

----- Original Message -----

**From:** [Axel Westrenius](#)

**To:** [Andrzej Krasiński](#); [Mike Ford](#)

**Sent:** Monday, December 10, 2007 7:14 AM

**Subject:** Ricc = 0

I just discovered that the second link was broken. Apologies. The correct link is <http://www.geocities.com/theometria/Ricci.html>.

Gentlemen,

As an interested layman, I have with not a little perplexity witnessed your apparent out-of-hand dismissal of Mr Stephen Crothers' latest paper [http://www.ptep-online.com/index\\_files/2008/PP-12-11.PDF](http://www.ptep-online.com/index_files/2008/PP-12-11.PDF).

As a layman, I am obviously not in the cross-hair for Mr Crothers' colourful language and find it perhaps a little easier to disregard his manners and only look at the substance of his work, which I find compelling. This is not at all diminished but rather the contrary by his further deliberations (the substance of it, that is) on the matter at <http://www.geocities.com/theometria/Ricci.htm>.

Admittedly, I too could easily be dismissed out-of-hand as just a layman. However, I am one of a large and very rapidly growing number of interested laymen worldwide. Just witness the phenomenal growth of the readership of "New Scientist".

The point I wish to make is that if you are too offended by Mr Crothers' lack of academic decorum to ascertain whether or not his claims have objective merit and to offer your well considered reasons for your position, and it turns out in the end that he is right, we will be decidedly unimpressed and will not be ignored.

Yours truly,  
Axel Westrenius  
Australian taxpayer

**From:** Andrzej Krasiński <[akr@camk.edu.pl](mailto:akr@camk.edu.pl)>

**Date:** 10 December 2007 11:14:12 PM

**To:** "Axel Westrenius" <[corbis@bigpond.net.au](mailto:corbis@bigpond.net.au)>

**Cc:** <[akr@camk.edu.pl](mailto:akr@camk.edu.pl)>, <[Mike.Ford@uts.edu.au](mailto:Mike.Ford@uts.edu.au)>

**Subject:** Re: Ricc = 0

Dear Mr. Westrenius,

Laymen have the right to ask all kinds of questions, and have them answered. There are forums and frameworks to do it - for example, public lectures. It is perfectly OK to ask questions in letters sent directly to scientists, provided they are serious questions by persons who want to understand something or overcome a difficulty in absorbing some segment of knowledge.

This is not what Mr. Crothers has done. He has accused us all of being fools who do not understand the obvious, and crooks who extort money from governments to pursue stupid projects. We, tens of thousands of professionals, are all stupid thieves in his eyes, and he is the only wise man who is honest. This alone would be sufficient to refuse to talk to him. But

this is not all. He fails to understand the science he criticises (contrary to what you claim, his arguments are not "compelling" - they are a complete misunderstanding), and, on the one hand, demands that we give him private lessons for free, but, on the other hand, he assumes in advance that whatever we say is stupid because he sees the Truth already now. You probably didn't see Mr Crothers' brief correspondence with one scientist who took him seriously and sent him a polite explanation of one of his errors. (I do not remember the name of that person - perhaps you can access that exchange via Mr Crothers' elaborate web page.) Crothers' reply was just as aggressive as his original attack - and equally ignorant. So, it does not make any sense to try to educate him.

As an aside: After a brief visit to Mr. Crothers' web page I discovered a large family of viruses on my computer, which I suspect were deliberately planted as a malicious revenge for my refusal to take seriously his maniacal attacks. The viruses were easily discovered and killed by my anti-virus system - but this is an additional indication of what kind of a man Mr Crothers is.

Regards  
Andrzej Krasinski

"Mike Ford"  
<Mike.Ford@uts.edu.au>

From: "Axel Westrenius" <corbis@bigpond.net.au>  
[View Contact Details](#)  
Subject: Re: Ricc = 0  
Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 11:44:01 +1100  
To: "Andrzej Krasinski" <akr@camk.edu.pl>

Dear Dr Krasinski,

Thank you for your response to my email.

