

In the Memory of Bert Schreiber.

Today I have learned, that Bert Schreiber have died October 19. It is very sad!

With Bert Schreiber I have met January 10 this year. This day I have received from him the letter (see. App. 1), in which he offered me to get acquainted with his works. In the answer I have written, that many our conclusions coincide. Practically identical titles of our papers testify to it even:

Titles of Bert Schreiber's papers	Titles of Joseph Smulsky's papers
FALSITIES IN CURRENT THEORIES	The Main Mistakes of Modern Science
Nonexistent Forces	Force Cannot Depend on Acceleration
Black Holes Do Not Exist	The "Black Hole": Superstition of the 20-th Century
GOODBYE RELATIVITY - HELLO REALITY	A MANIFESTO: RETURN TO REALITY

In reciprocal Bert Schreiber's letter from January 31 was two such phrases.

“Your #2: You are the very first person who ever agreed with me on my SP#3 and #8.

We are in agreement on many items. How we get there is immaterial. No one theory is the true theory anyway, including mine. It is how many of the end results agree and are probably the truth”.

I also for the first time in life have met the person who has come to the same conclusions, as I.

Bert Schreiber to me wrote: “I know I am asking you to read a lot of my papers, but all are important and if you read them you will see why”. However I was severely ill and might not work much.

In this letter he has informed me also about Steven J. Crothers works: “I received a few days ago some e-mails from Steven J. Crothers on Black Holes. I am going to forward them to you as they are EXTREMELY IMPORTANT. PLEASE let me know if you received them. What is in these is why I have to start from scratch on my Black Hole works.”

I began to get acquainted with Steven J. Crothers works and began to discuss them with S Steven J. Crothers and with Bert Schreiber. Steven J. Crothers is battling with black holers and big bangers. Therefore in the letter of June 4 to him I have written: “It is very good for science, if we in trio will write two papers about black hole and big bang with different point of view. You have my and Bert Schreiber's materials about black holes. As you is more youthful from us and has many strength, I suggest you to write a drag of paper about black hole. Then I and Bert Schreiber will correct it, and you will send the paper to Journal”.

In last letter of February 11 (see. App. 2) Bert Schreiber has presented a number of the interesting ideas and has given comments to my report “THE REAL FORCES And UNREAL HYPOTHESES” for NPA's May 2007 Conference at UConn-Storrs. I have formed an educated reply on this letter and in the near future was going to write it. Unfortunately I was late.

The absurdity of the contemporary theoretical physics has exasperated many talented people all over the world, and they excitedly were engaged in exposure of its mistakes. Many of them have with that admitted theirs mistakes. Some of them have proved an inaccuracy of several positions of the Theory of Relativity. I think, that Bert Schreiber was one of those who saw almost all mistakes of the theoretical physics. Its works are necessary for studying and using for elimination of all mistakes in the contemporary science.

When the well-known notable scientist leaves life, it is spoken that the Science has suffered heavy loss. I believe, we should tell, that the contemporary science has suffered heavy loss because Bert Schreiber was not in its numbers!

A chief scientist of the Institute of Earth's Cryosphere of Siberian Branch of Russian Academy of Sciences, doctor of physical-mathematical sciences, professor of theoretical and applied mechanics
29.10.2007

Joseph J. Smulsky
Institute of Earth's Cryosphere, P.O.B 1230, 625000, Tyumen, Russia.
<http://www.smull.newmail.ru/>

Appendixes

App. 1

Date: Wed, 10 Jan 2007 09:37:47 -0800 (PST)

Subject: Opening contact, please read (Sapere Aude)

Dear Dr. Smulsky:

I came across your name when looking over G. Walton's Sapere Aude from the links there to S. N. Arthea. There are many things wrong with the current theories and with those promulgated by the iconoclasts. The iconoclasts even fight among themselves and cannot and will not combine forces so to speak. So to be brief I would like to invite you to visit my web page at (no www.) web2.airmail.net/nptbs that is more easily found by going to search and entering: collected schreiber I am the first hit.

