

Re: final proof Einstein 1905 is crap.

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2004-12/0224.html>

From: Titan Point (titanpoint_at_yahoo.com)

Date: 11/22/04

Date: 22 Nov 2004 01:46:16 -0800

Creighton Hogg <wchogg@hep.wisc.edu> wrote in message
news:<Pine.LNX.4.44.0411190900330.10096-100000@dill.hep.wisc.edu>...

> On 19 Nov 2004, Eric Gisse wrote:

>

> > "eleaticus" <eleaticus@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:<pFdnd.33798\$z3.2745@bignews5.bellsouth.net>...

> >

> > [snip]

> >

> >

> > <http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=fD0fc2fa.0411130117.14e7bb25%40posting.google.com&output=gplain>

> >

> > You are unqualified. My comments stand.

> >

> > >

> > > One more obvious proof that Einstein's derivation in 1905 is just as much
> > > crap as his 1916/1962 derivation.

> >

> > Einstein died in 1955.

>

> That's not a good excuse for having a poor derivation in '62.

It does explain the poor handwriting. It's bloody dark in there.