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

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2006−03/msg00895.html

- *From*: "Bill Hobba" <rubbish@xxxxxxxx>
- *Date*: Mon, 13 Mar 2006 01:57:31 GMT

<guskz@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:1142189220.449766.47990@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

> Bill Hobba wrote:
>
> > <guskz@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
> > news:1142096677.425220.207700@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
> >
> > > 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@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
> > > > > >
> > > > > > http://hyperphysics.phy−astr.gsu.edu/hbase/forces/isq.html#is
> > > > > >
> > > > > > 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".

> When giving direct quotes give direct quotes not mangled bits with you
> own
> words added whose sole purpose is to try and support what the article
> does
> not support − all such tactics do is provide further evidence for the
> obvious − you comprehension abilty is appalling. The quote is:
> 'The resulting equations can be separated out into further sets of
> equations, one of which is equivalent to Einstein field equations,
> another
> set equivalent to Maxwell's equations for the electromagnetic field and
> the
> final part an extra scalar field now termed the "radion".'

Is it my fault I can read better than you.

It is obvious your comprehension ability is appalling.

Often in discussions with your type it reaches a point like this. Can I prove those who claim that obvious drivel make perfect sense, I am the one that does not understand what they do etc, etc are wrong in the sense of them agreeing with anything I say? Of course not. In the final analysis people have read what I have to say, what you have to say, and can make up their own minds.

Bye for now.
Bill

> and the FINAL PART is an extra scalar field

also means

and the FINAL PART is the radion which is an extra scalar field and an extra 5th dimension.

Look up the definition for radion from the same web link at:
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/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."

> If you meant size then you should have said size − the fact you did not does
> cause something to spring to mind however − let me think − oh yea got it −
> clutching at straws.

"a size" is nothing more than a length which is very abstract, since this size is related to the size of a curvature therefore a perimeter (otherwise you cannot return to the "initial position" as the theory describes. And what better word for perimeter of spacetime other than width (instead of size)...and to that I compared it to the width of a balloon.

I appreciate your words "clutching at straws" because mine are that you "never look at the whole picture", you over focus on improper details and that you are "dishonest" for you will not acknowledge that I did indeed interpret the theory properly.

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

> Nothing in that article says anything about 'scalar as 5th iemnstions' −

You seriously have a reading problem:

They say that the Radion is a scalar field (and not a vector field) and
that the Radion is a 5th dimension.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Radion

> what you wrote does not even make semantic sense − if you believe it
> does −
> as Tom would say − shrug. Either say what you meant in terms of
> something
> that does make sense − or well take up −−−−−−−−.

I would replied to your finger painting insulst with a kiddygarden
insult due to your inability to read but I will not since I admire your
research into such theories as this one.

> > 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?
>
> That because you do not understand the terms you bandy about.

I explained to you the terms and EXACTLY from where I got them with
direct quotes, it's you who cannot read and properly comprehend and
willl remain dishonest about all three of these facts.

> Bill

> 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

.