

Re: Respectable Physicist Pontificates in the Dark

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2004-11/1280.html>

From: David Evens (*devens_at_technologist.com*)

Date: 11/07/04

Date: Sun, 07 Nov 2004 01:48:12 -0500

On Sat, 6 Nov 2004 08:20:50 -0600, "Eugene Shubert"

<<http://www.everythingimportant.org>> wrote:

>Eugene Shubert wrote

><http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=c45b45b3.0408092138.1d26efce@posting.google.com>

><http://groups.google.com/groups?&selm=4177dd2e@sys13.hou.wt.net>

>

><http://www.everythingimportant.org/relativity/special.pdf>

>

>"David Evens" <devens@technologist.com> wrote in message

>news:ea6po0ptjnsn38tmd5ajrtj77ig3jpf5nk@4ax.com...

>> It was a discussion of that very paper, in which you grotesquely

>> distorted Puppetsock's lack of overt rejection of the products of

>> that open sewer you call a mind into a pretense that he supported

>> you that led to your admission that you feel free to distort

>> anything anyone says into a pretense that it is supportive.

>

>I call it effective rattling of a hostile witness. Any attorney worth

>is salt knows who to do that. The point that I was demonstrating was

>that Puppetsock had absolutely no understanding of my paper, even

>though he was commenting on it and pretending to have read it.

Current lies about what you were doing then do not change the fact that you fraudulently claims his support when it was actually him pointing out how POOR the paper you don't understand actually is.

>If you believe that I was literally accepting Puppetsock's obviously

>insincere and thoughtless rejection as a favorable endorsement, then

>you need to reread his comments again and try to find a single strand

>of evidence that he read and actually understood my paper beyond the