

A Formal Refutation of “Angular Energy”: Misapplications of Conservation Laws and Classical Mechanics

Dave Voorhis
Independent Researcher, UK

Google Gemini
AI

Abstract

This paper provides a comprehensive evaluation of the manuscript “Angular Energy” by J.H. Mandlbaur, which claims to expose a fundamental flaw in the law of conservation of angular momentum using a classical ball-on-a-string demonstration. We demonstrate that the author’s conclusions rely on a foundational category error: testing a zero-torque mathematical prediction against an observational environment dominated by external torques. Through a formal logical proof, we expose the explicit mathematical contradiction inherent in this comparison. Furthermore, by evaluating theoretical mechanics (Noether’s theorem), the work-energy theorem, and human empirical limits (centripetal force and mechanical wobble), we establish that classical physics fully accounts for the system’s behavior. Finally, we detail the manuscript’s logical fallacies, structural deficiencies, and omission of established variable-radii vacuum verifications (such as spacecraft yo-yo de-spin mechanisms). Ultimately, this critique renders the proposal of “Angular Energy” mathematically, physically, and logically unfounded.

1 Introduction

In the draft manuscript “Angular Energy,” J.H. Mandlbaur asserts that the widely accepted law of conservation of angular momentum is fundamentally flawed [1]. Using a theoretical framework based on a ball-on-a-string thought experiment, the author argues that applying standard angular momentum conservation equations yields an objectively absurd rotational velocity of 12,000 RPM, which contradicts observed reality [1]. From this discrepancy, the author concludes that the foundational laws of physics must be incorrect [1].

This critique systematically analyzes the physical, mathematical, and logical frameworks presented in the manuscript. We demonstrate that the discrepancy identified by the author is not a failure of angular momentum conservation, but rather a misapplication of idealized mathematical models to non-idealized, torque-heavy environments.

2 Misapplication of Conservation Laws

2.1 Formal Proof of Misapplication

The author’s primary argument rests on comparing a calculated prediction of velocity to an observed reality [1]. However, the mathematical premise applied is incompatible with the physical system chosen for observation. This failure can be demonstrated through the following formal proof:

Premise 1: The law of conservation of angular momentum states that angular momentum (L) is conserved if and only if the net external torque (τ) acting on the system is zero. Mathematically, $\frac{dL}{dt} = \tau$. Therefore, $L_2 = L_1$ is exclusively valid when $\tau = 0$.

Premise 2: The author calculates a predicted velocity (V_p) using the equation $L_2 = L_1$ [1], requiring the assumption that $\tau = 0$ in the predictive model.

Premise 3: The observed system is a hand-held ball on a string, which operates in a real-world environment. The observed velocity (V_o) is a product of initial angular momentum minus the effects of external torques (τ_o), such as atmospheric drag, friction, and pivot instability.

Step 1: The author’s argument assumes a valid scientific model should yield a prediction that matches observation ($V_o = V_p$).

Step 2: Expressing this equivalence using the system’s actual variables yields the equation:
 $L_{\text{initial}} - \tau_o = L_p$.

Step 3: Because $L_{\text{initial}} = L_p$ under the premise of ideal conservation, the equation simplifies to $-\tau_o = 0$. This mathematically demands that the external torque acting on the real-world observation is strictly zero ($\tau_o = 0$).

Step 4: However, observation undeniably confirms $\tau_o \neq 0$, because the ball rapidly slows and stops in the absence of energy input. This physically demonstrates that the hand-held system is subject to external torques such as friction, atmospheric drag, and wobble.

Step 5: The author’s assumed equivalence ($V_o = V_p$) mathematically demands that a known non-zero external torque value equals a zero external torque value, which is explicitly contradictory.

Conclusion: By testing a zero-torque mathematical prediction against a non-zero-torque physical reality, the author has created a false equivalence. The resulting ”absurdity” does not disprove the law of conservation of angular momentum; it merely proves that idealized equations cannot accurately predict non-idealized systems without accounting for external forces. The author’s experimental design is therefore inherently flawed, rendering the manuscript’s primary conclusion a *non sequitur*.

2.2 Noether’s Theorem and Theoretical Foundations

The manuscript characterizes angular momentum conservation as a mere “assumption” [1]. In modern physics, it is a mathematically proven consequence of spatial geometry. According to Noether’s theorem, every differentiable symmetry of the action of a physical system has a corresponding conservation law.

The conservation of angular momentum is the direct, mathematical consequence of the rotational invariance (isotropy) of space. To disprove the conservation of angular momentum, one must mathematically prove that space itself possesses a directional bias, a claim the manuscript does not attempt to make.

3 Mechanical and Empirical Limitations

3.1 Centripetal Force, Wobble, and Human Limits

The author correctly observes that a typical string would break long before reaching 12,000 RPM, preventing the ball from accelerating like a race car engine [1]. However, standard physics already predicts this mechanical failure.

