Dear Sir,
>
> I refer to my previous correspondence to which you did
> not have the courtesy to reply. You can obtain all
> relevant papers at the open archive of the Abdas Salam
> International Centre for Theoretical Physics
>
> http://eprints.ictp.it/view/subjects/C112.html
>
> Other leading specialists in GR have not taken your
> attitude. They have confirmed that the relevant papers
> are sound. You are well advised to read for yourself.
> The results are correct.
>
> You are invited once more to comment.
>
> Yours faithfully,
> Stephen J. Crothers.

This is the reply from Kerr, received 2 March 2006

Date: Thu, 02 Mar 2006 11:35:52 +1300
From:R.Kerr@math.canterbury.ac.nz  Add to Address Book Subject: Re: type 1 Einstein spaces To:"Stephen Crothers" thenarmis@yahoo.com

Why do you assume that I m going to reply instantaneously to your email? Your
remark that I "did not have the courtesy to reply" is insulting crap.

Since you want I reply I will tell you that:

Yourwork is rubbish. It is dependent on the coordinate system that you use. This
mistake was made by the relativity community in the early part of the 20th
century. It was assumed that r=2m was a real singularity. Then coordinates were
found which showed that this was not the case.

Roy Kerr

Here is my reply to Kerr, 2 March 2006

Mr. Roy Kerr,
> Dear Sir,
>
> My judgment of you was evidently sound from the
> outset, since you prefer to abuse rather then offer
> scientific argument. And now that you have confirmed
> that, there is no reason for me to be gentlemanly
> towards you.
>
> My work, contrary to your claim, is not "rubbish", and

> if you bothered to study it properly you would find
> that the so-called co-ordinate systems are entirely
> eliminated. The fact remains that there are two radii
> in Einstein's field, and they never coincide, except
> in the infinitely far field where the field becomes
> Efcleethean. The geometrical relations between the
> components of the metric tensor are inviolable, but
> you cannot see that, or refuse to see that, or now
> that it is pointed out to you, you simply don't like
> it. Well, tough luck, that is how the cookie crumbles,
> so wake up to yourself, a man of your age and alleged
> education.
>
> The co-ordinate singularity of the relativists arises
> because they do not understand the geometrical
> structure of type 1 Einstein spaces. The fact that the
> proper radius is identically zero when the radius of
> curvature reaches it invariant value of 2m is
> insurmountable, and independent of coordinate systems.
> If you object to the two radii not being identical
> then you have no alternative but to reject General
> Relativity. These two radii are identical only in
> Efcleethean space.
>
> You and the relativists work under the misconception
> that r is a proper radius in the field, which is
> "crap". Its position in the usual metrics alone
> demonstrates that it is a radius of curvature. The
> proper radius must be calculated, and the source is
> located where the proper radius is zero. You cannot
> make up your own geometry to make r, in the usual
> metrics, go down to zero. That r can generally go down
> to zero is an invalid assumption. The metric itself
> must determine the range on r. But that is an entirely
> superfluous procedure since it is not a measurable
> quantity in principle. The only measurable quantity is
> the circumference of a great circle and the metric
> should rightly be given in terms of quantities
> measurable in the field.
>
> r is in general a parametric distance in Minkowski
> space that is mapped into the radius of curvature and
> the proper radius of the field.
>
> Your solution is not invalidated by my work, but the
> black hole associated with it is not only "crap" it is
> bullshit, and a scientific fraud exceeding Piltdown
> Man. The coordinates to which your refer that make r =
> 2m a so-called "coordinate singularity" give rise to a
> non-static solution to a static problem (a simple
> contradiction), are spacelike at r = 0, and give an
> infinite acceleration of a test particle at r=2m
> where, according to that precious co-ordinate system,
> there is no matter! Your appeal to the
> Kruskal-Szekeres extension and the like is a cop out,
> because it cannot be used to refute an argument which
> refutes it. That is circular, but seems to be a

> widespread approach taken by corrupt physicists trying
> to protect their reputations and jobs.
>
> If you are such a great mathematician as is routinely
> claimed by the relativists, then it should not be
> difficult for you to rigorously refute my claims as to
> the geometrical relations between the components of
> the metric tensor. Only then can you shoot off your
> arrogant mouth, and think of yourself as a legend in
> your own lunchtime, and tell me that my work is
> "rubbish". I therefore challenge you to prove my
> geometry invalid. My prediction is that you will not
> take up the challenge as that is the only safe bet for
> you so that your own reputation and those of the
> relativists can be saved from humiliation. Turning
> one's back on facts is not scientific method. And if
> you refuse the challange I shall make your stupid and
> irresponsible email response to me public knowledge by
> placing it upon a scientific website for all to see
> and judge for themselves.
>
> Stephen J. Crothers.
> _____

Here is Kerr's final response.

Date: Thu, 02 Mar 2006 14:16:44 +1300
From: R.Kerr@math.canterbury.ac.nz Add to Address Book
Subject: Re: type 1 Einstein spaces
To: "Stephen Crothers" <thenarmis@yahoo.com>

charming