

Beyond Einstein: Science and Society in the 21st Century

By Richard Moody Jr.

Abstract

Arthur Eddington traveled to Principe in Africa in 1919 with the express purpose of proving Einstein right about general relativity, by attempting to do the impossible. With primitive equipment, operating under unbelievably hostile conditions, Eddington read data during the Eclipse of 1919 to an extreme level of precision. This level of extreme precision has been endorsed by Professor Stephen Hawking and by *Scientific American*.

Eddington's motives were quite clear; he was an advocate for Einstein, due, in part, to the fact that both men shared the same political beliefs, Pacifism. In his zeal to be both peacemaker and kingmaker, Eddington engaged in corruption and derogation of the scientific data, the scientific method, and much of the scientific community. It surpasses the Piltdown Fraud, a blatant attempt to fool anthropologists into thinking that they had found the "missing link", as the greatest Deception of 20th Century science.

The hallmark of any professional is consistency, but Einstein recanted on the absence of the ether, general relativity and the Cosmologic Constant. His fundamental failings in physics and math are unknown to the lay public, yet physicists have attempted to portray him as some great genius who towered above mere mortals. They promote as gospel, the agenda driven, unresearched, plagiarized, internet quality 1905 "Miracle Year" papers.

The consistent policy of scientists, politicians, the media and the agenda driven public to promote Einstein to icon status has had disastrous repercussions for the National Security of this nation. By persistently trying to give the impression that Einstein was a great scientist, physicists have tried to give the illusion that only physicists are doing "real" science. This has had the unfortunate effect of elevating physics and astrophysics to an exalted level and the predictable suppression of talent in other fields through lack of funding and public support. America has seen the diminution of its stature in the world as the leader in innovation, which is a direct byproduct of the "Einstein" revolution.

Introduction

Hero worship may seem harmless to some; in the case of Einstein, it has had disastrous consequences for the scientific community. Various journals have knelt before the altar of Einstein including *Skeptical Inquirer*¹, *Mensa Bulletin*², *Scientific American*³, and *Time Magazine*⁴. In the final publication, for example, we learn from Professor Stephen Hawking the following grandiose statement, “The equations of general relativity are his best epitaph and memorial. They should last as long as the universe.”⁴ What makes this statement decidedly dubious is the following statement by Einstein, “In that case, *nothing* remains of my entire castle in the air, gravitation included...”⁵ According to Einstein, the “father” of the theory, general relativity shouldn’t last another five minutes; according to Hawking, it should last the length of the universe.

It is bad enough that Hawking ignored the wishes of Einstein, but he also ignored the work of Nobel Laureate, Feynman, a peer. In a Nova broadcast, Chung⁶ summarized Feynman’s disenchantment with modern physics referring to the “eternal futility” (Chung’s summary) of, “not only of high mathematics, but also high physics and astronomy, spoken by him on the Nova program and available in print (‘The Pleasure of Finding Things Out’, January 25, 1983’). My article containing his remarks was published in Singapore, 1984...”⁶ Apparently, Hawking ignored one peer and another “superior” scientist when offering his grandiose assessment.

Hawking’s additional misinformation includes, “Some people have blamed the atom bomb on Einstein because he discovered the relation between mass and energy.” Actually, at least seven scientists before Einstein came up with either the mass/light or mass/energy relation.⁷⁻⁹ Professor Hawking, like author David Bodanis¹⁰, couldn’t find one. Hawking, much as many modern scientists, appears to either ignore or is oblivious to the true history of $E=mc^2$. Why should physicists promote the truth when promoting fantasy is a sure ticket to wealth, power and prestige?

Here is a better version of history than the one proposed by physicists such as Hawking: Einstein did not originate the equation⁹⁻¹¹. He tried seven times yet failed to derive it¹¹. At least seven scientists before Einstein came up with concept of the conversion of matter into energy or light⁷⁻⁹. He did not originate the conversion factor c^2 ⁷⁻⁹. The equation as written is wrong¹². E is proportional to mc^2 , not equal to mc^2 ⁽¹²⁾. Einstein violated the conservation of energy when he attempted to derive the equation because he has a candle emitting a wavelength of light and gaining mass at the same time¹². As near

as the author can determine, the sole contribution of Einstein to $E=mc^2$ was to get credit for it. What is surprising is that Einstein, in his autobiography, never mentioned $E=mc^{2(11)}$, perhaps out of a sense of guilt?

“In his **usual** cavalier manner, Einstein did not acknowledge von Laue as a source”¹¹ (emphasis added). In other words, Ohanian is saying that Einstein was “usually” a plagiarist. Which is a more accurate word to describe Einstein: “cavalier” or “unethical? If the purpose of not mentioning von Laue by name was not a deliberate fabrication of history, what precisely was it?

Professor Hawking has done a marvelous job of misinforming the public about the Eclipse data from 1919. Here is what Professor Stephen Hawking said in his book, “*A Brief History of Time From the Big Bang to Black Holes*, on page 32, with regard to the Eclipse data, “Their measurement had been sheer luck, or a case of knowing the result they wanted to get, not an uncommon occurrence in science. The light deflection has, however, been accurately confirmed by a number of later observations.”¹⁶ (Not according to Sir John Maddox, Editor Emeritus of *Nature Magazine*.)¹⁷

Then in his *Time Magazine* article, Hawking on page 79 stated, “It was confirmed in spectacular fashion in 1919, when a British expedition to West Africa observed a slight shift in the position of stars near the sun. Here was direct evidence that space and time are warped, the greatest change in our perception of the arena in which we live, since Euclid wrote his *Elements* about 300 B.C.”⁴

Apparently, Professor Hawking “forgot” what he wrote in his book when he wrote his article for *Time Magazine*. Professor Hawking gave *Time Magazine* editors exactly what they wanted to hear: First Einstein came up with this obscure theory and just like that, the data flowed seamlessly and the theory was confirmed. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Did *Time Magazine* staffers do a fact check of the Hawking article or did they just give him a pass? Perhaps if they were a little more concerned about doing research instead of puffing up Einstein, they might have discovered the discrepancy between the Hawking book and the Hawking article. Between the Hawking book and the Hawking article, he made five false statements. The apple does not fall far from the tree.

What possible motive could Hawking have for these three versions of the same event? The first two repudiate the data from the Eclipse. The third supports it, and thus validates support for general relativity. Who benefits by promoting Einstein’s general theory of relativity? Professor Hawking is heir apparent to Einstein and thus stands to benefit the most from puffing up

Einstein. He has a conflict between promoting himself and promoting science. Which did he choose?

As a direct result of this puffery, physicists no doubt rubbed their hands in glee when Einstein was named, “Person of the Century”. They could look forward to getting their research grants approved as far as the eye could see. Say the phrase, “You’re no Einstein” in public and you can put a dollar into the pocket of every physicist in the country.

Einstein is not a man; he is a product being marketed to the American public like tooth paste and deodorant. He is a brand name with as much name recognition in science as Coke and Pepsi have in the soft drink industry. He is an advertiser’s dream. He is a cash cow, a rainmaker, the 800 pound gorilla that gets fed first, and the sugar daddy of Big Physics. Hebrew University also makes 7 figures every year promoting Einstein goodies like bobble head dolls. He is an industry unto himself. That is the motive for Hawking to falsify events concerning the Eclipse in order to maximize wealth, power and prestige for Big Physics. Take a mediocre product and promote it aggressively and it will sell (Einstein); take a great product and market it poorly and it won’t sell (Poincaré).

Time Magazine had only one shot to maximize their profit from their manufactured story, the “Person of the Century” issue. Would they have sold as many copies of their magazine with Franklin Roosevelt on the cover? I’m sure every retiree who cashes their Social Security check or fills out their Medicare forms, thanks God for Einstein’s general theory of relativity.

There are literally thousands of papers critical of the works of Einstein that never rise to the level of any kind of receptive treatment in the major news outlets. We must assume that if *Time Magazine* only contacts big name physicists such as Stephen Hawking, they are going to have a warped view of physics. The only people they contact wish to promote the status quo, and the Editors of *Time Magazine* are so naïve that they see nothing wrong with this approach!

Eugene Mallove¹⁹ has done a marvelous job showing just the tip of the iceberg of the phenomenal stuff out there with respect to Einstein the public doesn’t comprehend. Here is a partial list compiled by Mallove: *Galilean Electrodynamics*²⁰, *Physics Essays*²¹, *Apeiron*²², *Journal of New Energy*²³, Aspden²⁴, Beckmann²⁵, Graneau and Graneau²⁶, Hatch²⁷, Phipps, Jr.²⁸, Selleri²⁹, National Philosophy Alliance³⁰, Ives³¹ and many others.

As a scientist, in many circles my criticism of Einstein is going to be construed as Anti-Semitism. I suppose if I refer to Arthur Eddington, a Quaker and a Pacifist, for corrupting science for almost a century as being one of the worst scientists in the 20th Century (based upon his negative

impact on science, the scientific method, the scientific community, history and research in America), that makes me an anti-Christian hawk. If I criticize Max Planck or Wilhelm Wien, the German editors of *Annalen der Physik*, for publishing the agenda driven, non reviewed³², unresearched, plagiarized, internet quality 1905 Einstein Papers^{7,8}, this makes me anti-German. If I criticize Hebrew University for making over \$10,000,000/year selling Einstein goodies, that makes me a communist for opposing the abuse of the free market system i.e. the ability to capitalize upon Einstein's ill gotten reputation and its potential salability to a gullible public. I suppose I could be called an opponent of the first amendment for questioning the motives of the editors of *Time Magazine*. By placing Einstein on the cover of their magazine as, "Person of the Century", they made Einstein off limits as a scientist and public persona. This insures that corruption of science, society and history is irreversible, and the truth, collateral damage.

Why should pursuit of the truth require political correctness? There appear to be two standards of "truth" when it comes to icons. The "truth" that enhances the icon is one type of truth. The facts are a subordinate truth and are frequently at odds with the icon "truth".

