

[Article One](#)

[Article Two](#)

[Article Three](#)

[Article Four](#)

[References](#)

[E-mail the Author](#)

[Home](#)

Roger Anderton © 2000



DESIGN:

SOLAR-FLAIR.COM

WWI was started by Germany because it was being surrounded by countries it perceived as enemies, and thought before its enemies united that 'attack first was the best kind of defence'.

Germany lost WWI in 1919 in the same year as Einstein became a world famous scientist.

As is human nature, when failure occurs a scapegoat must be blamed. The ordinary people looked for a scape goat and thought the blame lay with pacifists that it perceived as being unpatriotic i.e. did not contribute their fair share in helping the war effort. This opinion is of course erroneous but due to human emotion, people like to perceive matters in simplistic manners like this. It was unfortunate that a large number of pacifists were Jews. This reawakened latent anti-Semitism, the ordinary German person ignored the fact that the majority of Jews had been patriotic and concentrated its hatred against the few Jews who wanted peace not war. As is human nature, erroneous irrational thinking was applied and all the Jews were blamed for what a few Jews erroneously have been perceived as having done.

Einstein was a pacifist, and a Jew. In 1919 he had become famous and had made himself a big target for a hate campaign that was conducted against him. This hate campaign eventually led to the formation of the Nazis, and Hitler used the momentum of this movement to gain power, and start WWII.

Einstein's physics was perceived by these proto- Nazis of the 1920s as a Jewish physics, and hatred was directed at that physics.

In 1925 a theory that was different theory to Einstein's emerged. Einstein said this theory was wrong. The climate of the 1920s was one of appeasement towards people that were expressing hatred against Jews. The appeasement approach to these people extended up to the time of Nevil Chamberlain's famous speech 'this piece of paper gives us peace.'

As a result of the emotions of the 1920s, physics was then corrupted.

In WWII the atomic bomb was created, and the corrupted physics was not allowed to be corrected as the world entered into the Cold War. As many atomic secrets were kept as possible.

Scientists were prevented from doing experiments that could reveal that their physics was corrupted, by the US government passing the "command, control, communications and intelligence" (CCCI) doctrine as law. This doctrine prevents experiments being conducted that interferes with national security considerations. (i.e. political reasons for the corruption of science.)

As consequence the history of physics was rewritten, and the 1925 theory that Einstein said was wrong, became written down as the natural progression of his ideas. But really the 1925 theory is a profound misunderstanding of Einstein's relativity. Hence this 1925 theory (that deals with the subatomic scale) cannot be joined to Einstein's General theory (that deals with gravity). Instead of one complete theory of physics. The physics community is presented with two theories that are supposed to come from Einstein.

As consequence orthodox physics is wrong, and scientists are not allowed to show that it is wrong. Research grants are only allowed for experiments approved by the military as per the CCCI doctrine.

Nature is not so forgiving and operates on an alternative physics. As consequence of this alternative physics there are anomalous electromagnetic effects happening that cannot be explained by orthodox physics.

Electromagnetic effects: cause cancer increase, allergies, lowers body's immune system

makes it susceptible to illnesses such as AIDS, causes crop circles, messes up the weather, used by unorthodox aircraft, cause earth lights, cause poltergeist effects etc. etc.

The whole of the anomalies of the UFO arena is the result of orthodox science being wrong, and orthodox scientists ignoring the anomalies that do not agree with their orthodox theory.

Scientists that persist and want to investigate such areas that touch upon the CCCI doctrine, despite the discouragement placed on them by their peers, are then subjected to debunking techniques, and their data ridiculed.

Once compensation is allowed for the corruption of physics history in 1925, a different history of physics emerges that unites the ideas of Newton, Tesla and Einstein as a natural progression of ideas. Where the missing links between these scientists is a collection of scientists that have been written out of orthodox physics's version of history.

It could be that aliens watch with incomprehension our application of political blundering to science matters, as per an Arthur C Clarke type of scenario.

I call your attention to the political blundering that occurs in all other areas of human activity, and ask how can anyone be so naive as to believe that political blundering has not been applied to science.

The equation is:

Politics plus science equals the UFO mystery.

And I interpret the UFO Mystery as the ' dumping ground' of anomalies that are ignored by orthodox science. Orthodox science can claim to be successful, because it ignores the facts that contradict it.

There is an alternative physics, which has had its history suppressed. As consequence the UFO mystery cannot be solved by science, and we slowly kill ourselves and our planet with the application of a false science.

