

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

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2006-07/msg00249.html>

- *From:* dubious@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx (Bilge)
 - *Date:* Mon, 03 Jul 2006 09:32:40 GMT
-

Koobee Wublee, still the stupid Bumbling Boobie:

"Bilge" <dubious@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message news:slrneae378.5j.dubious@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Koobee Wublee, the bumbling boobie:

"Phineas T Puddleduck"
<phineaspuddleduck@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote
in message
news:290620062334517523%phineaspuddleduck@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

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.

Wouldn't you have more fun fantasizing about women? I mean, at
least you might be able to pay money to realize that type of fantasy,
especially if the lack of imagination in your posts is indicative of
the rest of your life.

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

[...]

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