The primary purpose of labeling opponents of Einstein theories anything is a perversion of the scientific method, and a deliberate attempt to muzzle dissenting views. It is icon worship that has resulted in the dismal state of affairs we have today, including our failed energy policy, the general level of science illiteracy facing America, and the total decline in ethics in science and society. Witness the fascination of America with their new heroes: people who can lie, cheat and steal in order to win or who can maim their opponents. If Einstein had participated in the *Survivor* series, he would have won merely by convincing the other contestants not to show up because obviously they would lose!

Discussion

Let us start with perhaps the worst cover up and brewing scandal science has seen in the 20th and 21st Century. I am referring to the Hoax of 1919, otherwise known as the eclipse data from 1919, hereinafter called the "Eclipse". Einstein's dubious science led other scientists to disgrace themselves for the express purpose of proving Einstein right about general relativity. It is almost unimaginable to ponder just how bad "reputable" scientists are when it comes to understanding the limitations of scientific instruments, the limits of the physical conditions under which data is collected and a complete lack of understanding of the logic behind the

various predictions for the deflection of light. These scientists don't appear to understand what the scientific method is or how to apply it.

According to Graf, strong models are like crude filters, readily admitting data consistent with the theory and systematically rejecting data inconsistent with the theory. This results in a feedback loop between the corrupted and derogated data to the strong model. They reinforce each other. This has been the case for general relativity. It went from an obscure concept from a rising scientist, to the reigning paradigm overnight, dominating thinking in theoretical physics over the past half century. "Strong models corrupt weak men and women."³³ "The desire to conform, is almost as strong as the desire to create."³³ Strong models discourage free and independent thought. Where wealth, power and prestige come into play, they serve as club to beat back promising alternatives. General relativity is just such a model.

I have also drawn the analogy between strong models and the queen bee syndrome.³³ The first official act of any queen bee when she recognizes what she is, is to immediately kill off any potential rivals. This is how strong models operate. Consider this observation from Ian McCausland, "In spite of the fact that the experimental evidence for relativity seems to have been very flimsy in 1919, Einstein's enormous fame has remained intact, and his theory has ever since been held to be one the highest achievement of human thought. The resulting deification of Einstein has had some unfortunate effects: critics of his theory are often dismissed as cranks, and the search for better theories has been inhibited. It is suggested that the announcement of the eclipse observations in 1919 was not a triumph of science as it is often portrayed, but rather an obstacle to objective consideration of alternatives."³⁴ "Einstein's enormous and enduring fame resulted directly from the announcement of the eclipse results, although the results were not particularly accurate"³⁴ This final sentiment is shared by Sir John Maddox, Editor Emeritus of *Nature Magazine*.¹⁷

"Because of the euphoric veneration of Einstein and relativity in November 1919, the objectivity with which science is supposed to act has been inhibited. Canonization, deification, and claims of personal communications from Nature, should have no place in science. If the findings of the eclipse expeditions had been announced as being inconclusive instead of decisive in 1919, general relativity would have had to compete with other possible theories..."³⁴

"It is also reasonable to ask whether the rapid and strong entrenchment of the general theory that occurred as a result of the eclipse announcement may have led experimenters to obtain the 'right' answers from their observations,

as suggested in the above quotation from Sciama.”³⁴ Strong models corrupt the data.

Existing models drive funding in this country because the old guard benefits in terms of wealth, power and prestige by promoting the status quo. There is tremendous scientific inertia today, and, as a result, it is getting progressively more difficult to break ties to a comfortable past.

Let us put things in historical perspective: As of 1919, General Relativity was an obscure theory of Einstein and others. The Quaker, Eddington, approved of Einstein’s political leanings i.e. both men were Pacifists and Eddington thought Einstein was a genius. He is reputed to have said, “Only three people understand general relativity, and for the life of me, I don’t who the third one is.” As fallout of the Eclipse, “Einstein awoke in Berlin on the morning of November 7, 1919, to find him self famous.”³⁶

So Eddington set out to Principe in Africa in 1919, with the express purpose of proving Einstein right. No supporters of Einstein appear to be fazed by the fact that Eddington was an advocate for Einstein, not some objective scientist. Eddington took his role as the great peacemaker and kingmaker very seriously. He attempted to calm the antipathy British and German scientists shared (“It was not without international significance, for it opportunely put an end to wild talk of boycotting German science.”³⁶ Later Eddington said, “By standing foremost in testing, and ultimately verifying the ‘enemy’ theory, our national observatory kept alive the finest traditions of science; and the lesson is perhaps still needed today”³⁶).

In other words, if you can get others to buy into bad science, it is, “...in the finest tradition of science”. Eddington engaged in the corruption and derogation of science that persists to this day, and he had the arrogance to tell others that this is, “in the finest tradition of science.” According to the great Indian astronomer Chandrasekhar, “had he been left to himself, he (Eddington) would not have planned the expeditions since he was fully convinced of the truth of the general theory of relativity!”³⁷

Paul Marmet has done a marvelous job showing the fundamental hypocrisy of Eddington. This clearly qualifies Eddington as one of the worst scientists in all of 20th Century science because he, like the Pied Piper of Hamelin, led the rats to the sea. “Although the material was very meager compared with what we had hoped for, the writer (who it must be admitted was not altogether unbiased) believed it convincing.”³⁸

“We will see also how the stars distribution was not good enough for such measurements to be convincing. Finally, we will discuss how Eddington’s influence worked for Einstein’s full displacement and against any other result.”³⁸

Also in the Marmet article: “Eddington was deferred with the express stipulation that if the war should end by May 1919, then Eddington should undertake to lead an expedition for the purpose of verifying Einstein’s predictions!”³⁸ You will note that he said, “verifying”, not testing.

This begs the question: What is science? According to Sakharov³⁹, “We regard as ‘scientific’ a method based on deep analysis of facts, theories and views, presupposing unprejudiced, unfearing open discussion and conclusions.” How does this have any relevance to the Eclipse? Was there any adherence to any of these principles? Einstein completely waffled as far as how he came up with the values he obtained for the purported values of the deflection of light, Eddington promptly cooked the data, and the supporters of Einstein have attempted to portray dissenters to any of Einstein’s theories as crackpots.

The number of “reputable” scientists who have bought into this whole farce looks like a Who’s Who of prominent scientists. For example, Eddington completely bamboozled the Royal Society and the Royal Astronomical Society at his triumphant talk he gave to them. “Sir Joseph Thomson, President of the Royal Society and Chair of the meeting, strongly endorsed the results.”³⁶ It does not appear that any scientists present actually looked at the photographic plates (the whole affair was more like a coronation rather than a scientific presentation e.g. Pais stated, “...the day on which Einstein was canonized.”⁴⁰)

Pathological Science

These Eclipse photographic plates were supposed to show that starlight was bent by the sun as the light passed by it during a total solar eclipse. The predicted Newton Deflection was supposed to be .87 arc seconds and the Einstein deflection, a totally ad hoc amount, was supposed to be 1.75 arc seconds. Unfortunately, the effect was so small it is impossible to detect accurately even with the strongest modern telescopes under ideal conditions. This is the true meaning of “pathological science” as defined by Langmuir⁴¹. Unlike cold fusion which has been demonstrated to produce heat, reliably, in a short period of time⁴² and high energy particles⁴³, the same cannot be said of the Eclipse data.

Cromer said it best with regard to pathological science, “Real discoveries of phenomenon contrary to all previous scientific existence are very rare, while fraud, fakery, foolishness, and error resulting from overenthusiasm and delusion are all too common.”⁴⁴ Isn’t this a great description of the Eclipse

data! Physicists have branded cold fusion as pathological science. Let's see how they like having the Eclipse data defined as pathological science!

What do eclipse researchers do? In a vain attempt to prove that Einstein was right, they "measure" minute changes beyond the capabilities of their equipment, the physical conditions that they encounter or their recording device, the comparison plates, the machinery necessary to rotate the telescopes mirrors or the photographic plates. This is truly the type example of pathological science. "This is not a problem, as we will show that the deflection is certainly not measurable."³⁸

What is clearly evident is that the expedition to Principe in Africa was a fool's errand before Eddington set foot there, because there was not the slightest possibility that Eddington could achieve what he hoped to achieve. "The error caused by the atmospheric turbulence is large enough to refute any measurement of the so-called Einstein effect."³⁸

"Eddington's overenthusiastic advocacy may perhaps be explained by his prior conviction that the theory was true and by his interest in saving something from the vast work of the Principe expedition." "But one retains the suspicion that besides these reasons, there was, especially for Eddington, another: the hope that a British verification of Einstein's theory would force on British scientists a more open-minded and generous attitude towards their German colleagues."⁴⁵.

Skeptical Inquirer

However, when it comes to fraud, fakery, overenthusiasm, and delusion, Cromer should start with his own journal, the *The Skeptical Inquirer*. They maintain that they are, "The magazine for science and reason". In a special edition, they compare Einstein to Jesus Christ and Moses!¹ On the cover, they morph a picture of Einstein on the left to a man with a halo on the right, obviously intended to be Jesus Christ. So this great bastion of "reason" has swallowed hook, line and sinker, all the cockamamie misinformation from Big Physics without any skepticism whatsoever. They are great at debunking others. Why don't they start by debunking themselves?

They have even portrayed Einstein as Moses in a cartoon on page 34 with a finger coming out of a cloud pointing to writing on a stone tablet that reads, "And God said let there be light".¹ Just like Moses, Einstein got a stone tablet. Einstein is seen writing the equation $E=mc^2$ on a chalkboard.¹ The clear implication is that Einstein was inspired by God when he came up with the equation. This is the first time I have heard Newton, Preston, Poincaré, de Pretto, Maxwell, etc. described as God!

Mensa Bulletin

Mensa Bulletin published a pro-Einstein article on $E=mc^2$ (2) called, “The Human Story Behind $E=mc^2$ ”. The book is called, “ $E=mc^2$ A Biography of the World’s Most Famous Equation.”⁴⁶ The book is said to be, “Superbly Researched” by the Dallas Morning News⁴⁶. This book is a very well researched novel, hardly a biography. Of course, Mr. Bodanis missed all the same information missed by Hawking.

