

Article

Epilogue: From 'Physics Policy' to 'Physics as Policy'

Alexandru C. V. Ceapa*

ABSTRACT

Leading physicists have become aware of the resulting lack of finality of most projects, which has scaled up the crisis of modern physics risen from the physicists' attitude toward the role played by revelation in the act of science and the resulting uncontrolled mixture of revealed and rational knowledge in their minds. But, instead of identifying the causes of the crisis which we pointed out in Prologue), and eradicating them as we partly did in this work, they have opted for substantial funds by launching big, expensive projects with feeble experimental results. 'Physics policy' should define the contest for funds turning research projects into main contributions to progress. The turning of 'physics policy' into 'physics as policy' may be followed by a boom on the world market of novel technologies and products with maximum of profit for mankind.

Key Words: physics policy, physics as polocy, Super Collider, gravitational wave.

44. EPILOGUE: FROM 'PHYSICS POLICY' TO 'PHYSICS AS POLICY'

'Physics policy' should define the contest for funds turning research projects into main contributions to progress. But once modern physics was founded disregarding the principle of the physical determination of equations, which associates physical significance to every term of the underlying equations, the only criterion for evaluating most research projects became just the beauty of their mathematical grounds. Bit by bit, mathematics has developed from a subordinate tool for obtaining physical information into the 'authorized', omnipotent tool for making physical predictions. The physical information obtained *using* mathematics as a subordinate tool, and that predicted by sophisticated mathematical theories having little to nothing in common with the objective reality, are on equal footing. So, in lack of funds, the chanes that the first information to be experimentally tested are substantially diminished by the 'prestige of the rigor' and the redundancy recommending the last information foe experimental testing.

Leading physicists have become aware of the resulting lack of finality of most projects, which has scaled up the crisis of modern physics (risen from the physicists' attitude toward the role played by revelation in the act of science and the resulting uncontrolled mixture of revealed and rational knowledge in their minds (Sec. 20)). But, instead of identifying the causes of the crisis (which we pointed out in Prologue), and eradicating them (as we partly did in this book), they have opted for substantial funds by launching big, expensive projects with feeble experimental results. Directed against the true advancement of physics, this procedure was a typical act of corruption that blew up modern physics.

What happened is best evidenced in particle physics. Important information on the structure of the 'elementary' particles was obtained by colliding them at relativistic speeds. Theories trying to connect and explain the obtained information were developed, and a 'standard model' of

* Correspondence: Alexandru C. V. Ceapa (Note: This work was copyrighted 2006 by the author)
c/o Yiannis Haranas, Ph.D. Website: http://vixra.org/author/Alex_Ceapa E-mail: ioannis@yorku.ca
or c/o Isabel Gaju. Website: <http://www.facebook.com/pages/Alexandru-Constantin-Ceapa-Doctor-in-Fizica-PhD-Physics/156901687585> . E-Mail: isabelgaju@yahoo.com

'elementary' particle followed. But the 'standard model' is far from complete; much more subquantum information is needed for completion. The particle physicists proclaimed two key ideas for thrusting the project (the same for any particle accelerator facility): 1) that *all* subquantum information would be exclusively obtainable by colliding high energy particles; and 2) the particle theories would then be 'well-settled'. Particle accelerator facilities were further overbid and the Super Collider was proposed as source of ultimate information. Massive funds for it were sought. But both assertions were quite false. Relativistic theories constructed without the principle of the physical determination of equations (and the particle theories *en vogue* are indeed such theories) are *not* 'well-settled': they have incomplete physical foundations (Sec. 21), and, consequently, miss the essential subquantum information embedded in the terms of their underlying equations. Without the missed information, the information they provide, as well as the information provided by the particle accelerator facilities cannot be understood. The last information is mainly useless. So the particle theories are true puzzles, and the 'standard model' of 'elementary' particle is incomplete, if not false. The missing information needs that radically new experimental facilities to be developed for its testing and exploitation (Sec. 41). So particle accelerator facilities, particularly the Super Collider, are presently unsuitable to develop.

