the general science journal

The Growing Evidence that Einstein was Wrong

jarybczyk@verizon.net

As development of the Millennium Theory of Relativity progresses, the evidence that Einstein was wrong continues to grow. Yet, there appears to be a stubborn resistance on the part of the scientific community to even examine this new evidence. In fact, it appears that they simply brush it aside in the hope that it will go away. A case in point: A world renown particle acceleration center continues to show on its website that Newton's kinetic energy formula,

$$k = \frac{1}{2}mv^2$$

cannot be successfully modified by gamma to correctly give the kinetic energy experienced at relativistic speeds, even though such modification was successfully accomplished last year in the millennium theories on energy. For those who are unaware of this, the formula is,

$$k = \frac{mc^2v^2}{c\sqrt{c^2 - v^2} + c^2 - v^2}$$

where k is kinetic energy, m is mass, v is speed, and c is the speed of light. This formula gives the same results as Einstein's formula and is superior to his formula for low Newtonian speeds because of an anomaly that was shown in the earlier millennium works. In the most recent paper, "Relativistic Motion Perspective" just now posted on the millennium website, this formula is re-derived to correct an oversight in the earlier works. The result was even more convincing then the original derivation and confirms the validity of the earlier findings. Additionally, in this latest work, the alternate Newtonian formula for kinetic energy,

$$k = mad$$

was also successfully modified, yielding a variety of new relativistic formulas for kinetic energy. One of particular interest is,

$$k = \frac{macvt}{c + \sqrt{c^2 - v^2}}$$

where a is the constant rate of acceleration, and t is the stationary frame time interval during which speed v is reached.

In re-deriving the kinetic energy formula for this latest work, another in depth examination of the relationship between mass and energy was unavoidable. Again, the author reaffirmed his original conclusion that mass is unaffected by acceleration. It is apparent nonetheless that the members of the scientific community are either unable to comprehend the evidence provided in the millennium theory, or simple don't care. This is unfortunate because future progress in the physical sciences would be greatly enhanced if everyone could come to agreement on this simple issue. To assist those who still have doubts as to the validity of the millennium findings, the following argument is offered:

If mass really does increase as a result of relativistic speeds, and if gravity is truly a function of mass, than wouldn't the gravity associated with the mass also experience an increase? And wouldn't this increase in gravity

be detectable at particle acceleration centers around the world where particles are accelerated to near light speeds on a daily basis? Or for that matter, in regard to the particles that come through the earth's atmosphere at such speeds on a daily basis?

On a final note: Recently on a respected TV science show it was indicated that humans can never be accelerated to such high speeds because they would be crushed by the increase in gravity associated with such speeds. Well, motion is relative and we are traveling at such speeds right now in regard to stars at the edge of the universe. Has anyone been crushed yet? And how about if we relate instead to a closer star? Does anyone feel a sudden change in gravitational force as they shift their gaze from one star to another in the night sky?

Yes, there is a case where acceleration to such speeds would crush us, but it has to do with inertia and not gravity, and it involves a form of acceleration that is outside the mainstream of science. But, that is another story.

For those who wish to develop an in depth understanding of how time variance works, please visit the millennium relativity website at,

http://www.mrelativity.net

and read the new research paper, "Relativistic Motion Perspective". This paper provides the first ever, common sense explanation for time variance yet to be written. Be prepared for many surprises.

Joseph A. Rybczyk