

## Re: GR ?

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-07/msg00865.html>

---

- *From:* "Bill Hobba" <[bhobba@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:bhobba@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Thu, 14 Jul 2005 05:18:14 GMT
- 

"Significant Zero" <[paulpsremove@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:paulpsremove@xxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
[news:1121078106.29029.0@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:1121078106.29029.0@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)  
>  
> "Bill Hobba" <[bhobba@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:bhobba@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
> [news:gjAe.37066\\$oSJ.24752@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:gjAe.37066$oSJ.24752@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)  
> |  
> | "Significant Zero" <[paulpsremove@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:paulpsremove@xxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
> | [news:1120986361.29445.3@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:1120986361.29445.3@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)  
> |>  
> |> "Bill Hobba" <[bhobba@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:bhobba@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
> |> [news:vDYze.29292\\$oSJ.13176@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:vDYze.29292$oSJ.13176@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)  
> |> |  
> |> | "Significant Zero" <[paulpsremove@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:paulpsremove@xxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
> |> | [news:1120901128.24485.0@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:1120901128.24485.0@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)  
> |> |> Would anybody that understands GR dispute the statement that the  
> |> geometry  
> |> of  
> |> |> GR is non-Euclidean due deformation of length and duration under  
> |> presence  
> |> |> of mass and that this deformation has the aspect and equivalence  
> to  
> |> | energy?  
> |> |  
> |> | If what you are trying to say is do gravitational fields have  
> nergy –  
> |> then  
> |> | I would say yes with caveats. Energy in GR is a rather slippery  
> concept  
> |> due  
> |> | to the fact that energy is the conserved Noether charge related to  
> time  
> |> | symmetry of the lagrangian – it is rather difficult to define such  
> when  
> |> that  
> |> | symmetry is lacking due to space–time curvature – see the FAQ –  
> |>  
> |> Thanks Bill that is the energy definition that I have some  
disagreement

Re: GR ?

> | with  
> | > and to a large degree is what much of my postings are in dispute with  
> and  
> | > are grouping for a more complete, accurate and satisfying definition.  
My  
> | > position is that all energy is a function of relative states of length  
> and  
> | > time deformation with the use of the word deformation not implying  
that  
> | any  
> | > intrinsic force is present in this deformation. The energy being  
present  
> | due  
> | > to the relationship of different length/duration states which from  
> your  
> | > previous posting I think you violently oppose {:-) .  
> |  
> | For your definition to make sense you need to do a few things. First  
> | express it mathematically so it can be used to make quantitative  
> | predictions. Secondly show it agrees with the current definition in all  
> | cases where such agreement is possible. And thirdly show why your  
edition  
> | is superior. You have not even done the first bit.  
> |  
>  
> Thanks for the advice Bill. I was aware of what I may need to do to  
convince  
> you that your view might be improved by some subtle changes was a mountain  
> to climb but as I had the rest of my life, so I thought I'd give it a  
go{:-)  
> I am on the first bit trying to familiarise myself with your notation OK

How about actually addressing the issue? – namely your definition lacks any  
quantitative predictive content or indeed makes any sense.

> {:-)  
>  
> | >  
> | > | [http://math.ucr.edu/home/baez/physics/Relativity/GR/energy\\_gr.html](http://math.ucr.edu/home/baez/physics/Relativity/GR/energy_gr.html)  
> | > |  
> | >  
> | > Maybe I don't understand this  
> |  
> | Unfortunately that seems likely.  
>  
> That crack is clearly an attempt by somebody with uncertainties to try and  
> gain some sort of psychological advantage as to the accuracy of the  
document  
> in question. Do you agree with this Bill ?

No.

Re: GR ?

Re: GR ?

> I wrote 'Maybe I don't understand  
> this' to indicate that I would try and have an open mind about it. I may  
be  
> able to close my teeth on your head if I need to at any time Bill so lets  
> not bite each other untill we need to Eh?{:–) and keep it amusing when you  
> need to and then I might not bite so hard back ?.

So you admit your agenda is not to discuss physics?

>  
> |  
> | > but it seems to me to have more conceptual holes than a  
> | > moth eaten jumper  
> |  
> | Then detail those supposed holes.  
>  
> First Hole  
>  
> It starts with a semantic hole that I know you love debating about 'energy  
> and conserved' that it never seems to address except with clichés. You  
might  
> like to do better ?

How about addressing the issue rather than your pathetic attempts at  
misdirection?

>  
> Second hole  
>  
> 'In flat spacetime (the backdrop for SR).....'  
>  
> It then degenerates into some semantic waffle to presumable come out the  
> other side with curved space–time that is not flat.  
> Hold on clarifying this until you have dealt with 'energy and conserved'  
>  
> |  
> | > but if you are prepared to pick it to bits with me I'll  
> | > give it a try, you may be able to educate me out of my dispute but I  
am  
> | hard  
> | > to educate about something that is itself in dispute.{:–)  
> |  
> | Ok. Just make you objections specific – not some vague semantic waffle.  
>  
> See the first hole introduced by the paper you linked

You mean the hole you said was 'you love debating about 'energy and  
conserved' that it never seems to address except with clichés'. How about  
sticking to the issue at hand instead of wandering off into appraisals of  
what I love and do not love. But this kind of misdirection is central to

Re: GR ?

Re: GR ?

your style and indicative of my hypotheses that your agenda is not to actually discuss physics but to engage in senseless semantic waffle. To be specific what is wrong with the definition of energy as the conserved Noether charge related to time symmetry? Or is it as I suspect your math is not much beyond kiddy level – yet you believe you can intelligently discuss modern physical theories? There is no shame in admitting you do not know what conserved Noether charge is or that you are not fluent in more advanced math or that you do not know the generalization of Newtonian potential is the metric – the shame is in avoiding the issue that you do not really understand what you are criticizing and trying to take the discussion into senseless semantics.

Bill

>  
> The stuff you presented in your link is vague semantic waffle IMHO its not  
> me thats introducing its you. In the header post I made my view as plain  
as  
> I could at that moment and asked for comments by posting it you then  
> referred my to a load of semantic waffle as presumable my posting did not  
> have enough semantic waffle in it. ?  
>  
> |  
> | Bill  
> |  
> |>  
> |> | Bill  
> |> |  
> |> |>  
> |> |> --  
> |> |> Significant Zero E-field = Electric field, M-field =Magnetic  
> field,  
> |> two  
> |> |> unbound field effects  
> |> |> <http://home.freeuk.com/paulps/>  
> |> |> Maybe updates. The spuds, beans and onions are coming up nicely.  
> Ooh  
> |> |> ah.{:~)  
> |> |>  
> |> |>  
> |> |  
> |> |  
> |>  
> |>  
> |>  
> |  
> |  
>  
>

Re: GR ?

- **Follow-Ups:**
  - ◆ **Re: GR ?**
    - ◇ *From:* Significant Zero
  
- **References:**
  - ◆ **GR ?**
    - ◇ *From:* Significant Zero
  - ◆ **Re: GR ?**
    - ◇ *From:* Bill Hobba
  - ◆ **Re: GR ?**
    - ◇ *From:* Significant Zero
  - ◆ **Re: GR ?**
    - ◇ *From:* Bill Hobba
  - ◆ **Re: GR ?**
    - ◇ *From:* Significant Zero
  
- Prev by Date: *relativity of simultaneity*
- Next by Date: *Re: relativity of simultaneity*
- Previous by thread: *Re: GR ?*
- Next by thread: *Re: GR ?*
- Index(es):
  - ◆ *Date*
  - ◆ *Thread*