

Re: The Brilliance of Our Teachers

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-03/4472.html>

From: Dr *** (paulpsremove_at_freeuk.com)

Date: 03/20/05

Date: Sun, 20 Mar 2005 19:22:16 -0000

"Einsteinhoax" <einsteinhoax@isp.com> wrote in message
news:d1k5gi\$06u\$1@news.chatlink.com...

| The Brilliance of Our Teachers

|

| A recent newspaper question and answer column raised an interesting
| subject. The query noted that, for a science course at a local school,
| there

| were two instructors. One of those instructors explained the concepts
| clearly and his students did well on standardized tests. The other
| instructor's teachings were scattered and his students performed poorly.

The

| students, however, believed that the second instructor was brilliant and
| thought that his explanations are simply over their heads. The query went
| on

| to ask why such a misperception occurred.

|

| The answer given was that both groups were easily misled into
believing

| that mysterious people are highly intelligent. When those listeners heard
| material they didn't grasp, they assumed that the fault was theirs and not
| the teachers. And, since the listeners considered themselves fairly
| intelligent, it was obvious that the teacher must be brilliant!

|

| Judging from the material posted in these Newsgroups, the effect
would

| seem to be quite pronounced. It is quite plain that the posters ardently
| believe in the validity of what they have been taught. It is also quite
| obvious that they are aware, if only sublimely, of the inconsistencies and
| contradictions within that teaching. If that were not the case, the
subject

| matter would be straightforward by now, the understanding of modern
physics

| would not be so muddled, and the postings would not suggest such a high
| level of misunderstanding.

|

| The truth of the matter is that the subjects, relativity in
particular,

| seem mysterious and contradictory for one basic reason. The teachers of
the
| subject do not themselves understand it. Because they don't understand the
| subject they hide behind sophisticated, often unnecessary and sometimes
self
| contradictory mathematical explanations to prevent that lack of
| understanding from being apparent. In order to achieve this goal they have
| made Physics into the only Science where MECHANISM is not considered. This
| is illustrated by a quotation from Dr. Hawking who exclaimed, in an
| interview, that he was only interested in mathematics and observation and
in
| the correlation of the two approaches. He didn't care about "reality" (for
| which we may read mechanism) because he didn't know what reality was. This
| is unfortunate because the present practice of ignoring mechanism, and
| overlooking the fact that nothing is known until observation, mathematics
| and understanding of mechanism are in agreement. Without such an agreement
| an understanding of the process(es) involved is not assured. It is only
when
| all three requirements have been met that we can have any hope of knowing
| "who is doing what to whom".
|
| Even more important, without including mechanism in our understanding
| matrix, we eliminate a vital check on validity. The mathematics of many
| processes extends to regions which are physically unrealizable. Without
| considering mechanism these "empty" regions will not be recognized. An
| example of the effect is the idea that "virtual photons" can explain
forces
| which act at a distance. "Virtual photons" can easily explain repulsive
| forces acting between material particles, but they can not be used to
| explain attractive forces. The same is true of "gravitons". They cannot
| produce the attractive force of gravity! "Virtual particles" can only
| produce repulsive forces. An understanding "mechanism" reveals this
| deficiency quite clearly.
|
| To put the relativity concepts into perspective, the current
orthodoxy
| accepts the validity of the idea that there are no absolutes. Length is
what
| yardsticks measure and time is what clocks measure. What is conveniently
| overlooked is that the forces existing between the atoms in a yardstick
and
| the hairspring of a clock escapement (or their conceptual equivalents in
| actual test equipment) must be electromagnetic in nature. Not only is
| electromagnetism the only known candidate for these forces, the need for
| them follows if the questionable idea of modern physics that interatomic
| forces are produced by the exchange of "virtual photons" is not to
collapse
| instantaneously. In addition, the speed of a clock is affected by the mass
| of its balance wheel (or equivalent) as given by $M=E/C^2$ and the stiffness
| of the forces between the nuclei of the "hairspring" (or equivalent).
Since

sci.physics.relativity: Re: The Brilliance of Our Teachers

| all of the preceding are functions of the velocity of light in the local
| reference frame, it is rather foolish to make the assertion that length is
| what yardsticks measure and time is what clocks measure without taking
into
| account the effect that possible changes in the actual velocity of light
| might have on them. Such changes may be concealed by relativistically
| induced changes in the atomic spacings, stiffnesses and inertial masses of
| our instruments When one does take these considerations into account, the
| Principle of Relativity and the invariance of the local velocity of light
| follow at once for the simple reason that matter must be using the local
"en
| vacuo" velocity of light to control its parameters.

And also the local "vacuo" to control the velocity of light.

:A physicist who does not
| recognize this instinctively is clearly in the wrong line of work. (I
| understand Wal-Mart is hiring.). One does not need to resort to the
| sophisticated and to a large degree defective teachings of an arrogant
| intellectual elite Once the basics are recognized, the understanding of
the
| process involved do not require advanced mathematics, they are within the
| capabilities of a bright high school physics student.

|
|
| The source material for this posting may be found in "Gravity"
(1987),
| "The Einstein Hoax" (1997), and "Corrections to Residual Errors in Special
| Relativity (1999) located at
<http://members.isp.com/einsteinhoax@isp.com/einsteinhoax/site.htm> .
| EVERYTHING WHICH WE ACCEPT AS TRUE MUST BE CONSISTENT WITH EVERYTHING ELSE
| WE HAVE ACCEPTED AS TRUE, IT MUST BE CONSISTENT WITH ALL OBSERVATIONS, AND
| IT MUST BE MATHEMATICALLY VIABLE. PRESENT TEACHINGS DO NOT ALWAYS MEET
THIS
| REQUIREMENT. THE WORLD IS ENTITLED TO A HIGHER STANDARD OF WORKMANSHIP
FROM
| THOSE IT HAS GRANTED WORLD CLASS STATUS.

|
| All Newsposts by this Website are available at
<http://members.isp.com/einsteinhoax@isp.com/einsteinhoax/postinglog.htm>

|
| Please make any response via E-mail as Newsgroups are not monitored
on
| a regular basis. Objective responses will be treated with the same
courtesy
| as they are presented. To prevent the wastage of time on both of our
parts,
| please do not raise objections that are not related to material that you
| have read at the Website. This posting is merely a summary.

| E-mail:- einsteinhoax@isp.com

|
| The material at the Website has been posted continuously for over 5
| years. In that time THERE HAVE BEEN NO OBJECTIVE REBUTTALS OF ANY OF THE
| MATERIAL PRESENTED. There have only been hand waving arguments by
| individuals who have mindlessly accepted the prevailing wisdom without
| questioning it. If anyone provides a significant rebuttal that cannot be
| objectively answered, the material at the Website will be withdrawn.
| Challenges to date have revealed only the responder's inadequacy with one
| exception for which a correction was provided.
|
|