

>>The Schnoll Effect - is it due to General Relativity? <http://www.ptep-online.com/2014/PP-37-01.PDF>

# The Schnoll Effect & General Relativity

How can a paper that refuses to discuss electromagnetism or charge tell us with a straight face what the Schnoll Effect is?

December 2021

Sf. R. Careaga, BSEE, MSTOM  
Lexington, KY

Best Viewed At: <https://bit.ly/33TPntj>

---

Re: "The Schnoll Effect is due to General Relativity and believe me because I am friends with Professor Schnoll"

From the Desk of Sf. Ramon Careaga, founder EP EMC, [www.epemcgateway.com](http://www.epemcgateway.com)

---

Dear Readers,

I am caught here between a rock and a hard place. First things first, I do not know Professor Schnoll, nor can I refer to him personally, twice, in my paper. Now I won't claim the author is using the Authority Fallacy, but it is rather difficult to respond to both the journal "Progress in Physics" and to this type of position with an OpEd letter. Secondly, I have *not yet* written the three PEMC papers due for late 2022 and 2023:

- Newton and MOND in the context of PEMC
- PEMC and Special Relativity
- Correcting General Relativity using the Unified Force

In the first place these all require a good deal of preparation time, and a review of present responses and issues. The problems of General Relativity are particularly so numerous that they will need an Appendix just to list all the ways that Einstein's approach is fallacious, wrong, problematic, fraudulent, and/or frustratingly distracting from reality.

The reality is that gravity is a macro-level model due to a systems analysis (performed first by Newton) of a particular, unique, but by no means Universal relationship of charge on this planet and in this solar system electric circuit.

We have no other context.

- All gravity measurements have been made with instruments neutralized by Earth charge
- Usually from within Earth's atmosphere
- Using EMF and magnetics
- Interpreted on electronic computers with electronic monitors and through our electric senses.
- To explain how gravity acts as a separate force to *bend EMF*

Figure 1 - the fabric demonstration fallacy; using classical gravity to fail in demonstrating stable orbits in a vertically oriented gravity field despite the fact that space has no up or down; credit: Dan Burns<sup>1</sup>



- Which is  $10^{37}$ - $10^{38}$ x stronger *than gravity*.
- All of the other forces are unifiable in the context of The Structured Atomic Model<sup>2</sup>
- And... the Cosmic Background Radiation has been isolated by Herouni<sup>3</sup> as an oceanic signal and is not a real artifact of a non-existent Big Bang, which rests upon one peg-leg: doppler redshift
  - ◆ When stars exist older than Big Bang<sup>4</sup>
  - ◆ And... there are galaxies obviously connected to quasars that are *supposedly* Giga-light-years apart!<sup>5</sup>

So there are some basically insurmountable obstacles for the Standard Model. But it only seems to get worse. Take the entire Dark Universe. It's more a matter of faith than science. It produces even less tangible results than religion, unless one counts the benefits of proving PEMC. After that, we get into the realm of pure pseudoscience - dark photons and negative mass and such.<sup>6</sup>

It is in this area that we find the copious problems of the Schnoll Effect as General Relativity hypothesis. Let us talk, first though, of the most strange aspect of this world (beyond the idea that EM noise measurements should be explained without EM or charge being central to the discussion).

That is, the way they act and think within a world of entirely faith-based/determined mathematical spaces (such as extra dimensional Riemannian geometry which requires "special skills" to understand). By the time they finish the hand-waving, high-falutin' super

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MTY1Kje0yLg>

<sup>2</sup> <https://sites.google.com/view/epemcgateway/pemc/atomic-models/sam>

<sup>3</sup> <https://sites.google.com/view/epemcgateway/pemc/researchers/herouni>

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.space.com/20112-oldest-known-star-universe.html>

<sup>5</sup> <https://sites.google.com/view/epemcgateway/pemc/eu-general/giants-of-eu-history/halton-arp>

<sup>6</sup> [https://www.academia.edu/37972998/Pseudoscience\\_Cannot\\_Be\\_Dark\\_Matter](https://www.academia.edu/37972998/Pseudoscience_Cannot_Be_Dark_Matter)

technical math-speak that masquerades as actual science<sup>7</sup>, from a lab or experiment, you'd think that these thought-clocks really existed, floating in space, and from them noise was measured and tied to the Schnoll Effect.

