

# Re: johnreed take 1

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-04/msg00642.html>

---

- *From:* "Bill Hobba" <[bhobba@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:bhobba@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Fri, 08 Apr 2005 21:09:12 GMT
- 

<[randamajor@xxxxxxxx](mailto:randamajor@xxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
[news:1112991737.892996.147710@xx](mailto:news:1112991737.892996.147710@xx)  
> Today the mathematical descriptions of the universe on the blackboard  
> and in the published papers, are abstract and devoid of any conceptual  
> connection to physical reality.

John do you actually know the theories you criticize in this way? For example can you describe to me what renormalization is all about?

- > The American physicist, Steven
- > Weinberg, wrote, "... it is always hard to realize that these numbers
- > and equations we play with at our desks have something to do with the
- > real world." With the phrase, "...something to do with the real
- > world", Weinberg reveals that the mathematician has an unformed idea
- > as to what his abstractions represent conceptually.

Weinberg believes in objective reality as I, and most physicists, do –  
<http://www.physics.nyu.edu/faculty/sokal/weinberg.html>

'When I was an undergraduate at Cornell I heard a lecture by a professor of philosophy (probably Max Black) who explained that whenever anyone asked him whether something was real, he always gave the same answer. The answer was "Yes." The tooth fairy is real, the laws of physics are real, the rules of baseball are real, and the rocks in the fields are real. But they are real in different ways. What I mean when I say that the laws of physics are real is that they are real in pretty much the same sense (whatever that is) as the rocks in the fields, and not in the same sense (as implied by Fish19) as the rules of baseball -- we did not create the laws of physics or the rocks in the field, and we sometimes unhappily find that we have been wrong about them, as when we stub our toe on an unnoticed rock, or when we find we have made a mistake (as most physicists have) about some physical law. But the languages in which we describe rocks or in which we state physical laws are certainly created socially, so I am making an implicit assumption (which in everyday life we all make about rocks) that our statements about the laws of physics are in a one-to-one correspondence with aspects of objective reality. To put it another way, if we ever discover intelligent creatures on some distant planet and translate their scientific works, we will find that we and they have discovered the same laws.'

Re: johnreed take 1

- > Consider the
- > words of the late Hungarian mathematician and physicist, Eugene P.
- > Wigner, "...the enormous usefulness of mathematics in the natural
- > sciences is something bordering on the mysterious... there is no
- > rational explanation for it." It is in the contemplation of the
- > mathematics and the operation of the stable systems in the universe,
- > that I found the rational explanation for it. Galileo may have been
- > the first to formally assert that, "...the laws of nature are written
- > in the language of mathematics." Today we may elaborate. Stability
- > in the field requires economy in cyclic motion.

?????????. Stability in physics (and engineering for that matter) usually refers how sensitive a systems equations are to a perturbation.

- > The invariant aspects
- > of the stable systems within the physical universe, toward which we
- > necessarily direct our investigative efforts, derive from least action
- > functions\*.

The PLA lies at the base of much of physics – true. And conservation laws are really symmetries in the lagrangian – Noethers powerful result. So?

- > It is illuminating to note that the action stable systems
- > must follow to maintain perpetuity in the field, is precisely an
- > action that mathematics represents well. The mathematics fits the
- > stable universe because mathematics easily represents the economic
- > properties of stable systems. Consider the continuing words from
- > Eugene Wigner, "... it is just this uncanny usefulness of mathematical
- > concepts that raises the question of the uniqueness of our physical
- > theories."

Your logic escapes me.

- >
- > The uniqueness of our physical theories is defined by the properties
- > they retain after reduction to their most basic state. In this form
- > they are consistent with, or reduced to, the orders of form attendant
- > to an instant or complete cycle of stable system action, be it as in
- > the inverse square property of an economic sphere, the circumference
- > line segment ratio to its radially enclosed area in the Euclidean
- > circle, or the planet's trajectoral time interval ratio, and its swept
- > out area of the orbital conic.
- >
- > Wigner approaches the idea that we can experimentally isolate a
- > quantity with a local numerical magnitude and if that quantity
- > operates within least action parameters, without influence, or effect,
- > it can be proportionally applied to other stable systems, by virtue of
- > the invariant, economic, time–area, or frequency–wavelength aspects,
- > common to each stable system. In fact, mathematical models of stable
- > physical systems are conceptual creations of the observers. The laws

