

black holes again...

The Urth list — 1 messages, 1 voices, 05 Jul 1998

<https://urth.darkrealm.vip/thread/urth/920>

Exported from an unofficial mirror of a public mailing list. Copyright in each message remains with the person who wrote it. Email addresses are obscured as `user at host`, the form the original archive published. This file was rebuilt from parsed fields rather than retained headers, so it is faithful in content but not byte-exact.

Matthew Freestone — 05 Jul 1998, 13:57

Okay, this is definitely my last post on black holes unless I find some scientific backup for either Prion's view or my own...

Prion:

The initial size of the black hole doesn't have much to do with the time for the cycle to complete. Any size of a hole would complete the process in under a minute (probably under thirty seconds, but I'm not sure).

This is what you keep saying, but as I pointed out in my last post, saying it's so don't make it so. I'm assuming from your comments to Jason V. that you aren't yourself involved in cutting edge research on the topic, so what is the basis for your claim? I'll accept citations from any recognised journal :-)

Prion:

The calculations that an astrophysicist would have to perform would be how small the initial black hole would be before the outer part of the star exploded before the black hole finished (as it would if the hole was microscopic). I explained that stars which naturally create black holes at their cores (which our sun will never be able to do) either are going to fall entirely into the black hole (if it's big enough to absorb it in some number of seconds) or partially explode (if it's smaller and takes a few extra seconds).

I didn't respond to this theory last time, but it seems to me to ignore the crucial point that stars that go nova are already in the process of collapse and this is what may create a central black hole. It doesn't follow that putting a black hole in the centre of a main-sequence star will have the same effect.

Just to come back to your original contention that the worm in the sun was a wormhole because it couldn't be a black hole: I think that basing this on current physical theories doesn't really help you:

On the one hand, wormholes are currently pure speculation on the part of physicists - they have all kinds of weird properties that nobody knows how to create. It's just as physically plausible to argue that it is possible to moderate black holes absorption rates in some way (perhaps Hawking radiation can be increased), as it is to claim that it is possible to create wormholes.

On the other, the Urth universe is not necessarily similar to our own anyway: there are no currently known equivalents to Briah, or to White Fountains. Perhaps black holes work differently there.

Cheers,

-- II |\ _,,,---,,_

Matt Freestone || zzz. /,`.-'`'- . ;;;;,_. matthew at matthewf.demon.co.uk || |,4-))-,_. ,\ (`'-'
www.matthewf.demon.co.uk/ || '---"(_/--' `'-'_)