The US Senate did vote against the project of the Super Collider, mainly due to the refusal of some physics leaders to accept diminished funds for other projects that they considered to be just as important as the particle physics [100]. The vote did not acknowledge the falsified grounds of the project. There still firmly persists an unfair fight to impose both the standard particle theories and the particle accelerator facilities (in particular the Super Collider). It is mainly manifested by the global editorial policy of academic publishers who, by rejecting without scientific review (e.g., [101-104]) or with reviews *falsifying* the authors' original ideas (e.g., [105-108]) (sometimes injuriously [106])¹ any papers and books that challenge the two issues, and publishing instantly denigratory papers written by 'authorities', hide challenging results. Particular attention is paid to prohibit works deepening the understanding of Einstein's special relativity theory, the heart of any particle theory. Claims that challenging results did not exist at the time are evidently false². This policy is accomplished by rejecting either without scientific review (e.g., [101-104]) or with reviews *falsifying* the authors' original ideas (e.g., [105-108]) (sometimes injuriously [106])³ in papers and books submitted for publication. So the standard particle theories and the Super Collider survive without rivals.

They invented stereotype formulas of perennial use, like i) "Physical Review Letters does not consider articles which propose a *speculative alternative* to a *widely accepted theory*"⁴, ii) "Physical Review D does not publish papers that present *alternative investigations* of old and *well-established concepts*", iii) "I do not accept your paper for publication. *I have reached this decision because*

¹ There are also reports claiming the 'need to protect readers' [2] and "the journal scientific prestige" [106] or merely stating that by accepting these results, 'we' would loose the control on their consequences.

² Our model of 'elementary' particle was the subject of former papers [101-104] submitted for publication to mainstream journals of physics, and automatically rejected. When presented at a conference [16], any comment of the audience on paper [104] was forbidden by a supervisor APS, and followed by an official teaching, standing for the editorial policy just pointed out.

³ There are also reports claiming the 'need to protect readers' [2] and "the journal scientific prestige" [106] or merely stating that by accepting these results, 'we' would loose the control on their consequences.

⁴ Like Phys. Rev. A and Phys. Rev. B, the Phys. Rev. Lett. requires, "in light of many experiments over the past century that have confirmed its whole validity" (see also [29]) that "any manuscript which attempts to show a contradiction in special relativity to meet a very high standard of proof". It is a false and cynical requirement. First because any deepening in understanding Einstein's special relativity theory is systematically qualified as pointing to a 'contradiction', and treated as such. Second because the reaching of a "very high standard of proof" of a paper is actually unwished: "the manuscript has been rejected (just by the editorial letter requiring the "very high standard of proof"!)" and hence we can not consider a revision there of".

certain statements and terms, such as 'absolute rest' and 'absolute speed' are completely foreign and unacceptable to physics... Your arguments are not understandable to me, and very likely to the large community of physicists who have learned about motion in first year courses" (A. Degasperis, coeditor for Europhysics Letters [2]), iv) "We were unable to publish your paper because it claims to find problems with the theory of special relativity and the Lorentz transformation. Both the physics and mathematics have been extensively explored over the past century. The observational predictions of special relativity are proved and reproved hundreds (why not thousands?) of time everyday around the world (confirmed by [29])!... The theory has been formulated in many different ways and there are no inconsistencies or mathematical problems. For these reasons the paper is incorrect and can not be published." (Classical and Quantum Gravity -CQG/120174/PAP/22 Dec. 2000), v) "Your paper has not been considered for publication in CQG because it concerns the understanding and formulation of special relativity. This is not within the scope of CQG which publishes only original research results" (Editorial Policy of CQG Senior Publisher), vi) "Editor thanks... but regrets that he is unable to publish it... that he can not enter into further correspondence on this matter" (Nature Administration) [102], vii) "It is not our policy to give explanations in every case as to why a manuscript may not be suitable for the Physical Review, nor do we request formal reports on every manuscript submitted. This is the summation of the Editor's judgement in the light of the advice from chosen consultants and the requirements of the journal. Your manuscript was judged to be unsuitable on the basis of its subject matter; no evaluation was made on the correctness of the manuscript" [109], viii) "If in the judgement of the editors a paper is clearly unsuitable for Phys. Rev. D, it will be rejected without review" (statement of Editorial Procedures, webpage), and ix) "It is Nature Physics' policy to return a substantial proportion of manuscripts without sending them to referees. Decisions of this kind are made by the editorial staff when it appears that papers are unlikely to succeed in the competition for limited space. In the present case, while your findings may well prove stimulating to others' thinking about such questions, I regret that we are unable to conclude that the work provides the sort of firm advance in general understanding that would warrant publication in Nature Physics." [110-111]. By such formulas, they clearly forbidden the deepening in understanding the physical grounds of Einstein's special relativity theory, which is the keystone for the true advancement of physics.

