

**Requesting reviews concerning
'Physics of gravity deduced' etc**

5 **From:** Michael Schmiechen
Sent: Wednesday, July 24, 2019 2:39 PM
To: Antoine Tilloy
Subject: ... unorthodox: understanding what is being done

10 Dear Antoine Tilloy,

with interest I have read the German version of your paper '... für immer unvereinbar?' in Spektrum (2019) 8, 12–19.

15 If you are really interested to understand, what you and your colleagues are doing, then you must have thought about the meaning of 'gravitation' and of Einstein's gravity field in 'empty' space, the space filled with the mass potential, the 'aether', the existence of which Einstein postulated in his inaugural lecture at Leiden in 1920?

20 I am 'only' a mechanical, a marine engineer and thus I am 'of course' not primarily interested in black holes and quantum gravity. As I do not know, what 'gravitation' might possibly be, I am cautiously talking only about 'gravity', observed in bodies of ponderable matter, prevented from moving
25 freely as components of the source field of the mass potential, typically our weight we are 'forced' to carry around at the surface of Earth.

Attached please find my extended tutorial on 'the physics of gravity', deduced from Newton's law of gravity, 'happening' to be in accordance with
30 the standard model of nucleons. And if you have understood, what I have written, you with your back-ground, will immediately start to work out the details of my nuclear explanation of gravity – and maybe win the Nobel prize.

35 I have published my model since 2001 for any 'taste' and brought it to the attention of many researches, asking them to point out mistakes in my reasoning, so far without success. I guess their problem is to admit, that they have all their lives been barking up the wrong tree.

40 What happens at all the large 'Institutes of Gravitation Physics' has been described by Hans Christian Andersen in his tale of the emperor's new clothes. Even at my age I feel like the young child and wonder how long the procession will go on. For ready reference I add the abstract found in the Wikipedia.

5 "A vain Emperor who cares for nothing except wearing and displaying
clothes hires two swindlers who promise him the finest, best suit of clothes
from a fabric *invisible to anyone who is unfit for his position or 'hopelessly
stupid'*. The Emperor's ministers cannot see the clothing themselves, but
pretend that they can for fear of appearing unfit for their positions and the
Emperor does the same. Finally the swindlers report that the suit is fin-
10 ished, they mime dressing him and the Emperor marches in procession be-
fore his subjects. *The townsfolk play along with the pretense not wanting
to appear unfit for their positions or stupid*. Then a child in the crowd, too
young to understand the desirability of keeping up the pretense, blurts out
that the Emperor is wearing nothing at all and the cry is taken up by oth-
ers. *The Emperor cringes, suspecting the assertion is true, but continues
the procession.*" *Italics: MS.*

15 With kind regards yours,
Michael Schmiechen.

20 PS: Any rigorous review of my paper, you may feel necessary, will be very
welcome and, if any, it will be published in addition to this invitation on my
website.

apl. Prof Dr.-Ing.
M. Schmiechen
25 m.schm@t-online.de
www.m-schmiechen.de

30 **From:** Michael Schmiechen
Sent: Thursday, June 27, 2019 10:33 PM
To: David Wiltshire
Subject: Fw: Dark energy

Dear David Wiltshire,

35 in the meantime I have published my mail attached on my website, though
without your response yet. Please remember: No response is also a re-
sponse!

40 My reason for publishing solely on my website is very simple. According to
my very long experience I do not believe in 'peer' reviews and in the even
more ridiculous rules of arXiv. And I publish in ResearchGate only very
rarely, recently since I understood, how to circumvent its draw-backs.

And my reason for asking for response concerning my work on gravity is also very simple. I am looking for some expert convincingly pointing out my mistakes, if any. Or, to phrase my search positively:

5 I am looking for the first courageous physicist publicly admitting, that my nuclear explanation of gravity is 'correct', that the assumption of a gravity field, of body forces outside bodies, is a blatant misconception, still uncritically followed by 'professionals' lost in [incoherent] math [and jargon].

10 The following quotation, closely related to one of your remarks, 'happens' to be in German:

"Ach, erwiderte Delitzsch, man habe doch früher
nicht getrennt zwischen Religion und Wissenschaft.
15 Und, sagte Koldewey, heute tue man das?

...

Es scheine also Koldewey, als fordere die Wissenschaft
von ihren Anhängern nicht nur einen weit intensiveren
Glauben ein, sondern sogar die masochistische Bereitschaft,
20 darauf gefasst zu sein, dass dieser Glaube morgen
nicht mehr gültig sei."

Kenah Kusanit: Babel. München: Hanser, 2019.

