

## Re: Relativistic Physics – Science or Religion?

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.particle/2005-03/0153.html>

---

*akalaniz\_at\_hotmail.com*

*Date:* 03/08/05

Date: 8 Mar 2005 11:28:22 -0800

What motivates you to try to do—but miserably fail—damage to physics and physicists? General relativity (GR)—or any other theory—has, or ever will be, taken as an item of faith. Theory has been, and continues to be tested, for nearly one-hundred years. In orbit today is Gravity B probe testing the prediction of frame dragging. Physicists are keenly aware of error bars. They look very carefully at the sources of error in a given experiment and produce a result qualified by error estimates. This was, if you look at the literature, the case for the atomic clock flown aboard a jet. The peer-reviewed results would not have published without such a mandatory error analysis. Within the error bars of tests of Special Relativity (SR) and GR lays room for alternative theories and/or corrections/extensions, as in the sense that Einstein's theory of gravity is a correction/extension to Newtonian gravity. The same goes for string theories, GUTs, and all other theories. They must pass rigorous tests and be consistent with data, be it from particle accelerators or radio astronomy. I'm sure you know that, but are somehow hoping to catch the naive junior high school kids out there who don't know better with your pseudo dispassionate aires of scholarly bunk. The next time you question a theory, do so with a proper investigation of the experiments supporting the theory, including their error analysis, wherein lays the room for new physics. An excellent example of such error analysis is the Anderson et. al. paper on the anomolous acceleration of the Pioneer 10 probes. "Study of the anomalous acceleration of Pioneer 10 and 11", Physical Review D (Particles, Fields, Gravitation, and Cosmology) Phys. Rev. D 65, 082004 (2002) (50 pages)

By the way, the webpages you so often post, "The Einstein Hoax (1997)", etc., contains manifold, demonstrably wrong physics. In particular is the case of the modified Maxwell demon. your device which "violates" the 2nd law of thermodynamics, you state, "the trapdoor and the membrane would be heated and the molecule which passed though it would be cooled. The process would generate a local temperature difference which would quickly be equalized by any reasonable level of heat transfer."

Assuming the trapdoor is able to rapidly transfer the energy it absorbed to the rest of the membrane, wouldn't then the heated membrane transfer the heat back to the gas molecules? The membrane, made of vibrating molecules, would, via thermal vibrations, and some radiation, transfer their heat back to the cooled gas to maintain thermal equilibrium.

If the trapdoor couldn't dump its excess energy (the energy absorbed from a fast molecule), it, thanks to its molecular vibrations, would start to bounce open and close to rid itself of its excess energy. By so doing, it would on occasion allow molecules to flow both ways, and on occasion, it would swat cold (slow) molecules and heat them back up (speed them up).

I think Dr. Feynman and the 2nd law of thermodynamics stand firm. You, on the other hand, need to fess up to your error and quit the neo-Nazi and KKK clubs.

AA another dumb PhD