

Re: "Defining Inertial and Gravitational Accelerations"

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2007-03/msg01415.html>

- *From:* "hanson" <hanson@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 13 Mar 2007 16:47:45 GMT
-

"Uncle Al" <UncleAl0@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
<news:45F6C480.E7E5264D@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

Suriv wrote: E-mail:– einsteinhoax@xxxxxxxxxx

"Defining Inertial and Gravitational Accelerations"

[snip interminable crap]

Newton: Inertia is a massed body.

Gravitation is an accelerating geometry.

$F_i = (m_i)a$ (inertia)

$F_g = G(m_g)M/r^2$ (gravitation)

$(m_i)a = G(m_g)M/r^2$ (vacuum free fall, $F_i = F_g$)

$(m_i)/(m_g) = \text{constant}$ (at each infinitesimal time interval; the
Equivalence Principle)

Hey schmuck – Newton says you are an ass. The only way to break
Newton consistent with observation is by admitting Einstein or
Einstein–Cartan or Weitzenböck (in which Einstein is a restricted
subset),

<http://arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/0609417>

16.8995 deg/yr periastron advance

GPS works.

Idiot. Uncle Al

Hey Idiot Uncle Al, yes "GPS works" but NOT because of
Cartan or Weitzenböck nor the restricted subset–Einstein.
Thanks for that laughs, fanaticAl... ahahaha... ahahanson