

# NOESIS

The Journal of the Mega Society  
Number 107  
July 1995

EDITOR

R. Rosner

5139 Balboa Blvd #303

Encino CA 91316-3430

(818) 986-9177

Here's another reminder to **send in material**. Maybe a miracle will happen and it won't take three months to get published.

IN THIS ISSUE

COMMENTS ON NOESIS 102-104 & TO NORMA WITH LOVE AND FAILURE  
BY ROBERT DICK

COMMENTS ON NOESIS 102-104 BY RON HOEFLIN

HANNON REPLIES TO HIS CRITICS & OFFERS FOUR ARTICLES

$E=mc^2$  BY ROBERT HANNON

PYCNOGENOL, NATURE'S MIRACLE (AND BANE OF SPELLING BEE CONTESTANTS)  
BY H. SCOTT MORRIS

Comments on *Noesis* 102 thru 104

By Robert Dick  
13 Speer Street  
Somerville, NJ 08876  
rdick@haven.ios.com

I was glad to see Robert Hannon elaborate on his "wave analyzer" hypothesis so as to make it even easier than before to shoot it down. He writes (*Noesis* 102 p 12) "The validity of the Fourier Series has been verified by countless measurements." Not so. The Fourier series is mathematics, not physics. No amount of measurement can verify or refute it.

If, he claims, we could spectrum-analyze a pulse *completely* and *before* it ends, then the future would be determinate. This is just what we cannot do. Mr. Hannon's argument is similar to saying that Euclidean geometry "has been verified by countless measurements." Therefore, parallel lines never meet, therefore the Earth is flat! (This is only an hypothesis.)

At this point I will forsake my "psychotic obsession" (p 15) with Mr. Hannon and move on to less trivial topics. Kevin Langdon has provided us with a number of statements which are nontrivial and to which I would like to respond. First, (*Noesis* 103, p 8) on abortion:

I think abortion is wrong, an interference with something sacred, but I do not believe it should be illegal. Prohibition of something this popular is unworkable. It would endanger the lives of those who feel compelled to seek out underground (and therefore unregulated) medical facilities.

I think abortion is homicide. There is no good reason why homicide should be safe and comfortable for the killer.

Kevin quotes *Scientific American* on the supposed decline of the ozone layer. This claim is pure speculation. There is no known natural history of the ozone layer. It was never measured systematically until a few decades ago. What, for example, is the effect of the sunspot cycle on the ozone layer? We don't know.

At the risk of sounding paranoid, let me state that I do not trust *Scientific American*. It has never ever run a piece favorable to the defense of America and the West since the cold war began. Some say it is because the publisher's wife is a Communist. Anyway, it publishes ideology disguised as science.

Kevin continues: "The world's rainforests, marshes... continue to be destroyed..." Yes, swamps and jungles are being tamed. Places such as these, and deserts, and mountains, are all hostile to human life. Only wealthy people have the luxury of enjoying pestholes and wildernesses. As I said, capitalism and the production of more wealth are the only hopes of "saving" such places.

Kevin enters fantasyland in his claim that "Most scientists studying the earth and its waters and atmosphere now believe that global warming is a real phenomenon..." I know of one study that

refutes global warming definitively. A scientist studied a grove of "alerce" trees growing on the west coast of Chile. These are extremely long-lived trees, and the grove has been in existence for many millennia. The trees grew thick rings in warm years, and thin rings in cool years. It was therefore possible to trace global temperatures for many thousands of years. The earth has warmed and cooled many times over that span, but since the Industrial Revolution there has been no change in temperature.

Kevin grows ludicrous with his claim (p 10) that "The rise of deadly diseases like AIDS is a predictable consequence of overpopulation." Pardon me, but the sexual revolution gave rise to AIDS. It has been spread mainly by homosexuals. AIDS reared its ugly head just a decade or two after liberals and radicals insisted on legalizing and destigmatizing sodomy. It's as simple as that.

The possibility of deadly pandemics is, in my opinion, only too real. The problem is not overpopulation, it is ubiquitous transportation. A deadly virus could only too easily spread around the whole world in one or two weeks, allowing no time for a vaccine to be mass produced and administered. Suppose the world had only one tenth its present population, but the same networks and speed of transport. Instead of jumbo jets there would be small jets. Instead of clogged highways motoring would be a pleasure. Or conversely, let us assume that almost everyone takes mass transit, that darling of liberals and radicals. So much the worse! Contagions would spread just as fast as in our actual situation.

I do not know how to prevent deadly pandemics. Perhaps after they happen once or twice there will be quarantine procedures based not on symptoms of disease but just on the mere possibility of disease. Perhaps there will be perverse people who will take it upon themselves to cut "overpopulation" by deliberately developing deadly viruses and releasing them on purpose. These are vital subjects that I invite all the members of the Mega Society to comment on.

