

sci.physics.relativity: Re: OK, I'm Ready For the Patronizing Insults From the Resident Gurus!

Re: OK, I'm Ready For the Patronizing Insults From the Resident Gurus!

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2004-10/4040.html>

From: Eric Gisse (*fsegg_at_uaf.edu*)

Date: 10/18/04

Date: 17 Oct 2004 20:46:47 -0700

H@..(Henri Wilson) wrote in message news:<ior5n0hf4h2n8vnc43lhi76sgaf158jia2@4ax.com>...

> On 16 Oct 2004 21:56:31 -0700, *fsegg@uaf.edu* (Eric Gisse) wrote:

>

> >H@..(Henri Wilson) wrote in message news:<n44rm05859clpetpal4v2dl8gcm2umo214@4ax.com>...

> >[snip]

> >

> >>

> >> *Mathematical treatments merely describe what we already observe. In this case,*

> >> *how fields behave.*

> >

> >Right.

> >

> >We observed computers before quantum mechanics.

>

> Where did you get that idea?

>

> >

> >We observed gravitational lensing before relativity.

>

> Where did you get that idea?

>

I guess I need to explicit with my sarcasm tags...

The mathematical treatments predicted things we have never observed before. They pointed us in the right direction.

> >

> >Right.

> >

> >Mathematical treatments have no use other than modeling. None at all.

>

> That's actually not what I said. It is possible to make predictions with a

> mathematical model by changing parameter values.

What is the parameter you have to adjust in SR to get the Compton

Re: OK, I'm Ready For the Patronizing Insults From the Resident Gurus!

sci.physics.relativity: Re: OK, I'm Ready For the Patronizing Insults From the Resident Gurus!

effect?

What is the parameter you have to adjust in SR to get the increased half-lives of particles?

What is the parameter you have to adjust in GR to get the Mossbauer effect?

What is the parameter you have to adjust in GR to get Mercury's orbit correct?

Well, the last two aren't fair – you don't understand GR. I will be generous in the assumption that you understand SR enough to answer the first two questions.

> *That still doesn't tell you the reasons behind an observation.*

So what?

>

> *All known theory so far doesn't reveal to us any 'reason' for*

> *action-at-a-distance, which is undoubtedly the biggest physical mystery.*

I guess spacetime geometry doesn't satisfy you. I thought geometry was your specialty...

Again, so what if a physical theory doesn't give you an answer to the "Why?" question?

> *Einstein's theory on gravitation doesn't help one iota. Nor do maths treatments*

> *of electrostatics and magnetism explain why charges attract and repel.*

They explain, only so far. The reasons are buried within the theory, but you are right – there is no answer to the ultimate "Why?" question.

But again, so what? The theory works irregardless of being unable to answer the ultimate question of Why Things Are.

I get the faint impression you don't understand the math behind E&M.

>

>>

>>> *That does not delve any deeper into the 'philosophy' behind them.*

>>

>> *Wah.*

>>

>> *Science \neq philosophy. BFD.*

>

> *It is a lot closer than you might think.*

No.

Science is testable, philosophy is not.

Re: OK, I'm Ready For the Patronizing Insults From the Resident Gurus!

sci.physics.relativity: Re: OK, I'm Ready For the Patronizing Insults From the Resident Gurus!

>

- > *Ask yourself, "why does a moving electron experience a force when in a magnetic*
- > *field", then ask, "what physical mechanism causes that force to be at right*
- > *angles to both field and velocity?" You can easily describe the effect*
- > *mathematically using vectors. but....*

I look to the math, because the math has yet to fail.

You do forget that math is based heavily in geometry. For many things, R^3 – our flat Euclidian space, is the foundation. Geometry satisfies me until it breaks, then I look further.

>

- > *This verges on philosophy because it asks what exactly gives us an impression*
- > *of 'three axes at right angles'. Is it physical or psychological?*

Verges but does not cross. You do realise that coordinate systems don't always have to be orthogonal, right? It makes the math painful because dot products of the unit vectors aren't 0 anymore.

At any rate, science is testable, philosophy is not.

I think this is a very big deal for you. Dollars to doughnuts when you asked "Why?" enough, you reached a point where nobody could answer your question. At that point, you rejected everything because it couldn't satisfy your insatiable desire for everything having a base reason.

Either that or at one point someone tossed you an equation you couldn't handle. Probably a combination of both.

>

> >

> > > *You will never make a physicist Geese.*

> >

> > *Correct...but I will be a physicist.*

> >

> > *How's the crusade against science going, Henri?*

>

> *The 'crusade', geese, is aimed at digging physics out of the Einsteinian rut*
> *and setting it going in the right direction again.*

Did you ever once think for a little while about how Einstein's ideas were accepted? Did you know Einstein's ideas were fought against viciously? Even after, but less so, after Eddington's expedition?

You are ignorant of history. I suggest you take an introductory physics class, and spend some time in the library reading about Galileo, Newton, Kepler, Copernicus, Lorentz, Einstein, Planck, etc and etc.

Re: OK, I'm Ready For the Patronizing Insults From the Resident Gurus!

sci.physics.relativity: Re: OK, I'm Ready For the Patronizing Insults From the Resident Gurus!

>

> >

> >[*snip*]

>

>

> *HW.*

>

> www.users.bigpond.com/hewn/index.htm