Re: Mystery about "c".

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2007−03/msg00941.html

- *From*: "Ken S. Tucker" <dynamics@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
- *Date*: 11 Mar 2007 13:02:38 −0700

On Mar 10, 2:29 am, "Sue..." <suzysewns...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

> On Mar 10, 3:39 am, "Ken S. Tucker" <dynam...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
>
> > On Mar 7, 12:27 am, "Sue..." <suzysewns...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
> >
> > > On Mar 6, 2:50 pm, "Ken S. Tucker"
> > > <dynam...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
> > >
> > > Sue says,
> > >
> > > > For a fundamental induction
> > > > force, I can't make
> > > > the radiators work beyond
> > > > what we recognise
> > > > as tidal forces.
> > >
> > > I'm inclined to agree that you (and me) hit a
> > > brick
> > > wall there. Let me turn a bit metaphysical,
> > > and
> > > suggest the over−all organization of the
> > > universe
> > > is based on love. Evidentally, the universe
> > > tends
> > > to organize itself into structures like
> > > galaxy's, stars
> > > and then bodies like Earth, that in turn create

life.

The basis of that "love" is gravitation, where the
force of attraction over−whelm's the forces of
repulsion, and results in an organized universe,
that can nurture life, as proven by our existance.

Our classical thinking since the 1800's is based
on Coulombs hypothesis as follows,

F = q1 q2 / X^2 , (Coulombs hypothesis)

that indicates, attraction and repulsion are equal
in magnitude.
But the "love" principle above indicates a tweak,
that I find to be,

F = q1 q2 / (X^2 +q1 q2) , (Ken's conjecture).

The modified denominator to Coulombs hypothesis
can be denoted, the "love" factor in Ken's conjecture,
and shows attraction to be stronger than repulsion,
to account for the organization of the universe.

Kouropoulos describes a similar interaction:
<< The correlation is transitive. Its modes form
coherent stationary or propagating states in large
ensembles weighted by their number n− whereas
the anticorrelation self−destructs, as its modes
decrease the collective strength of the overall interaction,
including their own coupling energy to the ensemble.
When the anticorrelated modes reach their maximum
number, which is always less than half the total, the
disordered system has no long−range interaction.
>>http://arxiv.org/abs/physics/0107015http://www.mypage.bluewin.ch/Biza...

...but you might want to contact him to learn if he
had some better name than the "love principle:. LOL

Sue...

> Some personal notes on that are
> here...http://physics.trak4.com/
> wherein Ken's conjecture to modify
> Coulomb is
> in accord with "General Relativity applied to
> a
> Charge Couple".
>
> That's a start,
> Best Regards
> Ken

Hi, Sue, I've been studying this....

Recently I've been focusing on the relation of Power "W_00"
to the time metric g_00.
For instance, I beam a laser vertically, the rate of changes.
(dW_00 = − dg_00) correspond, where the Power of the
laser depends upon Energy/time.
In GR, Energy and time are inversely varied, so that the
Energy is "red shifted" in proportion to frequency, but
the "rate of time" increases, so Power transforms in

the negative proportion to g_00,

W_00 = p_0/x0 = energy/time.

As a service, we might take two equal resistors, both calibrated to be 1 Ohm. Then we place a current loop running up a tower and back down with a resistor at the Hi and Lo in that circuit.
The power output, Power = Voltage x Current can be measured by the emission of heat and thus photons from those resistors, at that location.

I find Power W_00 = V_0 I_0 == Voltage x Current.
((I prove that if asked)).

For notation, call g= g_00 , V=V_0, I=I_0, W=W_00,

so that the gravitational field is the derivative dg.

dg = − (dW = I dV + V dI).

Recall dV & dI are based on "complex impedance" that uses the "j" operator.

Let's now apply the Principle of Equivalence, (PoE).

Does the probability of local inertia depend upon the "complex impedance"?

I wonder which interpretation of Pound−Snider Tajmar and de Matos would support. ;−)

> "Complex impedance" is a term of art where the
> imaginaries are inductive or capacitive and result
> from the coupling structure. so the short answer is no.

You surprise me Sue, I thought you taught
me that a vacuum had an "impedance" of 377
Ohms. So I thought I'd try applying "complex
impedance" in a gravitational field, using power
as a basis, for a lively change.

> The imaginaries in QED result from temporal and spatial
> application of statistics.

Microscopically yes, but my oscilloscpe
is bang on always. But you're right, reduce
the current and increase amplification and
the wave−form becomes fuzzy.

> Something Feynman−esque that formally uses
> Gaussian disibutions to transfrom between
> space and time seems what you are about.http://www.rp−photonics.com/gaussian_beams.html
> Recall that Feynman used classical paths to
> determine a probability... not the other way
> round.
>
> The term "complex impedance" seems perfectly
> happy in its classical world and gravity doesn't
> seem to depend on atomic emission/absorption
> processes so there is nothing countable for accessing
> a temporal domain.

By my resistor experiment there could be,
all I need to do it remove the wire.

> <<Planck's original result involved counting the number
> of uncoupled harmonic oscillator modes partaking in
> the field's motions in a disordered system averaged
> over some random phase f of the oscillators at each
> frequency. If instead of non−interacting modes we
> have a system with a fixed number of oscillators and
> two coupled modes of which one is coherent, the
> zero point energy vanishes at first order. This point
> has also been stressed by Post. >>http://www.mypage.bluewin.ch/Bizarre/GRAV.htm
>
> The marriage sounds less holy than all Einstein

> and Feynman's sins combined. LOL

Are you flirting again :−o

> "Particle in curved space"
> << For a particle in curved space the kinetic term
> depends on the position and the above time slicing
> cannot be applied, this being a manifestation of the
> notorious operator ordering problem in Schrödinger
> quantum mechanics. One may, however, solve this
> problem by transforming the time−sliced flat−space
> path integral to curved space using a multivalued
> coordinate transformation (nonholonomic mapping
> explained here)... >>http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Path_integral_formulation
>
> I think we don't really know if the frequency change in
> Pound−Snider is a conservative inertial effect or
> a lossy radiative effect (ignoring Okun's cautions).

I'm ok with either, Energy Conservation rules.

> That answer may lie in Tate's mass anomaly.
>
> What may look elegant on paper is really the
> adoption of quite a house of cards resulting from
> several unresolved issues. Don't some of these
> ambiguites need to be resolved before making
> extrapolations on the scale you propose?

I have a hard on for Energy Conservation, that
is often expressed in action units etc. so I'm
looking at the Generally Covariant expression
of "complex impedence" using Power.

Blame Dr. Yablon, (we should go to his castle
and burn it for blastforme), I recommend that
course of study, I mean about GR Power.
Regards
Ken

.