Kevin reveals his religious beliefs when he writes that "There are too many people for humanity to live in harmony with nature." I do not believe in living in harmony with nature. I believe nature was made for man, not man for nature. We should be good stewards of nature, not for the sake of the furbish lousewort or the snail darter, but for the sake of our posterity.

It is people with Kevin's mentality that outlawed DDT, a compound that has prolonged more human life than any other chemical in history. At one time the widespread application of DDT so suppressed malaria in India that the life expectancy of the entire population of that country was increased by more than a decade. Since the banning of DDT the Indian death rate went back up again. If this is "harmony with nature" I want none of it.

Finally, I find Kevin's statement on "major tranquilizers" and antidepressants to be perverse in the extreme (*Noesis* 104, p 10):

These drugs dull one's consciousness. I have known many people who used them and, without exception, they were sleepwalking through life—even more so than is generally the case in Western society, in which people are lost in dreams of material wealth, comfort, and ego-inflation. In my opinion, the use of these medications by the

psychiatric "profession" is nothing short of criminal.

No matter what your condition, these drugs are a cure worse than the disease...

Kevin does not know what he is talking about. The phenothiazines have been responsible for breaking the shackles off millions of mental patients. These drugs are known medically as major tranquilizers, but their true function is to act as anti-psychosis agents. True, they slow down your brain, but that is precisely what millions of people need.

Until about 1960 half the hospital beds in the United States were mental hospital beds. Today the big mental hospitals are closing, possibly too quickly. Why? Because of major tranquilizers.

I don't know what more to write about this. The liberals and radicals are doing a grave disservice to America's mentally ill by badmouthing the best thing that has ever happened to them.

## To Norma with Love and Failure

By Robert Dick, 13 Speer Street, Somerville, NJ 08876

I cannot say with any confidence what is sickness and what is health. Maybe we should just accept ourselves and our experiences just as they happen, and not label certain aspects morbid or diseased. At least that seems to be the lesson a psychologist taught me while I was a patient at a state hospital.

Norma was quite petite, quite blonde, and quite a girl. She had a long history of hospitalization, going back to the days before the phenothiazines revolutionized psychiatry. For a while I was the only young man in our unit, and then she would hold me enthralled for hours with stories from her past. She had had over a hundred shock treatments. She was epileptic. She was almost a nurse, but had run away to a "Jesus-people" commune rather than graduate. Her mother had been literally a witch. A jilted fiance had poured sugar in her gas tank and had taken a shot at her. As a teenager, in a blizzard a sign had fallen from atop a store and had fractured her skull (she attributed her epilepsy to that accident). She married her high school sweetheart, and he used to come home from work for lunch just for extra chances to make love to her. Later, he played around and brought a floozy home with him while very drunk. Norma took a frying pan and bashed his head in for that. She escaped being imprisoned for assault only by entering a state hospital. She had been in jail for shoplifting a sweater. She had been confined to a "disturbed" ward. She had prepared dead bodies for burial as a favor to the hospital staff. She had been a man's mistress. She had been a woman's mistress. She had been a drug addict. She... In spite of all that (or because of it?) to say that she was fascinating to me would be a gross understatement. I was more moved than when I first read *All Quiet on the Western Front*.

In his book *The Self in Psychotic Process*, Dr. John Perry wrote that often a psychosis works itself out as a kind of healing process, straightening out the psyche of someone profoundly wounded from the lack of his or her mother's love in infancy. The process comes to its grand finale, according to Perry, with a readiness to love, with a readiness for a love affair. I don't know about the infancy part, but the love affair part seems right on. Except that there is no guarantee that said affair will be mutual with the beloved.

Whatever thing we had going, Norma eventually let me know that she had none of the passion for me that I had for her. Actually, I had been extremely passive about the whole thing, not telling her how profoundly she had affected me. I think it was because somehow I knew that I had to be careful with this appalling woman. Anyway, when she told me I was desolate. I was broken.

My social worker told me that Norma would not let anyone "get close to her. That's part of her sickness. We figured it would be better to let you find out for yourself." I guess there is a wound that heals.

My psychologist had me draw up a list of plus and minuses of how I felt about Norma. I assigned point values. The pluses just barely outnumbered the minuses. He said that that showed

the relationship was very risky. Actually, I cheated. I assigned more points to the pluses to make it come out positive. My feelings for this object of my grand passion were precisely neutral! I date my recovery from Norma's rejection of me from that point.

Soon I began to reach this assessment of Norma: She was a virtuoso of failure. You name the mode of failure, and if it was at all possible Norma would do it. And she would continue to find new ways to fail. Some time after I got out of the hospital I found out that she was pregnant. Of course. She hadn't been an unwed mother before, so she had to do it. The last time I saw her was a few months after her son Jason was born. The psychologist told me a year or two later that Norma married a friend she had known previously.

