

Re: Bunch of corrections (multipart message)

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2007-07/msg02559.html>

- *From:* "Juan R." <juanrgonzaleza@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 23 Jul 2007 03:00:43 -0700
-

This is last part of the message.

It is funny to read above replies. Eric Gisse using more liar techniques, modifying I am really saying, parroting I wrote before for simulating he knows, and all those well-known tactics. And to Bilge and Karandash2 replying to questions I asked. Upps wait, no they did not reply still!

Karandash2 (a supposed physicist) still cannot write the general lagrangian not the full equation of motion for classical EM. I have asked him many times. I am doing it once again, but since the answer is not in the undergrad level textbook on the library, he cannot reply. End.

Bilge (the other supposed physicist) still has not explained what are the units of U. He has huge difficulties to apply dimensional calculus to U and to get its units. Since in their own words $U = [e * \phi] - [j * A]$ is not an energy:

Look, moron... That expression is not a potential energy. An energy is the time component of a four-vector, not the scalar product of two four-vectors. jeezzzz...

Bilge, since you claim U is not an energy, please show us what are the units of U? Length? Temperature?

Steve Carlip misconceptions and misreading ####
####

In a reply to Rafael Valls Hidalgo-Gato, Tim Shuba decided to submit next post:

On Jul 13, 11:11 pm, shuba <tim.sh...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Re: Bunch of corrections (multipart message)

Rafael Valls Hidalgo–Gato wrote:

We share same opinion about Juan.

<http://groups.google.com/group/sci.physics/msg/22bf366b013f1d39?dmode...>

---Tim Shuba---

It links to an old reply by Steve Carlip about Newtonian limits I had not replied in detail.

I had prepared a complete post with several references but I have thought better and finally I will not post here. Since Carlip has acquired an international fame by his attacks to several scientists with ideas and research different from he likes, he truly deserves more attention from my part. I prefer to reply him in a more formal way in a published letter.

The letter has a threefold aim:

i]

I want to correct certain technical mistakes that Carlip is spreading both offline (e.g. in recent publications about the speed of gravity issue) and online in this and other newsgroups.

ii]

Steve Carlip attributes to me many assertions actually were not made, and I want to correct that also. For instance i said, in a clear and simple way, that the Newtonian potential IS a solution of the Poisson equation and Carlip, accuse me from saying the contrary! That distraction tactic is well-know. Whereas he avoid to reply to thecnical questions i ask him. I am still waiting from him to explain us how functions $f(r,t)$ magically convert to $f(R(t))$

iii]

It has an educative and sociological orientation, since you can analyse Carlip behavior and diferent techniques used during debate: directly insulting, attempts to trivialize some technical question deserving further study, direct manipulation I am really saying, and some others.

.