I was quite taken aback by the acerbity of your comments. Your 'aside' about deliberate virus infection of your computer seems absurd. I was, as I said, trying to see past Mr Crothers' 'colourful language' and concentrate on the scientific merits of his claims and you respond with much the same vitriol.

Let me rephrase myself and focus on just one of Crothers' claims. Am I to understand your position as claiming that Karl Schwarzschild was wrong in his two papers from 1916? Refer

to : <http://arxiv.org/abs/physics/9905030> and <http://arxiv.org/abs/physics/9912033>

Would you mind pointing out to me where and how he was mistaken?

Yours truly  
Axel Westrenius

**From:** Andrzej Krasinski <akr@camk.edu.pl>  
**Date:** 11 December 2007 11:08:55 PM  
**To:** "Axel Westrenius" <corbis@bigpond.net.au>  
**Cc:** <akr@camk.edu.pl>  
**Subject:** Re: Ricc = 0

Dear Mr. Westrenius,

Karl Schwarzschild was as right as he could be at the time. In 1916, his paper was the first-ever attempt to find an exact solution of a newly formulated (and rather complicated) theory. He did understand what calculations to do, but he did not (and could not - at that early stage) see all the implications and understand the geometrical interpretation of what he obtained. That came gradually later. The full geometrical interpretation of his solution was provided only in 1960 by Martin Kruskal, but important contributions were made by several other people, among them Lemaitre and Eddington in the 1930s. The correctness of the result of Schwarzschild's calculations was never questioned, but some of his conclusions turned out to be wrong. One of the things he did not know was that the coordinates he used did not cover the whole of spacetime. What seemed an edge of the spacetime to him was merely the edge of the coordinate map he used, while the spacetime itself continued through it. (That edge was the outer boundary of a black hole, so much hated by Mr. Crothers). What he thought was time was only one of many possible time-coordinates, and not a universal physical time. You may be interested to know that almost simultaneously with Schwarzschild, somebody else found the same solution and interpreted it with more sophistication, he was Johannes Droste, see a reprint of his paper:

[Gen. Rel. Grav. 34, no 9, 1541 \(2002\)](#)

This is a rather brief answer, and it cannot be much more elaborate in a letter. If you seriously intend to learn more about relativity, I suggest that you begin by studying a textbook. I can recommend one that is not very long and written in a rather readable way, it is:

Hans Stephani, General Relativity. Cambridge University Press. (there was an edition in 1990, but I think it was re-edited still a few years later).

Regards  
Andrzej Krasinski

From: "Axel Westrenius" <corbis@bigpond.net.au> [View Contact Details](#)  
Subject: Re: Ricc = 0  
Date: Sat, 15 Dec 2007 13:22:42 +1100  
To: "Andrzej Krasinski" <akr@camk.edu.pl>

Dear Dr Krasinski,

Thank you for your message of 11/12/07.

I have in the intervening days tried my best (albeit somewhat bewildered) to understand by following your line of reasoning and I will borrow the book by Stephani at my local University library. However, I fail to understand why you do not simply demolish Crothers by demonstrating that Ricc = 0 is admissible and Einstein's 'Principle of Equivalence' is therefore not violated, and that 'r' is not the Gaussian radius of curvature.

Regards,  
Axel Westrenius.

CC: "Andrzej Krasinski" <akr@camk.edu.pl>, "Kim Carr"  
<senator.carr@aph.gov.au>

From: "Axel Westrenius" <corbis@bigpond.net.au> [View Contact Details](#)  
Subject: Theoretical physics controversy  
Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2007 15:25:46 +1100  
To: "Stephen Crothers" <thenarmis@yahoo.com>

Dear Mr Crothers,

As you will see below, I have over some time had an exchange of messages with Dr Andrzej Krasinski. He has been very generous with his time in trying to help me, a mere layman in theoretical physics, to understand why there is this 'mutual dismissal out-of-hand' situation (which seems to have descended to a very undignified street-brawl).

