

Re: Curing Einstein's Disease (is Copyrighted)

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2008-02/msg00031.html>

- *From:* NoEinstein <noeinstei@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 31 Jan 2008 21:09:54 -0800 (PST)
-

On Jan 31, 4:01 pm, PD <TheDraperFam...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

It's more attention than he otherwise gets. I wonder what he'd do if the both of us stopped replying all together – do you think he'd just keep populating threads in reply to himself like he seems to be doing now, or do you think he'd go away? Eric

Dear Eric: Some of my "added" replies to my own post are because Google, apparently, limits the number of posts by one person—at one time—to four. And those replies of mine contain detailed descriptions of my Einstein disproofs. If you would read each of them, you might could learn some truths!

Read what, you babbling endlessly about Coriolis even though he died a solid 70 years before relativity was discovered?

"Einstein's" relativity gets treated like: Laws of Nature by many physicists—as you probably agree. But true Laws of Nature have existed since creation. So, Einstein can't lay claim to relativity, if such is a law of nature. But relativity is just the concocted ideas of a moron who had even poorer spatial visualization skills than you (as for finding the side angle of a hemispherical pyramid).

Einstein screwed up by insisting that all observers must record observed events the same. Modern physicists screw up by letting that

Re: Curing Einstein's Disease (is Copyrighted)

moron "play God" with the Laws of Nature, and without challenge.

Or about your endless
misunderstandings about kinetic energy?

There is a ritual that physics professors go through: It's called "deriving equations". They string lines of this and that together; and faster than 'smart' students can write down, let alone question. But did you ever consider this: Someone had to be the first to come up with that equation. If the equation is correct, that person has discovered, or defined a law of nature. But should any equation be 'accepted' as being correct just because it is published in the text? Or, because the professor wrote it on the board?

Ultimately, the only things that should be accepted are those that can withstand repeated analysis and question. Unfortunately, there are so many equations, that physicists take the lazy way out... They just accept the status quo on everything. And that makes all of them fools.

Coriolis goofed by trying to attribute to velocity all of the destruction-causing effects of falling objects, their penetrations into clay, etc. He never realized that the materials being impacted respond differently to more rapidly applied loads. His $KE = 1/2 mv^2$ requires that a falling mass manifest a greater KE gain in each second than in the previous second. The source of the KE? It's the uniform for each mass force of gravity. But Coriolis's equation requires that a faster falling object (or one falling for a greater time) receive from gravity a greater force than a slower object of the same mass. So, for Coriolis, gravity discriminates by always applying the greatest force to the fastest object.

My correct equation for kinetic energy: $KE = a/g (m) + v/32.174 (m)$ is a linear equation that has gravity applying an identical force to identical masses regardless of their velocity. NoEinstein's theorem: "Falling bodies gain KE due to Earth's gravity at a uniform rate with time, adding one weight multiple per second (of fall)."

Nobody has taken you seriously
yet – why should they start now?

You can speak only for yourself. Bias is in your blood; think about that.

Re: Curing Einstein's Disease (is Copyrighted)

As I said before, you'd fail a freshman physics course not because of your idiotic rantings about what you don't understand but rather because _you don't know what you are talking about_.

And you fail by attacking the messenger, rather than the message.

Here's his premise:

1. Coriolis based his formula $(1/2)mv^2$ on an experiment with balls impacting the earth. Such an experiment has identifiable experimental flaws found by NoEinstein, and so $(1/2)mv^2$ cannot be right.

In the movie 'Good Will Hunting' the flaws were found by a janitor. Sweep some floors; maybe 'that' will improve your mind... No, not a chance!

2. Any subsequent experiment that provided support for $(1/2)mv^2$ must have been tainted by religious faith that the formula is right, and so those experiments cannot be trusted either.

Any such experiment would be wrong because the force of gravity can't discriminate falling objects' speed, so as to apply the most KE to those objects.

3. Since the experiment is faulty, the formula is therefore wrong, and therefore any subsequent experiment even involving the claim that $KE=(1/2)mv^2$ is wrong, and the whole edifice falls.

Not only can't you read, you can't write!

4. NoEinstein has a backyard experiment that he thinks supports another formula for KE, but he won't publish the results — you have to go to his back yard and have him talk you through it.

My results: $KE = a/g (m) + v/32.174 (m)$

5. Einstein obviously used $(1/2)mv^2$ in his development of relativity, so it's wrong.

Einstein and Coriolis believed that the energy progression of an accelerating object is exponential. Since that requires that gravity

Re: Curing Einstein's Disease (is Copyrighted)

be able to differentiate objects' speeds, it is wrong. Not because I say it is, but because I have found the various errors.

6. Einstein based his whole theory on that and the MMX, which is an experiment that again has a flaw that NoEinstein has found.

Mostly Einstein based his theories on the beer-hall-conceived Beta equation of Lorentz. It was such equation which I easily nullified by determining that M-M doesn't have a CONTROL.

7. Any subsequent experiment that provided support for relativity was similarly tainted by religious fervor, and so once again, the whole edifice collapses.

Originally, Einstein's ideas were just accepted, because few people cared one wit about the man's subject areas. Later, Einstein's ideas were held high, because of the jealousy of physicists to the undeserved acclaim the man got by his all or nothing parlor trick: Predicting the angle of bending stars' light by the Sun's gravity.

8. NoEinstein has another backyard experiment that he thinks demonstrates that there is either an ether or absolute motion, but he doesn't publish his results here either — you have to go to his backyard and have him talk you through it.

The errant M-M experiment had ruled out ether. My invalidating M-M reinstates ether. Since variations in ether density and flow near massive objects can explain every observation that had purported to be a "prediction" of Einstein's, I assert that ether is the most fundamental energy source in the Universe(s).

9. Scientific worth is established by how many scientists you can lure to your backyard to see work you've done.

No votes are required. "Truths don't have egos; but lies surely do!"
— NoEinstein

.