

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

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2006-07/msg00108.html>

---

- *From:* "Koobee Wublee" <[koobee.wublee@xxxxxxxx](mailto:koobee.wublee@xxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* 1 Jul 2006 23:38:47 -0700
- 

"Bilge" <[dubious@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:dubious@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
[news:slrneae378.5j.dubious@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:slrneae378.5j.dubious@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

Koobee Wublee, the bumbling boobie:

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

[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.

One day, the students of physics will regard the faithful believers of Lorentz Transform as cranks. For more than 100 years of crackpottery.

[...]

## 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.

You don't need any excuses to distance yourself away from the absurdity of Lorentz Transform in which Rutherford was one of the first to recognize the absurdity in it.

(ii) Inappropriate analogies

The mathematics of SR is ridiculously simple.

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

I do understand it. In fact, I am one of the very few who does. It is total BS. The proper resolution can only be done through math. Show me the math just like every single other problems in physics. This should be the very basis of physics.

This crank is not math-enviuous of SR.

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

Again, I challenge you to resolve the Twin's Paradox through math. You can present complex integrals if you wish. After all, the mathematics of GR is also under your disposal. Do it, and be a true physicist rather than one of the cranks which you have been calling others as if the pots calling the kettles black.

GR takes a little bit understanding of math involved. However, the math is just an extention 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.

Algebra, calculus, physics before MMX, etc. Did you even learn and understand these topics?

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

Yu mean, the equivalence principle? See:

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

esp. sec. 3.1.

No. Read my post. I have said the (Einstein) Equivalence Principle has served no useful purpose in the development of GR.

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,

Spacetime is merely a postulate. In fact, merely a solid one according to Dr. Draper. It was the brainchild of Minkowski, one of Einstein's professors. Around that time, Einstein seemed to be able to get himself surrounded with crackpots.

(2) a metric,

The metric was a mental, abstract exercise started with Gauss. Riemann amazingly took it a step further and explained exactly how an object would behave under the curvature of space. Since gravity is not caused by the curvature of space but only time, it is rather silly to assume gravity is caused by the curvature of spacetime which itself is one of the many absurd postulates.

(3) a group of transformations which define a lie algebra.

That is why Poincare failed. His interpretations to SR was totally based on group theory not based on sound mathematics in which it is the only way to reconcile the observations with theories. To this day, when directly confronted with this issue, I would get a lecture on group theory (Dr. Robert's foliation of spacetime for example). Face it. Lorentz Transform is not about the group theory although it forms a group of your Lie stuff. Big deal! It does not address the real world issues. You need to use traditional mathematics to deal with everyday experiences.

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 extention

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?

To deny Mach's Principle is to turn your back on Newtonian physics and GR.

Do you even know what you are talking about?

(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.

What evidence? My point-blank appeal to resolve the Twin's Paradox through the very basis of this paradox manifests ——— Lorentz Transform?

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

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.

Believe me. I am residing on the same planet earth as you are. I do have textbooks and internet at my disposal. Care to prove I don't? How did I post this message which you are reading now?

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 hyperbolic 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.

I do understand the subject of SR and GR. You can only stop me from posting by evil means. Would you try?

### 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.

No, no, and no. Read my writing again. Even if Einstein did not exist, I would still be criticizing Lorentz Transform for its absurdity in

Re: Anti-relativists in an IOP article – recognise names  
manifesting the Twin's Paradox.

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.

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.

Care to write a book about me?

.