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 Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics

> [http://eprints.ictp.it/viewsubjects/C112.html](http://eprints.ictp.it/viewsubjects/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:

Your work 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 challenge 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 I Einstein spaces
To:         "Stephen Crothers" <thenarmis@yahoo.com>

charming