I am not at all happy with how this exchange has been going, but before giving up completely on this avenue for putting my concerns to rest, I wanted to let you Mr Crothers, have your say, if you feel so inclined. Not that either you or Dr Krasinski owe anything to a lone voice amongst the Hoi Polloi, but perhaps you both share my worry about the future well-being of our grandchildren and great-grandchildren (I am 77) on this miserable third rock from the sun. Consider also what I said in my initial message to Dr Krasinski. Like so many other people, I read the New Scientist every week in the hope that some genuine breakthrough will emerge and change the downhill course of the planet.

Dr Krasinski is referring to 40 years of efforts by many physicists and contrast this with the, quote "quickie silly pseudo-arguments" by you Mr Crothers, as well as your distasteful and offensive attacks.

You, Mr Crothers, seem to put six points in black-and-white. Right or wrong. Nothing in between.

If you, Mr Crothers, turn out to be right, it will no doubt change everything dramatically. If you are wrong, nothing much will change. Theoretical physics will just continue its tortuous (and very expensive) way forward. Except that we, the Hoi Polloi may not be willing or able to foot the bill anymore. Somehow, we will want to know if you are right, or not. We have plenty of other worries except an academic dispute, such as climate change, health care costs, and so on and on.

The great majority of the theoretical physics community appears to share the views of Dr Krasinski. Yet, it seems as if no representative of that community is willing to come forward and take the nutcracker to your actual claims in your latest paper. I would have thought it an easy task to shoot you down in flames. If your claims are unfounded, that is.

We, the interested laymen and taxpayers, are not impressed.

By copy of this email, I am appealing to the Australian Federal Minister for Innovation, Industry, Science and Research, Senator Kim Carr to personally involve himself in this matter. It is in the interest of society as a whole to clarify this. The consequences could be far reaching. Not only could vast sums of taxpayers money be found to have been squandered on meaningless experiments but physics could be found to have been stalled for just about a century.

Yours truly,  
Axel Westrenius

Dear Mr. Westrenius,

Thankyou for sending me copies of your correspondence with Prof. A. Krasinski. It is evident to me that you are more able in physics than you explicitly let on.

It is quite plain from the remarks made by the Professor that he has no intention of even attempting to justify to you his unsubstantiated claims. This is, as I too have discovered, the usual method of the Standard Modellers (black holers and big bangers). I have for quite a long time now invited any of them to refute my arguments against and mathematical demonstrations of the invalidity of their holes and bangs, yet not a single one of them has even attempted to do so. You can see that my Challenge to them in relation to the public funding of the Australian International Gravitational Observatory was completely ignored by them:

[www.geocities.com/theometria/challenge.html](http://www.geocities.com/theometria/challenge.html)

Mr. Krasinski has referred you to some notes sent to me by one Professor M. MacCallum of Cambridge University UK (which I have posted to my website ([www.geocities.com/theometria/PhD.html](http://www.geocities.com/theometria/PhD.html), since I hide nothing). That those notes are replete with barely veiled insults and do not address any of the matters I have raised is plain, even by a cursory reading (you will also note that MacCallum apparently cannot even take a simple integral). Evidently Messrs. Krasinski and MacCallum take exception to my vulgar and wicked colonial vernacular, but I am required by them, it seems, to tolerate their insults (apparently because they insult me without recourse to a “common” parlance). As I see it, they are also indignant at my dishing out to them a dose of their own medicine, but in words used daily by the “common man”.

