

Re: "Is There a Force of Gravity?"

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-10/msg01546.html>

- *From:* Joe Fischer <efischer@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 26 Oct 2005 11:36:30 -0400
-

On Wed, stephen@xxxxxxxx wrote:

>>>> Joe Fischer wrote:
>>>> I don't know what you want, vector values in
>>>> polar or rectangular coordinates?
>>>>
>>>> I wanted your explanation about how the expansion of the
>>>> earth and moon explains the moon's orbit.
>>>>
>>>> If you are a student, please don't pay attention to anything
>>>> I say. I think you have it backwards, why do you think the
>>>> moon should go straight?
>>>>
>>>> I am trying to figure out what your theory is.

I don't have a theory. A "theory" requires some measure of formalism, and I am neither mathematically capable, physically comfortable enough, or even inclined to do that.

> Apparently
> you are rejecting Newton's first law and saying that the
> moon will not travel in a straight line relative to the Earth
> even though no force is acting on it.

Apparently you have never heard of General Relativity, sorry I forgot to check to see if this thread is being crossposted to relativity.

Of course the moon would travel in a straight line if there were no other matter in the vicinity, but I don't see how that is a concern considering the Earth is quite close, and the Sun is massive enough to be the dominating gravitational object.

The moon does not orbit the Earth, they orbit each other, and both orbit the sun. The orbit of the Moon is always concave toward the Sun.

I will snip some of your questions and remarks

Re: "Is There a Force of Gravity?"

for now, and skip to what I see as the problem, and maybe come back to what I skip later.

>[snip]

>What statement? I am asking you to explain your theory.

>If you want to reject Newton's first law that is fine,

>but you need to explain why it seems to work so well when

>it is apparently not true according to your theory.

>Stephen

Is it true according to General Relativity?

Isn't Newton's first law just a recitation of the basics of Euclidean space? I will have to see what it is and if General Relativity uses it or assumes it.

I really don't see anything about Newtonian gravitation that applies, even though it is the most useful for engineers and for quick calculations.

Are you assuming that GR merely describes gravitation as a curvature of spacetime with Euclidean space as a background?

While there is math in GR to convert to Newtonian or Euclidean coordinates for applied physics, GR uses no vestige of space attributes.

Perhaps the saying "GR is local" is thought to apply to space alone, or to spacetime, but the fact is, there is nothing to say that GR is not local in time.

Undergraduates and arts majors would be better off avoiding anything other than Newtonian physics, thinking about alternate theories of any kind can wreck a career.

Joe Fischer

.

• **References:**

- ◆ **Re: "Is There a Force of Gravity?"**
◇ From: Harry
- ◆ **Re: "Is There a Force of Gravity?"**
◇ From: Joe Fischer
- ◆ **Re: "Is There a Force of Gravity?"**
◇ From: stephen
- ◆ **Re: "Is There a Force of Gravity?"**

Re: "Is There a Force of Gravity?"

◇ *From:* Joe Fischer

◆ **Re: "Is There a Force of Gravity?"**

◇ *From:* stephen

◆ **Re: "Is There a Force of Gravity?"**

◇ *From:* Joe Fischer

◆ **Re: "Is There a Force of Gravity?"**

◇ *From:* stephen

◆ **Re: "Is There a Force of Gravity?"**

◇ *From:* Joe Fischer

◆ **Re: "Is There a Force of Gravity?"**

◇ *From:* stephen

◆ **Re: "Is There a Force of Gravity?"**

◇ *From:* Joe Fischer

- Prev by Date: **Re: force**
- Next by Date: **Re: "Is There a Force of Gravity?"**
- Previous by thread: **Re: "Is There a Force of Gravity?"**
- Next by thread: **Re: "Is There a Force of Gravity?"**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **Date**
 - ◆ **Thread**