

Re: new USENET guidelines (was: massless or massive photon?)

Re: new USENET guidelines (was: massless or massive photon?)

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2008-07/msg01507.html>

- *From:* Albertito <albertito1992@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 16 Jul 2008 05:07:14 -0700 (PDT)
-

On Jul 16, 12:39 pm, "Juan R." González-Álvarez
<juanREM...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Peter M. Brown wrote on Tue, 15 Jul 2008 15:47:58 -0400:

Peter M. Brown wrote on Tue, 15 Jul 2008 15:47:58 -0400:

"Juan R. Gonzalez-Ivarez" <juanREM...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in
message news.pan.2008.07.15.08.30.00@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Cosmik de Bris wrote on Tue, 15 Jul 2008 08:28:25 +1200:

On Tue, 15 Jul 2008 00:13:49 +1200, Eric
Gisse wrote (in article
<425617bb-4b25-4c6d-9839-cb9b1c8ba...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>):

Juan R. Gonzalez-Ivarez
wrote:

[snip whatever]

I'm not going through that
giant whine fest.

Re: new USENET guidelines (was: massless or massive photon?)

Eric, let Juan and Pete go, they don't contribute anything to this group and you have. You may be a little brash at times but I've learnt a lot from you. It's funny how Juan and Pete have dismissed and insulted the intelligence of the most knowledgeable people on this group and just dogmatically asserted their falsehoods with no proof. Put your time into those who want to learn.

Cheers.

** Posted from <http://www.teranews.com>**

Then welcome to the list of people who did learn from Eric the next nonsense

(blockquote
No. The special relativistic Hamiltonian is $H = L = -mc^2 \sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}$.
)

Juan – Why are you conversing with people like Cosmik de Bris, Eric and Dono. Each has proven that they are not worth conversing with? That's why I blocked each a while back.

Pete

Hi, Pete. Let me explain that.

When I read nonsenses, insults, and other nasty messages from people like Bilge, Dono (then Karandash2), Eric, Tom... I prepared a group of guidelines

Re: new USENET guidelines (was: massless or massive photon?)

<http://www.canonicalscience.org/en/miscellaneouszone/guidelines.html>

with recommendations. I know that the recommendation to ignore nasty comment is difficult to follow sometimes. Also the recommendations to ignore nasty posters didn't work as waited.

It only worked for the more beginner trolls, who after a time being ignored not more reply you, but it didn't worked for trolls of poor species as Eric and Dono.

Crackpot Dono has continued with lies, insults, and /ad hominem/ during more than a year probably believing he could say *anything* he want without waiting a reply from my part.

Crackpot Eric has continued to invent mistakes in my posts in his usual pathetic style. When I ignored his insults, lies, and nonsenses in sci.physics.relativity then he followed me to sci.physics.foundations and sci.physics.research. To my surprise their posts passed moderation and were posted in sci.physics.foundations!

I initially ignored Eric nonsense and /ad hominem/ on s.p.f but some people complained about Eric messages and his usual attacks on me, and then one discussion started in that moderated newsgroup this year, with one moderator calling attention to "Mr. Gisse" in public:

(\blockquote

At this point I would just ask Mr. Gisse (and all) to please try to be more polite and diplomatic in their replies.

)

Then was when I really considered the idea of changing the guidelines and react to the permanent attacks, lies, straw man, misreadings...

The issue was how react to attacks, noticing the crackpots to novice readers, and still maintaining the noise to a minimum all at once? This is difficult but I think I have some ideas about that. I have discussed this off-line with other posters of moderated and non-moderated groups. For example Murray Arnow from sci.physics.research has provided me a guideline is now introduced in the new version.

I am now preparing that new version of the USENET guidelines and will be updated in a few days.

The new guidelines introduce new tactics to beat the trolls and the crackpots and unlike the previous version also introduce examples of nasty content. As promised before I introduce samples of nasty content from Tom Roberts, Eric, and Dono.

For example the guidelines now include Eric above nonsense

(\blockquote

Re: new USENET guidelines (was: massless or massive photon?)

No. The special relativistic Hamiltonian is $H = L = -mc^2 \cdot [1 - v^2/c^2]$.
)

and also his arrogant "Yea but I'm smarter than both of you. By such a wide margin it boggles the mind".

Like example of the kind of nasty troll you can find on online discussion..

Also as noticed here recently

<http://canonicalscience.blogspot.com/2008/07/brief-presentation-of-canonical-science.html>

a future Micro-thought will be "Some samples of USENET fauna"

There I will cite many examples and links to nasty content.

Crackpot Eric *mistakes* and obvious *nonsenses* (both plural).

Crackpot Dono writing nonsense and next deleting his message from Groups and then starting a lie about all that without noticing that his nonsense even after deleted from Groups is still archived in other servers

<http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2008-07/msg00824.html>

Daryl 'bad faith' and mistakes...

Tom Roberts perennial straw man and lies...

--

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

Hi Juan,

Don't forget to include in your guidelines how the troll Dono does thousands of fake rates to posts, exploiting that feature from google groups,

:~)

.

Re: new USENET guidelines (was: massless or massive photon?)