

Re: force

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-11/msg00543.html>

- *From:* "significant zero" <paulps@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 8 Nov 2005 19:46:52 -0800
-

This is google under opera no spelling checker on this machine yet.

Sue... wrote:

> significant zero wrote:

>> "Sue..." <suzysewnshow@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message

>> news:1131452825.331379.27490@xx

>> |

>> | significant zero wrote:

>> |> |

>> |> | significant zero wrote:

>> |> |> "Sue..." <suzysewnshow@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message

>> |> |> news:1131181506.305345.277030@xx

>> |> |> |

>> |> |> | significant zero wrote:

>> |> |> |> "Sue..." <suzysewnshow@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message

>> |> |> |> |

>> |> |> |> | news:1131139215.491051.228040@xx

>> |> |> |> | snip|

>> |> |> |

>> |> |> | snip

>> |> |> | snip

>> |> |> |> Nice one but it suggests that charges and cultures are made

>> |> |> |> of

>> |> |> |> something other than space

>> |> |> |

>> |> |> | I certainly hope they are different.

>> |> |> |

>> |> |> |> Different yes but of the same basic substance ? time/space ?

>> |> |> |

>> |> |> | I expect a house to be built of bricks, and bricks of sand.

>> |> |> | I wouldn't expect a house to be built of miniature houses.

>> |> |> | Why do you expect matter to be built of matter?

>> |> |> |

>> |> |> |> That is not what I was saying I was saying that matter was an aspect of

>> |> |> |> time/space i.e compressed time space that exists within less compressed

>> |> |> |> time

>> |> |> |> space.

>> |> |> |>

>> |> |> |> You are substituting the word space for ether.

Re: force

That the opinion of a dentist (:-)

- >
- > Yes... I am being picky.
- > We can define H W D to be all on the same axis
- > compute its volume but it will represent no space.

Volume is not applicable to single axis time or space, distance is the normal result.

- >
- > If there were a place where unlike charges did not
- > exist or did not attract... we could still compute its
- > volume.

Only if had at least 3 axis.

- > It would be space... but nothing like the one
- > that we live in.

If charges did not exist or function then time and space may not exist or function,

- >
- > Our ability to imagine or measure volumes has no
- > relation to phenomena that might occur in the volume.

Are you shure of that ?

- >
- >>
- >> |
- >> | Calling the absence of matter by the mathematical term
- >> | 'space' doesn't resolve the issue. Call it taffy, or ether or
- >> | fairy dust... but don't delude yourself into believing that
- >> | application of an abstract name, space, banishes the force
- >> | we can easily measure between charges.
- >>
- >> The force between charges could be the state that existes in the less
- >> compressed time\space between states of compressed time\space. ?
- >
- > Pair annihilation would certainly seem suggest the state of
- > *ether* changes. Our measure of time and distance is in
- > no way altered in the volume. (Coulomb gauge)
- > <http://arxiv.org/abs/physics/0204034>
- > We have seen serial photos to prove it.
- >
- >>

Re: force

Re: force

>>|
>>|>
>>|> snip
>>|>|
>>|>|> Would it perhaps be more accurate (given no real knowledge)
>>|>|> to say that space is
>>|>|> differences in existence with the same statement being true for
>>|> matter
>>|>|> and its effects. ?
>>|>|
>>|>| Not till ya show us a charge-pair conjured from light.
>>|>| I know there have been some recent attempts but I
>>|>| don't have the URL handy.
>>|>
>>|> You seem to be saying that you think charges, light and space are
>>|> fundamentally intrinsically different and not just the product of a
>>|> different
>>|> assembly line using the same basic material (time/space) ?
>>|
>>| time and space are between the pages of mathematical textbooks.
>>|
>>| Energy, mass and displacement are the things we can measure.
>>
>>| By measuring their time/space in relation to other time/space.?
> Ugggh!
> Einstein tried that. Are you suggesting that ships might better
> navigate by Coriolis curves rather than lat and lon?

The practical may subvert accuracy.

>
> Would a CS based on the Coriolis effect better explain the effect?

It may do.

>
>
>>
>>|
>>|>
>>|>|
>>|>|>
>>|>|>| Time is an abstraction that relates such annihilation to
>>|>|>| space.
>>|>|>
>>|>|> An abstraction of space ?
>>|>|
>>|>| Space doesn't need further abstraction other than x,y,z.
>>|>
>>|> Why not ? perhaps a significant aspect of space is its time aspect
>>|

