

## The Ignorance of Mainstream Science to the Discoveries of the Past

The “science” journal Nature thought the following was new (they must have very ignorant editors over there) and published the following article in their 2/4/00 issue. Nikola Tesla, who was not even mentioned, not only knew the etiology of ball lightning but he also could create it over a century ago (Tesla, Man out of Time by Margaret Cherney B&N 1993).

*“Ball lightning caused by oxidation of nanoparticle networks from normal lightning strikes on soil”*

This is not the first time that “experts” have been ignorant of past discoveries.

### [NIKOLA TESLA--ERASED AT THE SMITHSONIAN](#)

**The Smithsonian curator essentially credits Edison for our worldwide system of electricity. He also credits Marconi for the invention of radio. This is a deliberate assault on factual history and needs to be challenged.**

Would you believe that the majority of engineering students today do not know that Tesla invented the radio, radar, electrical turbine, and even the AC electric motor? He also fought for AC current transmission to be the national standard rather than the DC that Edison wanted. If Edison had gotten his way, we would virtually be in the dark ages today.

Even the IEEE journal Spectrum, who did a lengthy summary of the “Electric Century” noting the scientists that made it possible over the last century, said nary a word about Tesla.

I tremble at the thought that the so-called mainstream journals can be so ignorant of scientific history. I guess that I should not be surprised anymore by the fact that most “expert” journals contain such errors on a regular basis.

My observations are unfortunately not unique. I hear from other scientists on a regular basis. Not only is scientific ignorance out there but also bias as noted in the article below.

---

The following is a summary of an article by Prof. Ruggero Maria Santilli. The full text of this article is available at <http://home1.gte.net/science2/ir00005.htm>. I wanted to bring these specific words about biases in the scientific literature to the Journal of Theoretics audience. The Professor’s CV is quite extensive of which I noted some of them below:

President of the Institute for Basic Research

President Professor of Theoretical Physics

Editor in Chief of the Algebras, Groups, and Geometries Hardonic Journal

Editor of Hadronic J. Supplement.

J. Balkan Geometry Society

And more...

# Call to Contain Ethical Decay in Physics

January 31, 2000

Dear Colleague,

Permit me to express my extreme concern for the current decay of ethics in physics, not only in the so-called "orthodox" physics community, but primarily in the so-called "progressive" physics community, under which conditions there is no window left of a real future for real science. I am here presenting my personal experience, soliciting your view, and suggesting that we unite forces to create at least a core of individual scientists willing to stand for scientific ethics, in which absence any scientific process is merely illusory.

As far as I am concerned, following repetitious denials of corrective actions protracted for years, in a desperate attempt to contain the decay of scientific ethics, I have been forced to file civil legal proceedings, with criminal proceedings under initiations (see <http://home1.gte.net/science2/>). On my part, I admit that such actions can be excessive, perhaps wrong, and ultimately counter-productive. I therefore ask for constructively critical suggestions for alternative ways of containing the decay of scientific ethics, under the clear understanding that such suggestions do not compromise on the central issue, the correction of ethical wrongdoings, because their tolerance would be vulgar complicity.

Let me outline my experience with the use of real names and expressed in my broken, yet plain English. Ethical misconducts in science constitute serious crimes against individuals as well as against society. Therefore, to avoid a vacuous academic talk, ethical misconduct cannot be treated with vague academic parlance.

## 1. THE ETHICAL DECAY IN THE "PHYSICS ESTABLISHMENT":

I have been prohibited from publishing papers at the APS journals since 1981, despite a documentation of about one hundred submissions, all rejections made with a reiteration of vacuous sentences, the known technique being that of suppressing unwanted advances by tiring the author.

Similarly, the Italian Physical Society has systematically rejected all my submissions since 1983, all rejections perpetrated with truly incredible "reviews", such as that personally released by Renato Angelo Ricci, President of the SIP, that "the theories treated are not accepted by Harvard University, your [mine] former affiliation."

The systematic, protracted, all inclusive, and forceful rejections by the British IOP since 1993 have been even more incredible, because perpetrated to such an extreme of offending the memory of distinguished British physicists (such as the rejection of all my papers dedicated to Rutherford's legacy protracted for years).

The rejections of all my submissions by the journals controlled by the Swedish Academy of Sciences are perhaps more un reassuring, because based on excessively transparent manipulations of scientific truths for excessively transparent political gains, as well as denoting the replacement by the Swedish Academy of Sciences of the scientifically oppressive role played by Italy during Galilei's times, a sinister role which delayed the advancement of basic human knowledge for hundred of years.

The legitimization of unquestionable scientific corruption by the editors of the above quoted orthodox scientific communities is sealed by the fact that each and every one of over one hundred papers they rejected, was then published, often without any change whatever, by more serious Journals of unimpeachable ethincal standard, such as Foundations of Physics, Foundations of Physics Letters, Mathematical Methods in Applied Sciences, Acta Applicandae Mathematicae, International Journal of Modern Physics, Modern Physics Letters, JINR Rapid Communications, and other distinguished Journals (other than those in which I am an editor).

You should be aware that, by no means, the obstructions I experienced from the organized academic interests were solely restricted to the suppression of publications with vulgarly corrupt "reviews." In fact, the organized scientific crime in orthodox academia has pushed its action to the extreme of suppressing any reference to my publication. The order going on in the corridors of the APS, IOP, SIP and other journals is that any paper merely quoting the name "Santilli" must be rejected.

