

Re: Definition of A Field

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2004-12/0315.html>

From: Bjoern Feuerbacher (feuerbac_at_thphys.uni-heidelberg.de)

Date: 11/22/04

Date: Mon, 22 Nov 2004 18:33:12 +0100

kenseto wrote:

> "Bjoern Feuerbacher" <feuerbac@thphys.uni-heidelberg.de> wrote in message
> news:cnq57q\$ont\$3@news.urz.uni-heidelberg.de...

>

>>kenseto wrote:

>>

>>>"robert j. kolker" <nowhere@nowhere.net> wrote in message

>>>news:307fniF2pgmbtU1@uni-berlin.de...

>>>

>>>

>>>>kenseto wrote:

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>>So Einstein's gedankens are not speculations?

>>>>

>>>>Which led to -real- experiments which in fact supported the theory. A

>>>>gedanken is just a test of concept, not a corroboration of theory.

>>>

>>>

>>>But in his 1905 paper he had no experimental support.

>>

>>He had. His theory explained experimental observations which were done

>>before (MMX etc.).

>

>

> So does my thoery.

Try to understand the difference between hand waving and explaining.

For starters, in physics an explanation should be **quantitative**.

> In fact my theory explains a lot more than SR/GR and QM

> combined. It explains:

> 1. the uncertainty principle.

No, it doesn't. You don't even understand the principle.

> 2. the rotational curves of the galaxies.

Again, nothing quantitative. Mere handwaving.

> 3. *the accelerated expansion of the universe.*

Your theory says that there is a repulsive force which obeys an inverse square law. That does **not** fit the actual observations of the acceleration of the universe.

> 4. *the anomalous motion of Pioneer 10.*

Again, nothing quantitative. Mere handwaving.

> 5. *action at a distance.*

Is already explained **quantitatively** by QFT.

> 6. *what is electric charge.*

Again, nothing quantitative. Mere handwaving.

> 7. *a new theory of gravity.*

Again, nothing quantitative. Mere handwaving.

> 8. *unifying all the forces of nature.*

Again, nothing quantitative. Mere handwaving.

> *etc.....*

Yes, there is indeed a lot more hand waving in your so-called "theory".

>> *Nevertheless, his theory was only widely accepted*

>> *after *further* experimental support came in.*

>

>

> *But never the right experiment that could falsify SR.*

There were quite a lot of experiments attempted to falsify SR.

> *For example:*

> 1. *do an OWLS experiment with two spatially separated and synchronized*

> *clocks.*

> 2. *Do the experiment in the following link:*

> <http://www.journaloftheoretics.com/Links/Papers/Seto.pdf>

Nice.

>>> *All he had was his gedankens*

>>

>> *Wrong.*

>
> *Not wrong.*

Wrong.

>>>*and yet you think that's the greatest paper ever written.*
>>
>>*It was a great paper because it presented a new, unifying approach to*
>>*several open problems of physics.*
>
>
> *No it doesn't.*

Yes, it did.

>>>*Is this*
>>>*double standard?*
>>>*BWT in my paper I have a very doable experiment that can falsify my*
>>>*theory. That's more than what Einstein has in his paper.*
>>
>>*Einstein made several theoretical predictions in his paper. By*
>>*checking these predictions, it is possible to falsify SR.*
>
>
> *The ether theory made the same predictions.*

I have not seen you make even **one* *quantitative** prediction so far.

> *In fact SR math is based on LET*
> *math and LET math came before SR math.*

Part of the LET math came before SR, part came afterwards.

Bye,
Bjoern