I admit I was half afraid, as I first learned the writer was himself at least versed enough to know what sort of myths about the "speed of light" and in particular the "light speed barrier" exist in both the academic and mainstream media, that I wouldn't be able to handle the extreme facial "posterizing" I was about to receive. However, in point of fact the paper is a paper-tiger. It is not so bad as it does not rely upon friendship with Professor Schnoll. It does accurately describe the Schnoll Effect, as well as numerous specialty discussions of reference frames, differences in space-time [obsessions] between Special and General Relativity<sup>8</sup>. It also spends a good deal of time explaining the periodicities which demonstrate the Schnoll Effect, and talking about noise and the history (in brief). It is, actually all in all, a pretty good paper.

However, what's odd is that there is a continual behavior (and even a discussion of the names of the insiders of the 1950s who promoted it<sup>9</sup>) of discussing reality sans The Force and charge in particular. There are three references to "electromagnetic" but only - and I mean **only** - in reference to *signals* from stars. These are, mind you, electric stars<sup>10</sup> wrapped in magnetism and electric fields.<sup>11</sup>

There are 0 references to electric, electron, magnetic fields, or to charge. There are references to quantum<sup>12</sup> electrodynamics (QED, which has nothing whatsoever to do with GR or SR), but no references to protons or neutrons. For that matter there are 0 references to ions, isotopes, leptons, or baryons. Short of the reference to "regular" photons (treated as a de facto particle), there is nothing in this paper that ties to known reality, or even Dark Universe reality.

There are 2 references to "virtual photons" and **10** references to non-existent "zero-particles."



Figure 2 - Dr. Manhattan being killed in the Tachyon Generator in the 1960s; even here we see not gravity (a model) but electricity (which is real); credit: "Watchman" movie/Warner Bros.

<sup>7</sup> <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=obCjQDeoLVw>

<sup>8</sup> The fact that both of these allegedly came from Albert Einstein and then they are sometimes inconsistent with one another in descriptions of space-time, should be a red flag to anybody. Special relativity of course was first worked on by Poincare with Lorentzian transformations of Maxwell's equations (of EM). So, in other words it, and Einstein's final products have nothing at all to do with Newton's macro-model called gravity.

<sup>9</sup> As well as some academic cross-chumming with Quantum community theorists, who were actually students of those who wouldn't be caught dead being associated with Einstein's Theory of Relativity! This alleged companionship of theories, like discussing "non-quantum teleportation" as if this is a normal, or Universe-relevant discussion, always strikes me as particularly peculiar. It's sort of like the greasers being cool like the jocks and cheerleaders, and they sort of respect one another... but not really. I guess everyone else not in these science cliques is irrelevant?

<sup>10</sup> <https://sites.google.com/view/epemcgateway/pemc/eu-general/giants-of-eu-history/r-juergens>

<sup>11</sup> <https://now.uiowa.edu/2021/07/physicists-led-university-iowa-more-fully-describe-suns-electric-field>

<sup>12</sup> <https://sites.google.com/view/epemcgateway/pemc/quantum>

There's a delightful paragraph or two that talks about the pseudoscientific "tachyons" which have **never been observed in any single experiment**.<sup>13</sup> But they make great fantasy/sci-fi (particularly in the story "Watchmen").

So while the paper is high-falutin', it is sort of like a hyped up fake boxer with a glass jaw. The reference section is "lit" with top-notch references. But there is no sign nor rigor, internally, to have an experiment that supports the hypothesis made with such gusto. It is as if the very *culture* of General Relativity, and the extremely recondite discussion of abstruse concepts and specialized tools in theoretical mathematics is being used to substitute for actual science. Where have we seen this behavior before? Oh yes, recently in my terse, but supportive response to the "Something from Nothing" experiment proposal out of Dartmouth College.<sup>14</sup> There, too, **for no reason whatsoever**, the authors attempt to lean their very real quantum experimental hypothesis upon the unreal and irrelevant General Relativity, which has nothing at all to do with their experiment. It is as if a "cult of personality" is bending the space-time fabric in the physics community. Could grant money be related? Pshaw!

I wish I could say that it was time to do a full line-by-line debunk as the rest of the DUD series requires. But for now, this short OpEd letter will have to suffice. In my opinion, this paper doesn't really convey any real, known mechanism to the Schnoll Effect. Rather it is the beneficiary of reality's (occasional) clemency:

❖ Reality >> The Force >> Atoms & Particles >> Forces & Fields >> General Relativity

General Relativity benefits, as a model does, from the facets of reality which it simulates well, and only those facets. But to understand noise is not to discuss "space-time" so much as the signals and modulations/amplifications/attenuations of those signals happening in space, measured over time. If you find a novel way to do this, a specialized tool, that isn't to say you found a mechanism. It's to say you found a way to "get around" needing to understand how it really works, with ridiculously specific math models that require "special skills." I think, in the end, I would have preferred an outright reliance upon the Authority fallacy instead of a backhanded compliment.

