

## Re: The Fifth Dimension

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2004-06/5222.html>

---

**From:** Leonard Pardin (*leopard\_at\_MailAndNews.com*)

**Date:** 06/27/04

Date: 27 Jun 2004 05:55:09 -0700

D.McAnally@i'm\_a\_gnu.uq.net.au (David McAnally) wrote in message news:<cbl7tf\$7t\$1@bunyip.cc.uq.edu.au>...

> *First of all, I notice that you have adopted a policy of only replying to those who respond favourably to you, and ignoring those who respond unfavourably to you. If you are going to acknowledge yes-men only, then how are you ever going to get a realistic and concrete perspective of the true worth of your ideas and postings?*

If I have neglected you, my deepest apologies. But I am very well aware of the intrinsic worth of my ideas.

>  
> *I also note that you could do with a few English lessons, since a lot of what you write below does not even have a meaning in English. You are using words with completely different meanings from the meanings that they genuinely have in English.*

I am learning and speaking Relativitese, the language of modern physics, where meanings are relative. For example, in Relativese, "time" is really a large chunk of malleable wet clay, "space" is a thing with parts that can bend and twist, "straight" really means curved, "wave" means particle, and so on. It's a fascinating language, one that I find most brillig.

>  
> *leopard@MailAndNews.com (Leonard Pardin) writes:*  
>  
> > *"Tom Potter" <tdp@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<2k2pg5F16vgi5U1@uni-berlin.de>...*  
> > > *"Leonard Pardin" <leopard@MailAndNews.com> wrote in message*  
> > > >  
> > > > *Remember that under the Pardin theory,  $dk = -c$ . Multiplying both sides by  $-1$ , we get  $c = -dk$ . This revelation leads to some interesting results. If we write Einstein's  $e = mc^2$  as  $c^2 = e/m$ , we can get*  
> > > > \_\_\_\_\_  
> > > >  *$c = \sqrt{e/m}$ . Substituting  $-dk$  for  $c$ , we get*  
> > > > \_\_\_\_\_  
> > > >  *$-dk = \sqrt{e/m}$ .*

> >> >  
> >> > *Again multiplying both sides by  $-1$ , and we have*  
> >> > \_\_\_\_\_  
> >> >  $dk = -\sqrt{e/m}$ .  
> >> >  
> >> > *The result must be a negative number for both mass and energy.*  
> >> > *In other words, I have determined the source of antimatter.*  
> >> >  
> >> > *Now be honest, Mr. Potter. Be brutal. Don't be afraid to hurt my*  
> >> > *feelings. Do you think the government would be willing to fund my*  
> >> > *work, considering all the money spent on trying to prove Einstein's*  
> >> > *theories, and worm holes, warped space, time travel, black holes,*  
> >> > *etc.?*  
> >> >  
> >> > *You are obviously on to something big,*  
> >> > *and it is clear that your model is more powerful*  
> >> > *than current models, because it not only addresses*  
> >> > *the discrete/continuous problem,*  
> >> > *but it also addresses the sentient/non-sentient problem.*  
>  
> > *You're very kind. But I don't want to take all the credit. You must*  
> > *admit that Einstein's work is at least equally non-sentient.*  
>  
> *Of course your work and Einstein's work are equally non-sentient. They*  
> *are not alive, and something has to be alive before it can be conscious,*  
> *i.e. something has to be alive before it can be sentient. So both your*  
> *work and Einstein's work fail one of the necessary criteria for sentience:*  
> *neither is alive. Theories are \*not\* breathing living things. It is*  
> *shocking that you perceived the possibility that they were.*

You are taking the narrow-minded classical view of "theories."  
Theories are living things. They have a life of their own and can  
evolve over time to meet the demands of the universe. And they go  
from owner to owner like stray cats. Take for example the quantum  
theory. It was Planck's for a time, but now it is Einstein's. The  
theory of matter contraction was at first Lorentz's but now it belongs  
to Einstein. The famous  $e = mc^2$  belonged to Poincare, but the sole  
owner today turns out to be Einstein. Only living and breathing things  
can be that fickle.

