

Re: Curing Einstein's Disease (is Copyrighted)

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2008-02/msg00032.html>

- *From:* Eric Gisse <jowr.pi@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 31 Jan 2008 21:30:50 -0800 (PST)
-

On Jan 31, 8:09 pm, NoEinstein <noEinst...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

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

Re: Curing Einstein's Disease (is Copyrighted)

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).

That "moron" revolutionized statistical mechanics, invented special and general relativity, and formed not only the _foundations_ of quantum mechanics but helped form some of the most important tests of quantum theory.

Oh, and he was awarded a Nobel prize.

Einstein screwed up by insisting that all observers must record observed events the same. Modern physicists screw up by letting that moron "play God" with the Laws of Nature, and without challenge.

Einstein made no such insistence.

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.

It is expected that the students not only understand what is on the board, but be able to derive what is written at a later date. There is nothing wrong with this. Especially since most often what is written on the board is a discussion of what is in the textbook – at least in undergraduate courses.

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?

Since you have no formal education in physics, I understand you don't know this so I'll explain it to you.

Nothing is taken on faith – every equation used is derived multiple times through multiple paths, and the reference for the equation is either the textbook itself or a reference written in the textbook.

Personally I can derive every single line you have ever used in classical mechanics, and many more you cannot use.

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.

You haven't the faintest idea what physicists do or do not do.

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.

Ahh, thank you. I was immediately sad when I made that reply to PD in thinking it was you because I thought what I was replying to was really stupid.

Go into a freshman physics lab and play with an air hockey table. It is rather easy to verify how kinetic energy behaves. Or talk to a crash investigator. Or read a fucking DMV manual that explains crash energy increases as the square of velocity.

So, for Coriolis, gravity discriminates by always applying the greatest force to the fastest object.

No. Gravity makes no such discrimination – the force is the same regardless of the particle. This is called the equivalence principle, by the way.

Re: Curing Einstein's Disease (is Copyrighted)

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)."

....and is wrong. Plain and simple.

This is a freshman in highschool class of observation.

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.

I didn't think you were stupid until after I read things that made me think you were stupid.

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.

Why? The messenger is the one who created the message, and the message is amazingly stupid.

Here's his premise:

1. Coriolis based his formula $(1/2)mv^2$ on an experiment with balls

Re: Curing Einstein's Disease (is Copyrighted)

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.

In Star Trek, ships can fly faster than light.

Children learn to distinguish from fiction and nonfiction at an early age – what's your excuse?

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

The only "various errors" are in your failure to understand classical physics and the exceedingly simple experimental methods required for testing.

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.

And your argument was nullified even easier by pointing out that you don't understand what an interferometer is and that Einstein didn't actually base his theories on anything Lorentz did.

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.

.....and the successful explanation of Mercury's perihelion precession. But don't let the facts get in your way, especially since there has been a lot of observations done since 1916.

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

Re: Curing Einstein's Disease (is Copyrighted)

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).

Are you aware that there have been successive versions of the Michelson–Morely experiment? You might want to do a literature search....

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

So why do you hide behind a pseudonym?

.