25 Of course the large institutes concerned with the physics (!) of gravity, *e. g.* the Albert-Einstein-Institut at Potsdam, are carefully protecting their self-perpetuating 'research' based on obsolete dogmata shared by their 'peers', also documented on my website.

30 With kind regards yours,
Michael Schmiechen.

From: Michael Schmiechen
Sent: Tuesday, June 18, 2019 3:43 PM
35 **To:** David Wiltshire
Subject: Dark energy

Dear David Wiltshire,

40 when Einstein noted, that God does not play dice, he was of course wrong. God keeps His world going by chance, although sometimes I feel inclined to believe in Sheldrake's morphogenetic fields. 'Thus' by chance only yesterday I came across your paper arXiv : 1102.2045v1 of 10 Feb 2011.

“My own theoretical prejudices are rooted in the knowledge” (copy from the end of your discussion) of classical mechanics, which I have reconstructed in my *opus magnum*, available on my website. I ‘happen’ not to have become a cosmologist, ‘but’ to have become a mechanical, a marine engineer, with a strong interest in the theory of science and the application of this powerful tool in my own research and my widespread interests.

An un-intended by-product of my reconstruction of classical mechanics has been the outline of a theory of gravity. And for nearly twenty years I have published my ideas for any taste, recently as a coherent tutorial, which I attach for ready reference. Purposely and cautiously I am modestly talking only about gravity and *not* about gravitation, whatever that may be.

In lining-up with the title of your paper the essence of my tutorial is very simple. Gravitational energy and dark energy are identically the same and ‘both’ do not exist. Einstein’s introduction of a gravity potential outside bodies of ponderable matter has been another mistake as was his decision, ‘no longer to talk about Mach’s principle’ (Abraham Pais). According to my very long experience problems cannot be solved by ‘forgetting’ them.

Thus your shot was too short: Alexander Friedmann’s equation is *not* at the root of the problem, but the fashionable ignorance of the implications of Newton’s law of gravity.

With kind regards yours,
Michael Schmiechen.

PS. As usual I shall publish my letter on my website in the pertinent section of the ‘News flash’ together with your response, if any.

apl. Prof. Dr.-Ing.
M. Schmiechen
Bartningallee 16
DE 10557 Berlin
Germany
m.schm@t-online.de
www.m-schmiechen.de

40

From: Michael Schmiechen
Sent: Friday, April 18, 2019 15:05 PM
To: Meinard Kuhlmann

MS 31.07.2019 10:46 h

Subject: Das eine Universum

Sehr geehrter Herr Kollege Kuhlmann,

5 in Ermangelung Ihrer Eingangs-Bestätigung habe ich meine anhängende mail eben in den 'Letters (yet) unanswered!' auf meiner website veröffentlicht, die regelmässig von der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek zur permanenten Archivierung 'eingesammelt' wird.

10 Mit freundlichen Grüßen zu diesem fröhlichen Osterfest
Ihr Michael Schmiechen.

From: Michael Schmiechen

15 **Sent:** Friday, March 29, 2019 10:47 AM

To: rkuhlman@uni-mainz.de

Subject: Das eine Universum

20 Sehr geehrter Herr Kollege Kuhlmann,

mit Interesse habe ich gestern die Sendung über Quanten-Physik verfolgt, obwohl mir die meisten Dinge bekannt waren. Beeindruckt haben mich eigentlich nur Ihre Bemerkungen. Aber eine 'anstössige' nehme ich zum Anlass, mit Ihnen Kontakt aufzunehmen, immer in der Hoffnung einen Gesprächs-Partner und einen kompetenten Kritiker zu finden.

25 Den Zusammenhang aller bodies of ponderable matter im Universum stellt ja bereits Newtons Gesetz der Schwere explizit fest. Ich spreche ausdrücklich von gravity, nicht von gravitation, und ich vermeide den völlig überflüssigen Begriff 'Machsches Prinzip', der soviel sinnlose Diskussionen verursacht hat.

30 Ausführlich habe ich die Dinge in meinem anhängenden paper 'Physics of gravity deduced' noch einmal dargestellt. In aller gebotenen Bescheidenheit bitte ich Sie hiermit um dessen kritische Rezension. Physiker wollen 'natürlich' mit meinen Vorstellungen gar nichts zu tun haben.

40 Denn in der Nachfolge von Einstein glauben die ja immer noch, dass es ein Schwere-Potential und Körper-Kräfte ausserhalb von Körpern gibt. Die resultierenden Ungereimtheiten sind Gegenstände sich selbst perpetuierender Forschung.