Years later, after better experiences of friendship and love, I was utterly appalled by the thought that once the thing I had wanted most was to marry Norma. Of all the things she did, that she once totaled a car she was driving because of an epileptic seizure summed up for me her total lack of responsibility.

Norma, my lady of failure, I remember you still with affection. You were the first stranger, the very first, to share with me the milk of human kindness in a way I could fully accept. I remember you from a distance, and I'm glad it's from a distance. You always generated as much erotic heat in those around you as you possibly could, and then—you moved on. I hope you have found some measure of peace and health, as I have. But I doubt it.

May 3, 1995

Ronald K. Hoeflin  
P. O. Box 539  
New York, NY 10101

Dear Rick Rosner:

The following are a few comments on the last three issues of Noesis --particularly the remarks of Kevin Langdon.

(1) In issue #103, page 7, Kevin says regarding the idea of Rick Rosner and Chris Cole to require ten pages of material from each member per year, "Who the hell do you two bozos think you are to dictate to the members of the Mega Society?" Yet Kevin apparently sees no dictating when he remarks in issue #104, page 6, regarding the verbal problems I constructed to which Chris Cole revealed his answers (one of which was wrong, incidentally), "No item that has been the subject of these discussions can be used [in any new test I, Ron Hoeflin, construct] as the answers are now public information." But since the circulation of Noesis is only 25 or 30, I personally do not consider this sufficiently "public" to bar use of the test items in, say, Omni magazine. I would simply have to exclude the readers of Noesis from taking the test. If Noesis readers were to share their answers with others, that would be little different from a person who scored high on the LAIT or Mega Tests sharing his or her answers with others--a shortcoming that none of these self-administered tests are immune to. To sum up, then, Kevin does not speak for me on this matter, and I really do not appreciate his ex cathedra tone.

Kevin also asserts in issue 103, page 11, that "The Hyper Test Ron has written about, which will contain his best spatial problems, will be much less strongly loaded on crystallized intelligence and will have a higher ceiling than the Mega Test." Here again Kevin is jumping the gun and speaking for me when in fact his assertion is incorrect. If I do construct a Hyper Test, it is likely to consist of 100 of the best items from my Mega, Titan, and Ultra tests, of which 50 would be verbal analogies and 50 would be non-verbal items. Conceivably the test could be divided into a separate verbal test of 50 items and a non-verbal test of 50 items. The latter would then be suitable for translation into foreign languages. It would probably include some numerical items, since I do not think I have enough spatial items in my three tests to construct an independent test. At any rate, I have not reached any final conclusions about all this, since I have been focusing my energies on the completion of my book, Decoding Philosophy, which already exceeds 1,000 typed, double-spaced pages. I may never complete my Ultra Test, much less a Hyper Test or some purely spatial test derivative from the latter if no outlet for the test manifests itself. Neither Omni nor the Triple Nine Society has expressed an interest so far. (Triple Nine had, through one of its officers, Clint Williams, expressed an interest in a timed, supervised test consisting of multiple-choice items derived from my Mega and Titan tests, but Mr. Williams seemed strangely incapable of fathoming the need to renom such a test rather than relying on norms based on untimed, non-multiple-choice tests. In any case, when I suggested to Clint that he make use of my new Ultra Test, perhaps suitably modified for timed, supervised use, he evinced zero interest in the proposal. Kevin's discussion of the low difference between timed and untimed test scores in issue #103, page 18, is perhaps intended as an indirect support for Mr. Williams position.)

(2) In issue 104, page 13, Kevin sums up his criticism of Ron Yannone's Creationism by stating, "'Creation science' is an oxymoron. And Ron Yannone makes Robert Hannon look rational." Yet we get a glimpse of Kevin's own bizarre intellectual landscape when we see his references in issue 104, page 11, to Gurdjieff and Ouspensky as his own intellectual gurus. Since I have not studied either of these writers sufficiently to pontificate on their shortcomings, let me try a different approach.

I think it can be shown that Kevin's critique of free will suffers from analogous intellectual problems to those that Creationism does. What Creationism can't adequately explain is why it is as if the world were billions of years old rather than the mere thousands specified in the Bible. Fossils could perhaps be explained as artifacts that God left around to lead the unfaithful astray. But then God would be a deceiver, which seems inconsistent with his purportedly all-good nature. The ancient Greeks invented a dictum in connection with the motions of the planets, namely, that the scientist's role is to "save the appearances." We might add to this the dictum of William of Ockham that "entities are not to be multiplied without necessity," which means, in other words, that we should save the appearances with the most efficient and simple intellectual machinery possible if we want to get at the truth. Now just as Creationists leave the fossils out there dangling in mid-air without efficient explanation, we find that Kevin also leaves something out of his system of thought, dangling in mid-air. In issue 104, page 7, he criticizes vocabulary items on the grounds that they merely require "familiarity" rather than "struggle." But in issue 103, page 12, he says that we have "delusions of agency," since Kevin believes, as he remarks on that same page, that "'voluntary' muscular action" can be given a "mechanical," i.e., deterministic, explanation. Now the problem with mechanism is that it has no evident use for a feeling of struggle or muscular strain at all. The feelings are dangling out there in mid-air just as fossils are for Creationists with no rationale for their existence.

