

## The way that Wikipedia deals with aether is dishonest

Roger J Anderton

[R.J.Anderton@btinternet.com](mailto:R.J.Anderton@btinternet.com)

There is a dogma in physics establishment where certain concepts like aether are denied, so the facts must be distorted to fit that dogma as for example a Wikipedia article does.

The way Wikipedia deals with it in one article is as follows [1]:

“Maxwell also introduced the concept of the *electromagnetic field* in comparison to force lines that Faraday described.<sup>[104]</sup> By understanding the propagation of electromagnetism as a field emitted by active particles, Maxwell could advance his work on light. At that time, Maxwell believed that the propagation of light required a medium for the waves, dubbed the [luminiferous aether](#).<sup>[104]</sup> Over time, the existence of such a medium, permeating all space and yet apparently undetectable by mechanical means, proved impossible to reconcile with experiments such as the [Michelson–Morley experiment](#).<sup>[105]</sup> Moreover, it seemed to require an absolute [frame of reference](#) in which the equations were valid, with the distasteful result that the equations changed form for a moving observer. These difficulties inspired [Albert Einstein](#) to formulate the theory of [special relativity](#); in the process Einstein dispensed with the requirement of a stationary [luminiferous aether](#).<sup>[106]</sup> “

The references cited are:

[104] Johnson, Kevin (May 2002). *"The Electromagnetic Field"*. University of St Andrews. Archived from [the original](#) on 27 August 2011. Retrieved 30 June 2013.

[105] Michelson, Albert Abraham; Morley, Edward Williams (1887). "[On the Relative Motion of the Earth and the Luminiferous Ether](#)". *American Journal of Science*. **34** (203): 333–345. doi:[10.2475/ajs.s3-34.203.333](#).

[106] Einstein, Albert. "[Ether and the Theory of Relativity](#)". *Archived from the original on 21 November 2013*. Retrieved 19 December 2013.

When says "...the existence of such a medium, permeating all space and yet apparently undetectable by mechanical means, proved impossible to reconcile with experiments such as the [Michelson–Morley experiment](#)." It is giving reference just to paper by Michelson, Albert Abraham; Morley, Edward Williams (1887). "On the Relative Motion of the Earth and the Luminiferous Ether" - was just about ongoing experiments and with nothing like a conclusion aether was "impossible to reconcile with experiments"!!

And when goes on to say: "Moreover, it seemed to require an absolute [frame of reference](#) in which the equations were valid, with the distasteful result that the equations changed form for a moving observer. These difficulties inspired [Albert Einstein](#) to formulate the theory of [special relativity](#); in the process Einstein dispensed with the requirement of a stationary [luminiferous aether](#).<sup>[106]</sup>"

The reference was to Einstein 1920 paper where Einstein seems to have changed his mind from 1905 and thinking there is some type of aether, and he saying such things as: "Recapitulating, we may say that according to the general theory of relativity space is endowed with physical qualities; in this sense, therefore, there exists an ether. According to the general theory of relativity space without ether is unthinkable; for in such space there not only would be no propagation of light, but also no possibility of existence for standards of space and time (measuring-rods and clocks), nor therefore any space-time intervals in the physical sense. But this ether may not be thought of as endowed with the quality characteristic of ponderable media, as consisting of parts which may be tracked through time. The idea of motion may not be applied to it." i.e. seems to be saying there is a type of aether."

Thus, the Wikipedia article is being dishonest and not giving citations to what it claims. Claims are being made and the facts cited don't support the claims! No reasoning is given as to how to conclude from the Michelson-Morley experiment that there is no aether, and Einstein who is supposedly dispensing with aether is being cited in a paper that seems to be accepting some sort of

aether. There is just total cognitive dissonance between the dogma being forced on us and what is written in primary sources.

Wikipedia is supposedly open to all contributors, but of course it is being policed by those enforcing the dogma.

## **Reference**

[1] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/James\\_Clerk\\_Maxwell](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/James_Clerk_Maxwell) at 27 Jul 2019

c.RJAnderton27Jul2019