Re: Update on LIGO.

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2008−01/msg01420.html

- *From*: Eric Gisse <jowr.pi@xxxxxxxxx>
- *Date*: Sat, 19 Jan 2008 05:03:52 −0800 (PST)

On Jan 19, 1:53 am, cliff wright <c.c.wri...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

> cliff wright wrote:
>
> > Benj wrote:
> >
> > > On Jan 18, 12:10 am, Eric Gisse <jowr...@xxxxxxxxx>
> > > wrote:
> > >
> > > > Why don't you be more clever and explain
> > > > why you think gravitational
> > > > waves don't exist despite the repeated
> > > > indirect observations of their
> > > > emission and the lack of even one
> > > > observational disproof of GR?
> > >
> > > Is this an open call?
> >
> > Well since it is clear that *I* am awl that matters now and
> > the only
> > one posting here smarter than Einstein, I will explain it awl
> > to you!
> >
> > "Gravity waves" are such a hoax because gravity is in serious
> > need of
> > "debunking"! The mistake is that everybody thinks that
> > gravity is an
> > attraction between masses. Just one more stupidity of the
> > physicists!

Put it in the same dustbin as "big bang", "displacement current",
"action at a distance" and all the rest of the "phlogiston theories".
Gravity is a PUSH shoving objects together. Take all that Einsteinian
mathematics about "4−space warps" and all the rest and dump it in the
SAME dustbin! *I* am awl that matters now!

Gravity is a push created when pre−existing waves upon the surface of
the 4D+ Hypersphere which is the universe are shielded by mass. The
result (as theorized by Feynman and Wheeler) is the creation of a
"PUSH" that shoves the objects toward each other due to the "shadow"
each creates upon the other. So the bottom line is you can "wiggle"
masses all you like but the most you can do is "wiggle" the shadows
they cast. You will NOT be sending out any kind of mass−generated
"gravity waves"! Sheesh. Just think about these things for a while,
OK? *I* am AWL that matters now!!!

PS. for more information go ask Uncle Al.

God's Teeth!
No wonder I sometimes just want to give up on science these days!
I ask a few questions about an ongoing experiment and get accused−
1− of knowing nothing about science.
2− Of asking a politically motivated question and having some particular position regarding the Middle East.
3− Of being "Anti Science".

Now, and yes this is directed to Eric in the first instance, but touches on other postings as well.
Thanks for the information about the slow analysis of the data from LIGO runs. Is this due to lack of computing power or actual problems with the

analysis?
As to costs. In a world where perfectly good existing Astronomical equipment is being mothballed or disposed of beacause of lack of funds, to quote only one example, a billion $US can make alot of difference.

As to understanding Physics. As yet we have NO reasonable theory of gravitation which combines Relativity and Quantum mechanics. However if you have one perhaps the Nobel commitee might be interested.
I have been involved in Physics in many fields for over 50 years including Astronomy both radio and optical, Acoustics, Aerodynamics , solid state Physics and semiconductors.

Ok so we have seen some apparent energy changes in the orbits of high density objects around each other. But consider, we do not actually have any real idea what we are observing in terms of the nature and especially the density of the objects involved. Certainly we have theories but with so little real data any such theory is on shaky ground.

I gather that Hulse and Taylor received a Nobel prize for work on Gravitational radiation. I haven't had a chance to check up on this yet but certainly will within a few days. That may or may not be relevant I still remember the Nobel prize for the discovery of Pulsars going to an academic who actually discouraged the research assistant, who made the real discovery. So the Nobel prize is not always a great criterion.

Next question. In what way have the models of "Gravitational Waves" been modified from LIGO's non results?
Now Please don't reply that I have to be familiar with an arcane branch of Tensor calculus to know! That is not an answer at all.
Any theory must have some kind of model behind it. Indeed a touchstone of a great Physicist like Richard Feynman is that he could explain a model of his ideas that an interested person could understand.
This without using a single 4 letter word!

Sure things have indeed progressed since Weber's cylinders. Sesitivity to the changes being sought has enormously increased and instrumentation and analysis are many orders of magnitude better.
But STILL no signals.

As another poster has pointed out even if the GW signals are somewhat different in frequency then we have serious problems.
All the equipment used so far is dependent on resonance effects to a great degree.
It has been suggested that we reduce the bandwidth to get a better S/N ratio. Fine but then our detection process gets less and less likely too.

I have made a study of early Radio and until about 1905 it was often the case that the reason that an installation didn't work was simply that they were on different frequencies and until then there was no way of measuring them.

We are obviously in at least as difficult a position here as Marconi was about 1902. At least he had Maxwell and Hertz to fall back on and could generate a signal in his laboratory whenever he needed to.

Hope we get more light and less heat if this discussion continues.
Regards Cliff Wright

A foot note to my last posting on this subject. Just today on my regular "Sky and Telescope" update we have apair of apparent Neutron stars which exceed Chandreskar's limit of 1.4 solar masses by a large margin. So now what are we looking at?

How large a margin? The exact limit is fungible − if it is much larger than 2 solar masses, I'd start wondering wtf is going on.

We also have news that Canada's David Dunlop observatory is under threat of closure due to lack of funds. That is what I meant
CCW.

.