Inzwischen arbeite ich, inspiriert durch meine aktuellen Arbeiten zur Identifikation der Eigenschaften von Schiffs-Antrieben, an einem paper über 'Ide-

al models in the real world '. Dabei bin ich auch auf die 'unglaublichen' Arbeiten vom Matthias Neuber gestossen, auf 'Mathematik und Ontologie' und den 'metrologischen Strukturrealism'. Für wen werden solche pseudo-theoretischen Aufsätze über für 'reale Forscher' selbstverständliche Dinge eigentlich geschrieben?

In Erwartung Ihrer Knall harten Kritik
mit freundlichen Grüßen
Ihr Michael Schmiechen.

PS. Auskunft über meine Person und meine Arbeiten finden Sie auf meiner website.

apl. Prof. Dr.-Ing.
Michael Schmiechen
m.schm@t-online.de
www.m-schmiechen.de

From: Michael Schmiechen
Sent: Friday, March 15, 2019 10:20 AM
To: Christian Carbogno
Subject: Fw: Mesoscopic material properties: gravity in particular

Guten Morgen, Herr Carbogno,

da ich von Ihnen weder eine Bestätigung, noch ein Antwort auf meine Bitte um kritische Rezension meines papers zur Physik der Schwere erhalten habe, stelle ich meine mail jetzt zu den unbeantworteten Briefen auf meine website, die von der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek halbjährlich permanent archiviert wird.

In view of publication of this mail and your eventual response I feel free to continue in English.

Independent of my former modest request for critical review of my work I am most interested in your work, while I am writing a paper 'on ideal models in the real world'. My concern are not any 'inter-subjective' interpretations of the physical parameters of abstract models adopted.

My concern are interpretations 'objective as far as possible', *i. e.* values of the parameters solely based on the behaviour of the systems under inves-

tigation. Paradigmatically I have demonstrated how this is possible in case of the propulsive performance of a ship model. To take the systems apart is as non-sensical as is killing animals in search of their souls.

5 For purposes of prediction and/or in view of the costs of testing heuristical methods for the identification of parameters need to be used. Due to the intricate interactions reliable 'theoretical' determinations of 'objective' parameter values is possible only in rare cases. But maybe I am not up to date and you can protect me from talking nonsense.

10

Another example is the gravity constant, a mesoscopic property of ponderable matter. So far its value has not yet been identified within 'satisfactory' limits. And to my knowledge theories, permitting to determine its value, have not yet been proposed, except for my reference to the dynamics of the nucleons. Even in that case the heuristics I have sketched will be necessary.

15

But as in case of the evaluation of ship model powering tests, based on the incoherent (!) data of separate hull towing and propeller open water tests, the data of the debris produced in high speed collisions of protons will not serve to determine the physics of gravity. The animals are being killed and their souls vanished.

20

In my paper on ideal models and their applications to real systems I am presently concerned with constitutive laws of fluids. According to theoreticians (*e. g.* Serrin, Truedell) these laws and their parameters are 'independent' of the molecular or maybe sub-crystalline structure in case of sub-fluids.

25

But according to my conceptions the term 'independent' is mistaken. If a law is 'tentatively' applied to a real fluid, in order to identify its properties, then these properties 'are due to' the structure of the fluid. Thus a great deal of my work concerns clarifying concepts and their usage in terms of clear-cut models on all levels.

30

35

With kind regards, looking forward to your hopefully helpful response
yours,
Michael Schmiechen.

40

From: Michael Schmiechen

Sent: Saturday, February 2, 2019 2:50 PM

To: Christian Carbogno

45

Subject: Mesoscopic material properties: gravity in particular

Sehr geehrter Herr Carbogno,

5 nicht nur mich interessiert das Phänomen der Schwere, *gravity* (nicht *gravitation*), nicht nur fester Körper. Und seit über zehn Jahren versuche ich vergeblich, 'offene' Gesprächspartner zu finden. Aber erst jetzt bin ich im Vorlesungs-Verzeichnis der TUB auf Ihre entfernt 'verwandte' Veranstaltung gestossen.

10 Anbei sende ich ihnen die aktualisierte Darstellung meiner Vorstellungen. Und ich würde mich freuen, wenn Sie gelegentlich die Zeit fänden, mein Elaborat unter Ihre kritische Lupe zu nehmen. und mich zu einem Gespräch über fundamentale Fehler, if any, zu empfangen.

15 Mit freundlichen Grüßen
Ihr Michael Schmiechen.

PS. Details über meine Person und meine Arbeiten finden Sie auf meiner website.

20 m.schm@t-online.de
www.m-schmiechen.de

25

From: Michael Schmiechen

Sent: Sunday, January 13, 2019 5:08 PM

To: Gerardus 't Hooft

30 **Cc:** Spektrum Leserbriefe

Subject: Fw: Das Universum als zellulärer Automat: Spektrum (2018) 12, 20-23

Dear Gerardus 't Hooft,

35

since I have not received any response from Spektrum, nor from you, I dare to contact you myself and to repeat my modest request for a critical review of my paper on the physics of gravity.