In a typical act of puffery, the introduction to the Bodanis article stated, “...he paints a series of colourful pictures of the heroes of science who paved the way for Einstein’s amazing leap of intellect.”² What precisely did these “heroes” of science do that was heroic? Catch a piece of chalk before it fell to the ground and shattered or save an equation from a burning building? Now for the, “...amazing leap of intellect”. He read and understood the papers by Newton, Maxwell, Preston, Keely, Becquerel, Soddy, de Pretto, Hasenhorl, von Laue, etc.. Where were the editors of the *Mensa Bulletin* when Bodanis was writing this balderdash?

The primary problem with the Bodanis article and book is that they corrupt history i.e. being used by the lay media as proof of Einstein’s genius (From HiBeam research, we see 45 references to the Bodanis book). The Bodanis book is viewed as the “gold standard” of publication just because it is a bestseller.

Scientific American

What was the precision Eddington was claiming with primitive equipment, operating under extremely hostile conditions with agile stars on a mobile, fault riddled photographic template? $1/100^{\text{th}}$ of an arc second. Apparently, this doesn’t bother the Editors of *Scientific American* who have reaffirmed the accuracy and precision of the Eclipse data.³ SA provides a nexus of science with the intelligent lay public. Wouldn’t one expect caution by the Editors of SA when they know there is a controversy about the quality of the Eclipse data? The title of the article in question is, “Did Researchers Cook Data from the First Test of General Relativity. Rumors of data mishandling in an historic eclipse study don’t jibe”.³

We are told in this article, “...who discovered that Royal Observatory staff in Greenwich had reanalyzed the Sobral data in 1978 using modern computer-based methods.”³ My goodness, they plan to use a computer to

turn a sow's ear into a silk purse by magically repealing the laws of astronomy! Somehow, with, "...modern computer-based methods"³, we are going to take data not even precise to ten arc seconds and convert this into data with a precision of 1/100th of an arc second! Aren't computers wonderful! They can provide you with any answer you want.

What is patently offensive about the *Scientific American* article is that clearly it is a cover up. In other words, the sole purpose of this article is to say to the world wide scientific community, "There is nothing to see here; just move along. Just ignore the limitations of the equipment, the conditions under which the data was collected and the overwhelming desire of the observer of the Eclipse, Eddington, to prove Einstein right."

The allowable precision is probably on the order of 10-20 arc seconds. In other words, the precision was read by Eddington and SA to perhaps one thousand X that permissible from the various sources of errors. This is fully in keeping with the work of the British Institute of Precise Physics who maintain, "They used **10 second exposure cap cameras, accurate to less than one 25th of a degree.**"⁴⁷ (Bold face from original text. The authors are referring to the errors introduced by the earth's rotation).

Although there was an attempt to deal with this problem, what kind of machinery would it have taken to exactly match the rotation, "so that the mirror could be rotated to compensate for the rotation of the earth during a time exposure, instead of rotating the telescope, which was not feasible under the conditions of the eclipse expeditions."³³ The resulting uncertainty of exactly matching the rotation of the earth to the machinery could have introduced poorer precision of over several arc seconds. This is just one source of error.

Precision

One of the most profound abuses of the Eclipse data has to do with precision. In other words, how many significant digits is it possible to read the data? According to Eddington, it was possible to read the data to a precision of 1/100th of an arc second: this was also echoed in an article in the *Scientific American*³ (see above). How small is 1/100th of an arc second? I would guesstimate that it is on a par with attempting to determine the width of a human hair with the unaided eye as seen from a distance of 10 feet. According to Ian McCausland, the difference on the edge of the photographic plate was the equivalent of 1/100th of a millimeter.³⁴

Apparently, none of these scientists have one scintilla of awareness of the maximum precision the equipment and conditions allowed. First of all, the

telescope used by Eddington, one physicist informed me, was about on a par with a telescope one could buy from any mass outlet for under \$100. Second, the condition under which the data was collected was only slightly better than viewing the “bent” stars through an erupting volcano.

It was 97° that day in Principe and 75° the previous night³⁸. This exceeded the allowable temperature range over which the equipment was supposed to operate. Not surprisingly, the focal length of one of the telescopes changed, and a backup telescope was used.

When the moon passed in front of the sun, it shut down all incident radiation. This must have immediately caused a sharp temperature drop and instantly the ground and vegetation began to emanate heat. This caused turbulence in the atmosphere and the predictable response, the “dancing” of the stars on the photographic plates causing them to be “bent” hither and yon, some sideways, some backwards⁴⁸. Naturally, this was attributed to accidental error. In other words, if the data supports the theory, it is “good” data, and if it doesn’t support the theory, it is called, “accidental error”. It is truly amazing how it is possible to get such random errors on the photographic plates that some stars move in totally unpredictable ways while others are bent just the right amount!

The 1922 eclipse was also used to support general relativity. Here is an excerpt from Jamal Munshi provided by Marmet, “Dr. F. Schneider of the Munich Observatory has published a paper (49) titled ‘The Einstein Shift An Unsettled Problem’ and a plot of shifts for 92 stars for the 1922 eclipse shows shifts going in all directions, many of them going the wrong way by as large a deflection as those shifted in the predicted direction!”⁴⁹

Bertolli, Brill and Krotkov, identify five sources of errors on the photographic plates:

- “1. Refraction of light in the Sun’s corona and/or in the earth’s atmosphere,
2. Distortions in the optical system caused by temperature changes during the eclipse,
3. Changes of scale between the eclipse plates and comparison plates,
4. Distortions in the photographic emulsion while drying,
5. Errors in measurements of the images on the plates.”⁵⁰

One of the biggest problems with the eclipse data is that there are at least five sources of error on the comparison plates. In order to tell if a star has been bent, it is necessary to compare it to a plate where the stars are away from the influence of the sun i.e. it is necessary to compare the “bent” stars to the stars before they are “bent”. This introduces significant errors in the process. Here is what Poor said about this:

1. Scale differences between two plates e.g. the plates are taken at different localities, at different seasons of the year, and under radically different atmospheric conditions⁵¹,
2. “Different inclinations of the two plates to the optical axis of the telescope”
- 3, “Optical distortion of the lens system”,
4. “Inaccurate centering of the two plates”,
5. “Inaccurate orientation of the two plates during measurement. In the process of clamping the two plates to the reference plate, it will always happen that one is twisted a little in reference to the other”.⁵¹

So what is the allowable precision of the data considering the limitations of the equipment, the condition of the atmosphere, and the distortions within the photographic plates? “A 10 inch diameter telescope under perfect optics can resolve 1 arc second.”⁵² “The earth’s atmosphere also refracts light, and because it is constantly moving, there is a blurring and jittering of images in a telescope. Astronomers call this ‘seeing’. Seeing actually dominates diffraction in most cases and usually limits resolution in practice to 0.5-2 arc seconds”⁵².

“Rare is the night (at most sites) when any telescope, no matter how large its aperture or perfect its optics, can resolve differences finer than 1 arc second. More typical at ordinary locations is 2- 3- arc second seeing, or worse.”⁵³

What Eddington did to prove Einstein right was so ridiculous, it borders on the sublime. Here is what Eddington did to get the results he wanted according to Poor⁵¹, “4. Not a single expedition so far reporting has made a systematic study of all the data obtained. In the South American eclipse of 1919, less than 15% of the actual measured data was used in obtaining the announced result...All non-radial components of the actual measures were discarded as ‘accidental errors’.”⁵¹

That's right: Eddington threw out over 85% of the data! If you throw out all the data that differs from the results predicted by general relativity, what remains, by definition, will be consistent with general relativity!

"7. The actual stellar displacements, when freed from all assumptions, do not show the slightest resemblance to the predicted Einstein deflections: they do not agree in direction, in size, or in the rate of decrease with distance from the sun." "8. The actual measured displacements, if real, can best be explained by some refractive effect of the earth's atmosphere: by a combination of the Courvoisier effect, of day-light refraction, and of temperature effects caused by the passing of the eclipse shadow."⁵¹

The Alice in Wonderland properties of the data are well displayed, "...Trumpler, as in all of his other calculations and reductions, assumes the truth of the very law the eclipse data was organized to test. And he naturally finds that his results are best represented by the law from which they were obtained."⁵¹

"Not a single one of the fundamental concepts of varying time, of warped or twisted space, of simultaneity, or of the relativity of motion is any way involved in Einstein's prediction of, or formulas for the deflection of light. The many and elaborate eclipse expeditions have, therefore, been given a fictitious importance. Their results can neither prove, nor disprove the relativity theory: at the best their results can prove that light is retarded by gravitational action, and is retarded by a certain definite amount."⁵¹

"An examination of the various tables of the deflections observed shows that many of them are far away from the quantities predicted. The quantity approximating the predicted one is obtained by averaging a selected few of the observations."⁵⁴ "Any reader, though far from an expert astronomer or physicist, who will study the description of the apparatus used in these observations and the large margin of error possible by reason of defects therein, will readily comprehend that, in view of the required delicacy of measurement of the things observed of the observed phenomena, the greatest caution in the analysis of the results is necessary."⁵⁴ This didn't bother Eddington or other proponents of the Eclipse data.

Apparently, none of these scientists paid much attention to the fact that the data collected by Eddington was almost non-existent. "They are all good of the sun, showing a remarkable prominence; but the cloud has interfered with the star images. The last six photographs show a few images which I hope will give us what we need."⁵⁵ "The cloudy weather upset my plans and I had to treat the measures in a different way from what I intended, consequently I have not been able to make any preliminary announcements of the result. But one plate that I measured gave a result agreeing with Einstein."⁵⁵

Here is what I think Eddington did: He worked backwards i.e. he “knew” what deflection he wanted, so he invented the correct length of deflection so that it created the results he wished to obtain. It is either that or he was completely incompetent as a scientist.

The Einstein Mythology

Spin is defined here as the selective presentation or falsification of the facts in order to induce the perception of a specific attitude towards a person, place, or thing that is fundamentally false. In the case of Einstein, there is a wide assortment of ways spin is used to enhance his reputation. But the question that needs to be answered is why do so many people feel this need to exaggerate Einstein’s accomplishments? Why not just tell the truth and see what happens? It is quite clear, why not.

