

Re: New version of a relativity FAQ

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2008-06/msg01480.html>

- *From:* Eric Gisse <jowr.pi@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 27 Jun 2008 08:24:51 -0700 (PDT)
-

On Jun 27, 5:27 am, "Juan R." González-Álvarez
<juanREM...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Eric Gisse wrote on Fri, 27 Jun 2008 05:48:43 -0700:

On Jun 26, 11:16 pm, "Juan R." González-Álvarez
<juanREM...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Pmb wrote on Thu, 26 Jun 2008 19:59:58 -0400:

You want to play with the big boys and you
don't even understand the
math that you're trying to use.

A few time ago, He pretended to review a research topic
about geodesics
in spf, but was rapidly noticed he did not know how to
differentiate
T_{ab}!

He never learn the lesson.

<http://groups.google.com/group/sci.physics.relativity/>

msg/0ab17ed15130a755?dmode=source

Re: New version of a relativity FAQ

Selective memory or lying? I cannot tell.

You are **so clever** that pretend to lye about a mistake from you, which is stored on-line!

Because unlike you, I do not delete embarrassing posts. The effect of making a mistake is lessened when you can hide it.

Plus I hesitate to imagine how shrill you would become if the offending posts got nuked without comment.

Your above link (I did **not** check your tensor indices) is the reply you wrote **after** I said you that you were deriving the tensor in a **wrong** way

<http://groups.google.com/group/sci.physics.relativity/msg/b40f637f3c1...>

Since you aren't going to let this go, I'll just go to the time stamps.

Do you have a different concept of "after" in your universe?

You provided the exact form on 22 May 2008 14:12:08 CST, *_my_* post with the exact form is dated 22 May 2008 07:23:20 PDT. Granted I may be sitting in Anchorage's airport with like 1 cumulative hour of sleep in the last 36 hours, but I'm almost completely sure that 7 am comes before 12 pm. It doesn't matter what the differential between CST and PDT is – it ain't 7 hours.

You can see the text in my message being quoted in the first link you introduced above :-)

And it was an obvious mistake which I should not have made. But I did, and I corrected it.

You didn't provide the correction – you just said it was wrong. Try not to be too much of a credit hog.

I was speaking about spf. This was the history on spf.

First I noticed you were deriving wrong T_{ab}

Re: New version of a relativity FAQ

<http://groups.google.com/group/sci.physics.foundations/msg/c14971322fbd9b3c>

In your usual arrogant and ill-informed attitude you replied

Hey now – I wouldn't be me if I suddenly became reserved and triplechecked everything I say.

I find damage control is easier, and it acts as a reeeeeeal good litmus test for the character of people I'm arguing against. If they keep whining about a mistake I made long after I admitted it was a mistake, it is a pretty good sign they are a moron.

<http://groups.google.com/group/sci.physics.foundations/msg/712eef5eb651663e>

I like your claim

(\blockquote

Since I am so clearly wrong in your eye, I'd appreciate you writing the proper expression for taking the divergence of a rank two tensor.

)

I explained to you how to do that

<http://groups.google.com/group/sci.physics.foundations/msg/8ac5d4ef041f1f8a>

After I corrected it myself.

and also explained to you why the number of Christoffels is **two** for T_{ab} instead one how you **incorrectly** believed.

Again – after I corrected it myself.

That really should have been something I caught on my own. But hey – it doesn't weigh down on me terribly much because I don't let little things like that rule over me.

Re: New version of a relativity FAQ

As already remarked this kind of basic stuff would be explained by your teacher *not by me*.

Self-taught, champ. Coming with that territory is the land of gaps in education, surrounded by the waters of "I'll deal with it later".

But the more surprising point is that you do not show the more simple sign of gratitude when your mistakes are corrected and you learn some physics!

Gratitude is reserved for either people I respect or for exercises that aren't sniping matches. You aren't interested in teaching, you just want to pick up on anything I do wrong and rub it in my face over and over. It is transparent, and even more pathetic.

As a bonus remember also you did not know dimensional analysis

<http://groups.google.com/group/sci.physics.relativity/msg/6fe7633a0e8...>

Apply the comment you wrote to yourself.

I do not see you hanging on every mistake Albertito makes, and by god he makes a LOT of them. In fact, I never see you correct or even comment on even one of his many mistakes that would have you try to roast me over an open flame.

—
Center for CANONICAL |SCIENCE) <http://canonicalscience.org>