The puzzle is that Kevin appears to struggle mightily to convince us of his points of view. But if this whole process is mechanical, then what possible difference could it make what we believe? We would be like shadows who are condemned to go wherever our masters walk. The decisions are not our concern, since we merely fall in line with whatever Destiny--in the form of a mechanized universe--has in store for us. So there is really an inherent contradiction in Kevin's system, just as there is one in the Creationist's position. Neither position saves the appearances efficiently and economically. One of the major goals of my own book, Decoding Philosophy, will be to show how virtually all of the major metaphysical outlooks that have been devised, including both mechanism and mysticism, can be integrated within a single coherent and elegant system of thought. Without slipping, I hope, into any form of "crackpotism."

Sincerely,

*Ron Hoeflin*



ROBERT J. HANNON  
2 May 95

4473 Staghorn Lane

Sarasota FL 34238-5626

Rick Rosner · NOESIS · 5139 Balboa Blvd · Encino CA 91316-3430

Dear Rick,

In response to Robert Low's A BRIEF NOTE ON THE DERIVATION OF THE LORENTZ TRANSFORMATION (Noesis 103, p4).

1) I have not (yet) published anything in TELICOM or NOESIS or elsewhere in which I claim that the ELT is "wrong". I have said that (assuming it is otherwise correct) it is algebraically incomplete by virtue of not being reduced to its simplest possible form. As they stand the ELT equations are physical impossibilities because they are dimensionally incorrect.

2) Your argument that the ELT is predicated on the conditional "hypothesis":

$$xP = CtP \text{ if and only if } XP' = CtP'$$

(which is the same as  $x/t=C$  if and only if  $x'/t'=C$ .)

indicates only that you do not remember that the results of conditional analyses are valid only when all conditions are fulfilled. The ELT derived on that premise is true only when:

$$xP = CtP \text{ and } XP' = CtP'$$

(which is the same as  $x/t = C$  and  $x'/t' = C$ .)

and can not be applied to situations in which that equality is not true.

You have actually proven my point.

Your conditional statement may be "the hypothesis used" where you operate, but it isn't elsewhere; it changes nothing.

No such conditional statement appears in either of Einstein's derivations. It does not appear in any of the many "different" derivations I have read, excepting only the one which includes your "hypothesis".

3) What do you imagine the constant velocities  $V$  and  $C$  means in physics and kinematics?

Best regards,



Robert J. Hannon

COPY 19 JUNE 95

ROBERT J HANNON            4473 Staghorn Lane            Sarasota FL 34238-5626  
26 April 95

KEVIN LANGDON, Box 795, Berkeley CA 94701

Dear Kevin,

Reading your letter on p9 of NOESIS 104, I wonder what can be the factual premises of your gratuitous slurs.

1) You say "Mr Hannon's writings are full of elementary errors and show that the author has not taken the trouble to understand the things he's criticizing."

What are these "elementary errors"? What is the basis of your judgment that they are errors?

What is the factual basis for your judgment that I have not taken the trouble to understand the things I criticize? Clearly from your later comments, you don't understand those subjects, so how can you judge my level of understanding?

2) You go on, "Others with more expertise in this field than I have pointed out many of these errors; I will not add to their critiques."

Who are the experts to which you refer? When did they point out "many" (indeed, a single one) of my errors? I'll appreciate specific references, as I am unaware of any cold, objective, scientifically-sound refutation of any of my views by any member of Mega or ISPE.

Do you presume that anyone who disagrees with me is necessarily more "expert" than I? If so, what is the premise of such a view?

3) Fundamental physics (such as relativity) presents a challenge to the intellect. I find it appalling that so few members of any of the "High IQ" groups seem truly interested in the subject. I also find it truly peculiar that so many claim a lack of understanding of freshman-level math.

I am bored to distraction by articles on religion, the colon, IQ testing, and puzzles. Nevertheless, I read them in NOESIS, in the hope of finding something of value. I had hoped to find really innovative thinking in the "High IQ" groups. I have been sadly disappointed.

4) Chris Langan's "letters" to me in NOESIS have been pure arrogant BS. He simply doesn't comprehend the fundamentals of special relativity.

5) You say, "Ron Yannone makes Robert Hannon look rational."

What is the factual basis of your judgment of my rationality?

6) I barely knew ~~Michelle Maccubbin~~ until she was defending me as an individual. She was defending the intellectual right of people to hold and express unorthodox views without being ridiculed by the

arrogant who always presume to know better. Apparently you are one of that truly sad group who believe that only they are competent to hold views on any complex subject.