Most explicit stereotype formulas are the editorial 'reports' [112-114] concerning papers [115-116]. Although I have deduced that 'abstract' coordinate systems at absolute rest (also defined and distinguished from reference frames in Sec. 4 (Sect. 1.1)) can be associated to inertial coordinate systems (see also Sec. 6) without violating the principle of relativity, proved (see Sec. 6 (Sect. 1)) that any relative motion is described with respect to such a coordinate system at absolute rest, and identified such a coordinate system at absolute rest in [1] (see Sec. 14 (Sect. 1)), although I defined the professional inertial observer (see also Sec. 6) and proved that absolute speeds can be determined experimentally by the inertial observers without referring to a physical substratum (see Sec. 17), it was claimed, respectively, that i) I "assumed that an absolute reference frame exists and can be determined by 'professionals' (also defined in Sec. 6), violating not just the results of special relativity but one of the two fundamental principles on which the theory is based" [109], ii) I "failed to prove that an inertial observer (what is a professional observer?) can always describe the motion of an object with respect to a coordinate system at absolute rest", rather I "assumed that such things as 'absolute rest' and 'absolute velocity' exist and can be measured. This assumption though violates a fundamental prediction of special relativity. Since at the present time there are no experimental which contradict any prediction of special relativity, it is accepted as the correct description of the reality" [112], and iii) I "introduced a common absolute rest frame with respect to which physics is referred" [113]. So it was concluded, respectively, that [115] "contradicts special relativity" [112] and "the conclusion of [116] is not correct" [114]. So [112-114] prove that the clue procedure of the global editorial policy consists in mystifying the main ideas of a paper, adding that "special relativity

theory has been experimentally confirmed about as much as any theory CAN be" [112], then claiming that the "manuscript's results are wrong and *it is not publishable in this or any other journal*" [112].

To the magnificence of the special relativity theory, incontestably proved by us that it is the only theory providing the physical foundations of modern physics, this policy opposes (*why?*) its "survival for the best part of a century, despite many challenges based on alleged discrepancies in its application, or on *apparent* inconsistencies in its *accepted (by whom?)* interpretation" [117].

Moreover, rejecting by this procedure an experimental proposal (the inertial observers ability to determine absolute speeds) [112], and adding that "if relativity is ever found to be incorrect, it will be because of experimental data" [112], there becomes evident that by decisions based on mystification (like [109-113]) *the editorial policy really stifles obtaining experimental data incontestably proving both the absolute rest and the absolute speeds in special relativity theory.*

Since these results (clearly proved in Secs. 14, 17) are basic for disclosing the validity of the principle of the physical determination of equations in Einstein's special relativity theory and relativistic quantum theories, so obtaining genuine information on the subquantum structure of matter, the editorial policy prohibits the way toward getting and applying this information. Any presumption that the aim of the common strategy of the editorial policy of APS, EPS, IOP, etc. would be that of keeping unaltered Einstein's fame is just a false. All the rejected results, now included in this book, like those in [101-104, 115-116], prove undoubtedly that Einstein's genius is actually far beyond that just celebrated in the 'World Year of Physics 2005'.

The fight to impose the standard particle theories and the Super Collider was successfully repeated bit by bit in connection with another relativistic theory -the general relativity theory. This time the imposed project was the cryogenic bar detection of gravitational waves. A dependence on speed of the gravitational wave interaction with test particles [68], which pointed to a diminished efficiency of the cryogenic detectors, raised doubts. But the doubts were deftly discredited by one short paper, published simultaneously in two physics journals [118-119], promising [119] a full paper soon. The project was launched, and the promised full paper never published in the following 27 years; its promise has been enough. Also no paper on the subquantum nature of the gravitational waves, except [83-85]⁵, was accepted for publication in the mainstream journals of physics. The short paper [89] has appeared initially in a mutilated form [88]. It becomes evident that in this case, like in that of the Super Collider, the global editorial policy has contributed mainly to, not the advancement of physics, but rather the crisis of physics. Truly shocking is the destiny of the peer reviewed science journals which referees refuse to change at command their decisions on the publication of correct papers. Such journals are merely dissolved⁶. Faced with this policy, there is no place for innocence.

