

Re: "Is There a Force of Gravity?"

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-10/msg01548.html>

- *From:* Joe Fischer <efischer@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 26 Oct 2005 14:13:35 -0400
-

On Wed, <bz+sp@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

>Joe Fischer <efischer@xxxxxxxx> wrote :
>> On Wed, 26 Oct 2005 05:28:36 +0000 (UTC), 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?
>
>Absent any external forces, all objects tend to move in straight lines.

That isn't what he said, he invoked Newton's First Law.

Where are all the Newtonians coming from, and why are they here?

Absent any external forces, all objects tend to move in straight lines unless there is ponderable matter nearby.

Unless somebody can describe, measure and explain those external forces, then there are none.

>> Because Newton, and most other models need mysterious forces
>> or abstract coordinate systems to work, the Divergent Matter model
>> only needs expansion of matter.
>
>Wrong. Any object can be approximated by a single point. If the earth and
>moon were to shrink to black holes, maintaining the same mass, they would
>continue to orbit each other at exactly the same distance as they currently
>orbit each other. Note: distance as measured from center to center.

Not true, in fact a fantasy story from the mid 1600s.

Re: "Is There a Force of Gravity?"

Not only do you bring up Newtonian concepts which are not considered current thinking in General relativity, you also claim as fact a gross assumption about hypothetical black holes. And then you seem to suggest that I am way off base.

>>>Apparently you do need mysterious forces, as you cannot >>>explain the moon's orbit with expansion.

>>

>> At one instance the moon has a vector relative to Earth, >> the Earth expands a lot, the moon expands a little, and the >> second gets a little longer. >> The moon's vector has a substantial radial component, >> and if the orbit appears perfectly circular, the outward radial >> component is equal to the amount the Earth expands.

>

>What gives it a 'radial component', if not gravity?

Well, I sure as hell diidn't mean radially downward, I know what freefall is, and my opinion, objects in freefall are moving upward. Undergraduates will not understand. :-)

> Expansion CAN'T do it, >because, if that were true, we could not use math and treat the earth and >moon as point objects and get the correct results.

Yes you could, Newton devised a universal formula that is simplistic to the point of being a scam. It works for most everything, so thank him.

But in the real world, with matter of many different densities, and most of it in large bodies is compressed, making any treatment of large bodies extremely difficult.

>> Your training has lead you to believe that without >> mysterious forces acting, the moon follows a straight line, >> but that requires something to make it follow a straight line, >> and that something doesn't exist. >> If matter is expanding, a straight line becomes very >> difficult to define

>

>Not at all, you just look at the line followed by the center of mass of the >objects in question. The center of mass, absent an outside force, will >travel in a straight line.

I am responding and posting in a relativity newsgroup, and there are no outside forces of significance at any substantial distances. There are no forces involved in gravitation unless there is a contact interaction.

>You must add an outside force (gravity) to get the center of mass to follow >an orbit.

Re: "Is There a Force of Gravity?"

Re: "Is There a Force of Gravity?"

Total nonsense. Gravity does have something to do with it, but "outside forces" do not.

>>, the DM model doesn't use space as a
>> controller for straight line motion, objects move relative
>> to each other.
>> If the moon does not have enough velocity to escape,
>> it can never leave the vicinity of the Earth, no matter which
>> direction it appears to take.
>
>Escape velocity is calculated on the basis of the mass of the objects
>involved and the gravity force factor. You are depending on gravity to
>calculate 'escape velocity'.
>
>How can your theory stand on its own when it must lean on gravity?

It doesn't lean on gravity, it is not a theory, it is a possible mechanism of gravity that I study.
There is no reason to bring Newton into the discussion, he has nothing to contribute.

>> All pulling on each other can do is make
>> them closer together, and that requires action at
>> a distance.
>>
>> Matter expanding makes them closer together,
>
>But it doesn't change the direction of their motion which can be described
>by looking at the direction of motion of their centers of gravity.

Right, now you get it,

>> and it does not require them to be pulling on each other.
>> It is the same result without the action at a distance.
>
>No! In a universe with no 'invisible forces' and expanding matter and
>space, everything would travel in straight lines (when you looked at the
>point at the center of the body).

Says you, Euclid and Newton.

Motion in spacetime does follow from the result of current vectors, but it is not determined by Euclidean space, Newton's laws or, the bunny rabbit.
It is determined by position, vector, velocity, and time flow.

>>>> All other models seem to need hypothetical
>>>> particles, computer controlled ether medium, or
>>>> radiation "billiard balls" coming from all directions.

Re: "Is There a Force of Gravity?"

Re: "Is There a Force of Gravity?"

>>>>

>>>> I know all gas molecules repulse each other,
>>>> so expansion would not require anything new or
>>>> unknown.

>>>>

>>>> Gas molecules repulse each other due to electromagnetic
>>>> forces.

>>>>

>> Right, and that is the only thing that can cause matter
>> to expand.

>>

> You need to rethink your theory. As people have been trying to tell you, it
> does NOT explain orbital motion.

Neither does Newtonian mechanics or gravitation,
that is why gravity is called a "fictitious force", because
it isn't a force at all, it is something else, most accurately
represented by a complex geometry.

I think after 60 years of study, I know what I need,
and it isn't an evaluation of the model on the basis of
Newtonian concepts.

Joe Fischer

.

• **References:**

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

• Prev by Date: **Re: "Is There a Force of Gravity?"**

• Next by Date: **Re: deterministic truth, deterministic falsehood**

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***