40 A matter of fact I have further streamlined my arguments in the revised file attached and am looking forward to the more or hopefully less fundamental flaws you may have detected.

45 With my best wishes for the new year
yours, Michael Schmiechen.

MS 31.07.2019 10:46 h

From: Michael Schmiechen

5 **Sent:** Monday, December 3, 2018 5:32 PM

To: Spektrum Leserbriefe

Subject: Fw: Das Universum als zellulärer Automat: Spektrum (2018) 12, 20-23

10 Sehr geehrtes Team,

in aller gebotenen Bescheidenheit gehe ich davon aus, dass Sie meine mail an Herrn Prof. 't Hooft weitergeleitet haben. Oder soll ich das selber machen?

15

Mit freundlichen Grüßen zur Advents-Zeit
Ihr Michael Schmiechen.

20

From: Michael Schmiechen

Sent: Monday, November 26, 2018 5:10 PM

To: Spektrum Leserbriefe

Subject: Das Universum als zellulärer Automat: Spektrum (2018) 12, 20-23

25

Dear Gerardus 't Hooft,

30

with great expectations I have read the interview you gave Spektrum (2018) 12, 20-23. *But ...*

35

On page 22 you (or Manon Bischoff?) raise the impression, that David Bohm 'needed' nearly (?) infinitely many universes. According to my knowledge this is *not* in accordance with Bohm's conception of the universe, which is in accordance with Newton's gravtiy law. Any body of ponderable matter is part of the source field of the mass potential, constituting the universe, the physical space we happen to live in, carrying our weights due to being prevented from falling freely, at least most of the time here on Earth.

40

And according to my knowledge of Bohm's theory quantum objects are described as clouds of ideal continua in n-dimensional state spaces, *not* universes! Schrödinger's classical (!) 'wave' equation, derived in my opus magnum (2009/897 ff), describes 'only' the dynamics of the 'moving' cloud. Bohm has 'added' the missing kinematic state equation, *not* 'hidden pa-

45

rameters'. Concerning this subject I quote only a remark by John S. Bell from my opus magnum (2009/906 f).

5 "This theory is equivalent experimentally to ordinary nonrelativistic quantum mechanics - and it is rational, it is clear, and it is exact and it agrees with experiment, and I think it is a scandal that students are not told about it. Why they are not told about it? I have to guess here there are mainly historical reasons, but one of the reasons is surely, that this theory takes almost all the *romance* out of quantum mechanics. This scheme is a living
10 counterexample to most of the things that we tell the public on the great lessons of twentieth century science."

15 While I write this, it occurs to me, that my exposition concerning the kinematic state equation may need to be up-dated! But these observations are *not* the reason for my mail, which has in fact been triggered by your (or Manon Bischoff's?) very short remarks concerning 'gravitation' on page 23. True is, that physicists still do *not* understand, how 'gravity' works. And I claim, that this fact is due to their fashionable ignorance of the implications of classical dynamics and of Newton's law of gravity.

20 My rather simple approach follows the safe route, recommended by philosophers. To protect me from talking nonsense, I do *not* talk about 'gravitation', *but* modestly and cautiously only about 'gravity' (Schwere). I followed this line of thinking during my reconstruction of classical dynamics,
25 now more than ten years ago, although the purpose of my opus magnum, now freely available on my website, was *not* to 're-search' gravity.

30 Since that time I have published explanatory expositions of my conception of gravity for nearly any 'taste'. And very recently I have published a conclusive, axiomatic exposition concerning this subject, addressed to experts. 'Encouraged' by your remarks I modestly dare to draw your attention to that brochure, attached for ready reference, and politely ask your favour to take the time and rigorously scrutinise my conception and my arguments.

35 In view of the fact, that physicists are *not only* 'Lost in Math', *but also* 'Lost in [incoherent] Jargon', as Sabine Hossenfelder and the scientists she interviewed, I dare to doubt, that young persons indoctrinated that way, will solve the problems physicists are still facing. Adhering to conceptions, which have caused the problems to be solved, results in irresponsible
40 waste of research resources.

45 With kind regards and best wishes for enjoyable reading I am looking forward to your response.
Yours, Michael Schmiechen.

PS1. In accordance with my practice I shall publish this letter together with your response on my website, which as a publication proper is regularly collected and permanently archived by Deutsche Nationalbibliothek.

- 5 PS2. Details concerning my person and my work are to be found on my website, the most recent work in the 'News flash'.

www.m-schmiechen.de
m.schm@t-online.de