

Re: Slabinski and Mingst/Stowe disagree in Pushing Gravity

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-05/msg00153.html>

- *From:* Paul Stowe <ps@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 04 May 2005 04:30:00 GMT
-

On 3 May 2005 19:02:12 -0700, "TC" <tclarke@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

>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"?

Because, like Newton & his equation, it is tied directly to observation. It is one thing to say,

$$q' = (\text{¥}2G/c^2)m/r$$

and another to solve for ¥, by 'linking it' to an observed value.

Like Newton when he said, I observe that,

$$F_o < Mm/r^2$$

And the solves for the magnitude of the proportionality constant BY linking it back to measured observations...

That's the 'empirical' part!

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

As I told you earlier, now that we've been made aware of this, it IS being worked on. My gut says, we're both right. We'll see.

Re: Slabinski and Mingst/Stowe disagree in Pushing Gravity

> 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
>> 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 ~ 6.6
>> Watts/ m^2 . Thus, either,
>
>> $x = 6.6(m/m')$
>
>> or
>
>> $x = 6.6(s/s')$
>
>> Where m' & s' 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.

Sigh, why do you deliberately distort? You know damned well that I've said no such thing. No, I do I think so. You also know damned well that if what you are claiming is true there

Re: Slabinski and Mingst/Stowe disagree in Pushing Gravity

would have never been and issue of 'anomalous excess heat' for the gas giant planets.

Further, you should also know that that very same \forall term is utilized to decompose G into its constitute parts of ζ & μ .

These in turn, are used in the classic derivation of the drag equation, which, just amazingly, matches the precise magnitude of that observed in Pioneer & Ulysses spacecraft.

Two from one, an amazing series of coincidences, eh?

Paul Stowe

• *Follow-Ups:*

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

• *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*
◇ From: TC

- Prev by Date: *Re: O'Barr comments (globarr):*
- Next by Date: *Re: Bending of light not well authenticated*
- 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*