

# Re: Anti-relativists in an IOP article – recognise names

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2006-07/msg00075.html>

---

- *From:* [dubious@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:dubious@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx) (Bilge)
  - *Date:* Sat, 01 Jul 2006 22:53:14 GMT
- 

Koobee Wublee, the bumbling boobie:

"Phineas T Puddleduck" <[phineaspuddleduck@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:phineaspuddleduck@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message <news:290620062334517523%phineaspuddleduck@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

[http://www.iop.org/EJ/article/0143-0807/26/6/S09/ejp5\\_6\\_s09.pdf](http://www.iop.org/EJ/article/0143-0807/26/6/S09/ejp5_6_s09.pdf)

Here are my responses to Mr. Raine's paper above. Although I cannot say for all cranks, this crank is a little bit different from the rest.

In what way? The only difference between you and any other crackpot is your choice of personal pet peeves about which to wax ignorant while claiming to be an expert. It goes without saying that all cranks are little different in that respect.

[...]

## 2. 'Crank' Relativity

### (i) Institutional relativists

Rutherford was right about SR being wrong.

That conflicts with your next comment about the mathematics being simple. Rutherford had an excuse. You don't.

### (ii) Inappropriate analogies

The mathematics of SR is ridiculously simple.

Then why is it that you cannot understand the resolution of the twin paradox?

This crank is not math-envious of SR.

In that case, you merely don't understand it.

GR takes a little bit understanding of math involved. However, the math is just an extension of the basics we all have learnt in high school.

Which are self-consistent if the "basics we all have learnt in high school" are self-consistent.

The concept of GR is based on even more postulates than SR.

You mean, the equivalence principle? See:

<http://relativity.livingreviews.org/Articles/lrr-2006-3/title.html>

esp. sec. 3.1.

It is rather easy to refute GR through these vast number of postulates.

Which "vast number of postulates," and why are you neglecting the fact that classical physics requires an equivalent set of postulates which differ only in what is assumed by the postulate? For example, galilean relativity assumes (1) an affine space to define the spacetime, (2) a metric, (3) a group of transformations which define a lie algebra.

The affine space is the same affine space upon which relativity is based, so the only differences are the choice of metric and lie algebra. Nature happens to be the arbiter of correctness here.

(iii) Megalomaniac extension

I guess Mr. Raine has not heard of Mach's Principle.

Since mach's principle has no rigorous definition which is used consistently, why should anyone bother mentioning it?

(iv) Symbolic jumble or spaghetti logic

The fallacy of the Twin's Paradox is very real.

For you, yes. But only because you think you understand relativity despite the glaring evidence to the contrary.

Yet, it is hand-waved away time after time. Even with spacetime diagram, the resolution must be backed up by mathematics. Yet, where is the mathematics that backs up any resolution to the Twin's Paradox.

On your planet? I don't know. Here on earth, one can take a trip to a library and seek resources called textbooks. One can also exploit the world wide web.

In 2006, we have been waiting for 109 years ever since Larmor introduced Lorentz Transform to the world. Poincare formed a BS interpretation based on the faulty mathematics of Lorentz Transform. It is absolutely laughable.

Have you proved that hyperolic geometry is inconsistent? If so, you have proved that euclidean geometry is inconsistent. You should immediately stop posting to usenet and write an article for Nature, as that would be one of the more amazing discoveries of the past several millenia. If not, you should stop posting to usenet and slink away in embarrassment.

### 3. Why Einstein

It has nothing to do with Einstein. It has all things to do with logic, science, and math. Yes, all the things science is supposed to stand for. Einstein is a nobody. His works were plagiarisms from other cranks and certain alchemists.

In other words, it really is all about einstein.

### 4. What this tells us about science

Flawed since 1897 on. Current version of physics on the topics of relativity is merely one of the 'crank' versions of relativity. It is sad, silly, and again laughable all at the same time.

Re: Anti-relativists in an IOP article – recognise names

I certainly hope no one ever trusted you to do any engineering that the unsuspecting public presumes to be safe unless you had someone checking every number you calculated.

.