

# Re: a new reward

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-11/msg00904.html>

---

- *From:* "PD" <[TheDraperFamily@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:TheDraperFamily@xxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* 15 Nov 2005 14:08:32 -0800
- 

Henry Haapalainen wrote:

> "Black Knight" <[Androcles@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:Androcles@xxxxxxxxxx)> kirjoitti viestissä  
> [news:XObef.4108\\$375.724@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:XObef.4108$375.724@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)  
>>  
>> "Henry Haapalainen" <[kirppu@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:kirppu@xxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
>> [news:dlb72e\\$gh3\\$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:dlb72e$gh3$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)  
>>> I have promised a reward of 1000 US dollars to anyone who will find a  
>>> serious mistake in falling space theory. Let's make it better. Now I  
> offer  
>>> the same amount of money to anyone who can prove that space time or time  
>>> dilation is real.  
>>>  
>>> Henry Haapalainen  
>>> Falling space theory: <http://www.wakkanet.fi/~fields/>  
>>>  
>> "Gravity appears to be really strange, something inexplicable by theory.  
>> This view has been stated at some time and appears to be well founded.  
> When  
>> an object falls in a gravity field, it seems to be in accelerating motion.  
>> However, this is not so, the acceleration is only apparent. We who observe  
>> it are ourselves in accelerating motion as we stand on the surface of the  
>> Earth, and we experience the acceleration as the surface of the Earth  
>> pushing us upwards. If we could see events from the "correct" perspective,  
>> we would observe that freely falling objects move forwards at a constant  
>> velocity. Gravity is not a force, but something else. But what is the  
>> correct perspective? "  
>>  
>> I am sitting in my chair unaccelerated, I can feel a force on my body.  
>> Gravity is a force.  
>> I claim the \$1000, pay up NOW.  
>>  
>> Androcles.  
>>  
> Yes, there is a force acting on you, but not gravity.  
>  
> <http://www.wakkanet.fi/~fields/>  
>  
> C. – THE TIDAL FORCE

Re: a new reward

> C1

\*snort\*

> But what is the tidal force? What causes it and how is it defined? Consider  
> the Sun, the Earth, and the Moon. The Earth orbits the Sun and the Moon  
> orbits the Earth. But the Earth should also orbit the Moon due to the effect  
> of the Moon's gravity.

It does. In fact, both orbit the common center of mass of the pair. Do you know where that center is?

Are you not aware that extrasolar planets have been deduced \*precisely\* because of the orbit of the star around the common center of mass shared by the planet?

> It is impossible to fully meet all of these demands.

Sure it is. This is a false, erroneous statement. You are simply unaware of how to satisfy those concurrent demands.

> The tidal force depicts the erroneous movements arising from the  
> contradictory demands.

Imprecise claptrap with no predictive power whatsoever. Can you \*predict\* the "erroneous movements" arising from the "contradictory demands" that are "impossible to fully meet"? If you have a theory that explains something, then it should be able to predict that occurrence at least as well as the preceding theory does.

> Precisely defined, the tidal force is a deviation  
> from free-fall motion. When we stand on the surface of the Earth, the tidal  
> force acts on us.

And so, when I'm on the beach immediately between high and low tide, I've got no force of gravity acting on me at all?

>

> Henry Haapalainen

.

---

• *Follow-Ups:*

◆ *Re: a new reward*

◇ *From:* Henry Haapalainen

• *References:*

◆ *Re: a new reward*

◇ *From:* Black Knight

Re: a new reward

- Prev by Date: *Re: A little challenge for relativists.*
- Next by Date: *Re: I caught a bottle of photons*
- Previous by thread: *Re: a new reward*
- Next by thread: *Re: a new reward*
- Index(es):
  - ◆ *Date*
  - ◆ *Thread*