

Re: The Fifth Dimension

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2004-06/9271.html>

From: David McAnally (*D.McAnally_at_i'm_a_gnu.uq.net.au*)

Date: 06/28/04

Date: 28 Jun 2004 15:41:13 GMT

leopard@MailAndNews.com (Leonard Pardin) writes:

>*D.McAnally@i'm_a_gnu.uq.net.au (David McAnally) wrote in message news:<cbmqv7\$21g\$I@bunyip.cc.uq.edu.au>...*

>> *leopard@MailAndNews.com (Leonard Pardin) writes:*

>>

>>

>> *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.*

> *The simple fact is that the key to the photoelectric effect is*

>*frequency. Frequency is a wave phenomenon.*

You claimed that the photoelectric effect would be explicable by resonance. I demonstrated that the experimentally determined physical properties of the photoelectric effect contradicted the hypothesis that resonance is responsible for the photoelectric effect (where I gave three compelling reasons why the physical behaviour contradicts resonance as the cause). You failed to acknowledge your mistake in your assumption that resonance is responsible for the photoelectric effect (and you still have not acknowledged that you were wrong). It is as simple as that.

>*Einstein's followers offer*

>*the nonsensical explanation that particles have frequencies.*

That is in Quantum Mechanics, for which, as I have already pointed out to you, Einstein was not a principal investigator. The originators of the rigorous formulation of Quantum Mechanics were Schroedinger and Heisenberg. Einstein considered Quantum Mechanics to be flawed. Specifically, he believed that there was a yet to be determined theory of quantum systems, of which Quantum Mechanics was a simplification.

sci.physics: Re: The Fifth Dimension

As I have remarked before, to identify Einstein with Quantum Mechanics as strongly as you do is laughable, and shows just how ignorant you are.

Quantum Mechanics has very hard and fast rules about how quantum objects behave, and when and in what way they behave like waves, and when and in what way they behave like particles. YOU don't know this because you are ignorant of the actual theory itself, and you are only able to work with the inaccurate popularizations which are written, popularizations which leave you completely ignorant of what you need in order to discuss the subject competently. You cannot hope to discuss quantum mechanics because you don't know enough about it to make a competent observation, or a competent appraisal.

Because of this, you do not understand quantum objects and quantum systems, and you certainly don't understand their properties. You are also not intellectually competent or have the education to pass judgement on a theory that you don't understand.

*>But no
>one can explain how a particle can have a frequency.*

Nobody can explain to YOU because you have deliberately denied yourself the necessary background. Imagine how much easier things would be if you actually bothered to learn some mathematics and some Newtonian mechanics.

Others, who do have a proper background, understand more about how quantum objects relate to frequency.

*>You insist on a
>solution to one problem by simply creating another.*

No. Just because you are too incompetent to understand quantum mechanics does not mean that everybody is.

*>You might as well
>insist that photons have wings and the frequency is the number of wing
>flaps.*

Your immaturity is showing again.

*>> 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.*

> "Absolute truth" is the claim of the Einsteinians.

Re: The Fifth Dimension

No, it is not. That is just another gross and outrageous lie that you have come up with. You really should try to stop lying. Your thorough dishonesty is not admirable.

*>You are beside
>yourself simply because I question Einstein's explanations.*

No. It is because

- (1) You ignore repeated explanations to you of certain facts, and you continue to post your lies as if nobody had ever corrected them, in spite of the fact that they have been corrected several times over;
- (2) You are ignorant of mathematics and Newtonian mechanics and you refuse to learn either in spite of the fact that several people have told you that you cannot offer any constructive or competent comments unless you do learn these disciplines;
- (3) You continually claim that Einstein wrote stuff that he never wrote, and then you attack him based on what you falsely claim that he wrote, i.e. on the basis of your own invention (such a breach by you actually appears below).

As far as your "questioning of Einstein's explanations" is concerned, the questions you raise are actually answered by Newtonian mechanics, and the answers are so easily understood by those who know Newtonian mechanics that anybody competent in Newtonian mechanics would consider it an insult to their intellect to be expected to ask such questions.

I have told you before that Einstein wrote his papers specifically for an audience who were well-versed in Newtonian mechanics, and therefore perfectly capable of filling in the gaps for themselves (and also perfectly capable of answering your questions for themselves).

