

Re: LIGO.

## Re: LIGO.

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2007-02/msg01028.html>

---

- *From:* "Ken S. Tucker" <[dynamics@xxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:dynamics@xxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* 13 Feb 2007 22:41:00 -0800
- 

On Feb 13, 2:27 pm, cliff wright <[c.c.wri...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:c.c.wri...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

Ken S. Tucker wrote:

On Feb 12, 8:30 pm, cliff wright <[c.c.wri...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:c.c.wri...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

Ken S. Tucker wrote:

On Feb 11, 7:40 pm, cliff wright  
<[c.c.wri...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:c.c.wri...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> 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

Re: LIGO.

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.  
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

Re: LIGO.

Re: LIGO.

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](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.

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.

Re: LIGO.

Re: LIGO.

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.

No prob, Eq.(4) " $S^2=X^2+ab$ " is the key, Eq.(1,2,3) are formalities, so that the article is founded within established General Relativity Theory, (GR).

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?

Yes, GR provides a means to convert length and mass–energy, for example the mass of the Sun is approximately 1.47 kilometers, and that figure has been verified fairly well by measuring the deflection of light. In Special Relativity (SR) recall  $E=mc^2$ , well GR blows the doors off that, it gives,  
 $E = L c^4/G$ ,  
where  $L$ =Length and  $G$ =Newtons gravitational constant. So a small difference like  $S-X$  (From (4)), provides the enormous energy that powers ElectroMagnetism.

If so you may indeed be on to something.

Maybe, but it would cost \$billions if it's true, many current text–books would be obsoleted, professors and teachers would have to be retrained, and new text books written and that's why LIGO is such an important test.

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

Re: LIGO.

Re: LIGO.

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?

There seems to be some mediocre consensus on strong and weak force theory, but I think the smart guys would like something better.

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.

Congrats Cliff, I'm a grandpa too.  
Best to you too.  
Ken