O'Barr: physical gravity.

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2006−01/msg01513.html

- *From*: "Gerald L. O'Barr" <globarr@xxxxxxxxx>
- *Date*: 23 Jan 2006 12:38:30 −0800

Gravity!

Well, here I am, with only a few days left in my
life, and what do I choose to talk about? I choose
to talk about the least important thing of all. Why
is that? Only Heaven knows.
What is gravity? It is the weakest force of all,
and I want to talk about the least. It fits me as to
what I am.

START OF ARTICLE:
****
Gravity!

The proper understanding of gravity requires the
concept of exchanges in mass between colliding
bodies. And for me, the best way under which
exchanges in mass can occur is by spalls. Spalls are
not the only way. But to me, spalls bring with them
a better ether−like medium, and really do solve a
large number of problems other than just gravity.
In the past, when considering collisions between
two bodies, such as m1 and m2, we have, in general,
automatically assumed that we end up with these exact
same two bodies. But with a spall, we know that
there is no real reason why the spall has to be the
identical mass as any of the original particles. And
thus, we can clearly end up with m3 and m4 particles,
different in mass than either m1 or m2.
With spalls, we find that we can actually end up
using the second set of math solutions to the
collision equations. Mathematically, when anyone
solves a quadratic equation (which one is doing when
they solve the collision equation), there is, in
general, two solution sets. And we have only been
using one solution set. With the at theory, we
begin, for the first time, to use the second solution
set, and by using this second solution set, we begin
to get things that have never been seen or done

before. We now have the complete physics of our reality presented before us.

When m1 collides with m2, and m3 and m4 are produced, these two new masses could individually be equal to their originals. How equal, or how different, might depend upon a multitude of unknown functions. One might assume their relative velocity of impact, the off−set of their center−lines of motions at their point of contact, the angle of impact, their individual spins, their geometry, their surface parameters, the nature of the shock waves generated in each, might all have different effects. And all these variables could have some effect on the spall that would occur or be expected.
But down on the lowest level of reality, some of these differences disappear. There cannot be normal shock waves due to restoring forces, since there are no potential fields at these lowest levels of reality. All that could be seen would be simple displacement acts, where one volume of matter might be able to replace another volume of matter by direct contact, etc.
The at theory only assumes that it depends upon their individual masses. The exact size or mass of m1, and the exact size or mass of m2, will determine, in general, the size or mass of the spall that will be produced. And any slight change in the mass of either particle, will result in a change, in one direction or the other, of the spall. The at theory, when it becomes fully developed, does not really require one to know the exact size of spall to be produced every time, if at least the effective average of these sizes can be assumed for any one precondition that is present.
One needs to be careful in all these areas of assumptions. In the end, only statistical trends need to be established. Whether we ever become able to establish all the factors that might be affecting these trends is not as important as knowing that trends are not un−imaginable, and that some trends are required just to have particles. And many of these variables might be sufficient, on their own, to provide the correlations necessary to correctly describe these trends.
By using mass as the variable, it certainly is a prime variable, it is always there, and statistically, the mass should provide to us correlations with size and geometry, etc. Many of the other variables will eventually average out to a null effect. So I have no problems with the use of

mass as the controlling variable, at least when only statistical trends are seen as the final goal.

But let us, for now, just ignore all these unknown possibilities, and just consider gravity as given to us by the at theory.

THE REAL START OF THE ARTICLE:
****
Gravity (according to the at theory, under the actions of spalls):

Any object that is a stable object (that is, an object that holds a constant average mass over any reasonable period of time) can affect the background in which it is interacting in several different ways.

1. If a body, hit by hit, produces spalls identically equal in mass to each and every colliding particle, there are no changes to the background or to the object being hit. (This includes no changes in the statistical sizes or dispersion of sizes of the ether particles, etc.)
If over general periods of time, the spalls produced fit the same distribution that originally existed, then the same effects are also achieved. This allows each individual hit to produce a different size spall from time to time, but over a large enough time base, all these differences can still add up to the same mix as originally existed.

2. Some bodies could produce spalls that have a spread in mass more tight than what was previously existing. (This is a decrease in dispersion or a reduction in the standard deviation in the mass of the ether particles.)

3. Some bodies could produce spalls that have a spread in mass greater than what was previously existing. (This is an increase in their dispersion.)

Now these are the choices for a non−time−dependent or steady−state type interaction for stable bodies. We can of course get many other type of fields, and time variable fields are something that has seldom been mentioned. But for completion, let me mention a few points.
If we allowed the mass of an object to vary (cycle) over a time period much longer than the average times between hits, where it continuously

went in one direction only (continuously increase, or continuously decrease), then this kind of change would immediately show up in the surrounding ether. We cannot allow such a situation to last too long, but if such changes were allowed to cycle back and forth, we would have strange effects indeed in the ether around such an object. We could get very interesting effects in the ether because then we could have the ether itself become different around an object: it would be gaining mass, or it would be losing mass. And these differences could be very striking.
And as a second effect, we could have a body that would oscillate between reducing or expanding the dispersion, rather than just do the one or the other. And an object that did all these things, constantly changing the dispersion as one separate variable, and then changing their average mass as a second variable, could produce some very interesting field effects around it. And how these two different variables interacted, their phasing between these effects, the deepness of their variableness, would produce many more variances than what we see in our reality.
But this is no place to start anything so complicated as this. We will stay, for gravity, with only one of all the above effects:

Bodies interacting in the ether can cause an increase in the dispersion of sizes of the ether particles.