Ohanian¹¹ wrote an entire book just to catalogue Einstein’s Mistakes¹¹; it should be obvious that Einstein was incompetent as a scientist. If Einstein was incompetent as a scientist, how should we describe “lesser” physicists? Why would the public want to finance incompetent scientists? Einstein’s attempt at formulating the Unified Field Theory was so bad that, Freeman Dyson avoided Einstein in the latter’s lifetime because Einstein’s work in the Unified Field Theory was, according to Dyson, “Junk”.

Did Einstein really do science i.e. do what scientists do? Did he design any equipment to measure and observe physical phenomena? Did he observe and measure anything? Did he collect data? Did he process data? Did he do research before writing his articles? Did he ever give credit where credit was due? Did he have no sense of propriety e.g. the Bose-Einstein condensate? Was Einstein ever involved in any science where he did not engage in self aggrandizement? Did he have any idea of the difference between good ideas and bad ideas or to him were they just “ideas”? How often did Einstein recant on his theories e.g. the Cosmologic Constant, tending to repudiate him as a serious scientist? Did he understand mathematics ($E=mc^2$ or Brownian Motion or his decision to throw out the negative square root of a number just because it didn’t fit the theory³²)? How many mathematical errors (27 according to one physicist who contacted me) does Einstein get to make before he is dismissed as a mathematician? Did he do anything of substance (e.g. how much of the mathematics of general relativity were done by Hilbert, Grossman, Mileva or Besso?) with respect to mathematics? Did he groom graduate students to become better scientists? Did Einstein do as Yoda said, “Do, or do not. There is no try.”

Einstein routinely failed to do what he attempted to do over and over

($E=mc^2$) and he failed to achieve the GUT, his lifelong ambition. If he “tried” to jump over the Empire State Building, does it really matter? Even Ohanian and all his presentation of Einstein’s mistakes (by his count 40 major mistakes in 180 papers), missed number 41. Einstein’s formulation of the Brownian motion paper was naïve. So it appears that all five “Miracle” year papers are either naïve, plagiarized, fatally flawed or trivial, yet we are told by physicists that this is a “Miracle”. I suppose for a physicist, this is a miracle.

Einstein would pick and choose only the data that supported his theory. Late in his life, Einstein still believed that the Eddington expedition proved him right. Did he read the article by Poor or consider the data of Dayton Miller? Or did Einstein practice self delusion where even, “the good Lord” would be wrong if he came up with data contradicting general relativity?

Here is how Einstein corrupted the editors of *Annalen der Physik*. It takes two parties to engage in the academic crime of plagiarism: 1) Einstein for submitting his plagiarized 1905 papers, and 2) The editors of *Annalen der Physik* for KNOWINGLY publishing documents that had clearly been plagiarized from other sources. All the editors had to do was consider only one fact: For the Einstein special relativity paper, lacking even a single reference, to represent a legitimate piece of writing, it would require that it be this great big balloon floating in nothingness. It does not connect to the foundation of physics. In other words, Einstein had to write the paper without knowing anything!

What Einstein has done is lower the standards of publication for all other scientists. After all, if it’s good enough for Einstein, it’s good enough for me. When one realizes that the Jewish Nobel Laureate and friend of Einstein’s, Max Born, felt compelled to go on the record and say, “The striking point is the absence of references. It gives you the impression of quite a new venture. But that is, of course, as I have already tried to explain, not true.”⁵⁶ it shows the utter denial of physicists of Einstein’s obvious plagiarism. What Einstein did to avoid referencing anyone was to make vague allusions to the work of other scientists i.e. the reader has to fill in the blanks when reading the Einstein special relativity paper. Of course these vague allusions get lost in the mist of time and all that remains is the, “Miracle Year”.

So why did the Editors of *Annalen der Physik*, do what they did? For that, we must understand the political climate of Europe in 1905. According to Michel Gendrot (pers. comm.), France and Germany were in a hot diplomatic war less than a decade prior to World War I. France had made diplomatic inroads in North Africa and Europe, so the German journal

Annalen der Physik decided to allow their favorite son Einstein to commandeer the legacy of the great French physicist, mathematician and philosopher Jules Henri Poincaré.

One of the worst decisions of the Nobel Prize committee was to award Einstein the Nobel Prize for the photoelectric effect. What the Nobel Prize committee was doing was to compromise; they couldn't award Einstein the Nobel Prize for special relativity because that would have outraged the supporters of Poincaré and Lorentz. They couldn't give to him for general relativity because no one understood general relativity, so they gave him a lifetime achievement award aka the Nobel Prize for the photoelectric effect. It was hardly a paradigm shift.

Unfortunately for Einstein, the photoelectric effect was known to Hertz who discovered the photoelectric effect, Maxwell who derived the equations, Lenard who determined that the frequency of the incident radiation as opposed to the intensity determined what energy was given off, Planck and Wien, who came up with the idea of quanta, and Poincaré for describing the recoil of an emitter when being struck by a burst of energy.

Here is how to think of Einstein's accomplishment. Conceptually, it is on the par with saying $2 + 2 = 4$. "But in fact, this proposal was rather less revolutionary than the original quantization of energy by Planck - it was merely a natural outgrowth of Planck's idea."¹¹ We are also told that "However, Einstein's paper on light quanta contained a glaring mistake in its analysis of the black body radiation..."¹¹

What is not emphasized by modern physicists is that Einstein relied on the "heuristic" approach i.e. the CYA approach¹¹. Einstein did this twice to avoid being associated with the ideas if they proved to be wrong. He did this with respect to the photoelectric paper and he did it with his paper, "Does the Inertia of a Body Depend on Its Energy Content?" Isn't it obvious that Einstein wanted credit for the papers if they proved to be right, but could disavow any knowledge of them if they proved to be wrong!

What the internet based model of science proposed by physicists may descend into, is scientific communism where everyone is equal, there is no need to properly cite papers and the day of the individual is over. We may soon see attempts to duplicate Einstein's method of referencing where vague allusions are made (special relativity paper) about a topic without actually giving credit where credit is due. One of the obvious examples of plagiarism in Einstein's special relativity paper was his failure to credit the Michelson-Morley experiment in 1887. What makes this truly incredible was that this was the basis for the entire special relativity paper and Einstein never referenced it!

The real danger of scientific communism is that we will live in this dark future world where the individual doesn't matter and no one has a stake in anything. Instead, we see a world of spin where facts are irrelevant and the most vocal supporters of any particular icon win. Once plagiarism is an acceptable practice, it will have a chilling effect on research because it will stifle the free exchange of ideas. Why would any researcher share his/her ideas with another researcher if they knew the ideas would be stolen?

From Clark⁵⁵, we are told, "Even in form and style (the special relativity paper) it was unusual, lacking the notes and references which give weight to most serious expositions." Einstein was writing internet quality papers before the internet was invented. Of course Big Physics has bought into this calling Einstein's 1905 papers, the "Miracle Year". Never mind that the papers were agenda driven, non reviewed, unresearched, plagiarized, internet quality papers that should have died in the review process. To physicists, this is a miracle.

As far as Ohanian¹¹ is concerned, "Four out of the five famous papers he produced during that year were infested with errors." Interesting choice of words: "infested". Sort of like cockroaches, lice, rodents or termites. What is particularly appropriate is the final observation because if your house has been eaten away by termites long enough, it will collapse.

What did Albert think about himself and his work? "There have already been published by the bucketfuls such brazen lies and utter fictions about me that I would have long since gone to my grave if I had let myself pay attention to them."⁵⁷ "It strikes me as unfair and even in bad taste to select a few individuals for boundless admiration, attributing superhuman powers of mind and character to them. This has been my fate, and the contrast between the popular estimate of my powers and achievements in reality is simply grotesque"⁵⁸ "With fame I become more and more stupid, which is, of course, a very common phenomenon."⁵⁹ Even Einstein was aware of the tremendous puffery around him.

Here is what Pais⁵ said about Einstein towards the end of Einstein's life, "As Einstein's life drew to a close doubts about his vision arose in his mind. 'I consider it quite possible that physics cannot be based on the field concept, i.e. continuous structures. In that case *nothing* remains of my entire castle in the air, gravitation theory included, [and of] the rest of modern physics' E[37]."⁵

The Cosmologic Constant was a totally ad hoc idea of Einstein's. He bought into the idea of a static universe and was concerned that gravity would collapse it into a point. So in order to keep the universe open, he came up with totally ad hoc concept of the CC, a mysterious anti gravity force that

would keep the universe open. Along comes the data from the background radiation and just like that Einstein abandoned the CC because an expanding universe would obviate the need for antigravity to keep the universe open. Einstein promptly proclaimed that the CC was the worst mistake of his career.

What is the status of the CC today? According to some investigators⁶⁰⁻⁶², the universe appears to exhibit signs of the universe accelerating instead of decelerating. This caused researchers to resurrect the idea of the CC. What caused Einstein to reject the CC? An expanding universe! What caused modern investigators to believe in the CC? An expanding universe!

It is bad enough to swear you're right when you're wrong. It is a whole different kettle of fish to swear you are wrong when you are right. In any discipline except physics, this would be the most mortifying experience any scientist could possibly experience. In physics, however, it is considered a rite of passage.

The Corruption of Science

A basic concept that seems to be missing from the popular understanding of science is one of the most fundamental and well understood aspects of life: Survival of the Fittest. This repudiates directly the whole concept of the Ivory Tower image of the lay public. Scientists are just like every American. Some are good people; some are bad people. By some quirk of fate, the latter seem to have gravitated to theoretical physics and astrophysics. Their vicious, unfounded opposition to cold fusion, and alternatives to the Big Bang theory and its practitioners, their extravagant and continued puffing up of Einstein, and their insatiable appetite for multi billion dollar toys (hot fusion machines, neutrino detectors and particle accelerators to name three) siphon off limited funds from legitimate scientists; these are "bad" scientists and "bad" people.