1. If you're in the club, the smugness doesn't touch you, you agree with it.
2. If you're not, and you're still impressed, you don't get to know how stupid you are and how thin a veneer this type of argument really is.

I won't assign malice to the writer, but I will assign nescience to the entire genre. Remember: Einstein got his Nobel prize for explaining the *photoelectric effect*.<sup>15</sup> Light is electric.



<sup>13</sup> <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/what-is-known-about-tachy/>

<sup>14</sup> [https://www.academia.edu/63382042/ Something\\_from\\_Nothing](https://www.academia.edu/63382042/ Something_from_Nothing)

<sup>15</sup> <https://www.privatdozent.co/p/einsteins-1905-paper-on-the-photoelectric-8e3>



It is modeled as a particle, but it is not a particle. It is an electric circuit, whose rate of induction is  $c$ .<sup>16</sup> That's as far as we know, so much as I know. Everything else is the model, and the unique behaviors of that massless circuit. Creating *virtual* particles to explain connections that should be explained via Feynman circuit diagrams<sup>17</sup> and typical circuit behaviors such as conductance, capacitance, and inductance, is superfluous and misleading.

Relying on those to then discuss a made-up “Zero-particle”<sup>18</sup> in order to account for noise, which could be explained via circuit modulation, is entirely untenable. The work by N. Scafetta goes a long way to show us just one likely source of the noise: planetary wobble, which would cover the climate change issue as well as multiple noise issues<sup>19</sup>. So long as we keep measuring space from Earth, we're going to get noise. The noise issue is covered better elsewhere by Pierre-Marie Robitaille<sup>20</sup>. So I won't go into that here.

Again I'm not assigning the misbehavior of Authority Fallacy to the writer. But I am saying it's a prevalent problem, and it makes it particularly troublesome when they admit that they are friends with those who have found the serious results. Einstein got his name attached to the work of Bose<sup>21</sup>, and the Bose-Einstein Condensates are a real phenomenon, however they are probably a form of ultracold plasma<sup>22</sup>, and not some separate distinct issue. But the making up of particles<sup>23</sup>, phase states<sup>24</sup>, and new forces<sup>25</sup> to fit special places is not the topic of this paper.

I want to leave you with a mental image of the problem with the SM that we do not have in PEMC. Imagine a very vivid, crystal clear picture. Here, let me give you one:

That's the very impressive 2012 NASA made “blue marble” image<sup>26</sup>. Now make a pair of copies in your mind. One copy is divided into fractal triangles called the



<sup>16</sup> <https://ia802502.us.archive.org/31/items/magnetism1small/magnetism1small.pdf>

<sup>17</sup> <https://sites.google.com/view/epemcgateway/pemc/quantum/qed>

<sup>18</sup>

<https://www.nytimes.com/1983/06/02/us/physicists-confirm-discovery-of-z-zero-a-key-subatomic-particle.html>

<sup>19</sup> <http://www.pattern-recogn-phys.net/2/1/2014/prp-2-1-2014.html>

<sup>20</sup> <https://sites.google.com/view/epemcgateway/pemc/researchers/robitaille>

<sup>21</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Satyendra\\_Nath\\_Bose](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Satyendra_Nath_Bose)

<sup>22</sup>

[https://www.academia.edu/37913321/Bose\\_Einstein\\_Condensate\\_Cosmology\\_vs\\_PEMC\\_Cold\\_plasma\\_Discussing\\_the\\_problem\\_of\\_replacing\\_all\\_forms\\_of\\_Dark\\_Matter\\_with\\_an\\_interstellar\\_medium\\_BEC\\_vs\\_PEM\\_UAE](https://www.academia.edu/37913321/Bose_Einstein_Condensate_Cosmology_vs_PEMC_Cold_plasma_Discussing_the_problem_of_replacing_all_forms_of_Dark_Matter_with_an_interstellar_medium_BEC_vs_PEM_UAE)

<sup>23</sup> [https://www.academia.edu/49497635/Converting\\_GNOME\\_CDM\\_Mass\\_Ratios\\_joke\\_paper](https://www.academia.edu/49497635/Converting_GNOME_CDM_Mass_Ratios_joke_paper)