⁵ By the way, 'accidentally', the ISI did not register the citation of [83] in [120] ("More interesting approaches have been discussed by... and Ceapa").

⁶ It is the case of the online 'Journal of Theoretics', now dissolving. After the referee's approval, a paper of mine has appeared in vol. 5-5 of the journal in mutilated, unintelligible form [121]. The 'mistake' was justified [122, 123] by the additional changes operated by author. The paper was withdrawn, on request, by three weeks later [122, 123]. A new version and reviewing process were claimed by the editor [122]... by courtesy. Referee has renewed his decision of publication, while editor downrighted his policy of discrediting the paper. Against the referee's decision acknowledged to me [123, 124], paper [22] did not appear in vol. 5-6 on 01Dec03 [125]. It was added to vol. 5-6 by two weeks later, after altered versions of [22] were added successively on 02Dec03 [123, 124], 03Dec03 [126] and 06Dec03 [127]. There was no acknowledgement of the readers about the 'editorial error' ("I cannot"). Moreover, after [121] has been removed from vol. 5-5 on 21Oct03, it was put back in vol. 5-5, in archives, on 01Dec03, and maintained there until 10Feb04 [128] Commanded discreditation fully accomplished. The title of [22] tells us all: the concept 'absolute rest' being proclaimed as "completely foreign and unacceptable to physics" [2], and papers on absolute rest frame (to which the abstract coordinate

All the cases cited mark the turning of 'physics policy' into 'physics as policy' by those responsible for making the decisions about which topics in physics get supported. 'Physics as policy' means physics as source of funds for boosting doubtful careers and maintaining good jobs. 'Physics as policy' deserves exclusively group interests. So 'physics as policy' is a deontological, social and political exercise. It is contrary to the advancement of physics and technological progress. It was assured by imposing a training system based on excessive repetition, which to relativize the scientific truth and inculcate into the minds of subsequent generations of physicists the belief in the relativistic theories, disregarding their foundations. The discretionary physics policy is maintained by the lack of any dialogue between the community of the physics researchers and people 'contributing to the development' (i.e., to the crisis) of modern physics, who falsely invoke the human lack of time [129]. It is actually the refusal with arrogance by those 'contributing to the development' of modern physics to investigate the correctness of their "understanding of the pattern of scientific explanation" before claiming in its name that "alternative ideas (perhaps most of them) are not worth pursuing" [129]. Their self-imposed 'professional' authority has prohibited systematically testifying and developing new ideas, so maintaining the crisis of physics.

We have to disappoint those suspecting that behind the turning of 'physics policy' into 'physics as policy' one would find the hiding of top-secret military researches. The project of the Super Collider was started indeed under President Regan's administration [130]. However, the particle theories on which this project was founded crowned the modern physics, which crisis prohibited the development of technologies having nothing in common with contemporary technologies, so tacitly undermined (at least) the US military power and security after the 1940's.

The 'religious' disregard of the concepts of absolute rest and absolute speed, promoted by APS, EPS, etc. through any means, seems to protect groups already exploring some of the physics which we just outlined in this book. The scenario looks very much like that of persuading Stalin in 1951 to stop launching officially the computer technology programme under the 'iron curtain'. Then it was altered a supreme decision, now are altered the physicists' individual decisions. Then it was 'kept unaltered the purity' of the communist doctrine, now it is 'kept unaltered the purity' of Einstein's doctrine (a doctrine from which the derivation of the Lorentz transformation in [1] was 'accidentally' wholly discarded!). So the turning of 'physics policy' into 'physics as policy' may be followed by a boom on the world market of novel technologies (not just one as in the case of the computers) and products with maximum of profit -one fabulous by comparison with the profit afforded by assuring the security of a state.

systems at absolute rest are reduced by mystification) "are not publishable in this or any other journals" [112], the abstract coordinate system at absolute rest should also be stifled in the Journal of Theoretics. Otherwise...