

Re: GR ?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-07/msg00873.html>

- *From:* "Bill Hobba" <bhobba@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 14 Jul 2005 09:29:23 GMT
-

"Significant Zero" <paulpsremove@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:1121325637.15682.0@xx

>

> "Bill Hobba" <bhobba@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message

> [news:qAmBe.47817\\$oJ.28366@xx](mailto:news:qAmBe.47817$oJ.28366@xx)

> |

> | "Significant Zero" <paulpsremove@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message

> | news:1121078106.29029.0@xx

> |>

> |> "Bill Hobba" <bhobba@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message

> |> [news:gjAe.37066\\$oJ.24752@xx](mailto:news:gjAe.37066$oJ.24752@xx)

> |> |

> |> | "Significant Zero" <paulpsremove@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message

> |> | news:1120986361.29445.3@xx

> |> |>

> |> |> "Bill Hobba" <bhobba@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message

> |> |> [news:vDYze.29292\\$oJ.13176@xx](mailto:news:vDYze.29292$oJ.13176@xx)

> |> |> |

> |> |> | "Significant Zero" <paulpsremove@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message

> |> |> | news:1120901128.24485.0@xx

> |> |> |> 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

Re: GR ?

> |> |> | 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
> |> | 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
> |

Re: GR ?

Re: GR ?

- > | How about actually addressing the issue? – namely your definition lacks
- > any
- > | quantitative predictive content or indeed makes any sense.
- > |
- >
- > What are you on about ?

Your definition of energy as '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.' This time no evasion – what is wrong with the modern definition of energy as the conserved Noether charge related to time symmetry.

Bill

- > I am only trying to compare my conceptual model with
- > others and my experimental data is the same as yours I hope. What do you
- > think the issue is Bill other than your claim that what I write is
- senseless
- > and your response of 'rest of semantic senseless rubbish sniped', which is
- a
- > bit of a broad criticism to address {:-)
- >
- > |> {:-)
- > |>
- > |> |>
- > |> |> |
- 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.
- >
- > A totally unexpected reply {:-)
- >
- > |
- > |> 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

Re: GR ?

Re: GR ?

> 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?
>
> I don't know how you managed to conclude that from what I wrote? I am
trying
> to compare my model of reality with others on this group, in my book that
is
> discussing physics. If it can be made amusing and entertaining then so
much
> the better, are you in disagreement with that ?
>
> |
> |>
> |> |
> |> |> 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?
>
> What issue have you moved to now Bill ?
>
> |
> |>
> |> 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

Re: GR ?

Re: GR ?

I

> | am
> |> | hard
> |> |> to educate about something that is itself in dispute.{:–)
> |> |
> |> | Ok. Just make your 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
>
> You linked me to the paper Bill so I was trying to address its content,
> pathetic red herrings is more your style.
>
> | instead of wandering off into appraisals of
> | what I love and do not love. But this kind of misdirection is central
to
> | 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
>
> I have read noethers paper and I do admit that the notations is difficult
> and beyond me at the moment but one of the statements about her paper was
> that it ' Proves both the theorems described above (Langrangian, Lie
Group)
> and there converses.
> This reads to me as a academic exercise that may have no bearing on
physical
> reality. Now if you can give a simple provable physical example that can
be
> proved both with and without Emmys theorem then please do and I will give
> the paper more study and see if I agree with your statements in which you
> use this as proof of.
>
>
> | or that you do not know the generalization of Newtonian potential is

Re: GR ?

Re: GR ?

> | the metric –
>
> That is your definition but mine is that the Newtonian potential is a
> gravitational gradient and nearest I can come to it in GR terms is a
> momentum 4 vector this view I find support for in the FAQ paper you linked
> me to.
>
> | 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.
>
> You may think that semantics is senseless but without a common meaning for
> things no communication can occur.
>
> |
> | 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 me 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*
 - ◆ **Re: GR ?**
 - ◇ *From: Bill Hobba*
 - ◆ **Re: GR ?**
 - ◇ *From: Significant Zero*

- Prev by Date: **Re: GR ?**
- Next by Date: **Re: hawking radiation**
- Previous by thread: **Re: GR ?**
- Next by thread: **Re: GR ?**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **Date**
 - ◆ **Thread**