

Re: Is it possible to be an important and influential amateur physicist?

Re: Is it possible to be an important and influential amateur physicist?

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2006-06/msg02529.html>

- *From:* Phineas T Puddleduck <phineaspuddleduck@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 28 Jun 2006 18:22:41 +0100
-

In article <%Myog.59\$25.4867@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, <mmeron@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

It goes further than this. "Unable to find" seems to indicate that they check for errors, just fail to find any. But as I can see they don't check since the idea that they may be wrong just won't cross their mind. They "know" that they're right:--)

They also refuse to demonstrate their results in proper conditions. Our recent gravity and Bernoulli cranks wouldn't dare repeat their "findings" in controlled conditions. On USENET, you can claim anything is true. You can claim there is no such force as gravity, it is invisible unicorns holding you down. When asked to provide evidence, you either attack the establishment for the "Cult of Insane Science" as Dennis B has, or claim you are being held back and your work suppressed.

All they have to do is take their groundbreaking research to a local university.

The greatest enemy of science is pseudoscience.

Jaffa cakes. Sweet delicious orangey jaffa goodness, and an abject lesson why parroting information from the web will not teach you cosmology.

Official emperor of sci.physics, head numbler of the "Cult of INSANE SCIENCE". Please pay no attention to my butt poking forward, it is expanding.

Relf's Law?

"Bullshit repeated to the limit of infinity asymptotically approaches the odour of roses."

.