Abstract:

The physics that was taught in the 20th century was supposedly based on Einstein. In fact this is not the case, there was a conspiracy against Einstein and his theory was replaced by the physics establishment in 1925/ 1926 by a false theory that is still called Einstein's theory. The conspiracy started before World war 2, and was maintained after the war because of Cold War tensions of wanting to keep atomic secrets from the Russians, and after that it evolved into a doctrine that prevents certain experimental research being carried out that can prove the 1925 theory as being wrong.

Introduction

Changes in science are supposed to come about when an experiment shows a theory to be wrong. My investigation into the theoretical structure of 20th century physics reveals to me that it is wrong. I then looked for the experimental evidence to support my views, and I found that research into the experiments that would reveal 20th century physics to be wrong, have been suppressed.

Robert O Becker MD pioneering researcher in the field of biological electricity, twice nominated for Nobel Prize, has pointed out the harmful effects of the misuse of electromagnetism. He explains in his book *Cross Currents* that research into this is suppressed by a Conspiracy in science [1] :

The military organism was designed on the 10 mW standard and, once in place, it had to be defended against the possibility of non thermal bioeffects. The recognition and validation of these effects would mean the collapse of the total organism and the death of [the US defence doctrine] "command, control, communications, and intelligence". My work on electrical control systems and the bioeffects of electromagnetic fields involved me in this controversy early in the 1970s. It quickly became apparent to me that evidence for non thermal effects was viewed as a threat to national security. Safety was not a consideration, because the military mind-set of the time held that despite the lack of actual hostilities, we were in a state of war with the Soviet Union. It was believed that our ability to prevail in that conflict required the virtually unlimited use of electromagnetic energy for all four facets of the "command, control, communications, intelligence" doctrine. This led to the policy of denying any non thermal effects from any electromagnetic usage, whether military or civilian.

Becker then goes on to explain that researchers are not allowed funding for certain topics. This is very interesting, it is within this area of physics that my theorizing has led me to become interested.

We have been greatly deceived. We have been led to believe that modern theory is supported by experiments, but we have not been told that the experiments that can disprove modern theory have been denied.

This now requires a complete change in our mind-sets. What we have been led to believe about science has been a delusion. We are denied the experiments to prove modern theory wrong. It requires a complete break with the myths that we have been led to believe in the 20th century as regards Einstein and the development of modern physics theory. Bear in mind that having been denied experimental evidence in my theorizing, by what has turned out to be a conspiracy, I have had to abandon theorizing, and instead play the role of a detective in piecing together the clues left from history as to the real events at a scene of a crime. The relevant events start from 1925 which resulted in the physics community rejecting the physics that Einstein was advocating, in favour of another theory.

Consider the possibility that when Einstein in 1925/1926 said that Quantum Mechanics was wrong, that Einstein was correct. The physics community at the time did not believe him. The

events leading from 1925/1926 left Einstein practically alone in his physics beliefs, and the rest of the physics community believing something else. Modern physics is based on the perspective that Einstein was wrong from 1925/1926, either implicitly or explicitly. To every side of an argument there are two sides. We have not been told Einstein's side of events. I now reconstruct them:

History records sorry fates for heretics such as Socrates, Bruno and Galileo. These heretics upset the majority of people by telling them that their belief system is totally in error. Socrates was forced to drink poison. [2] Bruno was put on a bonfire [3] and Galileo was threaten with torture to recant. [4]

Whether people talk about science or religion, they are still talking about belief systems. When Einstein popped up, on the surface it appears that he was treated much more leniently than the heretics of the past. But when you care to look deeper into the subject, below the superficial surface presented to science students, you find a much more different picture.

On the surface it appears to be just democracy in operation, as the physicists take a vote as to which path theoretical physics should take, with Einstein's approach losing the vote. It is presented to physics students as such. But when you care to really look. There is a completely different picture that emerges, which has all the hallmarks of a conspiracy.

What appears democracy can easily turn into conspiracy. Both activities involve groups of people, if people engage in fair and open debate and reach a majority agreement without prejudice then it is called democracy. But if a group of people gang up and decide to persecute one individual, because of prejudices then it is conspiracy.

The political climate in Germany at that time, was a great deal of hatred being stirred up against Jews by Hitler in particular against Einstein. In 1925 it does not seem a very favourable time or environment to be voting on the direction in which to take physics. There was so much hatred being stirred up against Einstein, by so many prominent scientists wanting a different theory than Einstein, it is highly suggestive that may be the vote was not conducted fairly.

