

## Re: The Fifth Dimension

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2004-06/5237.html>

---

**From:** David McAnally (*D.McAnally\_at\_i'm\_a\_gnu.uq.net.au*)

**Date:** 06/27/04

Date: 27 Jun 2004 16:00:39 GMT

leopard@MailAndNews.com (Leonard Pardin) writes:

*>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.*

Not just me. You ignored EVERYBODY who commented unfavourably on your ideas (and there were certainly others). It was as if you couldn't take the criticism.

For myself, I note that you also ignored where I pointed out all the PHYSICAL reasons why your hypothesis, i.e. that resonance was responsible for the photoelectric effect, was wrong. You argued (again) by analogy, and you came to a conclusion (through a very invalid argument), and you carried on believing that your presumption, i.e. that resonance was responsible for the photoelectric effect, was true. You didn't even bother to find out the physical evidence – you presumably didn't see the need to check the physical evidence. And then when the physical evidence falsifies your presumption, you ignore the fact.

*>> 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.*

This is to cover your complete and utter ignorance of the ENGLISH dictionary definitions of the words that you used. You are pathetic not to just admit your ignorance, but to make up lies to cover it instead. Your "meanings" of time and space that you gave above are figments of your imagination, with nothing to do with relativity, or any other physical theory for that matter, but, then again, it is not surprising that you are once again showing the dishonesty that you have already shown many times over. In General Relativity, the word "straight", if it were used in General Relativity, which it isn't, would mean "geodesic". And as far as "wave" and "particle" are concerned, that has NOTHING to do with Relativity. Of course, in your complete ignorance of anything to do with physics, it is not surprising that you were ignorant of the fact that wave-particle duality is \*\*\*\*\*NOT\*\*\*\*\* a part of Relativity. Wave-particle duality is a part of Quantum Mechanics. And "wave" does not mean "particle", and "particle" does not mean "wave". The words still mean the same things that they do in classical physics. Wave-particle duality is the statement that quantum objects exhibit the properties of both waves and particles. This may be contrary to what you think, but it is the height of arrogance for you to assert the the microscopic world behaves in exactly the same way as the macroscopic world, and then to assume that such an assertion is the ABSOLUTE TRUTH just because you happen to believe it. You have no experience of the microscopic world, and you have no reason, except for your prejudices, to believe that it is anything like the macroscopic world. Your insistence on believing that the microscopic world behaves exactly like the macroscopic world would be like an Eskimo believing that the entire world is covered in snow and ice during the Northern winter, purely on the basis that that is all the Eskimo has ever known or experienced. Such an Eskimo would have exactly the same logic as you to reach that conclusion. Such an Eskimo would be wrong, and so are you.

>> 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.*

Garbage. This is just your attempt to save face because you used the word "non-sentient" instead of what you meant.

> *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.*

This demonstrates how completely ignorant you are of the history of quantum mechanics. It was not Einstein who formulated the rigorous theory of Quantum Mechanics. The people who formulated the theory were Schroedinger and Heisenberg. You apparently are also ignorant of the fact that Einstein was not a supporter of Quantum Mechanics, but believed it to be a simplification of the actual, yet to be discovered, theory of the quantum world. For you to associate Quantum Mechanics with Einstein shows just how pathetically ignorant you are of Quantum Mechanics and of Einstein. It is almost as pathetic as your taking the trivially simple mathematics that Einstein used in his second 1905 Relativity paper (mathematics that a student in his first year of high school should be able to do), and believing that the trivially simple mathematics was complicated.

> *The*  
> *theory of matter contraction was at first Lorentz's but now it belongs*  
> *to Einstein. The famous  $e = mc^2$  belonged to Poincare,*

Reference please. You have continually ignored all calls for a reference. Either supply a reference or stop claiming this.

*>but the sole*

*>owner today turns out to be Einstein. Only living and breathing things*

*>can be that fickle.*

Garbage. Theories are not living breathing things. This is just you covering up for the fact that you were ignorant of the meaning of the word "sentient".

*>> >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.*

Did he? Do I have to take your word for it, or are you prepared to offer something more compelling? And what gives Potter's ramblings any authority, anyway? Even if Potter wrote such a statement, that hardly makes it the truth, considering that Potter's record for trolling is on a par with your own.

*>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.*

Why do you think that ANY physics theories have "patterns of problem resolution"? Is this another of your delusions?

*> I think that's what Mr. Potter was saying.*

Potter saying anything would be a great cause to be sceptical about it.