Returning to the technical matters adduced in my most recent paper

[http://www.ptep-online.com/index\\_files/2008/PP-12-11.PDF](http://www.ptep-online.com/index_files/2008/PP-12-11.PDF)

<http://www.geocities.com/theometria/Ricc.html>

you have clearly appreciated the simplicity of the arguments and proofs therein. The simple reason why you have not and will not receive any attempt at refutation from Prof. Krasinski (or for that matter from any black holer or big banger) is that it is impossible for him (and them) to refute my arguments, simply because my arguments are consistent with pure mathematics and the physical principles of the Theory of Relativity as laid down by Einstein himself. It is irrefutable, as proved by simple calculations (see my Ricc.html site), that Special Relativity, and hence General Relativity, forbids the existence of the infinitely dense point-masses (also called singularities by Standard Modellers, in relation to the gravitational field). It is irrefutable that  $Ricc = 0$  violates Einstein’s ‘Principle of Equivalence’. It is irrefutable that Einstein’s pseudo-tensor is a meaningless concoction of mathematical symbols. It is irrefutable that what is called “Schwarzschild’s solution” by Mr. Krasinski and all the black holers and big bangers is not Schwarzschild’s solution at all. It is irrefutable

that the quantity 'r' appearing in Prof. Krasinski's "Schwarzschild solution" is not a distance, radial or otherwise, in the spacetime of  $Ricc = 0$  but is in fact the Gaussian radius of curvature, and that the distance from the centre of spherical symmetry of the spacetime for  $Ricc = 0$  is given by the integral of the square root of the negative of the 2<sup>nd</sup> term on the right side of the line-element referred to by Mr. Krasinski as "Schwarzschild's solution". I have adduced mathematical proofs and so it is impossible to refute those proofs. Nonetheless, Mr. Krasinski and all the Standard Modellers refuse to acknowledge the facts, clinging instead to their unsubstantiated notions which violate differential geometry and the physical principles of the Theory of Relativity. I do not repeat the proofs here and refer you to my recent paper for all the details (which I know you have already studied and understood).

The signatures of the alleged black hole are (1) a singularity and (2) an event horizon. It is claimed by the Standard Modellers that hundreds upon hundreds of black holes have been discovered, as their literature clearly testifies, yet the fact is that these claims are patently false. Ask any one of the discoverers or proponents of these alleged black holes for the coordinates of just one infinitely dense singularity or for just one event horizon and you will not be provided with them, because they can't, as nobody has ever identified a singularity or an event horizon, i.e. nobody has ever found a black hole – and they never will, because they are figments of an irrational imagination that will not accept the scientific facts yet accuse those who object to their unscientific methods of refusing to "understand".

A vast sum of public money has indeed been wasted on so-called "research", e.g. LIGO, AIGO, etc, which are based upon demonstrably false theory. I have charged the Standard Modellers at large with scientific fraud because that is precisely what they have perpetrated. It is no real secret that the Standard Modellers have deliberately ignored and taken deliberate measures to suppress and prevent the publication of scientific papers which completely invalidate their theories and their "research projects". You can see, for example, as described on my Challenge website, that a recent gathering of Standard Modellers in Sydney did not permit the appearance of a single paper which questioned Standard Model claims. I sent a paper to Prof. D. Blair of the University of Western Australia (he is a major player in the AIGO and was closely associated with the organisers of that gathering), requesting him to ensure that my paper was presented. He ignored my request and my paper. This is common practice, and it amounts to suppression of science for gain. That is why I have brought the issues before Government, so that all is on the Public Record and can be subsequently cited. Mark my words, the black hole and the big bang are such monstrous frauds that they make Piltdown Man look like a pimple of an elephant's arse.

I also note that Prof. Krasinski has suggested to you that my scientific analyses should not be believed because I fiendishly infected his computer with a host of destructive viruses which I have hidden away in the code for my website, ever waiting to spring upon the likes of Prof. Krasinski (and the Standard Modellers in general), in some kind of revenge. Now I ask you, is that the response of a rational and honest man?