7) Rick and Chris publish my writings because they obviously receive an inadequate supply of printable stuff from the members. Langan is an example. It's possible that there is a great idea buried in his jargon, but it is not available to the rest of us because he is unable to express his ideas in plain English. Early on, I attempted correspondence with him, but gave up when he tried to impose rules on my use of the language.

Personally, I will be pleased to be nothing but a subscriber to NOESIS, when my writings are squeezed out by the truly superior ideas and views presented by the great geniuses who are members of Mega.

In the two years or so that I have been a subscriber, I have not found much of genius-level merit in NOESIS.

8) You refer to my "prolific output of material at a level of quality significantly below the standard, such as it is, of this journal."

What is the basis of your judgment of the quality of my writings?

9) I look forward to receiving your answers to my questions, so that I may have even a glimmer of understanding of the workings of an intellect purported to be vastly superior to mine.

Most sincerely,

Robert J. Hannon

PS: My unpublished paper THE DERIVATIONS OF THE EINSTEIN-LORENTZ TRANSFORMATION will be presented on 24 May to the regional meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science to be held at the University of Oklahoma.

ROBERT J. HANNON 4473 Staghorn Lane Sarasota FL 34238-5626  
15 June 95

Rick Roemer · NOESIS · 5129 Balboa Blvd · Encino CA 91316-3430

Dear Rick,

Enclosed are four more articles involving my crackpot science, which you may publish in NOESIS if you want.

1) **MASS AND RELATIVE VELOCITY** offers a fairly simple explanation of the apparent variation of mass with relative velocity, using only classical physics. I derive the "relativistic mass equation" using only the physics of Coulomb and Newton. The only "new" idea involved is the recognition of an established fact of nature. This is entirely original with me.

2) **ON TIME DILATION** explains the apparent increase of the half-life of unstable particles moving at near light speed, using only classical physics. The only "new" idea involved is the recognition of an established fact of nature. This is entirely original with me.

3)  **$E = mc^2$**  is mostly historical and educational. I'm sure most of your readers are not aware that  $E = mc^2$  was discovered before Einstein, and does not require Special Relativity. I'm also sure that most have never seen Einstein's derivation. This paper contains one of the pre-Einstein derivations of that equation, and Einstein's 1905 relativistic derivation. The only Hannon content other than the connective narrative is par 3, in which I point out the most glaring flaw (there are many others) in Einstein's derivation.

I suspect that if Einstein's derivation alone were published under my name rather than Einstein's, your readers would call it crackpot science....and they would be right.

4) **THE DERIVATIONS OF THE EINSTEIN-LORENTZ TRANSFORMATION** offers easily-understood algebraic proof that both of Einstein's derivations are incorrect. This paper was presented on 24 May 95 at the regional meeting of the AAAS held at Oklahoma State University. It is seventeen pages long because I quote Einstein at length so that my readers will know what he actually said (as opposed to the BS often found in textbooks). It also includes proof that the generic transformation equations can not produce the ELT without  $w/t=C=X/T$ . It is written as three independent sections, which could be published separately.

Best regards,



Robert J. Hannon

EMC2.TXT

Revised 14 June 95

E = mc<sup>2</sup>

ROBERT J. HANNON 4473 Staghorn Lane Sarasota FL 34238-5626  
14 June 95

Einstein is almost universally credited with the discovery (published in 1905) of the world-famous relationship  $E = mc^2$ , which was the premise for the development of the atomic bomb and nuclear power plants. Others derived  $E = mc^2$  years before Einstein, using the classical physics of Newton and Maxwell.

Numerous experiments indicate that, in nuclear reactions involving a loss of mass, E does appear to equal  $mc^2$ . This is generally accepted as proof of Einstein's Theory of Special Relativity. However, is the physical reason for this actually that postulated by Einstein?

While Einstein's 1905 derivation is based on his Theory of Special Relativity, in 1948 he published his non-relativistic "Elementary Derivation of the Equivalence of Mass and Energy", which is based on the "law of aberration of light".

The pre-Einstein derivations are predicated on the idea that electromagnetic radiation (EMR) such as light has "momentum" and exerts "pressure". Maxwell calculated the force (F) exerted by EMR of energy (E) to be:

$$F = (1/C)(dE/dt) \quad (A)$$

where C = the velocity of propagation of EMR in empty space.  $dE/dt$  is the rate of change of energy with time.

$$\text{In Newtonian mechanics: } F = ma \quad (B)$$

$$\text{where } m = \text{mass and } a = \text{acceleration. And: } ma = dp/dt \quad (C)$$

where  $p = \text{momentum} = mv$ , where  $v = \text{velocity}$ .

