

Re: our science replaced by their journalism

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2008-02/msg00073.html>

- *From:* Igor <thoovler@xxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 1 Feb 2008 10:24:21 -0800 (PST)
-

On Feb 1, 12:20 pm, "gdewi...@xxxxxxxxxxx" <gdewi...@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

hello,

I have figured out a number of awkward magnetic effects. I don't want to bother anyone with the details. I was just curious why people refuse to even look at perpetual motion. Sure you can claim nothing of the kind exists. Scientifically you have not begun to look in favor of this journalism. You have nothing to back up this claim as non of you have ever bothered to look into the topic in favor there of.

You guys are that what we call scientists. I am not, but I am the one looking into the science while you are all ignoring it? Every last one of you. There are practically no exceptions.

My question is not that of "perpetual motion real or nut?"

I would like to know at what stage of the analysis the actual data is allowed into this system. Then if you go as far as to disallow the actual data to be reviewed, how can you still continue to pretend it is science?

not looking at data = journalism

looking at data = science

You want to argue I'm wrong about that? I would be happy to hear it.

I know every last one of you likes to think the accumulated knowledge I have acquired over the years is equal to zero. This is quite insulting but it most certainly doesn't have anything scientific to it, such review only describes you.

I spend my time reading the work of thousands. Your ignorance based refutation of this is worthy of laughing in your face. You don't know what I read, where I read it, who wrote it AND what it was about. But now you want to pretend you are the expert. You are experts at Gonzo journalism. Are you trying to make me laugh or something?

Re: our science replaced by their journalism

I want to know what happened to science in general. Why did it have to die? Who killed it? Why have none of you ever looked at the hard real world facts? Why are you all ignorant bitches all of the time? The approach scores lots of points as fascism. Is there anyone here who wants to pretend it is scientific?

Can one of you throw me a banana from your tree of dogma?

Don't give me the imaginary crap about all of those devices that didn't work. You haven't looked at any of them. Claiming they do not work should be done after proving it scientifically. With hard data that is.

you have zero evidence, I on the other hand have abundant evidence of