I encourage you to continue to require the scientists to justify their claims, especially when the scientists are spending vast sums of taxpayers' money. You and an informed

Public at Large have the right to all sides of the arguments and the unfettered evidence, so that you can make an informed analysis and come to a sound decision. I can tell you that the scientists cannot be trusted, and that by and large they think themselves so much smarter and so much better than the celebrated "layman" or "man in the street" that they are more or less consumed by their indolent vainglory and also by cupidity. The scientists cannot be allowed to continue to decide how, when and where Public money will be spent and to dictate to the rest of society, and they must be held accountable, morally and at law, for misdeed and malfeasance when and where it occurs. It is my firm conclusion that a gross misappropriation of Public money, by deception, has been perpetrated by the Standard Modellers at large, and so they must be exposed, and where appropriate, prosecuted before the criminal courts. They long ago passed the boundaries of gross professional incompetence. It cannot go on.

Since Mr. Krasinski has told me that he has relegated all my email to him to spam, and so will not enter into any discussion whatsoever with me (no surprise in that), I have no objection to you sending to him a copy of this email, if you so wish.

Yours faithfully,  
Stephen J. Crothers.

**From:** Andrzej Krasinski <[akr@camk.edu.pl](mailto:akr@camk.edu.pl)>  
**Date:** 18 December 2007 11:27:44 PM  
**To:** "Axel Westrenius" <[corbis@bigpond.net.au](mailto:corbis@bigpond.net.au)>  
**Cc:** <[akr@camk.edu.pl](mailto:akr@camk.edu.pl)>  
**Subject:** Re: Theoretical physics controversy

Dear Mr. Westrenius,  
When answering your mails, I treated you as a responsible person and tried to explain to you the reasons why nobody wants to take up the discussion with the mad accusations of Mr. Crothers. Now you have grossly misused my trust by forwarding my mails to him - with all the details, including my postal address and telephone numbers. Now I will be vulnerable to all kinds of personal attacks if he makes use of that information.

So, this is my very last message to you. Do you really believe that tens of thousands of physicists who studied relativity over the last 90 years are plainly wrong, and a lone outsider has suddenly seen through all their stupidity and understood The Truth? What would be the value of all science if its foundations were really that feeble, and its practitioners really that dumb? Mr. Crothers is not the first, and not the last maniac who failed to understand that theory, and undertook to strike it down, using aggression instead of reason.

Your appeal to the federal minister of innovation et al. is bombastic. This is no crisis of science that would call for an intervention of any political authority - this is just a brawl started by a lone maniac that will be completely forgotten in a few weeks. Putting Mr. Crothers on equal footing with real professionals you only support his already oversized ego, and nothing good will result from that. Putting yourself in the position of a referee is equally objectionable. It is better if you just continue to read New Scientist (which, by the way, is not the only magazine that writes about science for open public - you may try other ones as well).

Regards for the last time  
Andrzej Krasinski

---

From: "Axel Westrenius" <[corbis@bigpond.net.au](mailto:corbis@bigpond.net.au)> [View Contact Details](#)  
Subject: Re: Theoretical physics controversy

Date: Wed, 19 Dec 2007 08:38:13 +1100  
To: "Andrzej Krasinski" <akr@camk.edu.pl>

Dear Dr Krasinski,

I'd like to conclude our exchange with a quote from "Thomas F. Glick, ed., The Comparative Reception of Relativity (Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1987), ISBN 9027724989."

In the Preface by Stanley Goldberg, "The Assimilation of Relativity in America", he writes, quote:

*"... While Lewis and Tolman were endeavoring to convince their colleagues that the theory was empirical and practical, those Americans who did comment on the theory ridiculed it as errant nonsense. L.T. More. Professor of Physics at the University of Cincinnati, teased relativists on the grounds that if they were right then the sun was melting away at an incredible rate and that when a man caught a baseball, the mass of both the ball and the man's hand should change. But he became deadly serious when he thundered that the "electronicist theories" were a throwback representing an attempt to undermine the three century struggle which science had waged to purge itself of metaphysics, that is, nonsense. ..."*

Merry Christmas!

Rgds  
Axel Westrenius