Well surely physics is a self correcting process, and if physics had become corrupted before World War 2 then after the war it would be corrected? You might naively think that, but consider the situation after World War 2, it was the start of the Cold War, the fear of the Atomic Bomb. The conspiracy that corrupted physics before the war, became the reason for continuing the conspiracy after the war: America wanted Russia to have as few atomic physics secrets as possible. This then ties into the conspiracy of science that Dr. Becker is talking about. A pre- World War 2 conspiracy in physics becomes a self perpetuating conspiracy for other reasons after that war.

In 1925/1926 the science community rejected the path of physics that Einstein was advocating. Based on their beliefs from these events, the science community have put their interpretation onto history. Thus the history of 20th century science is itself a lie.

Scientists believe they follow Einstein's physics, when really their understanding of Einstein's physics is now all wrong, because of the events around 1925/ 1926. Through schooling and college and university, scientists are being trained in an incorrect interpretation of physics. They are being taught to think in an erroneous way, effectively conditioned to think in this way, to believe in it and be unable to think in other ways. It is near impossible for them after all this training to then abandon practically everything they have been taught and believe. Any perspective presented to them that conflicts with their conditioned beliefs, now seem nonsense to their false way of thinking.

The physics conspiracy works by being a battle over beliefs, where only one belief is allowed

to be the physics establishment's belief system and the other is suppressed. Modern science can be demonstrated to be wrong, merely by looking at the relevant literature regarding its development.

Scientists make claims such as saying their science is based on experiments changing their theories. However, if we merely look at the history of science, without considering the conspiracy now in science research, their claims are demonstrated as clearly false. Scientists like to speak in flattering terms of how perfect they are, but when a comparison is made with the historical record one finds that on numerous occasions 'scientists say one thing and do the complete opposite'. The lies are clearly shown in the history of science. No matter how much scientists bodge their experiments and theories to uphold their erroneous beliefs, modern science fails the test of history. [5]

There are major inconsistencies in the history of science, as scientists have attempted to revise history so that it agrees with whatever is the prevalent set of mythologies that scientists like to claim is science.

Small conspiracies involving only a few people are easy to spot, because this small group is not able to cover its tracks very well and leaves big clues behind. However, when a conspiracy gets bigger then more people are involved and the misdemeanors are covered up by more people, leaving only small clues behind that they exist. The bigger the conspiracy the harder it is to detect.

Science is the quest for truth, but human interactions corrupt that process. Science is being pursued in an environment where people can place a greater value on emotions and other factors, than they do for scientific truth. No 'real' allowance for this is made in the scientific process.

Indications of Conspiracy

The points that indicate conspiracy are the following:

1. Climate of hatred at the time in Germany against Jews especially against Einstein:

When Einstein became famous in 1919, Germany had just lost World War 1, and the Germans were looking for someone to blame for losing that war. Einstein was an easy target for what became anti-Semitism. The Nazis built themselves up from a campaign of hate directed first at Einstein. It was not helped by Einstein who as a pacifist disliked the Germans, his own people after World War I, because he viewed them as the aggressors who had started the war. [6] Certain people then perceived physics as being governed by a Jewish theory. [7] These people then attempted to steer physics away from the direction that Einstein was taking. When in 1925 / 1926 Heisenberg brought out a theory that Einstein disagreed with, these people would then have found a theory to support against Einstein. The climate of anti-Jewish feeling in this conspiracy is one part of this corruption of modern physics.

Psychologists have addressed their problems with their theories in this period of history. There was a split between Freud's psychology and Jung's psychology starting from 1913, and both camps had different followers. [8] Freud was a Jew and Jung was a Christian. [9] As Nazism spread, Jewish analysts were systematically harassed, driven out of scientific and psychological associations, replaced by their Aryan counterparts and eventually forced to flee for their lives. Freud's theories were seen as part of "Jewish science", which the Nazis were trying to get rid of. [10]

Jung was trying to create an Aryan version of psychology to replace Freud's theories during this period. Adolf Guggenbuhl - Craig, a Jew and a renowned Jungian analyst said of Jung during this period: "Jung certainly was anti-Semitic. But everyone in Europe was anti-Semitic. The Jews were considered to be Christ killers. Europe was dominated by

appeasers." [11] (Later Jung realized how he had been duped into following the Nazi movement.)

Psychologists have reassessed their science in the light of the Nazis trying to destroy Freud's theories and replace it with something else. But physicists like to think that their science is immune to these historical events. Physicists seem to display an amazing naiveté. I propose that the Nazis movement had their first victory with trying to destroy "Jewish science" with Einstein. When Einstein stood practically alone in saying the 1925 theory was wrong, this was in the same atmosphere that later faced Freud.