Einstein did not write his papers for ignoramuses whose questions demonstrate their intellectual incompetence and limitations.

*>To
>question Einstein is a sin to you people.*

Garbage.

*>Well, I think the old boy
>had it all wrong, and I question just about everything Einstein did.*

As an ignoramus who refuses to learn mathematics or even the most basic physics, your opinion is worth diddly-squat. If you think that Einstein was wrong, that bears no reflection on whether he was actually right or

sci.physics: Re: The Fifth Dimension

wrong because you are too stupid to make a valid judgement either way. The question of whether Einstein was right or wrong is better left in the hands of those competent enough to make such a judgement. You are not such a person.

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.

That you can't understand the significance of the above paragraph is also testament to your ignorance and incompetence.

>> *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.*

> *Well, let's see: cats sometimes display the properties of dogs,*
> *and dogs sometimes display the properties of cats--sort of like*
> *particles and waves.*

This string-of-consciousness meandering on your part has no bearing on answering the question. It is just you wasting time.

> *So it seems that under Einsteinian logic, any*
> *statement that all of something is something-or-other is no longer*
> *valid.*

Stop referring to "Einsteinian logic". The logic that Einstein used was the same as classical logic. It is not Einstein's fault if you are too stupid and incompetent to understand that fact, a fact so simple that even a competent school boy could understand it. But then, you are less educated even than school boys just starting in high school.

> *As for horses, well if Einstein can transform radiation energy*
> *into kinetic energy*

Learn about conservation of energy, you stupid idiot. We have CONTINUALLY told you that the intended audience for the paper would have understood conservation of energy, and would have been able to follow Einstein's

sci.physics: Re: The Fifth Dimension

argument using conservation of energy. We have even given you the reasoning using conservation of energy (note that the energy in question was kinetic energy BEFORE the radiation and radiation energy AFTER the radiation). But although we have continually told this to you, you continue to ignore the fact, and then point to Einstein's conclusion as if he had made a mistake. And all because you are too stupid to admit that you need to know more, and you are too stupid to find out about conservation of energy, even though we have pointed conservation of energy out to you. Just where do you think the additional energy required for the radiation comes from?

*>(two completely different animals) with the waive
>of a constant, we should have no trouble transforming cats and dogs
>into horses if their frequencies are known.*

I take this as an admission from you that you wouldn't know where to start in order to ascertain whether the syllogism was valid or invalid, and so you thought that you would put out garbage instead. I asked a perfectly simple question: was the syllogism valid or invalid. And not only did you not answer the question, you actually tried to distract attention away from the question. And the question pertains to the validity or invalidity of the syllogism in classical logic.

>>
>> *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?*

> *That second one is easy. Watch how Einstein did it:*
> *All light radiation is energy.*
> *All body motion (kinetic) is energy.*
> *Therefore all light radiation energy is kinetic energy.*

That's not what Einstein wrote, you pathetic little liar. You seem to be totally incapable of telling the truth. Or is it that you are incapable of the most basic understanding. The latter explanation would be consistent with what we know of your ignorance and incompetence, but does not explain why you insist on telling lies such as the above AFTER you have been told SEVERAL TIMES OVER exactly what Einstein was doing at that point in the discussion. The fact that you continue to do so must be put down to a complete and utter intellectual dishonesty on your part.

> *See? Before Einstein, I would have thought that syllogism was
>invalid, but now I know better.*

Why can't you stop lying????? Honesty is a complete stranger to you, isn't it?

sci.physics: Re: The Fifth Dimension

Learn about conservation of energy before you reiterate these stupid comments. And stop putting words into Einstein's writings that he never put there. Do not pretend that Einstein wrote something which he did not write, and then attack him on the basis of what you falsely claim that he wrote. THAT is intellectual dishonesty.

Just how old are you? What is your educational background? What type of work do you do? What makes you think that your ignorance makes you any more competent to make a judgement than those who have taken the trouble to actually learn the mathematics and the physics?

And I was correct. You couldn't tell the difference between a valid syllogism and an invalid syllogism to save your life. I ask you again:

(A) Is Syllogism 1 valid or invalid?

(B) Is Syllogism 2 valid or invalid?

Just a simple word (i.e. 'Valid' or 'Invalid') will do for each question.

David

"Men were real men, women were real women, and
small furry creatures from Alpha Centauri were
real small furry creatures from Alpha Centauri."
