

Re: Scientific Errors (Proof)

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2006-06/msg02550.html>

- *From:* "Dennis B" <Utopian@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 28 Jun 2006 05:57:27 -0700
-

blair.houghton@xxxxxxxx wrote:

Dennis B wrote:

To further prove that a fluid exerts an increased force of pressure as the velocity of the fluid increases, take for example a water powered piston. Water is an incompressible fluid and therefore cannot (easily) change in density. Therefore, as the water enters the piston, most of the force of the fluid is then translated into moving the piston. If the flow of water into the piston is increased (in other words if the fluid velocity is increased) the water exerts a greater force or pressure upon the piston, does it not?

It does not. In general, when trying to get a greater force into such a volume, it is necessary to increase the volume more slowly.

TELL that to racecar engineers and they'l laugh you off of the racetrack. There is some truth in what you say though in that a lower velocity is more efficient at transferring force because a higher velocity results in higher viscous head or friction losses. And by the way, how do you get more force at a lower volume? I would imagine by using a large pump with a piston having a large surface area?

Same thing happens when you want to increase leverage. You can't raise an object as fast, but you can raise a heavier object.

Same
thing

happens when trying to impart knowledge to a denser skull. Speak slowly. Speak clearly. Repeat the idea several times, a little different each time.

Conversely, only when water is withdrawn from

Re: Scientific Errors (Proof)

the piston does the force of pressure decrease, in which case the water and the piston move in the opposite direction. SUCK ON THAT all you adherents of the Bernoulli Principle myth!

How can you believe that it's a myth when it's clear that you have no experience with the data?

I know enough to see that there are some obvious errors in the existing theories. As for the accusation that I have no experience with the data, you are very mistaken. I know what the observed facts are. I have a basic understanding of the processes involved. Not to say I haven't much yet to learn. Learning never ends. Yet, I have a right to speak my mind. And I call it as I see it.

How can you speak about it in any way when it's clear that you have never actually read the statement of the theorem?

You are making false accusations. I am VERY familiar with Bernoulli's principle. My understanding is internally consistent. Yours is not. Your beliefs violate the conservation of momentum and energy laws, the fundamental laws of motion ($ma = F$), *AND* do not agree with observed phenomena. If pressure decreased as velocity increased, there would not be any increase in friction loss. In other words, there would be no friction. Of course, Bernoulli's equation does not apply to viscous fluids such as air or water and therefore does not include friction in its pure form. This is not because there are no friction losses with a viscous fluid. It's because Bernoulli's principle applies only to inviscid fluids. In other words it only applies to super-fluids. Therefore, one could rightly call Bernoulli's principle a myth (with a seed of truth in it), although my original point was that Bernoulli's principle as it is COMMONLY taught (being used to explain the function of an airplane wing) is a myth.

In the steady state – constant velocity – if the external load is constant, the pressure in the piston is the same whether you are increasing or decreasing the volume. There will only be an increase or decrease in the transient phase, when the velocity is changing. And the assumed conditions for Bernoulli's principle do not apply to transients.

I hesitate to say this because I know it will blow your tiny, ossified mind, but, because of Bernoulli's principle, in the steady, nonzero-velocity state, the pressure in the feed tube for the piston is lower than the pressure in the piston body – no matter which direction

Re: Scientific Errors (Proof)

the piston is moving.

But wait! you say. How can I start it moving without increasing the force on the distal end of the feed tube? Increasing the force must increase the pressure! Well, it does. But that's the transient phase. By the time the transients end and the steady state is reached, the boundary condition for the pressures has changed from equal pressure in both places to a lower pressure in the feed tube. In the case of a perfectly incompressible fluid, this transition takes zero time. Real fluids aren't incompressible, but they're close. So what happens is huge shockwaves transit the system. And we've discovered the property of "water hammer".

I'll say it again (for reasons I've outlined above): when the piston is moving in the steady state, the pressure in the feed tube is lower than the pressure in the piston, no matter which direction it is moving. Bernoulli applies.

I presume this is because of inertia in the piston? It keeps the piston going even though the fluid flow from the feed tube has stopped? I don't see how that's related to the basic fluid dynamics. I get the impression you are simply attempting to discredit me. You try to make it look like I've made more errors than I have. Perhaps you don't understand what I've said (I certainly don't understand *your* vague and meaningless, dare I say fictitious, explanations). Perhaps you are one of the many individuals whom I've heard about that are actually employed to discredit individuals whom pose a threat to the powers that be (Energy cartel, etc.) through the accurate scientific knowledge they have to share via USENET? After all, it only takes a few responses such as yours and the others to strip an individual of any credibility in the eyes of those whom do not take the time or do not have the ability to discern between fact and fiction (either due to having been brainwashed by the church of "science" or lack of mental ability). Alas, I care not...because I know there are people whom will recognise the truth of what I have to say. The challenge you pose only serves to help me build a stronger and more stable foundation for what is yet to unfold. And I assure the show hasn't even started yet. I suggest you and everyone else get a tight grip while you are still able...because the world, as you know it, is about to come to an end.

Now you have a choice. You can continue to posit nonsense and get it batted out of the park and feel like a loser;

I don't feel like a loser at all. In fact I get a natural high from these debates. I actually feel like a winner because I know who's right and who's wrong, despite the fact that I have apparently failed thus far in my ultimate objective which is to open your eyes.

Re: Scientific Errors (Proof)

or,
you can ask questions when your scientific beliefs do not match what all the other scientists think, have your misunderstanding explained to you, and feel like a decent person.

If only the other scientists could actually explain to me the error of my beliefs. Of course, how could they. Their "logic" is not internally consistent. They've all been "brainwashed" with manufactured insanity as far as I am concerned. It's no wonder human "civilisation" has yet to conquer the heavens.

-Dennis B

.