<sup>24</sup>


[https://www.academia.edu/37558537/The\\_Predictable\\_Rise\\_of\\_Charged\\_Dark\\_Matter\\_How\\_Covert\\_Matter\\_Hot\\_Grains\\_Plasma\\_in\\_Dark\\_Mode\\_is\\_pushing\\_the\\_failures\\_of\\_CDM\\_and\\_MOND\\_into\\_the\\_Plasma\\_Electromagnetic\\_Cosmological\\_Paradigm](https://www.academia.edu/37558537/The_Predictable_Rise_of_Charged_Dark_Matter_How_Covert_Matter_Hot_Grains_Plasma_in_Dark_Mode_is_pushing_the_failures_of_CDM_and_MOND_into_the_Plasma_Electromagnetic_Cosmological_Paradigm)

<sup>25</sup> [https://www.academia.edu/53147237/Response\\_to\\_New\\_Dark\\_Energy](https://www.academia.edu/53147237/Response_to_New_Dark_Energy)

<sup>26</sup> Figure 4; credit: NASA/NOAA/GSFC/Suomi NPP/VIIRS/Norman Kuring  
<https://earthsky.org/earth/most-amazing-high-def-image-of-earth-so-far/>

Sierpinski triangle, and the other into jigsaw puzzle pieces.

Figure 5 - Sierpinski Triangle; credit: wiki<sup>27</sup>



One of these describes a very real mathematical issue which has been used in real world modeling... the other is arbitrary, shifting, and worst of all, difficult to solve. Half of the puzzle pieces get invalidated even as they are “found” and the other half hate the first half. By the time the jigsaw puzzle (the SM) is put together, it does not look like a planet that can harbor life or even work. Most of the math that describes the image you want, is not even compatible within the framework you’ve built with the other math.

But setting aside that you’re worshiping the math, return to the other image. You’ve cut the image into pieces and each reflects the design of the rest. But the constant changes in scale and size, while confusing, gives you new and penetrating insight into the larger triangles. You can even now - reasonably - suppose this one Universal Triangle is just itself another inside the larger. The image above is cut, but is put back together in a comprehensive and predictable manner.

Now, choose one. If you had to choose only one, most scientists would still choose the jigsaw puzzle, and not only for grant money. They love the elusive hope that the entire puzzle can be pieced together and at the top of it they will be standing there. That’s the cult of personality. To be Newton or Tesla, Einstein or Edison. But the discipline is out the window. That’s a problem. Because what’s left behind is a mishmash of reality.

When you take this problem and apply it to real phenomenon like the Schnoll Effect, or Biefeld-Brown Effect, and then misattribute explanations about how it works (GR or photon momentum and “ionic wind”), it no more explains the effect than solves the puzzle. It only delays it. It can be made prettier, and more recondite for a select special audience. Wizardry often works like this. But then, is it Science? Is it mimsical the way the Scientific Method is<sup>28</sup>? Indeed the Schnoll Effect can be used for earthquakes, weather, and even potentially astrological predictions. It could be a real money maker. But it will never be anything if put away as another jigsaw piece in a picture with too many holes to find Baja in relation to Florida. That’s my main problem with this paper. It really doesn’t offer anything. It only proposes it does. In the end, the clocks are just floating in the space of the mind. For more on the topic of GR’s *relative* failures, I’d like to refer you to S. Crothers’ works<sup>29</sup>, and in particular to E. Dowdye’s “Extinction Shift Principle”<sup>30</sup> which shows why macrolensing has never been observed beyond  $R=1$ . This fact alone should be enough to cause all to throw the theory out. All of visual outer space should look like a warped fabric, as the sky is literally full of high gravity masses. That just isn’t the case.

Sincerely, Sf. R. Careaga

---

<sup>27</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sierpi%C5%84ski\\_triangle](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sierpi%C5%84ski_triangle)

<sup>28</sup>

[https://www.academia.edu/50300514/On\\_the\\_Membranous\\_Interface\\_of\\_the\\_Material\\_and\\_the\\_Spiritual\\_from\\_an\\_EP EMC\\_perspective\\_and\\_Dual\\_Double\\_Layer\\_Economics\\_a\\_proposed\\_test\\_of\\_EP EMCs\\_metallic\\_properties\\_tensile\\_strength\\_malleability\\_durability](https://www.academia.edu/50300514/On_the_Membranous_Interface_of_the_Material_and_the_Spiritual_from_an_EP EMC_perspective_and_Dual_Double_Layer_Economics_a_proposed_test_of_EP EMCs_metallic_properties_tensile_strength_malleability_durability)

<sup>29</sup> <https://sites.google.com/view/epemcgateway/pemc/researchers/crothers>

<sup>30</sup> <https://sites.google.com/view/epemcgateway/pemc/researchers/dowdye>