Re: johnreed take 1

Re: johnreed take 1

- > that result from mathematical abstractions derive from a physical
- > system's potential for stability and not from its experimentally
- > isolated operational quantities. This is not to say that there are no
- > underlying reasons for the order we observe in the universe, beyond a
- > principle of least action. Rather, it is to say that our classical
- > laws are derived solely from the principle of least action and beyond
- > this we know nothing.
- >
- > Aside from the kinematic quantities common to stable systems, our
- > operational quantities are limited by our sense perceptions. The
- > quantity of mass is clouded by our sense of weight and force. Mass is
- > not acted on by the Earth attractor\*\* and operates within the least
- > action environment without influence or effect\*\*\*. Therefore the
- > proportionality of the quantity mass, can be universally extended
- > beyond its local value to obtain a superficial fit with the non-local
- > observed system\*\*\*\*#. Devising an operationally effective mathematical
- > scheme based on the quantitative notion of mass, OR high energy
- > particle collision data and principles of symmetry, does not raise the
- > operational quantities to the level of a controlling physical reality.
- >
- > The fact that we can alter the energy of a proton into transient
- > energy states we call bosons and fermions causes us to conclude that a
- > physical proton object is composed of physical quark objects, whereas,
- > this does not reasonably follow. The quarks have a physical
- > justification that is dependent on the notion of symmetry and the
- > trails of transitory atomic
- > fragments, largely created by high energy collisions in the laboratory.
- > I
- > introduce the question here. Of what significance is an unstable
- > energy state? Murray Gell-Mann put the theory together from the
- > particle data available, but he did not originally believe that it
- > truly
- > mirrored, real world quantities. Consider Steven Weinberg's words
- > again "... it is always hard to realize ..."
- >
- > Before the publication of The Physics Preview for the 21st Century,
- > the "... something to do with the real world" aspect of the
- > mathematics, had not been clearly articulated. As a result we assume a
- > too literal interpretation for the operational quantities within our
- > theoretical constructs, and the mathematicians and physicists are
- > taught, and accept the physical reality of the theories they learn.
- > What this means for the rest of humanity is: as long as the physicist
- > has something that works as a mathematical model for a physical
- > system's action, humanity is stuck with the operational quantities
- > used within that model. We are given these quantities as real, and we
- > are told that they are fundamental aspects of the universe. The most
- > recent additions are the logical result of an unquestioned, never
- > verified, one hundred year old seminal assumption\*\*\*\*\* Colored quarks
- > have no real existence in the universe, yet,

Hold on. Why do you say that? At the turn of the century the existence of

Re: johnreed take 1

atoms was questioned. Then Einstein and others were able to decibel Brownian motion using the atomic hypothesis that count not be explained any other way. From that point on few physicists questioned the existence of atoms – and for good reason. The same with quarks – just like atoms since we have no theory that can explain the facts without then the only reasonable thing do is assume they exist. And sure enough in recent times we can actually photograph individual atoms. But such did not create a revolution because the evidence of their existence was simply too strong.

- > today the academic
- > humanist must reason from a theoretical reality, composed of colored
- > quarks, joined together with gluons, within a time dilating, curved
- > space universe. Why? Because mathematics has something to do with the
- > real world.
- >
- > \* A simple example of an economic or least action function, in terms of
- > its form, is a Euclidean circle. The circumference is the shortest line
- > length to contain the greatest area. \*\* The Earth attractor is the
- > phenomenon that we presently call gravity, our feel force. \*\*\* The
- > Earth attractor does not act on mass during free fall acceleration,
- > during orbit, or during escape velocity from the Earth. \*\*\*\*# Emily
- > Noether concluded that space was symetric with respect to rotation and
- > that this guaranteed that the law of conservation of momentum would
- > hold everywhere. \*\*\*\*\*See Takes 2, 3 and 4 for discussions on mass. \*\*\*\*\*
- > The assumption was that the electron manifests as a particle inside the
- > atom.

I find what you wrote above basically unintelligible gibberish. But hey that may be because I am dumb.

Bill

---

• ***Follow-Ups:***

- ◆ ***Re: johnreed take 1***  
◇ *From: randamajor*
- ◆ ***Re: johnreed take 1***  
◇ *From: randamajor*
- ◆ ***Re: johnreed take 1***  
◇ *From: Martin Hogbin*

• ***References:***

- ◆ ***johnreed take 1***  
◇ *From: randamajor*

- Prev by Date: ***Re: The appearence of car wheels near the speed of light***

Re: johnreed take 1

Re: johnreed take 1

- Next by Date: ***Re: New improved facts part 2v031***
- Previous by thread: ***johnreed take 1***
- Next by thread: ***Re: johnreed take 1***
- Index(es):
  - ◆ ***Date***
  - ◆ ***Thread***