

Re: The Trouble with Physic(ist)s is that they are Not Even Wrong

Re: The Trouble with Physic(ist)s is that they are Not Even Wrong

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2006-09/msg00663.html>

- *From:* "JanPB" <filmart@xxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 4 Sep 2006 15:35:19 -0700
-

Tom Roberts wrote:

LEJ Brouwer wrote:

I 'know' that the Schwarzschild solution is wrong, and I also 'know' that my proposal must be either correct, or if not completely correct at least on the right path.

The rest of us want to do physics, not whatever it is you are trying to do. What God told you this? Why do you attempt to discuss such divine revelations in a physics newsgroup?

I can't tell you precisely how I know – it is just a very strong gut feeling, and when I feel like this, I am usually right.

Here all you've shown is that you do not understand the MANY papers and books that have been written about this. You merely re-hash old objections long refuted, and old mistakes long corrected.

I actually admire you a great deal. You are like a walking encyclopaedia on gravity, yet you do not appear to be at all pretentious or arrogant about it.

Yes, Steve Carlip is all of that.

BTW, could you please explain what you mean when you say that my infinite cone has an 'edge'?

Re: The Trouble with Physic(ist)s is that they are Not Even Wrong

I assume you mean your attempt to glue the two exterior regions of the Kruskal manifold together. The "edge" occurs when one follows an infalling timelike geodesic -- when it reaches $r=2M$ all of a sudden it is impossible to compute the geodesic, because the metric is not C^2 there. Steve implied there is a boundary there, but I believe this can be done such that the manifold is continuous there, just not smooth.

I think the manifold can be glued smoothly (one can write down a smooth atlas on the quotient manifold) -- it's the metric that has a "crease" at the glued horizon. I posted an outline of an argument few minutes ago. The problem is essentially with the Kruskal-Szekeres function $r(T,X)$ (the one given by the usual implicit equation) -- it has a nonzero slope at the horizon which would "crease" the metric there when glued.

--

Jan Bielawski

.