This is what responsible scientists are up against: Survival of the fittest. If integrity does not get you wealth, power and prestige, then why have integrity? These scientists have learned from the maestro, Einstein. "I have never obtained any ethical values from my scientific work."⁶³

Some people might view this as paranoia. But as some wag commented, just because you're paranoid doesn't mean that they are not out to get you. As long as I am below the radar (I did get hammered in the blogs for my Einstein Plagiarism articles^{7,8}), physicists will ignore me. If I am a threat to their acquisition of wealth, power and prestige, they will unleash the dogs of

war where anything goes. This is the second shot I have fired across the bow of the HMS Big Physics, and I've got the iceberg on my side.

Here is what I am up against. This will resonate with LENR (Low Energy Nuclear Reactions aka cold fusion) investigators: From the website, "The Suppression of Inconvenient Facts in Physics: The Big Bang Scandal"; one will find the following introduction to the article, a statement by Brian Martin⁶⁴, "Textbooks present science as a noble pursuit for truth, in which progress depends on questioning established ideas. But for many scientists, this is a cruel myth.

They know from bitter experience that disagreeing with the dominant view is dangerous - especially when that view is backed by powerful interest groups. Call it suppression of intellectual dissent.

The usual pattern is that some one does research or speaks out in a way that threatens a powerful interest group, typically a government, industry or professional body. As a result, representatives of that group attack the critic's ideas or critic personally-by censoring writing, blocking publications, denying appointment or promotions, withdrawing research grants, taking legal actions, harassing, blacklisting, spreading rumors..."⁶⁴

These scientists who opposed LENR research and alternatives to the Big Bang theory are nothing more than intellectual thugs, who could give lessons to the White House "Plumbers".

Does this sound familiar to LENR investigators? So we now have two entirely different disciplines in physics where the practitioners appear to have acted in a sleazy manner. As a reaction to this article, I predict we will see a third example. Three strikes and you're out. The physics community will eventually see a razing of theoretical physics to the ground and the appearance of the next generation of physicists; the process-dominated physicists, are about to replace the mathematicians in physics. This revolution is apt to be bloody.

One potential fall out of this article: We are about to see a schism in Big Physics over the next two years, where the applied physicists, men and women, who actually observe and measure real processes and promote concepts about the physical world, will stand in direct opposition to the theoretical physicists, who diddle in mathematics; these are people such as Albert Einstein and Stephen Hawking. The mathematicians who have brought us special relativity, general relativity, the Big Bang Theory, Black Holes and String Theory will cling to the Eclipse Hoax for dear life, for to abandon it now, would expose the soft underbelly of their dubious "science". Applied physicists will be furious with their peers for dragging them into this morass, and, as a result, being tarred with same brush impacting

theoretical physicists. The Deception of 1919 will ultimately prove to be a profound embarrassment to every physicist with integrity. The applied physicists will repudiate the theoretical physicists, because unlike theoretical physicists, they will know and understand the implications and significance of the accuracy and precision of data read during the Eclipse.

The Eclipse data will be the litmus test of astronomers, physicists and astrophysicists in the future. Those who fail to repudiate the Eclipse data should be regarded in the same vein as Creationists i.e. individuals who are so intent on promoting the “great” Einstein “Bible” that they cease to be scientists. They are, instead purveyors of a new religion, Einsteinism.

Brownian Motion

Einstein’s Brownian motion paper, Einstein, A. 1905, “On the Motion of Small Particles Suspended in Liquids at Rest Required by the Molecular-Kinetic Theory of Heat,” *Annalen der Physik*, 17, 549-560⁶⁵ is dubious mathematically. It is also dubious as far as the title is concerned. Einstein knew about the name Brownian Motion before he wrote his paper.¹¹ According to John D. Norton, HPS 2590 Einstein 1905, an internet article, Einstein’s assumptions: “Einstein’s methods in his dissertation seem very fragile.”⁶⁶

“a) Einstein’s entire analysis depends on the assumption that sugar molecules are spheres. They are not.”⁶⁶ In the article called, ‘Shape of Sugar Molecules Could Be All That Is Stopping Bird Flu Pandemic’, an internet article, we are told that, “The researchers were interested in a group of sugars called glycans. These are long strand chain molecules of different shapes...”⁶⁷

“b) He recovers the viscosity of a sugar solution by looking at energy dissipation in one very specialized case of a fluid with spheres. How can it adequately model a sugar solution? Should we expect that a fluid, laden with spheres, continues to behave like a Newtonian fluid for which the ordinary notion of viscosity is applicable?”⁶⁶ An excellent example of an end member, honey, is clearly a non-Newtonian fluid. Strands tend to entangle which has a direct bearing on viscosity. Einstein never made the case when a sugar solution goes from Newtonian behavior to Non-Newtonian behavior.

“c) Einstein recovers the force on a moving sugar molecule from Stokes Law. But Stokes Law was derived for spheres moving uniformly in a fluid.

The motion of sugar molecules in diffusion is not unidirectional or constant in magnitude.”⁶⁶

There are other fundamental problems with the Brownian motion paper that have a direct bearing on the conceptual basis adopted by Einstein. The kind of deference later scientists have given Einstein because of his manufactured icon status (The Eclipse Data) would cause lesser scientists to be dismissed. For example, from Chung⁶ we learn the following statement, “The time interval T forms a weak point in Einstein’s argument, since it is not previously established that a time-interval can be assumed at all. For it might well be the case that, in the observed interval of time, there would be a definite dependence of the motion of the particle on the initial state.”⁶

“In Einstein’s statement he considered only ‘two consecutive intervals’ and said nothing about three or more such intervals. Nowadays any student of elementary probability knows [or should he?] that three events can be pairwise independent without being ‘totally’ independent in the current usage of the word.” “The upshot seems to be: Einstein really had some more complicated model in mind which he did not make precise, of which the Brownian motion as formulated in (5.18) served as a first approximation.”⁶. Oh, really?

What is remarkable about the Brownian motion paper is that Einstein was obviously naïve when he set up the starting conditions, pretended he read nothing but somehow knew enough to write his article which, of course, wasn’t plagiarized from Brown or anyone else. The best that can be said about the paper is that it is, “...a first approximation.”⁶. Never mind that the title of the paper, “On the Motion of Small Particles in Liquids at Rest...” instead of calling it Brownian motion, is an attempt by Einstein to make it appear he is doing something new and revolutionary. If this paper is a “Miracle”, I shudder to think what an average physics paper looks like.

Einstein’s approach to research is fascinating. Very early he discovered that the more research he did, the fewer “new” ideas he discovered. His approach then was remarkable. He stopped doing research so that he could discover more “new” ideas. Think about it: If one does no research at all, 100% of one’s ideas will be new! “How has the history become so corrupted as to ignore these facts? Why do we feel the need to perpetuate the comic book legend of ‘Einstein’, as the great discoverer of all physical truths?”⁹

What did Einstein do for a living? He was a patent clerk. What do patent clerks do for a living? Research. What was the one thing Einstein refused to do as a scientist? Research. It really makes one wonder how many bogus patents Einstein was involved with as a patent clerk.

Einstein: The Mathematician

The basic mathematical errors made by Einstein with respect to his Brownian motion paper are vintage Einstein. The only “Miracle” about the Miracle year is how Big Physics managed to con the entire scientific community for decades and nobody noticed it. The best way to think of the Brownian motion paper is that it is, “...a first approximation.”⁶

Einstein’s mathematical errors are very expensive for the average American. For 67 years, Ricardo Carezani claimed that Einstein made a simple mathematical error because Einstein was using the wrong tool for the job, and his faulty math spawned neutrinos. If one uses the right tool for the job, the theoretical basis for neutrinos disappears because the theoretical values for nuclear decay match the observed values for nuclear decay. Occam’s razor i.e. there are either 40 kinds of nuclear decay and 40 different kinds of neutrinos, or there are no neutrinos.

So why, if neutrinos don’t exist, do physicists think they exist? Because they get oodles and oodles of money studying them! This is a multi billion dollar industry to identify particles that only physicists can “see”. Do you really think physicists are going to come back to the American Public and tell them, “Oh, by the way, we spent over \$1 billion of your money and found nothing.”? They’re everywhere! Having a neutrino detector is a status symbol. No country can compete in the “big leagues” without them.

Here is a summary of what Autodynamics offers scientists that special relativity does not. From the website, “Beyond Einstein The *Autodynamics Theory*” by David de Hilster⁶⁸:

“All great new theories begin with the simplest of observation. In the early 1940’s in Argentina, a young engineering student named Ricardo Carezani realized that Einstein’s Special Relativity theory (SR) does not apply in radioactive or ‘decay’ cases. Einstein’s equations contained a ‘kinetic’ component, introduced during its derivation, which is absent in decay. Decay is spontaneous, and requires no external energy.”⁶⁸

“Four years later, this observation led 24-year-old Carezani to discover a new theory that Einstein had come close to, but did not quite reach: a theory he called Autodynamics.”⁶⁸

“The difference between SR and AD is simple yet profound: their derivation. SR is derived using two frames of reference for describing a moving object: a reference frame and observer frame. AD eliminates the reference frame and uses only the observer. Carezani showed that the use of

two frames for relativity was physically unjustified and mathematically superfluous.”⁶⁸

“SR requires the neutrino to describe radiation or decay. The extra kinetic energy introduced in SR must be carried off by a ‘nonexistent’ particle called the neutrino, which has no mass or charge. In effect there is no physical reality to this particle.”⁶⁹

“The Proof”

“Mathematically, Autodynamics is indisputable. Experimentally, Autodynamics is nothing short of astonishing, its proof comparing to that for Galileo and Newton combined.”⁶⁸

“It was only in the late 1980’s and 1990’s that Carezani found much of the proof he had been seeking for the theory of Autodynamics: Muon decay, Pion decay, proton-proton and electron-electron annihilation, and the originator of the neutrino theory, Radium E decay. In all cases the mathematics worked out perfectly without the neutrino. The ‘bad boy’ of physics particle was no more.”⁶⁸

