Re: LIGO.

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2007−02/msg00639.html

- *From*: "dlzc" <dlzc1@xxxxxxx>
- *Date*: 8 Feb 2007 08:57:39 −0800

Dear Bullion:

On Feb 8, 9:35 am, Bullion <Bull...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

> dlzcwrote:
>
> > But what we have here is "propagation velocity" not of "gravity waves" but angular momentum. How fast (and how) do members of the Universe communicate with it, since light is not the carrier of gravitation? Is the Universe present at each point as some sort of remoted aether or "proxy", or is it simply present at each point with only some "flavors" diminished by distance? Mach would have an answer that will yield a null result (I think) for any tool we could make.
>
> What is a wave in space−time?

Good question. Would it be resolvable, in some part, in space−only?

> That is what they are looking for, isn't it?
> A wave in space−time caused by some large wobbling mass?

That is how it is loosely described yes.

> I can certainly understand time going forward more or less quickly but the idea of time going in reverse is more difficult.

No one is suggesting it would go in reverse. When you have c as a limit, "more or less quickly" should be enough to express what we

predict we can see.

> Does a wave in time have a positive offset, like a
> D.C. offset in electricity?
>
> I can certainly understand space contracting or
> expanding but the idea of gravity waves making
> regions of negative space is more difficult.
> Does a wave in space have a positive offset?

I don't think "negative spacetime" is necessary to transfer energy, any more than negative pressure (or antimatter gas) is necessary to transmit sound energy.

We are looking for a "spatial strain" in local geometries when a distant mass−pair "pops the clutch" and sends the excess torque into the "frame" that is the Universe. If this propagates instantly, we'll never see it. If it propagates via spacetime, we might never see it. So we look anyway...

David A. Smith

.