If nothing else, I hope you will at least read the section EASY MONEY II. In this item are a few of my discoveries in both mathematics and physics. It is extended in the section FALSITIES IN CURRENT THEORIES. Note the first item that is extremely distressing to ALL the scientists. Item #5 is typical of what is being taught and promulgated worldwide. These falsities are false by the scientist's own works or a common dictionary as each is explained why briefly.

As to Einstein's Theory of Relativity (GR and SRT) that is partially covered in the section SIDE PAPERS as items #s 11, 19, 23, 30, 49, 51, 53 and 58. But, 3 and 4 AUTOMATICALLY destroys the TOR and ALL current and past theories. However, these and from other sources are in the mini book GOODBYE RELATIVITY-HELLO REALITY.

Unfortunately the derivation and full proofs of all of these are in my book that can be read, downloaded or printed out for free. The home page and the sections and the papers titles speak for themselves. Not one single scientist in this world has been able to prove I am wrong, but by the same token with extremely rare specific exceptions (speed vs. velocity is one) refuses to admit I am right. And I do not expect (it is a rare occasion) to receive any further replies.

Respectfully,

Bert Schreiber

App. 2

Subject: Response

Date: 11 February 2007 8:04

Dear Professor Smulsky:

Thank you for your e-mails and attachments.

We agree to many things, but not for the same reasons. The more reasons something is wrong, the more logical it is so.

However, in your "THE REAL FORCES And UNREAL HYPOTHESES" I would like to make the following comments.

#1: Generically, you use velocity and speed interchangeably that causes confusion. They are not the same. Examine your paper closely and be sure when you use velocity (actually some vectors) you mean same. And where you have velocity, be sure you mean speed the resultant of said vectors.

#2 Paragraph starting Force (1): A: There is no proof that a moving magnetic field creates an electric field. See my paper on GSJ Electrostatic Fields, AND Magnetic Fields Surrounding Conductors. There is left out in the Magnetic field discussions equations etc. in ALL references; which way is the conductor WOUND?

B: Moving charged or uncharged bodies are subject to the Lorentz Operator or Factor. When $v = c$ the part under the radical goes to 0, not 1. See my paper on GSJ Lorentz Transformation Operator or Factor.

I have a very difficult time convincing others that it is how you can predict what the APPARENT MEASURED values are OR converting the APPARENT MEASURED values back to their REAL laboratory at rest frame of reference. The equation has LIMITS in the real world and v cannot go TO c . There is one exception, but no one believes me anyway as it has been detected, just not believed.

Simply, mass increase, length and time decreases are not real.

#3 paragraph starting Hypothesis about particles: Light has an intrinsic mass. You are correct that it is not a particle. BUT, it can be treated as a particle and will give the IDENTICAL results for many of its mechanical effects when so done. Namely, most of the Photoelectric Effect. Again see my paper on GSJ The Photon: Fact or Fiction?

#4 Paragraph starting Hypothesis about the light speed-: First sentence; "If gravitation - -" is a bad speculation. If the gravitational field had any propagation speed it is millions if not billions of times faster than light.

I can't and it never will be proved, but I suspect it is instantaneous. When a mass is created, any other mass in the Universe knows it instantaneously or in 0 time. That does not mean it can cause some measurable effect.

This and the propagation speed for the electric and magnetic fields are in my Falsities in Current Theory paper as items #8 and #9 respectively.

#5 Paragraph starting Hypothesis about black holes: I have now updated and it is now posted on GSJ on Black Holes do not exist.

#6 Paragraph starting Hypothesis about a deviation: This is fully covered in my paper on GSJ Gravitational Bending of Radiation. In all papers nothing is said about the function of the frequency of the light and the end results.

#7: Last three paragraphs: We both agree on these three items.

Regards,

Bert Schreiber