“Other calculations showed the power of AD over SR. Linear Momentum Transfer in Nuclear-Nuclear collisions could be explained clearly by AD--- something that SR could not do without the neutrino. Add electron-K capture to the list, U238, etc, as well as a new and improved Compton’s Effect equation that several physicists reviewed and admitted was more accurate.”⁶⁸

“The crown jewel of AD gravitation theory is its application to the precession of the binary star DI Herculis, a problem plaguing physicists for a century. AD comes within 20% of the observed values (minus the classical tidal force) while Einstein’s relativity differs from the observed by 300%. AD’s universal gravitation explains gravity and precession in one simple equation, directly related to Kepler’s second law.”⁶⁸

“In another triumph for AD, Carezani in 1990 predicted the existence of a new particle he dubbed the ‘electronmuon’. In 1994 physicists in the KARMEN collaboration apparently detected the particle and could not explain its existence. The prediction of a new particle alone holds great merit in physics. Carezani’s finding parallels that of Yukawa’s prediction of the meson (later called the muon).”⁶⁸

The Benefits

“Billions of research dollars will be saved by eliminating the neutrino and its associated particle zoo. Preliminary indications point to the elimination of other ‘esoteric’ particles allowing their research funds to be spent on more productive endeavors.”⁶⁸

“Additional benefits include cleaning up nuclear waste, explaining Bohr’s atom, and describing the red shift, just to name a few.”⁶⁸

What should have been the fate of neutrino research? Once Carezani, as a mathematically and fact based experimental physicist, waved a red flag that neutrinos had no theoretical basis, wouldn’t it have made sense to spend a few thousand dollars to vet the math i.e. why wasn’t Einstein’s math farmed out to 10 mathematicians, 10 geologists, 10 biologists, 10 chemists and 10 atmospheric scientists? What if they had come back with the observation that Carezani was correct? It would have saved the scientific community several billion dollars in pointless research.

We can never be sure how much of the paper on general relativity was the work of Mileva, Einstein’s first wife, Lorentz, Poincaré, Minkowski, Hilbert, Gerber, Soldner, Grossmann, Besso, etc..^{9,69} Maybe Einstein did something original and significant but hardly overwhelming and how much Einstein did is a matter of conjecture. Einstein often commandeered ideas and math; he found math and ideas he liked and just drove off with them. How many Americans have ever heard of Lorentz’s and Poincaré’s contributions to relativity or Grossmann’s and Besso’s contributions with respect to the math?

Einstein flip flopped on the ether, getting rid of it in special relativity and then bringing it back for general relativity “space without ether is unthinkable”. Einstein flip flopped on the Cosmological Constant calling his best work the “worst mistake” of his career. To top it all off, Einstein had data that confirmed his theory which promptly caused him to reject the theory! Einstein flip flopped on general relativity even repudiating it at the end of his life,

The Bose-Einstein condensate was the work of Bose. Einstein was already a Nobel Laureate, Bose wasn’t, when they first met in 1925. Einstein just cherry picked from hundreds of papers he received every year. He translated the paper, and, like any famous scientist, he gave a lesser scientist stature in the field¹¹. This allowed Bose to gain acceptance within the physics community. If Einstein had really done something significant with respect to

the Bose-Einstein condensate, it would be called the Einstein-Bose condensate.

Here is what Ohanian¹¹ said about Einstein in this regard, “I have translated your paper and given it to *Zeitschrift fur Physik* for publication.” And for this, he deserves to be indelibly associated with the concept ever since? This is an abuse of co authorship and leaves the reader with the unmistakable impression that Einstein had done something radical and revolutionary here, when all he really did was recognize the importance of and translate the paper.

The Ohanian book is a long laundry list ranging from Einstein’s seven failed attempts to derive $E=mc^2$, to his naïve Brownian Motion paper, to his multiple mistakes in understanding special and general relativity, to the ludicrous handling of the Cosmologic Constant, etc. In fact, between Einstein’s 1905 papers until his death, it is almost impossible to find any years when he didn’t make major mistakes.

A strong case could be made that Einstein got far more major ideas wrong than he got right. Einstein is considered by many to be the greatest physicist of all times, which explains why so much of modern theoretical physics and astrophysics is such a mess. Concept must precede mathematics, a concept foreign to mathematicians, modern physicists and astrophysicists. Some of the thought experiments of Einstein (like the twin paradox) are about as useful as trying to determine how many angels can dance on the head of a pin. As a geologist, I am more interested in: Are there Angels? Are there pins? Can Angels dance?

One way to demonstrate that the equivalence of gravity and acceleration is bogus is to consider that a body in space far removed from any gravitational field is weightless. What physicists never bother to tell the lay public is that a body falling in a gravitational field is subject to stress and strain that a body in space is not subjected to. In other words, the side of an object closer to the center of mass accelerates at a greater rate than the trailing edge of the body. This stretches the body out subjecting it to strain i.e. deformation. The body is also exposed to stress in a falling body that is not present in one far removed from any gravitational body. In other words, the forces within the body falling in a gravitational field experience a change unlike anything a body floating in space experiences. There is no equivalence between a body falling in a gravitational field and one floating in space despite what Einstein said.

What is truly amazing about the attitude of physicists is that they have created an entirely new category of mistakes for Einstein called “paradoxes” such as the clock paradox or the twin paradox. Why not call it what one

would normally call any internally inconsistent theory---a mistake? As a geologist I would love to be able any time someone found a conceptual hole in my theories and raise my hand and shout, "Paradox!" To those who reject Carezani's work because it contains a dubious example of scalar addition, my response is, "Paradox!"

The whole point of this "Miracle Year" farce is to permit Big Physics to convince Americans that A: Einstein is a genius, B: Einstein is a physicist, C: All physicists are geniuses and more deserving of funding than any other scientists. Physicists, the supporters of Einstein and the media, have done a marvelous job of conning America with this totally ridiculous "Miracle Year", and the "Man of the Century" nonsense. This would be funny if it weren't so disastrous for America's energy policy.

The most important question every physicist and astrophysicist, though, should think long and hard about is this, "At what point does this overwhelming corruption of science, the scientific method, society, funding, history and ethics result in physicists and astrophysicists, crossing the line into criminal behavior?" It is the belief of the author that physicists and astrophysicists have long since crossed that line.

Einstein and Energy

The reader may wonder, "Why is a little icon worship bad? So it distorts the funding process a little? So what? Icon worship in this country is directly responsible for our failed energy policy and the implications that has for our National Security. When Einstein became famous, he served as a symbol of genius that spilled over into the general perception that somehow, only physicists were doing really good science. (According to Gleick some physicists think that the only revolutions in science of any significance in the 20th century are chaos, quantum mechanics and relativity.⁷⁰ Of course such things as the Genome project, pale in comparison.)

This distorts funding. Where this distortion has been disastrous for Americans is in terms of our energy policy. We have spent over \$20 billion dollar funding the Big Physics toy, the hot fusion machine. One minor problem with this machine: One of the primary fuels for hot fusion, tritium, costs \$700,000/ounce! This is tantamount to using one carat diamonds for fuel. There is even talk of mining He₃ on the moon for hot fusion reactors!⁷¹

The evidence of active suppression of LENR technology by hot fusion scientists is obvious. From the website article by Emerging Energy Marketing Firm, Inc.⁷² we learn the following, "Lobbyists for the 'hot fusion' community took the following steps:

1. A committee visited several laboratories where low-energy nuclear reactions were achieved and declared them all invalid.
2. An agent was obtained at the Office of Patents and Trademarks to ensure that no cold fusion patents were approved.
3. All major U.S. technical journals were warned against printing any cold fusion articles (All but *Fusion Technology*, the journal of the American Nuclear Society agreed not to publish).
4. A fund of about \$30,000 was provided to Random House to fund a book to destroy the credibility of cold fusion. This book was *Bad Science, The Short Life and Weird Times of Cold Fusion*, a hatchet job by Gary Taubes” (For the record, the only reason that the great electrochemist John O’M Bockris did not sue Taubes for smearing his reputation was because his attorney told Bockris that libel suits are notoriously difficult to win. He told Bockris, that if he was right, he would be vindicated in the long run, which, of course, he was i.e. tritium was found in hundreds of experiments after Bockris first reported it, despite pressure from Taubes to get a graduate student of Bockris to recant or face dire consequences.)
5. An “official” from Washington, D.C. called all major universities and warned them, “If you have so much as a graduate student working on cold fusion, you will get **no contracts out of Washington.**”

Not mentioned in this website is the fact that Senator John Kerry was actively involved in shutting down a competing technology to MIT’s hot fusion program i.e. he scuttled the Integral Fast Reactor program in 1994 even though completing the research cost no more than shutting the program down.^{73,74} It is conceivable that we might be generating electricity from those IFR’s within 10 years, if the research hadn’t been shut down in 1994.

As far as the hot fusion program, think about it: Have you ever heard of any Draft Environmental Impact Statement, or a Final Environmental Impact Statement, that was conducted for the hot fusion program? Before we spent billions of dollars on this program, was there any significant input from scientists other than physicists? Should we shut down the hot fusion program until a DEIS and an FEIS are performed?

What gave the Department of Energy unlimited ability to provide billions of dollars to the hot fusion program just because wind and solar couldn’t

compete with cheap oil? How extensive was the review process before we embarked on this boondoggle? Did lobbyists from the hot fusion crowd “get” to DOE? This clear violation of the National Environmental Policy Act could only have happened with massive disregard of the wishes of every other branch of science.

As a geologist, wouldn't I want to invest billions of dollars to harness geothermal energy? Incidentally, this would provide a whole lot of geologists with a good living. If I were a biologist, wouldn't I want to spend billions of dollars trying to create cellulose biofuels, or develop new ways to genetically alter algae to produce hydrogen in large quantities? If I were a chemist, wouldn't I want to spend billions of dollars developing better batteries that were cheaper, more efficient and longer lasting? Wouldn't I be interested in funding for new energy technologies and ways to make solar panels cheaper and more efficient? If I were an atmospheric scientist, wouldn't I be interested in spending billions of dollars to place large wind mill complexes on ocean platforms to generate electricity from large offshore complexes or in other desirable areas?

