

Re: Slabinski and Mingst/Stowe disagree in Pushing Gravity

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-05/msg00028.html>

- *From:* Paul Stowe <ps@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 01 May 2005 17:08:12 GMT
-

On Sun, 01 May 2005 04:57:50 GMT, aphidias@xxxxxxxxxxx (Strael Nosduj) wrote:

>On Sat, 30 Apr 2005 Paul Stowe wrote:
>> ...how does one determine the value for μ ???
>
> See the referenced web page, which gives the complete derivation in
> detail.

Really? I musta' missed the equation that quantified the value of μ . Care to point it out?

> In brief, one determines the ultramundane flux and the absorption
> (and reflection if you're willing to accept small violations of
> Newton's third law for gravity) necessary to account for the observed
> force of gravity, consistent with the absence of any appreciable
> shielding.

This is quite vague and I presume that you're talking about the weak limit, linearized cases.

> This amount of flux and absorption corresponds to a specific amount
> of energy absorption, ...

Duh!

> ... depending on the speed of the supposed ultramundane particles.

Ah, do you mean for the ultra-mundane particles of mass m' and mean speed c that

$$dp = m'(dc)$$

and

$$dE = m'c(dc)$$

> Lower bounds on this speed are then determined, ...

Re: Slabinski and Mingst/Stowe disagree in Pushing Gravity

Not by lack of aberration you can't! There are many specific detail problems in the page you referenced. Barry took the time & effort to point many of these out.

<http://groups-beta.google.com/group/sci.physics.relativity/msg/982030b9f3d78380?dmode=source&hl=en>

<http://groups-beta.google.com/group/sci.physics.relativity/msg/3db4a663f4a27799?dmode=source&hl=en>

<http://groups-beta.google.com/group/sci.physics.relativity/msg/53e6d3fafce5c1ad?dmode=source&hl=en>

<http://groups-beta.google.com/group/sci.physics.relativity/msg/ab1f374a72cab477?dmode=source&hl=en>

<http://groups-beta.google.com/group/sci.physics.relativity/msg/6fdf4a19783e5397?dmode=source&hl=en>

<http://groups-beta.google.com/group/sci.physics.relativity/msg/7ba762e40f7fb88c?dmode=source&hl=en>

<http://groups-beta.google.com/group/sci.physics.relativity/msg/440347db69626a4c?dmode=source&hl=en>

<http://groups-beta.google.com/group/sci.physics.relativity/msg/3bfa252862d7d98c?dmode=source&hl=en>

(Comment for the peanut gallery [this means YOU Dinky!]: Trying to distract by references to irrelevant postings is the mark of someone that has no capability for any other relevant technical input.)

And this page is a moving target and is modified often. In the time these were posted we have,

<http://groups-beta.google.com/group/sci.physics.relativity/msg/a5a08ded256cc736?dmode=source&hl=en>

and it has continued to be changed...

Nature herself are not bound by assumptions and constraints placed on model by those unwilling or too ignorant question them!

> .. giving lower bounds on the rate of energy absorption.

Oh, BTW the correct specific power equation is,

$$q' = \Psi[\rho]t$$
$$q' = (\zeta c/4\pi)\mu[\rho]t$$

Since power flux Ψ is related to momentum flux by,

$$\Psi = \zeta c/4\pi$$

You failed one implicit test of your knowledge of details of a LeSagian model!!! Hopefully you are NOT the author of that reference :)

Paul Stowe

- **Follow-Ups:**

- ◆ **Re: Slabinski and Mingst/Stowe disagree in Pushing Gravity**
◇ From: Dirk Van de moortel
- ◆ **Re: Slabinski and Mingst/Stowe disagree in Pushing Gravity**
◇ From: Strael Nosduj

- **References:**

- ◆ **Re: Slabinski and Mingst/Stowe disagree in Pushing Gravity**
◇ From: Strael Nosduj

- Prev by Date: **Re: How do you know that acceleration is absolute? <eom>**
- Next by Date: **Re: How do you know that acceleration is absolute? <eom>**
- Previous by thread: **Re: Slabinski and Mingst/Stowe disagree in Pushing Gravity**
- Next by thread: **Re: Slabinski and Mingst/Stowe disagree in Pushing Gravity**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **Date**
 - ◆ **Thread**