

Re: A Theory of Everything: Geometric Generalization is updated

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2006-11/msg02012.html>

- *From:* "Ken S. Tucker" <dynamics@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 22 Nov 2006 17:28:00 -0800
-

Sue... wrote:

Ken S. Tucker wrote:

Sue... wrote:

Ken S. Tucker wrote:
[yep... time to snip]

AE deferred
to Mach on
the question
of inertia,
I think that
was
presumptuous.

If all the bodies of the
universe pull you in all
directions
but a nearby planet causes
an isotropy, it is an easy
concept to visualise... as
Mach did. But when you
try formulate some maths
for that it is not so
straightforward.
That may be why AE didn't
give it more consideration.

Problem AE had and exists today is the CS
setting $g = -1$ is wrong, although ok in
simple
applications. Although at first complicated, a

Re: A Theory of Everything: Geometric Generalization is updated

$g=1$ really is simpler over-all and inertia becomes quite apparent. For example, to get an accelerometer to provide a non-zero reading an inertial input, like a photon, is required. We may discussed that before.

A tower with equal orange and white stripes makes a perfect accelerometer.

I think you are saying the freefall approximation is wrong and I believe Erk mention that as well. If the man in the box releases balls from his outstretched hands they will move toward each other as they fall. If the man in a rocket powered box releases balls from his outstretched hands they will move on parallel paths as they fall.

So much for Einstein's equivalence. :-(

[Knee-jerk] The elevator, is an analogy to the PoE, it's a bridge from the use of the covariant derivative of the metric $g_{uv};w=0$ to a physical example.

In tensor analysis is a particularly powerful operation known as "association". In order to use association $g_{uv};w$ must=0, so far as I know, never encountered an exception.

If you model some London forces I think you'll find exceptions.

I think consideration of $g_{uv};w=0$ as an important Law of Nature should have more discussion, anyway that's the math speak (IMO) ofthe PoE.

The use of the term 'inertial' here is inconsistent with the 1920 theory.

<< In special relativity, the laws of physics are only required to exhibit tensor behaviour under transformations between different inertial frames: i.e., translations, rotations, and Lorentz transformations. Parity inversion is a special type

Re: A Theory of Everything: Geometric Generalization is updated

of transformation, and will be dealt with later on. In general relativity, the laws of physics are required to exhibit tensor behaviour under all non-singular coordinate transformations. >>
<http://farside.ph.utexas.edu/teaching/em/lectures/node112.html>

I am not quite sure whether a non-singular coordinate transformation makes the same unfounded assumptions about gravity and inertia as in SR (remembering, inertia is being ignored by Einstein wherever possible.)

Bingo, I think that's pay-dirt.
(I feel like Seabiscuit wanting to hoof 4 walls with equations and diagrams, but I'll refrain)).

One can readily experience a non-singular CS by simply using one eye and then the other, and easily get a sense of nonorthogonality that a "non-singular" CS can provide.

The hassle with convention tensor analysis is the concept of the singular point, but GR is ultimately a theory of relations whereby a CS must embrace two separate origins, that relate equally.

Once your convinced that Lorentz invariance is insufficient, it gets difficult to find anything that is solidly founded in GR.

How much of this do we scrap:

<http://farside.ph.utexas.edu/teaching/em/lectures/node106.html>

...if Maxwell's equations don't tell the whole story?

I suppose this might be a clue:

http://www.research.ibm.com/grape/grape_ewald.htm

I'll get back to you on that :-), really need thought.

The force of a powder charge shifts the barycentre of a bullet and the universe pulls it forward. If a rabbit gets in the bullets path, the universe will pull the bullet through the rabbit. If a nearby planet also pulls on the bullet, the trajectory can curve under the rabbit resulting in a hungry hunter and a grateful rabbit. :o)

You majored in Elmer Fudd too,
I'm working on my Richie Rich major.

Re: A Theory of Everything: Geometric Generalization is updated

Well you didn't object to bullets being towed around
the universe so there might be some hope for you. :o)

He
seemed
to
know
it
was
a
plausible
mechanism
where
he
lacked
any
mechanism
at
all.
Had
he
not
limited
himself
to
the
Lorenz
gauge,
he
might
have
predicted
Tajmar
and
de
Matos.

"Eistein's
Mistakes"
--Stephen
Weinberg
<http://www.aip.org/pt/vol-58/iss-11/p31.html>

I'd
like
to

position
Erk
closer
to
relativity,
me
thinks
he
needs
to
be
severely
lashed
by
GC,
for
his/her
betterment,
plenty
of
IQ
and
knowledge,
but
blocked
by
a
prejudice,
along
the
lines
of
Aether.
The
young
man
has
potential,
so
I'll
hang
around
for
a
few
more
rounds,
and
see
how
it

goes.

GR
makes
?ALL?
isotropic
forces
vanish,
then
plugs
in
Newton
by
mass
energy
equivalence.
IMHO
Pound–Snider
is
proof
of
the
quantitative
sucess
of
the
techinque.
(what
is
a
reversed
sign
among
friends?
)
;-)

But
the
Tajamar
de
Matos
experiment
is
actually
measuring
a
derivative–of–a–deravitive
of
the

Re: A Theory of Everything: Geometric Generalization is updated

Coulomb
force
(much
amplified)
(~10
^
42)
and
equating
it
to
inertia.
That's
what
we
need
for
quantum
gravity.

I'm going to
have to look
at that
again.

There is a recent paper,
several on the ESA page and
several by Janet Tate.

http://www.physics.orst.edu/PhysicsWeb_2001/People/Faculty/Pages_Faculty/tate.htm

<< (nice babe, you know what they say about red-heads). >>

Yeah... they are totally incompetant with a whip :o)

<http://theplumbutchronicles.typepad.com/photos/uncategorized/internet20dominatrix.jpg>

I'll defer to your experience. Did you notice Dr. Tate
has a serious Adam's apple, she's been hit with a
serious amount of testosterone, possibly accounting
for her above average interest in the sciences.
She could also benefit in other unseen ways.

[...]

<http://hyperphysics.phy-astr.gsu.edu/hbase/electric/elefor.html>

Re: A Theory of Everything: Geometric Generalization is updated

Do we need a snip?

How 'bout two?

Thanks for the whips, I mean snips.

Sigh... We'd probably have quantum gravity today if someone had put you on anti-testosterone about 10 years ago. :o)

Pssst, they tried, it was ineffective.
Hormones come the heart?

Sue...

Ken

.