So why do we have a hot fusion program? Physicists at the Department Of Energy have an incestuous relationship with physicists at MIT. The preposterous nature of the hot fusion program can be summed up in just one sentence, “DOE would have you believe that electricity generated with enormously complex and expensive machinery, whose fuel is so expensive that there is serious talk of mining it on the moon, requiring large expensive cooling towers, is more cost effective than simple, rapidly improving technology (e.g. solar), with free fuel and no cooling towers.” Just consider the following chart:

Cost of Reseach

Hot Fusion	Cold Fusion	Wind/So/Geo.	Biofuels	Fuel Cells, etc.
Exorbitant= Over \$20 billion to date over the past 30 years.	Shoe string budget. No Federal Funds allotted, but ongoing gov't research in France, Italy, Israel, South Korea and Japan.	Inexpensive	Inexpensive with large upscale potential	Relatively inexpensive to research

Cost of Fuel

Hot Fusion=Burning one carat diamonds---all other fuels free or inexpensive

Cost of Cooling

Hot Fusion=Large numbers of cooling towers---all others, none or cheap cooling

Engineering Feasibility

Hot Fusion Cold Fusion Wind/So/Geo. Biofuels Fuel Cells, etc.

<i>Impossible to improbable</i>	<i>Simple and already accomplished</i>	<i>Simple and already accomplished</i>	<i>Existing and progress assured</i>	<i>Existing and progress assured</i>

Impact on Global Warming

Hot Fusion Cold Fusion Wind/So/Geo. Biofuels Fuel Cells, etc.

<i>Terminal Warming</i>	<i>Mitigation likely</i>	<i>Known Mitigation</i>	<i>Known Mitigation</i>	<i>Known Mitigation</i>
-------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------

What the pro-Einstein/hot fusion crowd will discover in the next decade is that they are tied directly to the LENR and the Integral fast reactor program controversies, two of the most promising new energy technologies in the past 50 years, and thus our failed energy policy. If it turns out the Einstein scandal is exposed first, the hot fusion scandal will be uncovered as collateral damage. If the LENR opponents are exposed first, the Einstein scandal will be unmasked as the result of collateral damage. It should be abundantly clear, the entire physics community teeters on the verge of collapse.

If the money spent on hot fusion had been divvied up to the other branches of the sciences starting 30 years ago as outlined above, and combined with more fuel efficient cars, better insulation, more use of natural gas (T. Boone Pickens) and conservation, we would have energy independence today. MIT physicists gave away a monopoly we had on LENR, by systematically demonizing, denigrating and demeaning LENR researchers by branding their research, “Pathological” Science. MIT physicists quite clearly acted against the National Security of our country. They deliberately gave away our opportunity to develop LENR patents to France, Italy, Israel, South Korea and Japan, by systematically denying them to American inventors. The status of LENR technology today is that inventors can get excess heat, reliably on demand in a short period of time⁴². They even get high energy alpha particles with their LENR devices.⁴³

The hot fusion lobby and Senator John Kerry gave away a monopoly we had on a new generation of nuclear power⁷³. Who did they give it to? France: (One of their Generation 4 reactors).

If MIT physicists were right about LENR technology being, “pathological” science, the worst that would have happened is that a few perpetual motion machines would have been patented. If they are wrong, they could cost America several billion dollars in lost patent revenues over the next several decades. The enormity of what MIT physicists have done to our country by making us beholden to Saudi Arabia, Iraq (in the future), to Venezuela and Nigeria is beyond belief. MIT physicists were, quite clearly, acting in their own self-interest at the expense of our National Security and our national interests.

Summary and Conclusions

Science connects the known to the known⁷⁵; what we have in theoretical physics today is a castle in the sky, the mathematical universe, which has as its foundation in quicksand, the Eclipse data. The desperate attempt to provide a physical representation of general relativity, has resulted in scientists acting in ways that they ought not to act. This includes the enthusiastic approval of the corrupted and derogated data from the Eclipse.

We have an entire class of scientists so bent on puffing up Einstein in a concerted effort to get a stranglehold on wealth, power and prestige, that they have overlooked the most basic pursuit of good science, the unbiased search for the truth. Theoretical physicists have substituted agenda driven “science” for real science, the unwavering pursuit of truth. According to theoretical physicists special relativity is settled science; 3789 papers critical of special relativity have been published⁷⁶, much to the ennui of Big Physics. This is what Big Physics means by settled science i.e. thousands of papers disagreeing with special relativity are just ignored.

Theoretical physicists are no strangers to agenda driven science. *Annalen der Physik* published five agenda driven, non reviewed, unresearched, plagiarized, internet quality papers by Einstein in 1905; these should have died in the review process. Unfortunately, according to Smith³², the editors of *Annalen der Physik*, violated their own editorial policy, “But also in this very same journal issue, Einstein published several other avant-garde theoretical papers, including his ‘Special Theory of Relativity’ which contained the mathematical error. Why did no one catch the obvious error? It was simply because chief editor, Max Planck or co-editor, Wilhelm Wien, had made the fateful decision not to send Einstein’s Relativity paper out for the usual in-depth peer review.”

Now, we are being led to believe that Einstein’s 1905 papers are the most profound accomplishment of any scientist in the 20th Century! No reputable editor today in any scientific discipline would touch the 1905 Einstein papers with a 10 foot pole.

The sole purpose of the phrase “Miracle Year” is an advertising ploy to make it seem, somehow, Einstein had distanced himself favorably from the vast unwashed masses of his peers. The sole purpose of his inflated persona was to secure wealth, power and prestige by Big Physics and their minions. As long as the high priests of physics can maintain their mystique, science will suffer. We will ever be tied to fantastic concepts such as special relativity, general relativity, inflation, the big bang theory, black holes and

string theory. The commonality of all these theories: They are based on a belief in untested and untestable “constants”⁷⁷. They use as “givens” that the speed of light is constant (it isn’t), that the ether was proven wrong by Michelson-Morley 1887 (it wasn’t). Physicists believe that the gravitational constant is really constant. How do we know this? Physicists would have you believe that units of mass, length and time are constant. How do we know this?

The approximation of the truth is a lie. Physicists are great at approximating the truth. Constants evolved out of mathematical necessity, not out of some objective proof. It is necessary to have constants in order to “run the numbers”. If all constants are non linear terms, it may make a mathematical universe impossible, much to the chagrin of physicists, astrophysicists and mathematicians. Mother Nature did not design the universe for the convenience of mathematicians.⁷⁷ The rejection of a spiritual universe for a mathematical universe is not sophistication, it is sophistry.

The self delusion theoretical physicists have for the Deception of 1919 challenges their competence to speak to the issue of science in general. They apparently lack the skill to distinguish real science from fantasy science. The question must be asked, “Why are we funding scientists who seem intent on promoting fantasy science, at the expense of real science and real scientists?”

One of the first things on the agenda of Congress is to fire every physicist working for the Federal funding agencies or is a Federally funded public persona. These scientists have no business doling out contracts to their buddies in academia. Since physicists appear to have a chronic problem telling the truth, it is a bad idea to have physicists or astronomers such as David Levy providing a public face to the scientific community (he was apparently unaware that one corrupted, derogated data point does not prove a theory correct⁷⁸), for if they do so, the American public will have a totally bogus idea of what good science is, what the scientific method is, or what good scientific research is.

The Eclipse hoax has damaged science, the scientific method, society, history, ethics, our energy policy and communication between the scientific community and the lay public. We deal with a reality, not based on fact, but instead on the gnomes of Einstein. They weave a tapestry of lies, spin, exaggeration, half truths and other devices to create the illusion of Einstein the “genius” for the sole purpose of increasing their market share of wealth, power and prestige.

Einstein will be regarded by historians as the worst scientist in the history of science and his supporters as the “corrupters of history”. The 20th century

will be viewed as the century when science took a wrong turn into the mystical priesthood of mathematicians and physicists with the suppression of the truth as their primary goal, and the substitution of fantasy in its stead. The net result: some scientists are going to be viewed as the scientific equivalent of the Mafia, except, of course, the Mafia has an honor code.

Epilogue

Why was this paper written by a geologist instead of a physicist? If I had been a graduate student, I would have lost my fellowship. If I had been a university professor, I would be denied tenure and my colleagues would black list, ostracize or make my life miserable. The paper would be rejected from major physics journals not because it lacked merit, it would be rejected as being inconsistent with the acquisition of wealth, power and prestige by physicists. While the scientists can put their thumb on the neck of any dissident physicist, they cannot control an investigative scientist who could expose their long running scandal.

This paper should be required reading for every geologist, chemist, biologist and atmospheric scientist, because scientists with integrity have no idea what they are up against. They think they are competing with legitimate scientists of integrity who just happen to get “breaks” in terms of funding for such things as hot fusion, particle accelerators and neutrino “toys”. They have no idea how the entire funding process has been hijacked by the supporters of Einstein.

Acknowledgments - This paper would not have been possible without the advice, consultation, support and review by Suzanne Moody. Andy Gilchrist was responsible for stimulating discussions. I owe a debt of gratitude to Professor Win Means for learning what science is, what the scientific method is and that integrity is an integral part of the character of any legitimate scientist.

