

## Re: Dennis get your mail!

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2004-09/2937.html>

---

**From:** Dennis McCarthy (*djmenck\_at\_aol.com*)

**Date:** 09/10/04

Date: 10 Sep 2004 21:37:30 GMT

>  
> "Dennis McCarthy" <djmenck@aol.com> wrote in message  
> news:20040910153424.04845.00003139@mb-m24.aol.com...  
>>  
>> *Dennis: And Dirk sidesteps the wager.*  
>>  
>> >[exceptional top-post]  
>> >  
>> >Hm, Dennis, I hadn't noticed this embarrassing slip. Ouch ; -)  
>> >  
>> >Dirk Vdm  
>>  
>> *Dennis: And it just gets sillier.*  
>  
> *Dennis aka Sue aka Jahn, it's \*very\* clear that you want to  
> know how I found out and how I can prove it : -)  
> And as you perfectly know, I already told your old mate Vern  
> (who could be you as well, but I can't prove it, so never mind)  
> to start guessing \*why\* you are the one who has to do the  
> guessing. He didn't even try.  
> Of course both of you perfectly know why that's the way to go.*  
>  
> *So you'll have to work for it. Start guessing.  
> When you hit the jackpot, I'll let you know ; -)*  
>

Dirk, please forgive me, but do you think such childish convinces anyone? Read closely: I, Dennis McCarthy, will bet you \$1000 that you are wrong — that you can't prove that I am Sue or Jahn or whatever — and that in fact I am not.

You say you can prove it.

I'm saying you are lying.

And I'm willing to bet \$1000 (or how much ever you want) on that.

Okay?

I didn't think so.

Of course you will continue to backdown from the wager. You'll say you don't like to bet or it's just a trick or, you'll ignore it and just keeping saying

sci.physics.relativity: Re: Dennis get your mail!

something childish like "guess how I found out," or "no that's not it." This is precisely like many of our other correspondences where you simply can't respond in any meaningful way -- like when you were trying to argue that time is whatever a clock says it is:

<http://groups.google.com/groups?q=g:thl3371818409d&dq=&hl=en&lr=&ie=UTF-8&selm=20040218093418.17156.00002297%40mb-m03.aol.com&rnum=39>

or the correspondence before that where you could not be made to understand the well known problem involving modern physics and local, material causality:

<http://groups.google.com/groups?hl=en&lr=&ie=UTF-8&selm=20030423190125.18842.00000393%40mb-m19.aol.com&rnum=16>

Indeed, a couple paragraphs from that last correspondence sums up this one quite nicely:

"Dennis: Oh, my dear Dirk, we had a guy on these boards a few months back who, when confronted with peer-reviewed articles that challenged a particular belief, would retort with something to the effect: "Oh, yes, I read the paper. See if you can find the errors that I found." And he would never specify the error other than that. So what I am trying to say here is really for your benefit: Dirk, really, think about this for a moment. Do you really believe that such, and please don't take offense, that such infantilism really convinces anyone? It's almost sweetly naive. Look, Dirk, you made a mistaken comment regarding physics and causality, embracing the concept of material causality for all material effects -- apparently innocent of the fact that such comments are at odds with modern physics. You have probably since become aware that there is no way to extract yourself from such a comment gracefully, so you hide behind vague allusions that I am making some unmentioned mistake that you are keeping to yourself. No matter what you may believe, you obviously haven't obscured the simple fact that you can't address the points I made to anyone. And I think perhaps a few years down the road, you'll find it less embarrassing just to admit the mistake immediately. Just a little advice that I hope you won't take the wrong way.

(...)

"I hope I'm wrong, but judging by past performances, when faced with these direct questions above, Dirk will respond by editing it all out and posting vague insults. Let's see if I'm right...

\*\*\*\*\*

"Anyway, the last two lines of the last post above proved to be prophetic. I asked Dirk again and again what he believes to be the material causes of clock differentiation or gravitation, and he edited it out repeatedly. Eventually, he wrote "I don't know" to both. Lately, over half a dozen posts, Dirk has avoided explaining what he originally meant by his seeming embrace of material causes or what he meant by "reading comprehension problem" -- then, comically, he self-dramatized this lack by suggesting his vacant posts comprised a chess-like crafting. "

-----

sci.physics.relativity: Re: Dennis get your mail!

The more things change... ;-)

Dirk now has made a ludicrous claim that someone who clearly doesn't follow my ether view or apparently my view of clock retardation was me, that I was, for some reason, posting these physics views anonymously. More, he is continuing to state the lie that he can prove it. He has now been challenged with a \$1000 wager that there is no such proof. But he'll back down of course

--Dennis

Dennis McCarthy