

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/msg01605.html>

---

- *From:* "Pmb" <someone@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Wed, 16 Jul 2008 17:17:13 -0400
- 

"Juan R. González-Álvarez" <juanREMOVE@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message [news:pan.2008.07.16.11.40.50@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:pan.2008.07.16.11.40.50@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

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

<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.

There was a time when I used to respond to all the nonsense posts by people like Tom Roberts, David Waite, Androcles etc. But a time came (i.e. I had a staphy infection which once again threatened my life -> I became a Christian) to a point where I realized that it just wasn't the way I wanted to behave. Plus it stressing me out having to deal with the constant streams of flames and ignorant comments. So I stopped wasting my time. It takes a few days to notice who the new ones are, or to remember who I have forgotten are flamers. Thus my recent blocking of Dono, Oh no, and Eric Gisse. They're too irritating to bother with.

E.g. I was explaining something about how to view relativistic mass as an invariant quantity, i.e. the scalar product of the particle's 4-momentum with the observer's 4-velocity. The thread was called "Comment on "definition".

If you find and read that thread you'll have a solid example of Tom Roberts (TR) horrible personality quirk, i.e. he could care less on what you're trying to say and whines about what you posted, ignoring possible errors that might have been made in posting when you find them and point them out. E.g. I made the mistake of writing "U = 4-velocity of particle " when I

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

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

meant to write " $U = 4$ -velocity of observer". Tom Synder was kind enough to point my error out to me (without being condescending as TR usually is). Did Tom stop there? Nope. Not at all. He ignored my correction and kept whinnying as if I never corrected myself. Oy! Typical Tom Roberts behaviour. I believe that this is what a "straw man" argument is? The others are much worse. At least Tom knows the basics, although not as well as he should know them.

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.

Yeah, I know. Some people can't stop flammng for some reason.

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.

As you know I've recently seen an example of that, i.e. his changing of what is recorded in google. Have you reported this to google yet? He could get into very serious trouble for this. He'd deserve everything he got too. In fact I think I'll E-mail Google now on this point. :) So whatever Dono says must be assumed to be a lie unless one already knows differently.

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!

IT was probably Oh no's fault. He has proven to be an idiot/flamer. You should contact the moderators and complain when that happens.

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

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

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

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.

You have to find people who really know physics. That's rather difficult and takes time. But when people start flaming its easy to see whether they know physics that well or not. When flaming people tend to make serious errors, some times on purpose in order to avoid admitting their mistakes. Eric did that when he refused to either shut up or admit his mistake of thinking that  $L = T - V$  holds in relativity ( $T =$  kinetic energy and  $V =$  potential energy) for the non-covariant Lagrangian.

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.

It would be wise to mention Tom Roberts famous ploy of ignoring clarifications and corrections in order to suit his needs to be condescending. You should note how condescending comments are used. Tom is famous for that.

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

Heh heh! I got a good laugh out of that. Eric has a poor understanding of relativity as evidenced by his total lack of commenting on the counter examples provided where the "mass = proper mass" fails to work. Have you noticed that? Eric refuses to respond to those in hopes that people won't notice that he's clueless in those areas, i.e. has a lack of understanding on the most general situations in relativity.

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

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

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

Both are very true. Sad specimens are they indeed! (Do you know who used the term "sad specimen" when referring to his college professor? :))

<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...

Very true. Still you'd be better off ignoring them now that you've done all that work.

Pete

.

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