

## Re: Energy of Gravity is Nonlocal

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2004-11/0473.html>

---

**From:** vonroach (*hadrainc\_at\_earthlink.net*)

**Date:** 11/02/04

Date: Tue, 02 Nov 2004 14:45:46 GMT

On Tue, 02 Nov 2004 09:43:08 GMT, "Bill Hobba" <bhobba@rubbish.net.au> wrote:

>  
> "vonroach" <hadrainc@earthlink.net> wrote in message  
> news:ghabo0pcoiockknakni70upaoaate86qn7@4ax.com...  
>> On Sun, 31 Oct 2004 22:46:36 GMT, "Bill Hobba" <bhobba@rubbish.net.au>  
>> wrote:

>>  
>> > *It is hard to even conceive of an*  
>> > *alternative theory that could explain the basic features of the observed*  
>> > *Universe.*

>>  
>> *Do my ears deceive me? You sound like a contemporary of Newton.*

>  
> *First I am not the one who wrote that. But if you doubt it then detail your*  
> *alternative.*

>  
Chuckle..., new theories concerning the origin and nature of the  
Universe jump up as thick as fleas on a junkyard dog.

>> > *We are not 100% confident of that at all – but what really going on is*  
>> > *probably beyond your ken.*

>>  
>> *Is that the best you can do?*

>  
> *Just in case I am wrong here is the detail. The POR gives the Lorentz*  
> *transformations up to an undetermined constant whose value must be found*  
> *from experiment. That value is found to be the speed of light to a very*  
> *high degree of accuracy. But it is possible for light to have a very small*  
> *mass so it strictly is not the same speed in all inertial frames. If that*  
> *was true it would in no way change the fact that such a speed exists and is*  
> *finite which is basically what SR is about – see*  
> *http://www.courses.fas.harvard.edu/~phys16/Textbook/ch10.pdf and the section*  
> *on relativity without c*

>  
Speed of light outside an imagined vacuum is not all that constant.  
Wonder what it might be in a black hole or at a singularity? Also it

can be measured by physical experiments. Gravity, gravity waves, the graviton, and quantum gravity – all remain `concepts'. All except the acceleration produced by the force of gravity acting on a real mass, which has been elegantly measured and described in relatively simple experiments that anyone can perform and compare their results. If you choose to view that force as a distortion of space, the results still hold. Elegant mathematical concepts can't always be closely applied to reality. The fact that the equations balance is nice but irrelevant to reality.

I assume that your comment applies to all electromagnetic waves from radio to cosmic (and beyond if they exist).

>> >

>> >> *Sounds closer to hubris than intellectual appeal. I*

>> >> *tend to be a bit cynical.*

>> >

>> >*Your cynicism is fine – simply do not confuse it with science.*

>> >

>> *It is the essence of science.*

>

>*Not really – correspondence with experiment is.*

>

True experiments that give consistent results when other perform them. Not to be confused with `Gedanken experiments' carried on in the inner recesses of one's cave.

>>

>> >> *IMHO, even our invented language of mathematics has more `intellectual*

>> >> *appeal' than the above melange of assumptions that appear to have*

>> >> *worked for the anecdotal period of a few hundred years in vicinity of*

>> >> *a small star.*

>> >>

>> >> *But carry on, it gives you something to do while DNA plays out its*

>> >> *game.*

>> >

>> >*It is obvious the above poster understands nothing or at the most little*

>> >*about science. His philosophical evaluation of a theories foundations*

>*are*

>> >*irrelevant – what is relevant is correspondence with experiment. Now I*

>> >*wonder if he has any concerns on those grounds?*

>> >

>> *Billy, I wasn't aware that any experiments had successfully found any*

>> *definite evidence of gravitons, gravity waves, or energy strings*

>> *beyond `mathematical conceptual models'.*

>

>*Vonroachy (you don't mind if I call you Vonroachy do you – Billy is fine by*

>*me) science does not require direct experimental confirmation of every*

>*prediction or assumption of a theory. We however do have evidence for*

>*gravity waves.*

You practice an artful `science' but not a true scientific science.

These `gravity waves' must be your own cherished property. The tiny polished balls in space and the long terrestrial tubes have had less

success. The ancient variety has had considerable success in guiding people to space and on to the Moon and back.

It has also aided many generations of engineers in their constructive efforts even such trivial pursuits as amusement park rides.

It has also made possible to a satisfactory degree of precision for our needs, our mapping of the cosmos.

>> *I don't even know if there is*

>> *a way to prove these `concepts' wrong.*

>

>*Sure there is – simply find an experiment that is in disagreement with theories that predict or assume them.*

OK. I predict and assume that they are erroneous concepts incorrectly applying mathematical concepts to reality. Now ball is back in your court . Please furnish evidence that I am wrong.

>> *Then there is a horizon beyond*

>> *which we cannot see with the most powerful telescopes arrayed in*

>> *space. The light had not disengaged and the Universe was dark. A*

>> *`philosopher' might say this destroys the credibility of these*

>> *concepts beyond mathematical curiosities.*

>

>*Philosophers ask many things – a lot of which science can not answer – see*

>*<http://www.friesian.com/feynman.htm>.*

>

Scientist ask many things – a lot of which scientists or science can not answer. Meta physicists ask many questions that metaphysics can not answer. And relativists and quantum mechanics ask a lot of questions that the theories don't answer. Homo sapiens has been asking a lot of `things' for a long, long time that they still can not answer.

>> *I can see that my reference to human destiny on this speck of rock was*

>> *a bit over your head.*

>

>*Sure is – like a lot of philosophiocal rot is eg the following rubbish by*

>*Hegel:*

>

>*'All the worth which the human being possesses, all spiritual reality, he*

>*possesses only through the State... For Truth is the unity of the universal*

>*and subjective will; and the Universal is to be found in the State, in its*

>*laws, its universal and rational arrangements. The State is the Divine Idea*

>*as it exists on earth. We have in it, therefore, the object of history in a*

>*more definite shape than before; that in which Freedom obtains objectivity.*

>*For Law is the objectivity of the Spirit'*

Then I take it that you are unfamiliar with the false `logic ' of the dialectic, which claims it is a science and socialism or communism (from a practical standpoint – tyranny) is its aim.

>

sci.physics.relativity: Re: Energy of Gravity is Nonlocal

>*Bill*

>

Vonroachy