, 7:12 pm

In article <HlCw8.30491\$Ze.5...@afrodite.telenet-ops.be>,
"Dirk Van de moortel" <dirkvandemoor...@ThankS-
NO-SperM.hotmail.com> wrote:

[- Show quoted text -](#)

ROTFLMAO, oh, oh, pleeeeeeaaaaassse let me catch my breath...

OK, First, those have NOTHING to say about Maxwell's theory. Second, didn't you know that the equations developed by Maxwell's based upon his theory WAS the impetus for LET/SR? OOW, Maxwell's equations ARE Lorentz covariant 'right out of the box', as written by Maxwell.

What a novice...

Paul **Stowe**

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#) [Report spam](#)

Paul Stowe [View profile](#) [More options](#) Apr 21 2002, 7:32 pm

In article <3CC2F28D.A2EBE...@attbi.com>,
Bob Kolker <bobkol...@attbi.com> wrote:

>Paul **Stowe** wrote:

>> > the aether of your liking other than spacetime) ...

>> Oh, I think Maxwell's aether has been quite detected. BTW, Maxwell's
>> aether was never refuted by any observation or experiment. Further, as
>> you should be aware, Maxwell's aether is also space-time's aether.

> Complete with the rollers and the idler gears?

> See - Physical Lines of Force - by James Clerk-Maxwell

Please, do. BTW, its "ON the Physical Lines of Force"... Further how
about a citation from same...

>>> ...and theories that do not assume aether predict successfully, so
>>> who needs aether?

>> Anyone who ever really wants unification...

>>> How does aether account for the predictions made by the various flavors
>>> of quantum theory?

>> Easily.

> Cite please. Show where. Show how based on experimentally confirmed
data

> and rigorous mathematical derivation.

Thats a tall order

>> All one needs realize is that Planck's constant is the aetherial
>> 'kinetic action' parameter. Next, they need to recognize that all material
>> manifestations are interactions of Maxwell's vortices...

> Maxwell knew nothing of Planck's constant although he was getting easy
> about the equipartition of energy. He know something was wrong with
> statistical mechanics, but he did not know what. Show where aether was
> specifically used to derive Planck's Constant. A citation to a real
> honest to god journal will do just fine.

First, how about you give us the general mathematical definition of the
kinetic action parameter from kinetic theory...

>>> No aether theory ever predicted anti-particles. But Dirac was able to do
>>> so by modifying Schroedinger's equation and taking into account
>>> relativistic effects.

>> Dirac was a closet aetherist. As for anti-particles, they're in Maxwell's
>> model...

> Cite Please. Maxwell did not even know about electrons when he was alive.

Maxwell's theory was one of interacting ring vortices... Now, you have
four possible basic individual ring states. These are,

>	<	
x	*	Ring state A
<	>	
<	>	
x	*	Ring state B
>	<	
>	<	
*	x	Ring state anti-A
<	>	
<	>	
*	x	Ring state anti-B
>	<	

Note, x is **toroidal** circulation into the page, * **toroidal** circulation out

of the page, > & < direction of **poloidal** circulation in the plane of the page...

Now hydrodynamically, these rings can & do interact with each other? Want to guess happens when A & anti-A interact, or B & anti-B interact? Try looking at what the circulation vectors do, they cancel, being equal & opposite. IOW, the 'blow' each other apart at the speed of propagation.

Now are you going to try to tell me it ain't so, or that Maxwell model wasn't ring vortices. If you can't do either, one must conclude that anti-states (anti-matter since Maxwell's theory was the atomic vortex hypothesis) was always there... inherent to his system.

[- Show quoted text -](#)

Yup, backward looking, a clear trait of the unimaginative...

Paul **Stowe**

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#) [Report spam](#)

Dirk Van de moortel [View profile](#) [More options](#) Apr 21 2002, 7:43 pm

[- Show quoted text -](#)

You are beginning to sound like Spaceman. Be careful, there is no way back.

> OK, First, those have NOTHING to say about Maxwell's theory. Second, > didn't you know that the equations developed by Maxwell's based upon > his theory WAS the impetus for LET/SR? OOW, Maxwell's equations ARE > Lorentz covariant 'right out of the box', as written by Maxwell.

I'm very well aware of that.

Since you seem interested in ether sniffing, I provided some pointers so you can learn about your hobby.

Dirk Vdm

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#) [Report spam](#)

Bob Kolker [View profile](#) [More options](#) Apr 21 2002, 8:45 pm

[- Show quoted text -](#)

Quantifying and predicting the outcome of experiments. Our "explanations" are hypotheses. If you state a cause for something, then it can be asked what is the cause of the cause etc. Since we cannot operate with infinite regresses we get back to something we * assert * is a cause, but we cannot prove it since that would give us an infinite regress. Result: we have to start some where and say such and such is so because we measured it that way.

Result: we never really provide causes. We formulate hypotheses from which we make predictions. If the experiments supports the prediction all well and good. If not we have a bad theory and we must try something else.

