

Re: Electo London Gravity ?

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-07/msg00844.html>

- *From:* "sue jahn" <[susysewshow@xxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:susyshow@xxxxxxxxxxx)>
 - *Date:* Wed, 13 Jul 2005 17:47:54 -0400
-

"Significant Zero" <paulpsremove@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:1121291995.9634.0@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

>

> "sue jahn" <[susysewshow@xxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:susyshow@xxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message
> [news:42d570d3\\$0\\$18636\\$14726298@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:42d570d3$0$18636$14726298@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

> |

> | "Significant Zero" <paulpsremove@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
> news:1121155351.32460.0@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

> |>

> |> "sue jahn" <[susysewshow@xxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:susyshow@xxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message
> |> [news:42d30163\\$0\\$18646\\$14726298@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:42d30163$0$18646$14726298@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

> |> |

> |> | "Significant Zero" <paulpsremove@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
> |> | news:1121119930.8243.0@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

> |> |>

> |> |> "sue jahn" <[susysewshow@xxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:susyshow@xxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message
> |> |> [news:42d2cab0\\$0\\$18646\\$14726298@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:42d2cab0$0$18646$14726298@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

> |> |> |

> |> |> | "Significant Zero" <paulpsremove@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
> |> |> | news:1121105795.2849.1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

> |> |> |>

> |> |> | snip

> |> |> |> |

> |> |> |> | OK... If you say so. I'd much rather call it force unless

> we

> |> can

> |> |> |> | can quantify time and displacement.

> |> |> |> |

> |> |> |> |

> |> |> |> |

> |> |> |> | <How do you quantify force except by time and displacment ?>

> |> |> |> | It is a good question. I am sure at some subatomic level you

> can

> |> |> |> | quantify the force between your bum and your chair in those

> terms

> |> |> |> | but a cushion maker might not appreciate that kind of data in

> |> helping

> |> |> |> | you select a soft meduim or firm cushion.

Re: Electo London Gravity ?

> |> |> |>
> |> |> |> Well he should unless he's after a snow job because as far as I
> know
> |> |> good
> |> |> |> expanded foam has compressibility data.
> |> |> | Results 1 – 10 of about 17,800 for "compressibility data" newtons.
> |> (0.24
> |> |> seconds
> |> |> | Results 1 – 10 of about 55 for "compressibility data"
> acceleration.
> |> (0.28
> |> |> seconds)
> |> |> | LOL A contrarian Eh?
> |> |>
> |> |> Definitely
> |> |>
> |> |> |>
> |> |> |> |>
> |> |> |> | Let's call it instinct... or copying what others do. The
> workers
> |> |> actually
> |> |> |> | producing some meaningful calculations are in chemistry and
> |> |> |> biosciences.
> |> |> |> |>
> |> |> |> | Most of the data we are reading is not in terms of
> acceleration
> |> and I
> |> |> |> don't
> |> |> |> | see what we gain converting it. AFAIK all of the moving mass
> is in
> |> |> |> | orbits predetermined orbits where we can't alter it anyway.
> |> |> |>
> |> |> |> | We work from mass and inertial data to determine acceleration
> that
> |> is
> |> |> |> keeping mass in orbit ?
> |> |> | Is gravity what keeps electrons in orbit?
> |> |>
> |> |> Alright Electro London gravity as a remainder of Electric field,
> Coulomb
> |> |> force and what keeps electrons cuddling up to protons{:–) So the
> answer
> |> is
> |> |> partly.
> |> | That's comforting. We are not trying to make gravity with something
> |> | that depends on gravity. :o)
> |> |>
> |> |> |>
> |> |> |> |>
> |> |> |> | Dubya likes democracy. So let's do democracy
> |> |> |> | Results 1 – 10 of about 14 for "london acceleration". (0.26

Re: Electo London Gravity ?

Re: Electo London Gravity ?