Re: force

Re: force

>> | Perhaps Amy Noether preferred energy. She looks rather
>> | big boned and muscular, so argue at your own risk. :o)
>>
>> Can be a very convincing argument if you are alive. (:-)
>> Energy could be perhaps be defined as the condition that exists between
>> states of time\space.
> If you name is Leibnitz you can probably come up with a few
> more variations than just that. :-)
> <http://faraday.physics.utoronto.ca/PVB/Harrison/ConceptOfEnergy/ConceptOfEnergy.html>
>
>
>>
>> |
>> |>
>> |> |
>> |> | Time is an abstraction that expresses the *relationship*
>> |> | between displacement and mass/energy conservation.
>> |>
>> |> So time is an abstraction of space ? and is used to express the
>> |> relationship between one space and another space ? and the
>> character of
>> |> any space ?
>> |
>> | Very good! You just wrote a paragraph that can be completely severed
>> | from the physical world and squashed between the pages of a maths
>> | book. Now... Can you write the same paragraph using terms
>> | energy, mass and displacement?
>>
>> Tweek my tail and find out (:-)
>>
>> |
>> |>
>> |> |
>> |> |>
>> |> |> |
>> |> |> | << the energy is conserved if and only if the physical laws
>> are
>> |> |> | invariant under time translations (if their form does not
>> depend
>> |> on
>> |> |> | time) >>
>> |> |> | http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Noether's_theorem
>> |> |> |
>> |> |> | Howzat, Mr. Moustache?
>> |> |> | Sue...
>> |> |>
>> |> |> Balls to stump as they may say in cricket (:)
>> |> |>
>> |> |> Do you (or Noether) mean local time or average(cosmic) time in
>> |> |> which
>> |> |> this poorly defined condition (that cannot include time) is

Re: force

Re: force

>> |> connserved
>> |> |
>> |> | The time as measured by the drag-strip official's watch or the
>> |> | fuelers calibrated can.
>> |>
>> |> local average time I think you mean by this ?
>> | I meant nothing other than:
>> | $E = mc^2$
>> | or
>> | <http://physics.nist.gov/cuu/Images/alphaeq.gif>
>>
>> Retreating into your spiders web I see (:-)
> A fitting analogy for lines of Coulomb lines of force. :o)
>>
>> |
>> | Ya think they are wrong?
>>
>> When I find my 0.5" socket and get the head of this thing and find out
>> if it needs a rebores I will then cast an opinion to the wind (:-).
> Hmm.... I see.
> <http://www.turfmachinery.com.au/images/OC.Motor%20Hand%20Mow.jpg>
>
>>
>> |
>> | http://www-gap.dcs.st-and.ac.uk/~history/BigPictures/Noether_Emma_3.jpeg
>> |
>> | GAWD! Talk about stopping clocks? :-)
>>
>> Daisy pushing ?
>>
>> |
>> |>
>> |> | Neither knows if a car improves it elapsed
>> |> | time by getting lighter or exerting more force because $F = ma$.
>> |> | Both can detect an improvement.
>> |> |
>> |> | IOW... a rail passenger three galaxies away will note a
>> correlation
>> |> | between the fuel used and the official's watch unless lightning
>> |> | strikes them simultaneously. :o)
>> |> |
>> |> | Sue...
>> |>
>> |> I think you must be referring to local fuel used and local
>> official's
>> |> watch and are making no commitment that they will be the same (for
>> the
>> |> same scenario) three galaxies away, perhaps at different gravity if
>> |> compared. ?
>> | Forget the galaxies. I should not have multiplied by one.
>> |

Re: force

Re: force

>> | I meant nothing other than:
>> | $E = mc^2$
>> | or
>> | <http://physics.nist.gov/cuu/Images/alphaeq.gif>
>> |
>> | Sue...
>>
>> (E = a condition of time\space) = (m = a condition of time\space) * (c
>> = a number) * (c = a number)
>>
>> ?
>>
>> Has opera got a build in speeling checker ? my economy bb isp dont have
>> a news server so I'm having to use free servers or google.
>
> It has an icon that says "spell check" under it, but eye have
> neever tryed it. Aye hope ewe Kant tell.
>
> Sue...
>
>>

I wonder what it will hide under "show quoted text"

>> |> |>
>> |> |> Pig zoro (:-)
>> |> |
>> |

.

• *Follow-Ups:*

- ◆ **Re: force**
◇ From: Sue...

• *References:*

- ◆ **Re: force**
◇ From: significant zero
- ◆ **Re: force**
◇ From: Sue...
- ◆ **Re: force**
◇ From: significant zero
- ◆ **Re: force**
◇ From: Sue...
- ◆ **Re: force**
◇ From: Sue...
- ◆ **Re: force**
◇ From: significant zero
- ◆ **Re: force**

Re: force

Re: force

◇ *From: Sue...*

◆ **Re: force**

◇ *From: significant zero*

◆ **Re: force**

◇ *From: Sue...*

◆ **Re: force**

◇ *From: significant zero*

◆ **Re: force**

◇ *From: Sue...*

◆ **Re: force**

◇ *From: Sue...*

- Prev by Date: **Re: OWLS & Out of Sync Clocks–By How Much Are They Out of Sync.**
- Next by Date: **Re: SR & probability problem – please explain**
- Previous by thread: **Re: force**
- Next by thread: **Re: force**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **Date**
 - ◆ **Thread**