>  
> > *Einstein*  
> > *must be recognized as the father of non-sensate physics.*  
>  
> *Not at all. Physics was done in the minds of people before Einstein.*  
> *For example, Maxwell, just by using his mind, with pen and paper, derived*  
> *the equations that bear his name. So for you to claim that Einstein was*  
> *the first to do physics not through his five senses of sight, hearing,*  
> *touch, smell and taste, makes you utterly and completely wrong.*

Perhaps I misunderstood Mr. Potter's meaning. He observed that my work took into consideration both the sentient and non-sentient. I am fairly certain he meant modern "sentient" rather than classical. I think he meant sentient as in following a rather rigid pattern of thought often insisted upon by the non-relativist. My work, like Einstein's, does not contain the common patterns of problem resolution. I think that's what Mr. Potter was saying.

- >
- > *You truly are pathetic. If you are going to use a word in English, at least look the word up in a dictionary to make entirely sure that you are using the correct word.*

Unfortunately, the bookstores in my area are all out of Relativity dictionaries.

- >
- > *I am simply*
- > *following in his giant footsteps.*
- >
- > *In order to answer what you were presumably \*trying\* to say, before you stuffed it up with your ignorance of English vocabulary, I would suggest that you have deliberately denied yourself the background necessary to be able to make a competent judgement about how sensible or otherwise Einstein's work is. In view of the fact that you have deliberately kept yourself ignorant of the physics background that is necessary for understanding (view for example, the complete and utter shambles you made with kinetic energy when you first posted under your "fascination with  $E = mc^2$ " thread), you are intellectually dishonest in delivering an appraisal that you have absolutely no competence to deliver.*

Well, I admit that Einstein's jump from radiation energy to kinetic energy in his derivation of  $e = mc^2$  was a "quantum leap." That leap left gigantic gaps in the common thought patterns normally expected in development of a viable theory. That's an excellent example of Einstein's non-sentient proclivities. (For the readers who are not familiar with the thread, Einstein theorized that radiation energy was related to kinetic energy by the addition of an arbitrary constant. Einstein thought it was "clear" that the emission of radiation energy resulted in the loss of kinetic energy.)

Einstein

- > *understood the laws of logic, and he applied them. You have no understanding of the laws of logic, and you would not be able to distinguish between a valid syllogism and an invalid syllogism if your life depended on it.*

I haven't gotten to the study of Relativistic syllogisms yet; I am still working on the language. But I am sure that Relativistic logic curves, contracts, bends, expands and transforms very much like

the theories.

All that you have to fall back on is your pathetic

- > *"Big Picture" philosophy, where you deny yourself learning even of*
- > *Newtonian mechanics, on the basis that learning would destroy the bloom of*
- > *your ignorance (to pursue an analogy used by Lady Bracknell), and it would*
- > *destroy the deep understanding of physics that you think your complete*
- > *ignorance of the subject gives you.*

That may be true, but my clock keeps better time than yours. So there.

- >
- > *It is not the job of physical theories to conform to your prejudices.*
- > *It is the job of a physical theory to provide a self-consistent logical*
- > *construct with which to explain and predict the results of physical*
- > *experiments. Relativity is self-consistent. And, in its range of*
- > *applicability, the experimentalists tell us that special relativity is*
- > *so far 100% reliable.*
- >
- > *David*

I am satisfied that Relativity has resolved all the relativity mind problems that the Relativists have so far been able to imagine. I most certainly agree that Relativity is "self-consistent." It is also "self-contained" in its own little world of curve-ball space, Salvador-Dali-like melting timepieces, bottomless black rabbit holes, and shrinking munchkins. I visited there once, and I knew immediately I wasn't in Kansas anymore.