

# Re: Slabinski and Mingst/Stowe disagree in Pushing Gravity

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-05/msg00176.html>

---

- *From:* "TC" <tclarke@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* 4 May 2005 05:46:52 -0700
- 

Paul Stowe wrote:

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

>> 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,

>  $q' = (\frac{2G}{c^2})m/r$

> and another to solve for  $\frac{2G}{c^2}$ , by 'linking it' to an observed value.

You can always make one observation fit a theory by adjusting  
a constant [well almost always]

> Like Newton when he said, I observe that,

>  $F \propto Mm/r^2$

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

Newton had a whole lot, enormously more support,  
than you can claim.

> That's the 'empirical' part!

But the form of the equation is based on a theory.  
It is not a purely empirical formula like a regression equation.  
Better to term it a theoretical formula.

>> [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

Re: Slabinski and Mingst/Stowe disagree in Pushing Gravity

> see.

OK.

.....snip for brevity.....

>> [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.

I know you didn't say that your results support classical  
gravity theory.

You say excess heat fits an equation of the form  $Km/r$ .

I pointed out that this can be seen as support for classical  
gravity theory.

> No, r do I think so. You also  
> know damned well that if what you are claiming is true there  
> would have never been an issue of 'anomalous excess heat'  
> for the gas giant planets.

I just point out that potential energy has form  $m/r$ .

I'm really not that familiar with all the possible explanations  
people have posited. But any one having an  $m/r$  dependence would  
fit the same data.

By the way the fit is not all that good.

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

What does this have to do with the alternative explanation  
provided by classical gravity theory? The decomposition is  
only part of your theory.

Also, Slabinski does a decomposition and derives an upper  
bound from it.

> 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?

Now you have to tackle the binary pulsar, deflection of  
light by the sun, gravitational redshift ...

Tom

---

• **Follow-Ups:**

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

- Prev by Date: **Re: New book by Sarfatti "The Theory of Everything for Everyone" soonto be released**
- Next by Date: **Re: Ken S. Tucker. Time is an imaginary axis**
- 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**