As one among too many examples, I identified the first known (p, q)-parameter deformations of Lie algebras,

$$(A, B) = pAB - qBA = m(AB - BA) + n(AB + BA),$$

$$A(t) = [\exp(iHqt)]A(0)[\exp(-itpH)],$$

as part of my Ph.D. thesis, and published it in *Nuovo Cimento* Vol. 51, page 571, 1967 (which, at that time, was not yet controlled by the scientific cartel headed by Renato Angelo Ricci). This identification was done some two decades before being "rediscovered" by others, such as by Larry Biedenharn, who was fully aware of my origination (we even applied for a DOE grant together on my deformations!). Yet, Biedenharn elected to suppress the quotation of my prior work in his first paper of 1989 on the particular case of q-deformations because, as he admitted to me under serious duress, of "Cantabridgean pressures."

Ironically, Biedenharn and a river of followers initiated studies in q-deformations precisely at the time, 1989, when I had abandoned them because of catastrophic physical inconsistencies (lack of invariance, thus total lack of any physical value - see below-) as Biedenharn himself admitted to be at the Third Wigner's Meeting in Oxford, again, under duress.

I have accumulated a rather massive documentation on the systematic refusal to merely add my paper of 1967 among the list of quotation in the current sea of publications on deformations, NONE of which quotes my origination. These systematic refusals were perpetrated for about two decades by now, by Roger Newton and his editorial cartel at the *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, by the notoriously anonymous cartel controlling the *British Journal of Physics* and the *Proceedings of the Royal Society*, by *Nuovo Cimento*, by *Nuclear Physics*, etc.

A similar rejection for due quotation of my origination of the deformations of Lie's theory has been perpetrated by Howard Georgi (a co-founder of the *Hadronic Journal* when I was at Harvard University, I thought he was my friend) in his capacity as editor of *Physics Letters*, thus establishing a serious violation of the Laws at that particular journal.

Additional repeated rejections of my origination of the isotopies of Lie theory,

$$[A, ^A B] = ATB - BTA,$$

$$A(t) = [\exp(iXTt)]A(0)[\exp(-itTX)],$$

(see my *Found. of Theor. Mechanics* with Springer-Verlag, 1983, and *Elements of Hadronic Mechanics*, Ukraine Academy of Sciences, 1993, and a subsequent vast literature in the field by others) have been perpetrated by Arthur Jaffe, also of Harvard University, this time in his capacity as President of the AMS, as well as editor of *Letters in Mathematical Physics*, the latter journal refusing the publication of a paper identifying the proper paternity of the isothory by one of my associates after its admission of being "correct" (see for details *Algebras, Groups and geometries* Vol. 15, p. 497, 1998).

Vulgar plagiarisms of my broader Lie-admissible theory,

$$(A, B) = ARB - BSA = (AMB - BMA) + (ANB + BNA),$$

$$A(t) = [\exp(iXSt)]A(0)[A(-itRX)],$$

and related formulations (see the latest paper at *Found. Phys.* Vol. 27, page 1159, 1997) are just too many for comfort, the more organized being those by fellow Italian colleagues, e.g., at the Universities of Turin, Milan and Florence.

At this point what shall I do just to have my prior references merely quoted? Please let me know your suggestions. Over a span now surpassing twenty years of efforts, I have tried everything I could for the implementation of at least minimal conditions of decency, let alone minimal scientific process, and failed without any hope of self-corrections by the organized academic greed. Therefore, my only possibility left is to file lawsuits in civil and criminal courts.

[I will now jump to the end of the article.]

Hoping for leniency from the audience, I present the view that, at the beginning of the third millennium, we are experiencing a scientific obscurantism not only comparable to that during Galileo's times, but perhaps deeper, and more diversified. I define "science" as mathematical representations, producing invariant numerical predictions, which can be subjected to experimental verifications via available technology. The first obscurantism I can, therefore, point out is that in pure mathematics, because of the lack of admission and scholar treatments of basic mathematical insufficiencies, e.g., for a classical representation of antimatter; an invariant, classical and operator representation of nonlinear, nonlocal, and nonHamiltonian interactions; an axiomatically consistent representation of irreversibility in chemical reactions and biological systems, and other fields. I then pass to the outline of the contemporary obscurantism in classical physics, particle physics, nuclear physics, quantum chemistry, superconductivity, biology, astrophysics, and cosmologies, with particular reference to the obscurantisms caused by the limitations of Einsteinian doctrines and quantum mechanics in face of an ever growing knowledge. To provide a tentative historical perspective, I make a parallelism of the current scientific obscurantism with that during Galilei's times. In particular, I show that the techniques employed by the Jesuits in attempting to suppress Galilei's novel ideas, not only are fully in force today, but have been refined into a rather sophisticated art. I then draw a number of parallelisms between specific technical obscurantisms in full dominance of the scientific scene today with corresponding specific scientific manipulations perpetrated against Galilei's work. I finally conclude by recalling that the scientific obscurantism initiated in Italy with Galileo Galilei delayed the acquisition of basic scientific knowledge for centuries. A similar unreassuring perspective appears to emerge in the contemporary scientific obscurantism, however with implications nowadays much more serious than those occurred in the Middle Age, such as the inability to resolve truly basic needs for our societies, such as bias new clean energies and fuels, as well as the recycling of radioactive and other wastes created by our generation, all advances which necessarily call for halting the contemporary fanatics on the universal validity of Einstein doctrines for the totality of all possible conditions existing in the universe.

Ruggero Maria Santilli

The Institute for Basic Research

P. O. Box 1577, Palm Harbor, FL 34682, U. S. A.

E-address: [ibr@gte.net](mailto:ibr@gte.net)

Reprinted with permission from the Committee for Scientific Ethics.

[Journal Home Page](#)

email: [mail@journaloftheoretics.com](mailto:mail@journaloftheoretics.com)

© Journal of Theoretics, Inc. 2000 (Note: all submissions become the property of the Journal)