Bob Kolker

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#) [Report spam](#)

Paul Stowe [View profile](#) [More options](#) Apr 21 2002, 10:44 pm

In article <3CC316FB.1205D...@attbi.com>, Bob Kolker <bobkol...@attbi.com> wrote:

[- Show quoted text -](#)

Faulty logic... While it is quite true one cannot drill down with infinite regress, it is untrue that this is always necessary. Also it is quite

acceptable to, at some point in cycle stop and say, ya'know, we just don't know yet...

> Result: we never really provide causes. We formulate hypotheses from
> which we make predictions. If the experiments supports the prediction
> all well and good. If not we have a bad theory and we must try something
> else.

I would say we formulate explanations, and far too often, many accept them as unquestionable gospel. I can state with 'absolute' certainty that the Sun will set and rise tomorrow morning. Tomorrow I'll get back on the computer and claim victory, but BFD. Do I need any other basis for my claim, sure but I think everybody is quite comfortable with the established explanation and that, in fact it is 'True' beyond ANY reasonable doubt. So what causes the Sun to set and then rise, the rotation of the Earth. We need go NO FARTHER in explaining that particular item. So see, it's NOT Turtles all the way down...

Paul **Stowe**

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#) [Report spam](#)

Sergey Karavashkin On 2002-04-19 17:10:01 PST je Apr 22 2002, 11:08 pm

pstowe [View profile](#) [More options](#) Apr 23 2002, 2:34 am

In article <3CC2F28D.A2EBE...@attbi.com>,
Bob Kolker <bobkol...@attbi.com> wrote:

>> Paul **Stowe** wrote:
>> Dirac was a closet aetherist. As for anti-particles, they're in Maxwell's
>> model...

> Cite Please.

I now took the little time necessary to look this up see:

<http://www.blavatsky.net/confirm/ev/ether/ether.htm>

Citations,...

In 1954 P.A.M. Dirac, a Nobel Prize winner in physics in 1933, said,

"The aetherless basis of physical theory may have reached the end of its capabilities and we see in the aether a new hope for the future."

While Dirac was not able to develop the mathematics as he would have liked to, we note this further observation on his activities:

In 1957, however, the Nobel physicist P. A. M. Dirac asked (as the title of a paper), "Is there an ether?" He answered affirmatively, and since then other atomic scientists have suggested that the ether may be defined as an energy-rich subquantum medium composed of neutrinos, pervading all space, interpenetrating all matter, and acting as the common denominator in all particle reactions. The question is still being debated. (Pole Shift by John White p 54)...

Also see:

<http://www.calphysics.org/articles/sst97.pdf>

I will presume to sources will satisfy you...

Paul **Stowe**

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#) [Report spam](#)

Bob Kolker [View profile](#) [More options](#) Apr 23 2002, 3:05 am

[- Show quoted text -](#)

In short, good old quantum foam. I suggest that there are so many aethers as to render the term meaningless.

But I do thank you for your efforts.

Bob Kolker

[- Show quoted text -](#)

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#) [Report spam](#)

Bob Kolker pst...@ix.netcom.com wrote: [http://www.cal](#) Apr 23 2002, 3:16 am
Discussion subject changed to "You people treat ether like the next best thing

pstowe [View profile](#) [More options](#) Apr 24 2002, 2:21 am

[- Show quoted text -](#)

Hmmm, the silence is deafening... I figured that, when asked to put up, Reany would shut up. Can't do the Higgs, how about gluons..., or perhaps, my all time favorite, virtual photons :):) I want to see more direct 'proof' of any of those than exists for the aether medium.

[- Show quoted text -](#)

Yup, thought so...

Paul **Stowe**

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#) [Report spam](#)

Discussion subject changed to "The Aether Question." by pst...@ix.netcom.cc

pstowe [View profile](#) [More options](#) Apr 24 2002, 2:26 am

In article <3CC4C17C.DDD3A...@attbi.com>, Bob Kolker <bobkol...@attbi.com> wrote:

[- Show quoted text -](#)

This statement is logically flawed... That's like saying there's so many different types of manifestations of physical media (gases, liquids, solids, plasmas, inviscid, viscous, turbulent... etc.) as to render that term meaningless.

> But I do thank you for your efforts.

You're welcome...

Paul **Stowe**

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#) [Report spam](#)

Discussion subject changed to "You people treat ether like the next best thing

Patrick Reany - [Hide quoted text](#) -- [Show quoted text](#) -p Apr 24 2002, 3:01 am

Paul Stowe [View profile](#) [More options](#) Apr 24 2002, 5:03 am

In article <3CC61167.741AF...@asu.edu>, Patrick Reany <re...@asu.edu> wrote:

[- Show quoted text -](#)

Oh Patrick, you're such a lightweight... Why do you bother? If you 'truly believe' that everything is just imagination, then sleep peacefully in your Matrix and quit letting your 'imagination' aggravate you so much :)

Sweet dreams...

Paul **Stowe**

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#) [Report spam](#)

Discussion subject changed to "The Aether Question." by Bob Kolker

Bob Kolker pst...@ix.netcom.com wrote: > You're welc Apr 24 2002, 9:34 am

Messages **26** - **50** of **326**

[< Older](#) [Newer >](#)

[« Back to Discussions](#)

[« Newer topic](#) [Older topic »](#)

[Create a group](#) - [Google Groups](#) - [Google Home](#) - [Terms of Service](#) - [Privacy Policy](#)

©2011 Google