

## Re: The theory of relativity is 100% wrong .....

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2004-11/0142.html>

---

**From:** Marcus Wellpoth ([wellpoth\\_at\\_gmx.de](mailto:wellpoth_at_gmx.de))

**Date:** 11/01/04

Date: Mon, 01 Nov 2004 01:14:09 +0100

Bill Hobba wrote:

> "Marcus Wellpoth" <[wellpoth@gmx.de](mailto:wellpoth@gmx.de)> wrote in message

> [news:41841871\\$0\\$20927\\$9b4e6d93@newsread2.arcor-online.net...](mailto:news:41841871$0$20927$9b4e6d93@newsread2.arcor-online.net...)

>

>> Bill Hobba wrote:

>>

>>> "Mike" <[eleatis@yahoo.gr](mailto:eleatis@yahoo.gr)> wrote in message

>>> [news:9c1b39be.0410300913.1e947fa7@posting.google.com...](mailto:news:9c1b39be.0410300913.1e947fa7@posting.google.com...)

>>>

>>>

>>>> David Evens <[devens@technologist.com](mailto:devens@technologist.com)> wrote in message

>>>

>>> [news:<fl4sn0p60jpvs9kxnh4k2d1v0mqkvs8l9b@4ax.com>...](mailto:news:<fl4sn0p60jpvs9kxnh4k2d1v0mqkvs8l9b@4ax.com>...)

>>>

>>>

>>>>> On Mon, 25 Oct 2004 22:55:27 GMT, H@..(Henri Wilson) wrote:

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>> On 22 Oct 2004 21:09:09 -0700, [netspider4@lycos.com](mailto:netspider4@lycos.com) (Karl-Hugo

>>>

>>> Weesberg) wrote:

>>>

>>>

>>>>>>> Sorry, but this theory is rubbish and must be replaced by a new,

>>>>>>> better theory or mankind is doomed!

>>>>>>

>>>>>>> As far as I can see, Einstein's version of relativity was never taken

>>>

>>> seriously

>>>

>>>

>>>>>>> outside of the USA and GB. It is a western hoax, perpetuated by

>>>

>>> generations of

>>>

>>>

>>>>>>> academic inbreeding.

>>>>>>>

sci.physics.relativity: Re: The theory of relativity is 100% wrong .....

>>>>> *Most physicists elsewhere still accept the Ritzian view that light*  
>>>  
>>> *speed is*  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>>> *source dependent. Accordingly, the universe is much easier to*  
>>>  
>>> *understand.*  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>>> *How would some like you, with no contact with the scientific*  
>>>>> *community, and no knowledge of any language but English, know anything*  
>>>>> *about what anyone outside the English-speaking world thinks about*  
>>>>> *anything?*  
>>>>  
>>>> *He is right and you are wrong, left with your ad hominen weapon. The*  
>>>> *same was true with Newton's laws. British and Americans taught them as*  
>>>> *empirical laws. Continental Europe taught them as axioms. As a matetr*  
>>>> *of fact, anyone knows and admits today that Newton's law carry no*  
>>>> *empirical content at all.*  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> *That is not quite true. Newton's third law carries empirical content.*  
>>> *Carefully analyzed and suitably reformulated Newton's second and first*  
>  
> *law*  
>  
>>> *can be given empirical content eg the first law can be interpreted as*  
>>> *inertial frames exist where inertial frames are defined by symmetry*  
>>> *properties. Newton's second law as analyzed by Feynman shows it is*  
>  
> *'half a*  
>  
>>> *law'. But even this difficulty can be overcome in an exact treatment.*  
>  
> *In*  
>  
>>> *modern times however, at least for advanced work, it has become standard*  
>>> *practice to formulate classical mechanics from the POR and the PLA which*  
>>> *avoids these problems from the outset, shows the connection between*  
>>> *conservation and symmetry, and generalises more readily to QM and field*  
>>> *theories.*  
>>  
>> -----  
>  
> -----  
>  
>> *What are POR and PLA are standing for?*  
>  
>  
> *The POR stands for Principle of Relativity. PLA stands for Principle of*

Re: The theory of relativity is 100% wrong .....

