Sat, 8 Dec 2007 13:23:00 +1100 (EST)

From: "Stephen Crothers" <thenarmis@yahoo.com> Add to Address Book

Subject: Review Briefing - Exploring Black Holes

To: eftaylor@mit.edu

```
Dear Prof. Taylor,

I have noted your request for comment in relation to
the 2nd edition of Exploring Black Holes. I have a
copy of the 1st Edition.

There is I believe a major problem here. The fact is,
Ricc = 0 violates Einstein's 'Principle of
Equivalence'. I have recently published a paper on
this. It is attached, and can also be downloaded from:

www.ptep-online.com/index_files/2008/PP-12-11.PDF

The 1st Edition of your book is cited in this paper.

Yours faithfully,
Stephen J. Crothers.
```

Sat, 8 Dec 2007 09:35:29 -0500

From: "Stephen Crothers" <thenarmis@yahoo.com>
"Edwin Taylor" <eftaylor@MIT.EDU> Add to Address Book

Subject: Re: Review Briefing - Exploring Black Holes

Dear Dr. Crothers:

Thank you for your note and attachment. Edmund Bertschinger, my co-author, is on sabbatical, but he makes a quick visit to Boston soon, and I will consult with him on your analysis.
Sincerely, Edwin Taylor

Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 16:37:33 -0500
To: "Stephen Crothers" <thenarmis@yahoo.com>
From: "Edwin Taylor" <eftaylor@MIT.EDU> Add to Address Book
Subject: Re: Review Briefing - Exploring Black Holes

13 December 2007

Dear Dr. Crothers:

Ed Bertschinger and I discussed your objection to a point in our book Exploring Black Holes. You were kind to begin the conversation with such a specific point. Much more central is your general denial of the existence of black holes. If you are right, our whole book is essentially useless and should be abandoned.
Neither of us wishes to enter into a discussion with you on this larger subject; you and we are so far apart that all of us would exhaust ourselves in the process.

So we will continue on our perhaps benighted way. Sooner or later there will be a definitive judgment between us.
Sincerely, Edwin Taylor

Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2007 15:50:22 +1100 (EST)
From: "Stephen Crothers" <thenarmis@yahoo.com> Add to Address Book
Subject: Re: Review Briefing - Exploring Black Holes
To: "Edwin Taylor" <eftaylor@MIT.EDU>

```
Dear Prof. Taylor,

Thankyou for you note. But surely you can see that
since Ricc = 0 is inadmissible then it follows that
```

the black hole is fallacious. That stands on its own, irrespective of my other geometrical arguments on spherically symmetric metric manifolds. Therefore, there is no need to exhaust one another in discussions. The 6 points raised in my paper (you have a copy) should be easy enough to address. Therefore, please tell me you position and reasons on at least the following, since you have not stated you position let alone reasons for you position:

1. Ricc = 0 violates Einstein's 'Principle of Equivalence'.

2. 'r' is the Gaussian radius of curvature.

3. Einstein's pseudo-tensor is meaningless.

I am aware that Dr. Bertschinger knows of my work, and disapproves of me generally, but that has nothing to do with the science. May I also ask why do neither of you even wish to enter into discussion of such important matters? That seems to be contrary to the public invitation on your website to comment on your review of the 2nd edition of your book. Will you include any of my counter-arguments in your book?

Yours faithfully,
Steve Crothers.

Date: Sat, 15 Dec 2007 18:50:00 +1100 (EST)
From: "Stephen Crothers" <thenarmis@yahoo.com> Add to Address Book
Subject: Fwd: Re: Review Briefing - Exploring Black Holes
To: edbert@mit.edu

Dear Prof. Taylor,

Thankyou for your note. But surely you can see that since Ricc = 0 is inadmissible then it follows that the black hole is fallacious. That stands on its own, irrespective of my other geometrical arguments on spherically symmetric metric manifolds. Therefore, there is no need to exhaust one another in discussions. The 6 points raised in my paper (you have a copy) should be easy enough to address. Therefore, please tell me your position and reasons on at least the following, since you have not stated your position let alone reasons for you position:

1. Ricc = 0 violates Einstein's 'Principle of Equivalence'.

2. 'r' is the Gaussian radius of curvature.

3. Einstein's pseudo-tensor is meaningless.

I am aware that Dr. Bertschinger knows of my work, and disapproves of me generally, but that has nothing to do with the science. May I also ask why do neither of you even wish to enter into discussion of such important matters? That seems to be contrary to the

public invitation on your website to comment on your review of the 2nd edition of your book. Will you include any of my counter-arguments in your book?

Yours faithfully,
Steve Crothers.

http://www.eftaylor.com/