

## Re: Curing Einstein's Disease (is Copyrighted)

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2008-02/msg00058.html>

---

- *From:* PD <TheDraperFamily@xxxxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Fri, 1 Feb 2008 07:29:44 -0800 (PST)
- 

On Jan 31, 11:09 pm, NoEinstein <noeinst...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

... a post too rich to pass up. I'll only comment where I guffawed when I read.

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

Re: Curing Einstein's Disease (is Copyrighted)

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.

No physicist claims to inventing a law of nature. That's not what physicists do. They \*discover\* the laws by which nature works. Columbus did not invent the New World. He stumbled on it. He discovered it, where it had been laying the whole time. Einstein is credited for having \*found\* something fundamental about the way nature works and has always worked. You apparently have these crazy ideas about what scientists get credited for.

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.

No, he didn't. Where on earth did you ever read such claptrap?

Modern physicists screw up by letting that 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.

Not in my classes. The smart students just followed what I was doing by watching and questioning now and again, and then they went back to their dorm rooms or apartments and did it again for themselves. It was the not so smart students that were trying to write everything down so that they wouldn't have to work it out for themselves, and were so busy writing that they didn't have time to think of any questions, let alone asking them.

## Re: Curing Einstein's Disease (is Copyrighted)

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?

Of course not. The first equation should be tested in practical experiment (and good physics classes do just that) to demonstrate that they do in fact hold.

Ultimately, the only things that should be accepted are those that can withstand repeated analysis and question.

No, that's not enough. Analysis and question are not enough. Experimental test **MUST** be included.

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)."

As mentioned before, analysis and questioning do not a theorem make. The question is whether this matches reproducible experimental data. You perhaps have a deep misconception about how physical laws are determined.

Re: Curing Einstein's Disease (is Copyrighted)

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.

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!

I'll remind you that Good Will Hunting is a work of fiction written by two actors, Matt Daman and Ben Affleck. I'll also remind you that the subject matter there was mathematics and not physics.

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.

Here again, the quality of reason is determined by whether that reason stands up to experimental test. You have the attitude that if an experiment conflicts with your reasoning, then the experiment must be wrong. A physicist comes to precisely the opposite conclusion: if the result of reasoning conflicts with experiment, then the reasoning must be wrong. Nature informs us what the laws of nature are, we do not inform nature what the laws are. This is what separates what you're doing from science. It's fine that you dabble and play in the manner that you've been doing, but you should understand that it has nothing to do with science.

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

Sorry, that doesn't count as an experimental publication. Perhaps you'd like to see a model for what is included in a good experimental publication?

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.

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.

Actually, no he didn't. He based them on Galileo's principle of relativity and on Maxwell's discovered laws of electrodynamics,

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.

And a number of other things. Those "parlor tricks" are called comparison of theoretical predictions against experiment. It's how science is done. You should try it some time.

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.

Uh, no, it does no such thing. An experiment that indicates the effects of the ether would reinstated the ether. Do you have one of those?

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).

Re: Curing Einstein's Disease (is Copyrighted)

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.

You just keep telling yourself that. Your Profound Insight Into the Universe will just sit in your backyard then. Perhaps if you at least write it up, then someone might buy it at the estate auction along with the crockpot and the color TV.

"Truths don't have egos; but lies surely do!"  
— NoEinstein