

Re: Slabinski and Mingst/Stowe disagree in Pushing Gravity

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-05/msg00150.html>

- *From:* "TC" <tclarke@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 3 May 2005 19:02:12 -0700
-

Paul Stowe wrote:

> On 3 May 2005 05:17:53 -0700, "TC" <tclarke@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

>> Paul Stowe wrote:

>>> ... The equation derived empirically for heating is,

>> empirically? No theory?

> Come'on Tom, every significant step is spelled out in our article

> (Eq. 22-26, pages 190-191). Within the assumptions specified

> there is, as far as I'm aware, NO mathematical inconsistency there.

Then why did you use the word "empirically"?

[But there must be a mistake somewhere in your paper
or in Slabinski's or else your results would agree with
Slabinski.]

Snip definitions for brevity.

>>> $q' = kM/r$

>> Once again the problem is that this is incompatible with

>> Slabinski or any other LeSage/Fato theory in which provides

>> heat on a per unit mass basis.

> Yes, on a 'per mass basis'.

>> Mass is M – no dependence on r .

>> Area is $4\pi r^2$

>> so to be compatible with Slabinski et al your expression

>> should read

>> $q' = KM/r^2$

>>

>> [pi etc goes into little k to big K switch]

> OK Tom, do a simple fit test. Let Jupiter be the base and

> we'll say that the net heat is proportional to either the

Re: Slabinski and Mingst/Stowe disagree in Pushing Gravity

> mass divided by radius (s) OR mass (m).

Don't forget that m/r can also be accounted for by classical gravitational potential energy of collapse when the planets formed.

> ... Now, we know that
> the net heat flux for Jupiter is $\sim 6.6 \text{ Watts/m}^2$. Thus,
> either,

> $x = 6.6(m/m')$

> or

> $x = 6.6(s/s')$

> Where s' & m' are the mass & mass per radius of our basis,
> Jupiter.

[Paul argues that m/r is the best fit by comparing some heat fluxes from various planets]

Thereby he disproves LeSagian gravity (which predicts m dependence) and supports classical theory wherein m/r is deposited in the body from its gravitational collapse and is currently escaping from the body as relict heat.

Tom

.

• **Follow-Ups:**

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

• **References:**

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

Re: Slabinski and Mingst/Stowe disagree in Pushing Gravity

- Prev by Date: *Re: CMBR– A More Explicit Answer*
- Next by Date: *Re: O'Barr comments (globarr):*
- 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*