1) One pre-Einstein derivation is as follows:

$$F = dp/dt = (1/C)(dE/dt) \quad (1-1)$$

$$\text{Therefore: } (dE/dt)/(dp/dt) = C = dE/dp \quad (1-2)$$

Then, assuming C is constant:

$$E/p = C, \text{ or } p = E/C \quad (1-3)$$

Since  $p = mv$ , and, since  $v = C$  because EMR always moves at C, then:

$$p = mC \quad (1-4)$$

$$\text{So: } dp = Cdm \quad (1-5)$$

Substituting (1-3) into (1-5):

$$\begin{aligned} da &= dp/C = dE/C^2 \\ dE &= daC^2 \end{aligned} \quad (1-6)$$

and integrating both sides:  $E = aC^2$  (1-7)

Derived in this way,  $E = aC^2$  is valid for any mass regardless of its velocity or other dynamics.

This derivation is premised on what were, at the time, unproven theoretical assumptions: (a) C is a constant, (b) EMR has momentum (which is a mechanical concept) which can be equated with  $aC$ , (c) mass is a variable. Equation (1-1) can not state the EMR has momentum without the more subtle but vital presumption that the seemingly independent "mechanical" and "electromagnetic" domains contain phenomena that are equivalent and interchangeable. This was a reasonable idea in the late 19th century, but only in theory.

2) Einstein's 1905 relativistic derivation ("Does the Inertia of a Body depend upon its Energy-content?" *Annalen der Physik*, 17, 1905) is based on the specific physical situation fundamental to Special Relativity: two Euclidian, Cartesian, Systems of Coordinates (SCs) in constant, linear, translatory, relative motion at velocity V. SC-K has coordinate axes x,y,z and time t. SC-K0 has coordinate axes X,Y,Z and time T. The coordinate axes of the two SCs are parallel and the x-axis coincides with the X-axis. Velocity V is such that the origin x=0 is moving in the direction of increasing x relative to the origin x=0.

Einstein first tells us that on the principles of his previous investigation ("On the Electrodynamics of Moving Bodies", *Annalen der Physik*, 17, 1905) he has "deduced, among other things, the following result:"

$$E_x = E[(1-(V/C)\cos\theta)]/[1-(V^2/C^2)] \quad (2-1)$$

- where: E = the energy of a system of plane waves of light measured in SC-K.
- $E_x$  = the energy of the same system of plane waves of light measured in SC-K0
- $\theta$  = the angle "the wave-normal" of the plane waves of light makes with the x-axis (of SC-K).
- V = the velocity of x=0 relative to x=0 in the direction of increasing x.
- C = the velocity of light.

Then Einstein proceeds: "Let there be a stationary body in the system [SC-K], and let its energy-referred to the system [SC-K] be  $E_0$ . Let the energy of the body relative to the system [SC-K0] moving as above with the velocity V, be  $H_0$ . Let this body send out, in a direction making an angle  $\theta$  with the axis of x, plane waves of light, of energy  $\frac{1}{2}Er$  measured relatively to [SC-K], and simultaneously an equal quantity of light in the opposite direction. Meanwhile the body remains at rest with respect to the

system [SC-K]. The principle of energy must apply to this process, and in fact (by the principle of relativity) with respect to both systems of coordinates. If we call the energy of the body after the emission of light  $E(1)$  or  $H(1)$  respectively, measured relatively to [SC-K] or [SC-K0] respectively, then by employment of Equation (2-1) we obtain:

$$E_0 = E(1) + \frac{1}{2}Er + \frac{1}{2}Er \quad (2-2)$$

$$H_0 = H(1) + \frac{1}{2}Er \left( \frac{[1-(V/C)\cos\theta]}{[1-(V^2/C^2)]} \right) + \frac{1}{2}Er \left( \frac{[1+(V/C)\cos\theta]}{[1-(V^2/C^2)]} \right)$$

$$H_0 = H(1) + Er / [1-(V^2/C^2)] \quad (2-3)$$

By subtraction we obtain from these equations

$$(H_0 - E_0) - [H(1) - E(1)] = Er \left( \frac{[1-(V^2/C^2)] - 1}{[1-(V^2/C^2)]} \right) \quad (2-4)$$

The two differences of the form H-E occurring in [(2-4)] have simple physical significations. H and E are energy values of the same body referred to two systems of coordinates which are in motion relatively to each other, the body being at rest in one of the two systems [SC-K]. Thus it is clear that the difference H-E can differ from the kinetic energy K of the body, with respect to the other system [SC-K0], only by an additive constant (Q), which depends on the choice of the arbitrary additive constants of the energies H and E. Thus we may place:

$$H_0 - E_0 = K_0 + Q \quad (2-5)$$

$$H(1) - E(1) = K(1) + Q \quad (2-6)$$

since Q does not change during the emission of light. So we have

$$K_0 - K(1) = Er \left( \frac{[1-(V^2/C^2)] - 1}{[1-(V^2/C^2)]} \right) \quad (2-7)$$

The kinetic energy of the body with respect to [SC-K0] diminishes as a result of the emission of light, and the amount of the diminution is independent of the properties of the body.....