> |> seconds)
> |> |> |> | Results 1 – 10 of about 912 for "london force". (0.20 seconds)
> |> |> |> |
> |> |> |> | ...Look's your party need to hire a few more slimey lobbyists
> |> |> |> | and political consultants. :o)
> |> |> |> |
> |> |> |> | What units does your force come in ?
> |> |> | Newtons
> |> |> | <http://scienceworld.wolfram.com/physics/Newton.html>
> |> |> | <http://scienceworld.wolfram.com/physics/Force.html>
> |> |> |
> |> |> | Newton's are as a result of the acceleration of 1 kg which is
> |> |> | itself
> |> |> | defined by gravity so we end up using something to measure gravity
> |> |> | that
> |> |> | contains a component that has been defined by itself. Acceleration
> |> |> | which
> |> |> | is
> |> |> | somewhat more independent of gravity seems a better tool to measure
> |> |> | it
> |> |> | with
> |> |> | otherwise you are carrying this 1 kg weight about with all your
> |> |> | measurements.
> |> |> | Remember acceleration due to gravity is independent of the mass
> |> |> | being
> |> |> | accelerated so it seems cleaner to me ?
> |> |> | I understand your concern but is that not the same argument that
> |> |> | we shouldn't express the electron mass as MeV ?
> |> |> |
> |> |> | Yes but lets eat the first elephant first. {:-))
> |> |> |
> |> |> | OK you take the first bite:
> |> |> | Quantum states in the Earth's gravitational field can be observed,
> |> |> | when ultra-cold neutrons fall under gravity. In an experiment at the
> |> |> | Institut Laue-Langevin in Grenoble, neutrons are reflected and
> |> |> | trapped in a gravitational cavity above a horizontal mirror. The
> |> |> | population of the ground state and the lowest states follows, step
> |> |> | by step, the quantum mechanical prediction. An efficient neutron
> |> |> | absorber removes the higher, unwanted states. The quantum states
> |> |> | probe Newtonian gravity on the micrometer scale and we place
> |> |> | limits for gravity-like forces in the range between 1 micron
> |> |> | and 10 microns. >>
> |> |> | <http://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0301145>
> |> |> |
> |> |> | Good paper as it seems the sort of data I was looking for from the gravity
> |> |> | experiment I posted.
> |> |> | Still reading it but do you read it as them saying they cant detect grav.
> |> |> | forces at 1um-10um ?
> |> |> |
> |> |> |

Counts the kink in fig 6 and see if it doesn't look like the near-field effects we

Re: Electo London Gravity ?

Re: Electo London Gravity ?

have been studying.

Elsewhere you mumbled: :o)

<< 1.4 divergence, curl, laplacian ? didnt seem to find it there but could be hidden in the notation {:-}>>

<<4. Conceptual and philosophical differences

The main difference between these two formulations of electromagnetism lies in the mechanism of interaction between the charges. According to Weber's electrodynamics we have a direct action between each pair of charges, no matter their distance nor their motion.

We do not need to speak in electric nor in magnetic fields. While Weber starts with force between the charges directly, Maxwell's approach is interaction via the field. Maxwell believed that each charge generated electric and magnetic fields, which would move in space typically at light velocity. These fields would act on the other charges. According to him there would not be any direct action between two charges separated in space. The action between them would be performed by the fields. Maxwell believed in a material medium filling all space, the ether, which would be the responsible for carrying the action of one charge until the other and vice-versa. For instance, his last two sentences in the Treatise state ([13], vol. 2, article 866, p. 493, our emphasis): 'In fact, whenever energy is transmitted [http://www.ifi.unicamp.br/~assis/Pramana-J-Phys-V55-p393-404\(2000\).pdf](http://www.ifi.unicamp.br/~assis/Pramana-J-Phys-V55-p393-404(2000).pdf) <http://www.ifi.unicamp.br/~assis/wpapers.htm>

Sue...

• *Follow-Ups:*

- ◆ **Re: Electo London Gravity ?**
◇ *From:* Significant Zero

• *References:*

- ◆ **Re: Electo London Gravity ?**
◇ *From:* sue jahn
- ◆ **Re: Electo London Gravity ?**
◇ *From:* Significant Zero
- ◆ **Re: Electo London Gravity ?**
◇ *From:* sue jahn
- ◆ **Re: Electo London Gravity ?**
◇ *From:* sue jahn
- ◆ **Re: Electo London Gravity ?**
◇ *From:* Significant Zero
- ◆ **Re: Electo London Gravity ?**
◇ *From:* sue jahn
- ◆ **Re: Electo London Gravity ?**
◇ *From:* Significant Zero
- ◆ **Re: Electo London Gravity ?**
◇ *From:* sue jahn

Re: Electo London Gravity ?

Re: Electo London Gravity ?

- ◆ **Re: Electo London Gravity ?**
◇ From: Significant Zero
- ◆ **Re: Electo London Gravity ?**
◇ From: sue jahn
- ◆ **Re: Electo London Gravity ?**
◇ From: Significant Zero
- ◆ **Re: Electo London Gravity ?**
◇ From: sue jahn
- ◆ **Re: Electo London Gravity ?**
◇ From: Significant Zero
- ◆ **Re: Electo London Gravity ?**
◇ From: sue jahn
- ◆ **Re: Electo London Gravity ?**
◇ From: Significant Zero
- ◆ **Re: Electo London Gravity ?**
◇ From: sue jahn
- ◆ **Re: Electo London Gravity ?**
◇ From: Significant Zero
- ◆ **Re: Electo London Gravity ?**
◇ From: sue jahn
- ◆ **Re: Electo London Gravity ?**
◇ From: Significant Zero
- ◆ **Re: Electo London Gravity ?**
◇ From: sue jahn
- ◆ **Re: Electo London Gravity ?**
◇ From: Significant Zero

- Prev by Date: **Re: Electo London Gravity ?**
- Next by Date: **Re: GR ?**
- Previous by thread: **Re: Electo London Gravity ?**
- Next by thread: **Re: Electo London Gravity ?**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **Date**
 - ◆ **Thread**