> *Least Action.*

>

>

>>*I can figure out that it has to*

>>*do with Lagrangians, Noethers Theorem (Homogeneity of space leads to*

>>*momentun conservation, Isotropy of space leads to angular momentum*

>>*conservation, Homogeneity of time leads to energy conservation) and the*

>>*Hamiltonian principle but what does it exactly mean?*

>

>

> *The best way to answer it is to go and get Landaus classic – Mechanics where*

> *the whole of classical mechanics is developed from the POR and PLA alone.*

> *The physical basis of the PLA lies in Feynmans sum over history approach to*

> *QM, the physical basis of the POR – well it is something fundamental rather*

> *than something for which a basis is sought. He even defines an inertial*

> *frame correctly IMHO by using symmetry properties which is much better than*

> *the usual free particle moves at constant velocity (which is rather circular*

> *ie what is free – why force free – but what is force free – why a particle*

> *that moves at constant velocity). To get a flavor for what is going on*

> *reviews of that wonderful book by Landau may help –*

>

>

> [http://www.amazon.com/gp/product/customer-reviews/0750628960/ref=cm\\_cr\\_dp\\_2\\_1/103-3298122-3672611?%5](http://www.amazon.com/gp/product/customer-reviews/0750628960/ref=cm_cr_dp_2_1/103-3298122-3672611?%5)

>

> *'As soon as you read the first page of this book, you'll soon understand*

> *that this book is not for using Physics.(or not for studying for your*

> *exams.) This book is a kind of "Stoicheia" (that was written by Euclid). So*

> *you might waste your time, especially if you don't want to know why*

> *"mass>=0" is mathematically true. But, if you are a mathematician or a*

> *logician or so on, (and want to learn Physics systematically,) this book*

> *must become your favorite. Remember, this book is not too mathematical. If*

> *you are good at mathematics, just read and learn the mathematical way of*

> *thinking for Phisics.'*

>

> *To expand on the above you learn that force is not fundamental, conservation*

> *laws are nothing but expressions of underlying symmetries in the Lagrangeian*

> *and why we have mass. In short it turns Newton on its ear as far as*

> *understanding is concerned. Basically it does what Taylor is pushing for in*

> *teaching mechanics <http://www.eftaylor.com/pub/FmaAJPguest5.pdf>.*

>

> *IMHO there is no excuse in teaching mechanics using Newton's laws – the*

> *method espoused by Landau and Taylor should be used. It removes all trace*

> *circularity and ambuguaruty such as Newton's first law.*

>

> *I firmly believe the best way to learn physics is to read Feynmans lectures*

> *then Landau – Mechanics to correct Feynman major omission – no treatment of*

> *the lagrangian formulation. Sure you are exposed to the usual Newton laws*

> *type treatment in Feynman – but he is careful to analyze its basis. Once*

> *you read Landau the process is complete – you understand the true basis of*

> *classical mechanics and have the foundation for future study. It is*

> *probably a good idea to read Feynmans QED as well because it is really easy*

sci.physics.relativity: Re: The theory of relativity is 100% wrong .....

> *to see why the PLA is true once you understand that wonderful little book –*  
> *and probably the link I gave to Taylor or similar which brings it all*  
> *together.*

>

> *Thanks*

> *Bill*

>

>

>

>>-----

[snip]

I just want to thank you for this wonderful review. Unfortunately the joy of discovering the variational principle behind mechanics (classical and relativistic) has past for three years by now for me. Now Yang–Mills type theories are the cutting edge for me.

I was taught mechanics in the "classic" way with Newton axioms being the starting point. Analytical mechanics came in my third term with a discussion on non–integrability (that's what the Lagrangian of the first kind is for.) and a very brief introduction to chaotic systems. I indeed used Landau Lifschitz for this lecture (I did not posses it, but it was part of the library).

My connection to the variational principle was a little bit detached during the quantum mechanics cycle where the notion of the trajectory of a particle makes no sense at all. But it surfaced with the introduction of the Ritz method where the variation of  $\langle p|A|p \rangle$  gives a good estimate of the ground energy state.

General relativity was treated poorly but again Landau Lifschitz worked for me. And when we finally summed over all possible path,  $\int Dx \exp(-\int_0^T dt L)$  came to no great surprise to me.

mw