

Re: LIGO.

Re: LIGO.

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2007-02/msg01010.html>

- *From:* cliff wright <c.c.wright@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 14 Feb 2007 11:27:00 +1300
-

Ken S. Tucker wrote:

On Feb 12, 8:30 pm, cliff wright <c.c.wri...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Ken S. Tucker wrote:

On Feb 11, 7:40 pm, cliff wright
<c.c.wri...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
...

No I'm not one of those people you speak of with regard to science being a con job. Just as well that it usually isn't. Religion and Politics are quite enough in that department. I might add that it would be remarkable if I gave up many hours of my time to listen to a lot of Con men while spending a lot of my time in retirement building telescopes and observatories and researching the history of electronics, one of my pet subjects, if I was anti science. The fact is most people think of me as fanatically pro Science especially the local Creationists and members of the anti Space lobby. regards Cliff Wright.

Cliff makes a point, we can all see faces in clouds, that's human, but what he fails to realize is the effort put into the evolving the algorithm that combines the signals.

Re: LIGO.

Re: LIGO.

Dr. Baez explained that awhile ago, it takes serious processing power + algorithm.

Ken

BTW, Al Gore did NOT invent the algorithm!

Oh Dear Ken! I'm afraid I still don't seem to be getting through!
My son for example is an expert (and highly qualified and experienced) software engineer so I have access to pretty good technical advice on software.

I can write software, the problem is (I repeat) the "numerical analysis" algorithm(s), the situation calls for a "phase arrayed" analysis, looking in the data to detect a common harmonic "thumping", using time triangulation. A "one off" event is not likely to be taken as proof, but it's encouraging if it corresponded to a visually confirmable event.

My WHOLE POINT is that the detection of a previously unobserved phenomenon requires definitive and independent proof. This was for example fortunately insisted on in the case of "Cold fusion" and the infamous "n" rays early last century. No matter what results the 2 LIGO's give the definitive proof of "gravitational radiation" is not in until a source for the signal can be at least strongly suggested which agrees with the current state of Physics knowledge, or which by observation extends our knowledge.

Again agreed, I've published this paper,
http://www.vacuum-physics.com/KST/GR_Charge_Couple3.pdf
that suggests g-waves will appear as EMR,
and that in turn leads to a Unified Field Theory.
Do you know how much work it is to write up a UFT (?), well it's a lot, so if LIGO works, I can get out of doing that, otherwise I got a serious homework assignment. That's ok but, I'd rather make sure it's necessary.

I have seen just how far astray the use of massive computing power can lead in the case of Acoustics modelling. Indeed a post doc student I was working with once discovered that the algorithm used in the standard reverberation tests for auditoria by some of the worlds best equipment companies was seriously flawed.

Re: LIGO.

Re: LIGO.

It's not that simple. The complex "search" algorithm differs from the simple "verification" algorithm, a verification algorithm is straightforward.

No matter what the old maxim still applies GIGO to LIGO just as much as any other use of computing analysis.

Doing maths on its own does not constitute complete scientific investigation, it remains a thought experiment or model until tested in the real world.

It's being tested in "the real world" right now, and the procedure looks really good to me.

Regards Cliff Wright.

Thanks, Regards
Ken

Hi Ken! Had a quick look at your paper intro, very interesting indeed tho with my maths I would have to sit down for a while to work it all out.

The residual attractive force looks very well worth following up.

Does it roughly give the correct result for the enormous difference between gravitational and electromagnetic forces? If so you may indeed be on to something.

It reminded me of a very good book on Physics I came across probably 20 years ago, I think it was by a lady physicist actually but I can't remember her name. This gave a very good non mathematical (or reasonably so) suggestion that the nuclear "weak force" was a similar "imbalance"

of "strong forces" in the nucleus. Has that theory stood the test of time?

If so this might be a big step towards a "unified field" theory.

As soon as I get a bit of time I must really work my way thru your equations and get a better handle on it.

Despite being retired I have 3 grandsons and in 2 weeks time they will rise to 6 as my son is getting married with a ready made family so I don't have all the time I'd like!

Best Regards Cliff Wright.

.

Re: LIGO.