

Re: my gravity theory – Web Link

Source: <http://sci.tech–archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2004–12/6461.html>

From: Bill Hobba (*bhobba_at_rubbish.net.au*)

Date: 12/22/04

Date: Wed, 22 Dec 2004 00:56:48 GMT

"SeanSinjin" <delphiconsultinguy@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:1103673192.596494.322610@z14g2000cwz.googlegroups.com...

> *Hi Bill, thanks for your feedback,*

>

> *>big emptiness just past the end of the upper atmosphere.'. It is not*

> *>science to assume, without evidence, and as if it is truth beyond*
> *question,*

> *>the existence of something no one has ever been able to detect.*

>

> *Your definition of science seems to preclude hypothesizing.*

It precludes incorrect hypothesizing ie hypothesizing based on a fallacy – you say 'We'll use a "soft, massless, transparent rubber" model to help us describe the properties of ether, rather than the fluid, sea-like historic model.' and 'One endearing new quality we'll introduce is homogeneity, or a lack of particles. Our version of ether claims it to be the only substance in existence, and also claims that it is not composed of smaller particles'. Elsewhere I cited The Conceptual Development of 20th Century Field Theories – Tian Yu Cao – page 30–40 to show it was not considered a fluid sea like model – it was considered an elastic medium and further is was not considered to be composed of other particles.

> *I will*

> *however state that the observations of gravity and magnetism tend to*

> *support the existence of my ether model.*

The evidence I have seen says otherwise. Mind detailing yours? My evidence is that assuming SR (which implies the non existence of an aether because an aether wind would break the POR) and coulombs law leads to Maxwell's equations – <http://www.cse.secs.oakland.edu/haskell/SpecialRelativity.htm>. Thus the non existence of an aether is in perfect agreement with EM – indeed it leads to Maxwell's equations. It is well known that aether theories exist but all known viable ones are, so far, are experimentally indistinguishable from SR (Ijla's GLET is in principle experimentally distinguishable but detecting the difference is beyond our current capability). So unless you can actually cite an experiment that distinguishes between them, then, obviously, you are speaking rubbish. As

to why this is and physicists prefer SR to aether theories see the following posts by Tom Roberts:

<http://www.google.com/groups?selm=3838AC00.87B78404%40lucent.com>
<http://www.google.com/groups?selm=3838A838.81CE8090%40lucent.com>
<http://www.google.com/groups?selm=3838AA2A.829F46AD%40lucent.com>

- > *My evidence is all around us,*
- > *I'm simply binding the observations together in a model that is*
- > *consistent with all of them, something that hasn't yet been done.*

That is not true. The standard model and GR are in accord with all known physics. And GR can be combined with the standard model as an effective field theory – see <http://arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/9512024>. My evidence comes from correspondence with experiment ie the foundation of the scientific method – not the desire to see a preconceived notion in everyday observation.

- > *If*
- > *you have truly read my article, you would understand that my proposal*
- > *for ether is quite adapted to fit current observations.*
- >

It does not. You, for example, claim that gravity can be considered as a stretching of an aether filling space. This is not compatible with GR which says that in the weak field small velocity limit it is the curvature of time that causes gravitational effects – space is flat ie it does not enter into it at all.

- > *This is both*
- > *convenient, in the sense that everything fits, and yet precise, in that*
- > *I've tried to keep the ether model as simple as possible.*

The point is it does not fit.

- > *You may have*
- > *a point that my ether may be more of a metaphysical construct rather*
- > *than a true substance, but I think we'll find eventually that there is*
- > *a point in reality where the physical becomes metaphysical, pure*
- > *mathematics, and that is my version of ether.*

Then please explain how your aether incorporates the curvature of time to explain gravity in the weak field limit.

- >
- > *Such is the*
- > *way of the crank and crackpot. You need go no further than this to*
- > *know it*
- > *is rubbish of the first order.*
- >
- > *So I'm to assume that your disregard for my theory is based upon the*

sci.physics.relativity: Re: my gravity theory – Web Link

- > *first few lines? No disrespect, but wouldn't the very scientific*
- > *method you purport to be so necessary, be violated by the act of*
- > *judging something without getting all the facts?*

I have now detailed precise objections.

- >
- > > *A genuine scientist would give reasons for*
- > > *supposing it or deduce it from more fundamental postulates. For a*
- > > *genuine*
- > > *aether theory, and an example of what science is about, see*
- > > *<http://www.ilja-schmelzer.de/GET/>.*
- >
- > *Very interesting. I don't subscribe to his concepts but I'll make a*
- > *better attempt to get inside his thoughts. However, I fail to see how*
- > *my ether theory fails to convey information in a satisfactory way,*

It is nothing but analogies – to count as a theory it needs to make predictions – preferably different from current theories so it can be checked. All you have is waffle.

- > *regardless of its lack of similarity to your above example. My*
- > *approach was to be conceptual and visual. It still ultimately contains*
- > *the same information that the math would, however, I feel more*
- > *comfortable and expressive working with diagrams that more or less*
- > *'virtualize' the mathematics that are so difficult to digest. I think*
- > *you'd understand better if you actually read my work prior to rejecting*
- > *it.*

Then make predictions that can be checked against experiment. Specifically explain how it is compatible with the experimentally confirmed fact that in the weak field limit it is the curvature of time that is important eg the Pound–Rebeka experiment and the experiments of Alley – <http://world.std.com/~sweetser/quaternions/gravity/redshift/redshift.html>.

Bill

- >
- > *kind regards,*
- > *Sean*
- >