Neglecting magnitudes of the fourth and higher orders, we may place

$$K_0 - K(1) = \frac{1}{2}Er(V^2/C^2) \quad (2-8)$$

Through this point,  $m$ , the mass of the "body", is not mentioned in Einstein's analysis.  $m$  does not appear in (2-7) or (2-8). Then Einstein says:

"If a body gives off energy  $Er$  in the form of radiation, its mass diminishes by  $Er/C^2$ . The fact that the energy withdrawn from the body becomes energy of radiation evidently makes no difference, as that we are led to the more general conclusion that

The mass of a body is a measure of its energy-content; if the energy changes by  $Er$ , the mass changes in the same sense by

$(E_r/C^2)$ .

where does equation (2-8) come from? Einstein elsewhere had assumed: "...the kinetic energy of a material point of mass  $m$  is no longer given by the well-known expression

$$E_k = mv^2/2 \quad (2-9)$$

but by the expression

$$E_k = mC^2/(1-V^2/C^2) \quad (2-10)$$

....If we develop the expression for the kinetic energy in the form of a series, we obtain

$$E_k = mC^2 + mv^2/2 + (3/8)m(V^4/C^2) + \dots \quad (2-11)$$

When  $V^2/C^2$  is small compared with unity, the third of these terms is always small in comparison with the second, which last alone is considered in classical mechanics. The first term  $mC^2$  does not contain the velocity, and requires no consideration if we are dealing only with questions as to how the energy of a point-mass depends on velocity." In the same article, Einstein later explains, "... the term  $mC^2$ ...is nothing else than the energy possessed by the body..."

While this may explain "Neglecting magnitudes of the fourth and higher orders", it does not yield (2-8). The series of (2-11) is derived from  $E_k = mC^2/(1-V^2/C^2)$ , and, from (2-7),  $K_0 = E_r/(1-V^2/C^2)$ , so:

$$\begin{aligned} E_k &= K_0 \\ mC^2/(1-V^2/C^2) &= E_r/(1-V^2/C^2), \\ m &= E_r/C^2 \end{aligned}$$

Substituting this into  $mv^2/2$  yields (2-8).

Where does (2-10) come from? Einstein doesn't explain. Here is an explanation. If the kinetic energy of a mass  $m$  is  $mv^2/2$ , then, since light must always travel at  $C$ , the kinetic energy of light must be  $mC^2$ , so:

$$mv^2/2 = mC^2$$

So:

$$E_r = mC^2$$

(The factor  $1/2$  in  $mv^2/2$  is due to the fact that a mass must accelerate from  $V=0$  to  $V=V$ , so its average energy is  $1/2$  of its peak energy  $mv^2$ .)

A change in kinetic energy due to emission of light is:

$$K_0 - K(1) = mC^2((1/(1-V^2/C^2)) - 1) \quad (2-7a)$$

So before emitting the rays of light:

$$K_0 = mC^2/(1-V^2/C^2)$$

and since  $K_0 = E_k$  before emitting the light rays:

$$E_k = mC^2/(1-V^2/C^2)$$

3) The most astounding aspect of Einstein's derivation is that, assuming it is physically and algebraically valid, it does not apply to "bodies" that are not in motion. Einstein's entire analysis is predicated on assumed differences in the "energy" of a "body" and of light rays when measured relative to two SCs that are in a specific kind of relative motion. If the SC containing the "body" is not in motion at  $V$  relative to the other SC, (that is,  $V=0$ ) his equation:

$$E_k = E((1-(V/C)\cos\theta)/(1-V^2/C^2)) \quad (2-1)$$

becomes  $E_k = E$  (2-1a)

and his entire analysis collapses, as follows:

$$E_0 = E(1) + E_r \quad (2-2a)$$

$$M_0 = M(1) + E_r \quad (2-3a)$$

$$M_0 - E_0 = M(1) - E(1) \quad (2-4a)$$

$$M_0 - E_0 - [M(1) - E(1)] = 0$$

Since, according to Einstein:

$$M_0 - E_0 = K_0 + c \quad (2-5a)$$

$$\text{and: } M(1) - E(1) = K(1) + c \quad (2-6a)$$

$$\text{Then: } K_0 - K(1) = 0 \quad (2-7a)$$

and, according to Einstein:

$$K_0 - K(1) = E_r((1/(1-V^2/C^2)) - 1) \quad (2-7)$$

$$\text{So: } E_r((1/(1-V^2/C^2)) - 1) = 0 = E_k$$

$$\text{And: } E_k = 0, \text{ not } mE_r(V^2/C^2)$$

$$\text{and, when } V=0, \text{ his equation: } E_k = mC^2/(1-V^2/C^2)$$

from which he obtained  $E = mC^2$ , is without any physical or algebraic foundation.

