

In article <C4KvJF.4qo@well.sf.ca.us> metares@well.sf.ca.us (Tom Van Flandern) writes:

>crb7q@kelvin.seas.Virginia.EDU (Cameron Randale Bass) writes:

>> Bruce.Scott@launchpad.unc.edu (Bruce Scott) writes:

>>> "Existence" is undefined unless it is synonymous with "observable" in

>>> physics.

>> [crb] Dong Dong Dong Do I hear the death-knell of

>> string theory?

> I agree. You can add "dark matter" and quarks and a lot of other

>unobservable, purely theoretical constructs in physics to that list,

>including the omni-present "black holes."

> Will Bruce argue that their existence can be inferred from theory

>alone? Then what about my original criticism, when I said "Curvature

>can only exist relative to something non-curved"? Bruce replied:

>"'Existence' is undefined unless it is synonymous with 'observable' in

>physics. We cannot observe more than the four dimensions we know about."

>At the moment I don't see a way to defend that statement and the

>existence of these unobservable phenomena simultaneously. -[Tom]-

"I hold that space cannot be curved, for the simple reason that it can have no properties."

"Of properties we can only speak when dealing with matter filling the space. To say that in the presence of large bodies space becomes curved, is equivalent to stating that something can act upon nothing. I,

for one, refuse to subscribe to such a view." - Nikola Tesla

ET "Tesla was 100 years ahead of his time. Perhaps now his time comes."