

1) Some Further Rebuttals of the
Brink Disinformation Site

09.05.2007 (151 Hts size June)

The deliberate disinformation (DM) occurs to
the assertion that the speed of light can be
exceeded. If the original frame is moving at
 c , then there is no physical meaning to a frame
moving at $c + v$. Thus $v = 0$.

25.05.2007 (88 Hts size June)

The standard of English is very poor. The
general rule for Lorentz transform of basis
sets is given by (L2.0) to (L2.3).
reproduced in Brink's (L2.0) to (L2.3).
Brink gives:

$$\underline{i}' = \underline{i}, \quad \underline{j}' = \underline{j} \quad - (1)$$

$$\underline{i}' \times \underline{j}' = \underline{k} = \underline{i} \times \underline{j} \quad - (2)$$

so:
This is what I proved. Brink now admits
that the cyclic theorem is the frame of reference.

27.05.2007 (145 Hts size June)

Here Brink admits that my definition

$$R \underline{q}^a \times := \int^u (\Gamma^u_{\mu\nu} \underline{q}^a - \omega^a_{\mu b} \underline{q}^b \times) \quad - (3)$$

is correct. In this equation (3) there is

2) summation over repeated ν and μ indices, and over repeated b indices, a \otimes right hand side! So a and λ indices match either side, so R is a scalar. Multiply both sides by $q^\lambda a$ and we:

$$q^a \times q^\lambda a = 4 \quad - (4)$$

to find:
$$R = \frac{1}{4} q^\lambda a \left(\prod_{\mu \nu} q^\nu - \omega_{\mu b}^a q^\lambda \right) \quad - (5)$$

One can use the normalization:

$$(q^a \times q^\lambda a)_n = 1 \quad - (6)$$

This just repeats $q \cdot 04 \cdot 07$, which I have answered many times before. $\prod_n q \cdot 04 \cdot 07$ breaks again admits that the Lemma is correct, he accepts:

$$\boxed{D^\mu (D_\mu q^a) := 0} \quad - (7)$$

This is an identity because $D_\mu q^a = 0$. $- (8)$
 This means that Burke also accepts the retarded postulate (8). He now attempts to disprove it by setting up his own error, and then attributing a second proof to correct his contrived error. He falsely asserts that I give

3) 29.01.07

Here Jadczyk asserts that Cantan geometry is not generally covariant, this is completely erroneous, the very reason for Cantan geometry is its 'general covariance'.

14.03.06

For some bizarre reason he reproduces the 1857 Act referring to Civil List.

12.08.07

The meaning of the index a has been discussed since 1992. Here Burke sets up his own eq. (2.1) and proceeds to rebut his own error. This is his usual method. The tensor $F^a_{\mu\nu}$ is generally covariant as discussed by Carroll.

31.07.07, 04.08.07 and 16.08.07

This is as already rebutted in paper 92