Re: Does a Magnet's force weaken witht the distance cube?

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2006−03/msg00816.html

- *From*: "Bill Hobba" <rubbish@xxxxxxxx>
- *Date*: Sat, 11 Mar 2006 23:37:09 GMT

<guskz@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:1142098290.978863.292530@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

> guskz@xxxxxxxxxxx wrote:
>
> > Bill Hobba wrote:
> >
> > > <guskz@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
> > > news:1141921767.804453.128640@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
> > >
> > > > Bill Hobba wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > <guskz@xxxxxxxxxxx>
> > > > > wrote in message
> > > > > news:1141834335.950690.17520@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
> > > > >
> > > > > http://hyperphysics.phy−astr.gsu.edu/hbase/forces/isq.html#isq
> > > > >
> > > > > The link
> > > > > above
> > > > > shows
> > > > > Gravity,
> > > > > Light(photons),
> > > > > and Charge
> > > > > (I
> > > > > believe
> > > > > sound
> > > > > waves also):
> > > > > all these
> > > > > weaken
> > > > > with the
> > > > > distance
> > > > > square.

How about Magnets...I think there's is the distance cube which is strange since EM waves are made of photons and photons above weaken with the distance square???

Then you thought wrong − magnets also obey the inverse square law. Of course since magnetic monopoles have never been found the fact they would obey similar rules to charges is deduced.

_____

Also from the same link, it makes me believe all these three forces (Gravity, photons, charge) are the very same with the ***ONLY*** difference methaporicaly

speaking is they each have a different mass(energy)???

Then you are wrong. EM (unified by Maxwell in the 19th century) is one field described by a 4 vector. Gravity needs a 4x4 tensor called the metric.

Therefore could Gravity, charge, photons be virtually the same in the same metaphorical way as light and EM waves are the same (both made of photons).

Check out Kaluza Klein theory.

A scalar as a 5th dimensions

Your inability to comprehend is showing again − that has nothing to do with it.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kaluza−Klein_theory
quote:

1. "Theodor Kaluza who extended general relativity to a five−dimensional spacetime"
2. ....."the final part(meaning 5th dimension) an extra scalar field now termed the "radion".

3. Meaning of scalar and 5th dimension, quote: "The distance a particle can travel before reaching its initial position is said to be the size of the dimension."

#3 above speaks of a scalar and not a vector ....

example of vectors: x,y,z vectors form the balloon
exampe of scalar : the width of the balloon = scalar and the 5th dimension

You easily say "no" that's not what they really mean but I haven't found any arguments while reading the article that contradict it?

My Moma didn't raise no dummy.

Even more from the same link that agains says the same thing:

Quote
"Radion, ... is a scalar field ..... It can be interpreted as the length or size of the fifth dimension as a function of the usual four dimensions of spacetime.

I did a search on 'function' in the article. It is not even there. As a double check I did a search on 'interpreted' and could not find it as part of your quote. It is obvious your comprehension is so appalling you actually imagine words that are not there. Or maybe you got it from somewhere else? Either way this is something you need to drastically improve on if you wish to learn physics.

Bill

Seems to basically say the 5th dimension is a LENGTH (or width as I compared it to a balloon) and not a an additional directional vector as a "FUNCTION OF" the 4 other dimensions of spacetime

Actually I'm a little mixed up....but lets not pretend this simple information and belittle me as a finger painter:

to keep simple say we only 2 use vector x and y (instead of the initial 4 vectors of spacetime)

Now from the definition above:

The 5th dimension (or 3rd in this case) would be the perimeter (instead of surface since it's only 2 vectors and thus 2 dimensional) of the function for the x and y vectors since as they say above it's the total distance "TO TRAVEL" in the 2 dimensional space (of the x and y vectors) to reach the initial position.....

if y = x^2 is the function

y = 2x^3 = area, i think

y = 1/2 x = perimeter, i think....thus the scalar (Radon) would be 1/2???

> seems too strange for my tastebuds,
> strange how it can make a function out of the 4 other vectors with it
> also being a vector but a scalar instead??
> Are they saying something like 5th dimension = scalar*x*y*z*t ?

No.

> It seems almost (using 3d instead 4d as an example) like saying the
> scalar width of an inflated baloon made of x,y,z dimensions forms
> another dimension? Are they saying that intensity or density forms a
> 5th dimension?

How about reading some articles on it and this time making an effort to

understand what they say? To start you off here is one
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kaluza−Klein_theory

Bill

Therefore
the main
difference
between
Gravity,
charge, and
photons
would be
the
Energy(mass)
that they
contain.

For Gravity
= mass (=
energy) =
density *
volume,
For Charge
= intensity
* volume,
For Photons
= intensity
*volume

???

No.

Bill

.