If I were you, I would take anything that Potter said with a grain of salt.

*>> 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.*

There is no such thing as a "Relativity" dictionary. Anyway, you are having difficulty with the ENGLISH meaning of various words, let alone the scientific meaning.

>> >*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."*

Only for ignoramuses like you who have never heard of, or understood, Conservation of Energy, and who are intellectually incapable of understanding the true significance of the Principle of Relativity.

>*That leap left gigantic gaps in the common thought patterns normally expected in development of a viable theory.*

This is complete garbage. The reason why YOU can't understand is because you have deliberately denied yourself the background necessary to read and understand the paper, on the basis that you pathetically believe that your ignorance of even Newtonian Mechanics gives you a deeper understanding of physics than those to whom Newtonian mechanics is second nature. Einstein did not go into the sort of detail that you need since he wrote his papers for people who had a thorough grounding in Newtonian Mechanics, and he did not realize that he would have to go into basic details for ignoramuses like you.

Einstein's arguments were of the same type that others would have used at the time, and the intended audience were more than capable of filling in the gaps for themselves.

>*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.*

You have been told often that this is not true. I have myself explained what he actually wrote. The fact that you continue to write the above lie demonstrates that you are a liar who is as dishonest as any politician,

and that you wouldn't recognize the concept of truth if you tripped over it. How dare you continue to tell such blatant lies after you have been corrected several times over.

>Einstein thought it was "clear" that the emission of  
>radiation energy resulted in the loss of kinetic energy.).

As would you if you had ever bothered to actually sit down and learn some physics, rather than pontificate from your position of complete ignorance, and if you actually bothered to learn a bit of mathematics. The loss of energy of the body in the frame in which the body was moving is greater than the loss of energy of the body in the rest frame of the body. The extra loss had to be loss of kinetic energy, since there was no other energy available from which it could lose energy. Anybody with a background in physics could understand that argument. You can't because you have deliberately chosen to keep yourself ignorant.

>> 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.

The laws of logic that Einstein used in the Theory of Relativity are EXACTLY THE SAME laws of logic that were used in classical mechanics, and exactly the same that are used in all of science. But you are too ignorant to understand that.

And tell me whether or not you believe the following two syllogisms are valid (just testing to see whether or not you can distinguish between a valid syllogism and an invalid syllogism):

1. All cats are dogs.  
All dogs are horses.  
Therefore all cats are horses.
2. All cats are mammals.  
All carnivores are mammals.  
Therefore all cats are carnivores.

Is Syllogism 1 valid or invalid? Is Syllogism 2 valid or invalid?

>But I am sure that Relativistic  
>logic curves, contracts, bends, expands and transforms very much like  
>the theories.

You are becoming a pathetic little troll in your attempts to belittle what you don't understand, and in the gross and outrageous lies that you are

sci.physics.relativity: Re: The Fifth Dimension

prepared to make up about these things, just because things don't behave like your pathetic little mind wants them to behave.

>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.

I see that you do not deny that my description of your "philosophy" is accurate, so I will take that as a confirmation from you.

>> 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

What followed from you was more of the same pathetic attempts to belittle what you are too intellectually and mentally incompetent to understand. The world does not revolve around making Leonard Pardin's prejudices correct. If you can't cope with what the physical world throws at you, then you should get out of sci.physics.relativity. You have already admitted an ignorance of mathematics and Newtonian mechanics. You have also made it quite clear that you refuse to rectify either of these inadequacies. And yet you attempt to argue about a subject where a person needs a knowledge of both mathematics and Newtonian mechanics in order to make any sort of constructive contribution. You wish to argue about relativity, and yet you can't be bothered preparing yourself intellectually to be able to make any meaningful comments about the subject. Relativity is not a subject about which you can write in any meaningful way. You should just get out of sci.physics.relativity immediately and find a group where you at least can understand something about the subject matter.

And it is not surprising that you don't understand what self-consistency is, or why it is so important. That is just another artifact of your own self-imposed ignorance.

Do not try to presume to extrapolate the world that you know to rapidly moving bodies or to the microscopic world. You have no personal experience with rapidly moving bodies or with the microscopic world, and the only support that you can call upon to assume that they are just an extrapolation of the macroscopic world is your own prejudices. Remember

the hypothetical Eskimo from earlier. He extrapolated from his experience and got things totally wrong.

David

And all dared to brave unknown terrors, to do mighty deeds,  
to boldly split infinitives that no man had split before –  
and thus was the Empire forged.

-----