The author posits a one-second reduction in radius from 0.5 meters to 0.05 meters [1]. Using the author’s variables, the final angular velocity is $\omega_2 = 200$ rev/s, or approximately

1256.6 rad/s [1]. Assuming a standard demonstration ball mass of 0.1 kg, the centripetal force ($F_c = mr\omega^2$) required to maintain this orbit at the final radius is:

$$F_c = (0.1 \text{ kg}) \times (0.05 \text{ m}) \times (1256.6 \text{ rad/s})^2 \approx 7,895 \text{ Newtons}$$

Holding 7,895 Newtons requires securing approximately 800 kg of force. Because the human hand cannot output or anchor this force in one second, the demonstrator’s grip and arm will inevitably buckle. This mechanical failure at the pivot point makes it impossible to hold the axis of rotation steady, introducing massive wobble. In physics, a displaced rotational center acts as a severe external torque ($\tau_{\text{net}} \neq 0$), fundamentally violating the $L_2 = L_1$ premise of the author’s mathematical proof.

3.2 The Work-Energy Theorem

The title of the manuscript is “Angular Energy,” yet the concept is never formally defined in the text [1]. The author’s incredulity regarding the final rotational speed likely stems from the massive increase in rotational kinetic energy ($E_k = \frac{L^2}{2I}$) as the radius decreases.

This increase does not require a novel term or violate existing physics. It is entirely accounted for by the macroscopic work done by the demonstrator’s hand pulling the string inward against the outward centrifugal reaction force, expressed as $W = \int F \cdot dr$.

4 Structural and Methodological Failures

4.1 Hybridized Models and the Fallacies of Argument

A valid *reductio ad absurdum* requires accepting all premises of the theory being tested to show that they inevitably lead to a contradiction. The manuscript accepts the premise of ideal conservation ($L_2 = L_1$) [1], but implicitly rejects the standard physical constraints of that same theory, such as centripetal force limits, work-energy inputs, and external torques. By hybridizing an idealized mathematical model with real-world material limitations, the author constructs a fallacious strawman of standard physics rather than a genuine logical contradiction. The subsequent dismissal of 12,000 RPM as “absurd” represents a fallacy of incredulity, ignoring that classical mechanics already limits the system long before such velocities are achieved.

4.2 Empirical Ignorance and Established Vacuum Verification

The author asserts there are “no scientifically verified empirical experiments directly confirming that angular momentum is conserved in a variable radii system” and challenges the reader to show examples of behavior in a vacuum [1]. This demonstrates a critical lack of literature review.

Variable-radii angular momentum conservation is continuously verified in the vacuum of space through astrodynamics, specifically via yo-yo de-spin mechanisms [2]. These devices consist of masses on cables wrapped around a spinning spacecraft. When released, the masses expand outward, drastically increasing the effective radius of the system. Exactly according to the conservation principle ($I_1\omega_1 = I_2\omega_2$), this variable-radius expansion rapidly bleeds the spacecraft’s angular velocity without expending propellant [3]. These systems are exhaustively documented in standard orbital mechanics literature and successfully deployed in zero-torque vacuum environments on missions ranging from early sounding rockets to modern planetary probes [2].

4.3 Definitional, Structural, and Tone Deficiencies

Finally, the manuscript fails to meet the structural and tonal standards of both theoretical and experimental physics. Despite the author’s explicit claim that the work is a “rigorous, theoretical physics paper” relying on logical proof [1], the core argument rests entirely on anecdotal observations of a physical classroom demonstration. As a physical evaluation, it lacks a methodology section, data collection, error analysis, and overall experimental rigor.

The text is introduced with a scanty, colloquial opening and relies inappropriately on an introductory textbook for its citations, entirely omitting formal citations for the prediction method itself. Furthermore, the discussion section abandons academic analysis in favor of illogical pleadings and highly colloquial language. Most notably, the titular concept of “Angular Energy” is mentioned only in the abstract [1] and remains completely undefined and unused in the body of the text.

5 Conclusion

The draft manuscript “Angular Energy” does not expose a flaw in standard physics. Instead, it demonstrates a misunderstanding of external torques, human physiological limits, and the work-energy theorem. Because the author applies a zero-torque predictive equation to a physical system dominated by external torques, the subsequent mathematical and logical conclusions are invalid. The law of conservation of angular momentum remains mathematically and empirically sound.

References

- [1] Mandlbaur, J.H. (2022). *Angular Energy*. ResearchGate. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/364946928_Angular_Energy
- [2] Vallado, D. A. (2013). *Fundamentals of Astrodynamics and Applications* (4th ed.). Microcosm Press. Available at: <https://microcosmpress.com/publishing/fundamentals-of-astrodynamics-and-applications-fourth-edition/>
- [3] Fedor, J. V. (1961). *Theory and Design Curves for a Yo-Yo De-Spin Mechanism for Satellites*. NASA Technical Note D-708. National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Available at: <https://ntrs.nasa.gov/citations/19980228062>