Bibliography

1. *Special Issue* "Science and Religion Conflict or Conciliation," *Skeptical Inquirer*, (Cover), 34.
2. Bodanis, D. "The Human Story Behind $E=mc^2$," *Mensa Magazine*, March 2001, 8-11.
3. Minkle, J.R. "Did Researchers Cook Data from the First Test of General Relativity?" *Scientific American*
<http://www.sciam.com/article.cfm?id=did-researchers-cook-data-from-first-general-relativity>
4. Hawking, S. 1999. "A Brief History of Relativity," *Time*, 154, 27, 66-70 79-81.
5. Pais, A. 1982. ''*Subtle is the Lord...*' *The Science and Life of Albert Einstein*, Oxford University Press, Oxford. 551p.
6. Chung, K.L. 2002. *Green, Brown, and Probability & Brownian Motion on the Line*, World Scientific, Singapore, 102.
7. Moody Jr., R. 2004. "Albert Einstein: Plagiarist of the Century," *Nexus*, 1, 47-50, 82-83.
8. Moody, Jr. R. 2005. "Albert Einstein: Plagiarist of the Century," *Infinite Energy*, 10, 59, 34-38.
9. Bjerknes, C.J. 2002. *Albert Einstein the Incurable Plagiarist*, XTX Inc., Downers Grove, Illinois, 408p.
10. Bodanis, D. *$E=mc^2$ A Biography of the World's Most Famous Equation*, Berkley Publishing Group, New York 337p.
11. Ohanian, H.C. 2008. *Einstein's Mistakes The Human Failings of Genius*, W.W Norton and Company, New York, London, 394p.
12. Sharma, A. 2007 *Einstein's $E=mc^2$ Generalized*, Raider Publishing International 300p

13. Precise Experiments Confirm Einstein's Equation of Relativity. Dec. 22, 2005. Xinhua News, <http://www.highbeam.com/doc/1P2-15980804.html>.
14. Einstein, A. 1905. "Does the Inertia of a Body Depend on its Energy Constant," *Annalen der Physik*, 18, 639-671.
15. Giannetto, E. 1993, 94, 95, "The Rise of Special Relativity: Henri Poincaré's Works Before Einstein, *Atti Del XVIII Congresso Di Storia Della Fisica E. Dell'Astronomi*, 171-206.
16. Hawking, S. 1988 *A Brief History of Time From the Big Bang to Black Holes*, Bantam, New York, Toronto, London, Sydney, Auckland, 32.
17. Maddox, J. 1995. "More Precise Solar-Limb Light-bending," *Nature*, 37, 11.
18. Cowan, G.A. 1976. "A Natural Fission Reactor," *Scientific American*, 235, 36.
19. Mallove, E. 2001. "The Einstein Myths: Of Space, Time and Ether," *Infinite Energy*, 7, 38, 6-11, 91.
20. *Galilean Electrodynamics*, published by Space Time Analyses, Ltd., 141 Rhinecliff Street, Arlington, MA 02476-7331.
21. *Physics Essays*, Physics Essays Publication, c/o ALFT, Inc. 189 Deveault St. Unit 7, Hull, Quebec J8Z 1S7, Canada.
22. *Apeiron*, C.R.K. 4405 St.-Dominique, Montreal, Quebec, H2W 2B2, Canada.
23. *Journal of New Energy*, 3084 East 3300 South, Salt Lake City, Utah 84158-0639.
24. Aspden, H. <http://www.energyscience.co.uk>.
25. Beckmann, P. 1987. *Einstein Plus Two*, The Golem Press, Boulder, Colorado.

26. Graneau, P. and Graneau, N. 1993. *Newton Versus Einstein: How Matter Interacts with Matter*, Carlton Press, New York (available through *Infinite Energy*).
27. Hatch, R. 1992. *Escape From Einstein*, Kneat Kompany, Wilmington, California.
28. Phipps, Jr. T.E. 1986. *Heretical Verities*, Classical Non-fiction Library, Urbana, IL. (Available from *Infinite Energy*).
29. Selleri, F. (Ed.) 1998. *Open Questions in Relativistic Physics*, Apeiron, Montreal.
30. Natural Philosophy Alliance, P.O. Box 14014, San Louis Obispo, CA, 93046-4014.
31. Ives, H.E. 1979. *The Einstein Myths and the Ives Papers*, Edited with comments by Richard Hazelett and Dean Turner, The Devin-Adair Company, Greenwich, Connecticut. (Contact *Infinite Energy* for information).
32. Smith, M. "Where Dr. Einstein Went Wrong," <http://www.brojon.org/frontpage/EINSTEIN-WENT-WRONG.html>.
33. Moody Jr, R. 2007. "Beyond Plate Tectonics: 'Plate' Dynamics," *Infinite Energy*, 13, 74, 12-24.
34. McCausland, I. 1999. "Anomalies in the History of Relativity," *J. Scientific Exploration*, 13-2, 271-290.
35. 2004. "The Big Bang Theory Busted by 33 Top Scientists," <http://www.rense.com>.
36. Clark, R.W. 1984. *Einstein The Life and Times*, Avon Books, New York, 284.
37. Chandrasekhar, S. 1987. *Truth and Beauty: Aesthetic and Motivations in Science*. Univ. of Chicago Press. Chicago.

38. Marmet, P. Appendix II "The Deflection of Light by the Sun's Gravitational Field: An Analysis of the 1919 Solar Eclipse Expeditions." <http://www.newtonphysics.on.ca/EINSTEIN/Appendix2.html>.
39. Sakharov, A. 1974. "Progress, Coexistence and Intellectual Freedom, in *Sakharov Speaks*, ed. Knoph, Harrison Salisbury, 56.
40. Pais, A. 1982. "Subtle is the Lord..." *The Science and Life of Albert Einstein*, Oxford University Press, Oxford. 305.
41. Langmuir, I. 1968. "Pathological Science," *Technical Information Series* General Electric Research and Development Center Transcribed and Ed. by R.N. Hall, April.
42. Chubb, S. 2007. "Cold Fusion Debate Reignited During March Meeting Madness," *Infinite Energy*, 73, 9-10.
43. Moisiere-Boss, P.A., Szpak, S., and Gordon, F.E. 2007. "Production of High Energy Particles Using the Pd/D Co-Deposition Process, *American Physical Society Meeting Session A31: Cold Fusion 1*.
44. Cromer, A. "Pathological Science: An Update," *Skeptical Inquirer*, Summer 1993 7,4.
45. Earman, J. and Glymour, C. 1980. "Relativity and Eclipses: The British Eclipse Expeditions of 1919 and Their Predecessors," in *Historical Studies in the Physical Sciences*, 11, 49-85.
46. Bodanis, D. *E=mc² A Biography of the World's Most Famous Equation*, Berkley Publishing Group, New York 337p.
47. "Royal Society 1919 Eclipse Relativity Report Duped World for 80 Years!" *British Institute of Precise Physics*, <http://www.bipp.freemove.co.uk/newpage12.htm>
48. Brown, G.B. 1967. "What is Wrong with Relativity," *Bull. Inst. Physics and Physical Soc.* 18, 71-77.

49. Munshi, J. *Weird But True*, <http://www.munshi.sonoma.edu/jamal/physicsmath.html>
50. Bertotti, B., Brill, D. and Krotkov, R. 1962. "Experiments on Gravitation," in *Gravitation: An Introduction to Current Research*, L.Witten, ed. John Wiley, New York, 1-48.
51. Poor, C.L. 1930. "The Deflection of Light as Observed at Total Solar Eclipses," *J. Opt. Soc. Amer.*, 20, 173-211
52. O'Connell, "14 Telescopes" *Diffraction*, <http://www.astro.virginia.edu/class/oconnell/astr121/guide14.html>.
53. MacRobert, A.M. 1995. "Beating the Seeing," *Sky & Telescope*, 89, 40.
54. Guggenheimer, S.H. 1925. *The Einstein Theory: Explained and Analyzed*, Macmillan, New York, 298-9.
55. Clark, R.W. 1984. *Einstein The Life and Times*, Avon Books, New York, 878p.
56. Born, M. 1956. *Physics in My Generation*, Pergamon Press, London and New York, 232p.
57. Calaprice, A. 1996. *The Quotable Einstein*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, Chichester, West Sussex, 48.
58. Calaprice, A. 1996. *The Quotable Einstein*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, Chichester, West Sussex, 47.
59. Calaprice, A. 1996. *The Quotable Einstein*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, Chichester, West Sussex, 11..
60. Lemonick, M.D. 2001. "Einstein's Repulsive Idea He Invented Antigravity in Desperation and Abandoned It First Chance He Got - But It May Be the Most Powerful Force in the Universe," *Time*, 157, 15, 58+.
61. Perlmutter, S., Turner, M.S. and White, M. 1999. "Einstein's Mistake is Revived," *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 83, 670.

62. Cowen, R, 2000. "Revved-Up Universe," *Science News*, 157, 7.
63. Calaprice, A. 1996. *The Quotable Einstein*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, Chichester, West Sussex, 16.
64. "The Suppression of Inconvenient Facts in Physics: The Big Bang Scandal" <http://www.8int.com/bigbang.html>.
65. Einstein, A. 1905. "On the Motion of Small Particles Suspended in Liquids at Rest Required by the Molecular-Kinetic Theory of Heat," *Annalen der Physik*, 17, 549-560.
66. Norton, J.D. "HPS 2590 Einstein 1905" Internet article.
67. "Shape of Sugar Molecules Could Be All That Is Stopping Bird Flu Pandemic," *Medical News Today*, Jan. 7, 2008.
68. de Hilster, D. 1996. "Beyond Einstein *The Autodynamics Theory*," *The Armchair Scientist*. 1-7.
69. Bjerknes, C.J. 2003. *Anticipations of Einstein In the General Theory of Relativity*, XTX Inc., Downers Grove, Illinois, 400p.
70. Gleick, J. 1988. *Chaos: Making a New Science*, Libri, New York 340p.
71. 2007. "Mining the Moon," *Technology Review*. www.technologyreview.com/Energy/19296/78
72. March 8, 2000, "Emerging Energy Marketing Firm, Inc. Prepared For Republican National Committee Subject: The Politics of New-Energy Technology" <http://www.ratical.org/ratville/newETP.html>.
73. "Integral Fast Reactor" Wikipedia
74. Stanford, G. S. December 2001, "Integral Fast Reactors: Source of Safe, Abundant, Non-Polluting Power, *National Policy Analysis*, #378. <http://www.nationalcenter.org/NPA378.html>.
75. Means, W. (pers. comm.).

76. Mueller, G. O. and Kneckebrodt, K. (pseudonyms) *95 Years of Criticism of the Special Theory of Relativity (1908-2003) The G. O. Mueller Research Project [GOM-Project Relativity]* Germany 2006.

77. Moody, Jr. R. 1995. "Communal Blind Spot Theory," *Mensa Bull.*, 384, 10-11.

78. Levy, D. *Millennium Milestones #8*
<http://www.kuat.org/arizonainillustrated/millennium/08.shtml>.