Dear Friend,

Testimonials by various kinds of doctors using this product on their patients is overwhelming. The enclosed tape is just one such example. Whether you listen to one of the testimonials by a chiropractor, an M.D., a plastic surgeon, a heart surgeon, or many others, the story is always the same. Listen to the tape, you'll see what I mean. You owe it to yourself to listen to this tape for your personal health, regardless of how you presently feel.

Opportunity has just knocked. Now it's up to you! Call me for more information. You'll be glad that you did! If you would like to call me after listening to the enclosed tape, I will share with you how this product has dramatically improved my health. This information can be very financially rewarding to you as well!

This is the greatest home business opportunity to ever come across your desk. Guaranteed!

Sincerely,

H. Scott Morris  
1-219-836-4240

## PYCNOGENOL!

• NATURE'S MIRACLE •

- The world's most powerful sponsoring tape is made by a doctor in which he reports the phenomenal results obtained in using Pycnogenol. He describes his personal experiences on himself and his patients using this powerful all natural antioxidant superfood.

### IT'S A NETWORK MARKETERS DREAM COME TRUE!

- Pycnogenol is the world's most powerful antioxidant. Researchers have shown Pycnogenol to be 50 times more powerful than Vitamin E and 20 times more powerful than Vitamin C against free radicals.
- NO sign up fee. NO inventory. NO breakage fees. NO group volume. Toll free 800# ordering. Powerfully simple marketing plan with unlimited width paying 6 levels deep. Plus an infinity bonus.
- Call now to receive your free copy of this powerful tape. For once in your life, be first with a unique company that lets you duplicate yourself simply by handing out this powerful tape. If you listen to only one tape this year... this is it.

FOR YOUR FREE TAPE CALL (219) 836-4240 NOW!

# NEW SUPERNUTRIENT

## FIGHTS AGING AND DISEASE!

Like Vitamins C and E, Pycnogenol (pronounced pick-NAH-jen-ol) is an antioxidant - a chemical that neutralizes unstable or "radical" oxygen molecules that wreak havoc on your body's cells. When these "free radical" molecules go unchecked, they degrade collagen, reprogram DNA and are implicated in more than 60 diseases. Aging, inflammation and improper functioning of the circulatory, nervous and immune systems often result from free radical damage.

Our bodies naturally produce some antioxidants, and Vitamins A, C, E and Beta Carotene are others. But all natural Pycnogenol has been shown in clinical studies to be 20 times more effective than Vitamin C and 50 times more effective than Vitamin E as an antioxidant. In fact, Pycnogenol appears to be the most powerful antioxidant ever discovered!

### The "Youth Nutrient"

Scientists in Europe have dubbed Pycnogenol "the youth nutrient" because they find its free radical scavenging effectiveness slows cell mutation. Pycnogenol also helps keep collagen in healthy condition, inhibiting the natural enzymes your body produces that normally break collagen down. It actually has the ability to bind to collagen and help collagen fibers rebuild their crosslinks to reverse the damage

caused by injury and free radical attack. This collagen build-up helps return flexibility and suppleness to skin, allowing it to function as an "oral cosmetic." It also returns flexibility to joints, arteries and other tissues.

### Special Benefits to Smokers

The noted French professor who discovered and researched Pycnogenol maintains that this super-nutrient acts in a special "synergy" with Vitamin C. Together they increase capillary strength and lower the permeability of the capillary wall, making it easier for cells to accept nutrients and eliminate wastes. At the same time, a protective barrier is created that helps ward off infection.

Circulation is improved, offering strong benefits to smokers, diabetics, stroke victims and women who take oral contraceptives. Research also shows Pycnogenol to be highly successful in treating capillary fragility conditions such as varicose veins, diabetic retinopathy, edematous legs, ulcers and other inflammatory conditions in veins and capillaries.

Pycnogenol also reduces histamine production, helping the linings of arteries resist attack by allergens which contribute to cardiovascular disease. One famous British medical scholar has referred to Pycnogenol as "the arteriosclerosis antidote."

Amazing Pycnogenol is a natural herb food factor extracted from the bark of the French maritime pine. This pure nutrient has undergone extensive testing in such renowned research centers as the Pasteur Institute, the Huntington Institute and others. It contains no solvent residues, or synthetic additives or other dyes.

### Other Incredible Health Benefits

Pycnogenol has been shown to benefit asthma sufferers and help relieve the pain and symptoms of osteoarthritis, arthritis, rheumatism and rheumatic fever. It inhibits the formation of enzymes that cause allergies and inflammation. Another benefit is the ability to penetrate the blood-brain barrier to protect the blood vessels in the brain from oxidation. Thus, free radical quenching can take place in the brain.

According to some scientists, Pycnogenol may be viewed as the antidote to the pressures and environmental pollution in today's world.