And if all particles were of this one nature, they would all attract each other directly proportional to the gradient of this dispersion.

Now how do I know all this? As some might be able to see, gravity is not a simple math equation. It is not due to a single interaction or to a single effect. It requires several interactions. Gravity is the net effect of having some established stable background, and one object changing that background, and another object then reacting to that change in background. And thus, to get to the effects of gravity, requires first a system of mechanical interactions in which some form of stability is able to be maintained, and then have this stability changed by a body present in this system, and then seeing what these changes in the stability of this system does to another body that is present in this

system. And thus, none of this is easy.

Now I know all this because I have ran a large number of computer programs, using backgrounds of various selections. And I know how to form stable backgrounds. It is vital that equal potential of kinetic energy is present. And I have put different particles into these different backgrounds, seeing the changes they could make to these backgrounds. And then seeing what these changes in backgrounds can do to other particles that are then interjected into these changed backgrounds. In all these acts, there are no math results, only physical results. There is no math trail to follow, there are only physical events, and whether or not certain events occur. An attraction is an event, whether there is any math present or not.

Now of course the math is not really difficult to obtain. Especially if one wants to use approximations. If one wants only first order effects, or first order approximations, one can sure do this. When I first tried this, I found that I had to go further than just first order effects, but this was no problem, mathematically, one can go to any order one might need to go, as long as one wants to take the time to do it. And so I have done it. And the math confirms the computer result (or maybe the computer is confirming the math approximation?) But after it is all over, one still only has an approximation, and one still has all the assumptions that were involved. And so I personally do not see any advantage in having either the math or the computer results. They are all useful and both support each other. Therefore, choose your own weapon, if you have a choice.

But the physical cause of gravity is now firmly established in my mind, and it is important to have this physical understanding. The day has to come when such an approach will be of value.

At this point, we can now state the nature of gravity in a summary.

THE REAL REAL START OF ARTICLE:
****

Let there be a system of particles (an ether) mechanically interacting with each other in such a way that they are in equilibrium in terms of the

mixed of sizes that are present in the system. When this is stated, we mean that if anything came along, and changed the mix of sizes, the system would begin to restore itself to the original mix as collisions within the ether occurred.
Now if other particles (very large particles) are placed in this system, and these other particles cause a slight increase in the mix of sizes of the ether particles, these other larger particles will appear to be attracted to each other, proportional to the gradient of these changes in the dispersions within the ether.
If we assume that the mean free path between the particles that make up the ether system is on the order of the distances between many galaxies, then every thing is in order for a correspondence with gravity. The only thing that has to be stated is that the ability of any one mass to establish its own dispersion is not affected by any pre−established dispersion. In other words, there is no limit to the amount of dispersion that can be created, at least for the amount of mass that we have so far observed. This maintains the non−saturation characteristics of gravity, and the 1/r^2 is naturally obtained due to normal geometry effects.

For those who are more particular, please note that what I have presented is mainly for a Newtonian gravity approach. To get to the more fine points as might be seen with GR, it is there. The rate at which these dispersions progress out, and the velocity components of fast moving bodies, will give us added parameters that will be useful to tie it into GR. But having the correct physical start is absolutely important. And the at theory provides to us a physical understanding of the origin of these forces.
Now of course none of this can just be accepted to be true. Someone has to actually do it. So who here is going to do it? So far, that someone is no one. Why is it that no one wants to do such a simple test? Any computer can be programmed to set up a test where a series of interactions are being performed, establishing a stable system. Then an external particle is introduced where its interactions result in it remaining at some fixed average mass, but it results in an increase in the dispersion of the stable system. Then you introduce a second external particle, just like the first one, and see what results occur!
Surely someone knows how to verify that an

initially stable system is in place. Surely someone knows how to keep the average mass a constant. And surely anyone can understand how to cause an increase in the dispersion. And with these simple accomplishments, you will have attraction occurring. This attraction is being accomplished with no loss of energy, with no gain in mass, with none of the problems that we often have with a LeSage like approach. And no one cares?
Come on people, this is important!

Thanks for reading.
Gerald L. O'Barr <globarr...@xxxxxxxxx>

.

- ***Follow−Ups***:
  - ♦ ***Re: O'Barr: physical gravity.***
    - ◊ *From:* Hexenmeister
  - ♦ ***Re: O'Barr: physical gravity.***
    - ◊ *From:* Joe Fischer

- Prev by Date: ***Re: Time question***
- Next by Date: ***Re: The falsity of Einstein's continuum***
- Previous by thread: ***Time question***
- Next by thread: ***Re: O'Barr: physical gravity.***
- Index(es):
  - ♦ ***Date***
  - ♦ ***Thread***