The individual intentions of people is difficult to gauge. But there was this strong group of people that were opposed to Einstein because of racial hatred, and would not base their reasoning solely on the physics. Some physicists could have been voting from prejudices, while others could have been voting from trying to appease the racists. Many of the physicists voting against Einstein must have been trying to appease the anti-Semitism, the same situation as Freud faced. I have looked at the main players in the voting process, some were bullied to follow the majority, some were confused by the issues involved, and some were carried away with their own erroneous beliefs. It was just that the momentum propelling these main players was a background of hatred directed at Jews and Einstein in particular, that distorted the physics. Einstein's version of physics was the first science that fell in this misguided attempt at appeasement.

2. Einstein's lost theory:

Einstein's arguments against the 1925 theory have been portrayed as being only philosophical, and he did not have a contra theory to put in its place. But consider the following undated letter to Max Born around 1927, Einstein says:

.....Last week I handed in a short paper to the Academy, in which I show that one can attribute quite definite movements to Schrodinger's wave mechanics, without any statistical interpretation. This will shortly be published in the minutes of the meetings.

Max Born says that he cannot remember what the theory was about, and says that it has disappeared without trace. [12] Now Heisenberg +co's Quantum Mechanics is based on a statistical interpretation. Thus Einstein had a different theory to Quantum Mechanics. [13]

The conventional explanation that the physics establishment would like us to believe is that - Einstein rejected Quantum Mechanics purely for philosophical reasons. But from this single scrap of information above, we now know that Einstein had a different theory, and so that part of conventional belief is wrong. And Einstein's quantum theory mysteriously disappearing is very suggestive of something being covered up.

The people who want the history of science to reflect their beliefs have had a long period in which to cover their tracks. They appear to have been a bit lazy in places. Oh, well to err is to human.

3. The general public recognised Einstein as a great man, but physicists ridiculed him after 1925:

Einstein said that the physicists who believed in the 1925 theory were wrong, eventually he made famous quotes like ' God does not play dice with the universe.' Bohr replied ' Einstein don't tell God what to do.' There were many exchanges like this, which if you look at them carefully were making Einstein the ' butt' of a joke, and belittling him. Once you start doing that to a person it becomes easier to ignore what that person is saying, and that is what happened to Einstein. Eventually the majority of the physics community ignored what Einstein had to say.

Physics students were taught a reinterpretation of Einstein's theory, and discouraged from following Einstein's approach to physics. After Einstein rejected the new theory of 1925, the physics community reacted in rejecting Einstein as a 'crank'. Einstein was aware of being viewed as an old fool. [14] In 1931 Einstein's colleagues were no longer enthusiastic about his ideas. The older ones kept silent; the younger ones were beginning to make jokes about Einstein. [15] Despite the rejection of Einstein by the majority of the physicists, there were a number of good young physicists who sought out and appreciated proximity to him. But these young physicists had to ignore the widely accepted advice that for career reasons "it would be better not to work with Einstein." [16]

To the population at large, Einstein was still perceived as a genius, but to young people engaging in learning physics, the establishment was managing to indoctrinate into them the belief that Einstein was wrong in his beliefs from 1925 and those ideas from 1925 were not worth pursuing. This process of indoctrination has carried on into today with ever more elaborate advertising campaigns carried out by the many popular physics books claiming that Einstein's ideas after 1925 are not worth pursuing.

All of this is so far very suggestive of a conspiracy, so I think I am justified from this evidence for reaching for the idea that there was a conspiracy against Einstein. What starts to make that suggestion a strong possibility is the activity of misquoting Einstein.

The establishment wants Einstein's support for its belief system, because Einstein is perceived as a hero, so engages in misquoting him, and making this the common knowledge for what we believe Einstein said.

Everyone knows that Einstein said that the speed of light is constant, that the aether does not exist etc., it is common knowledge. Everybody is wrong. It takes a big shift in the way that we think to realize that Einstein did not say the things that he is deemed to have said. This is a great psychological barrier to overcome. It means that most of what we think is Einstein's physics is NOT his theory, but a revision.

What did Einstein really say?

LIGHT SPEED

Einstein in a book that he revised in 1952, *Relativity: the special and general theory* [17] on page 76 he makes his important statement - that in General relativity, the law of the constancy of the velocity of light in vacuo, which was a fundamental assumption in Special relativity, cannot claim any unlimited validity. And that Special relativity can only hold when there is no gravity affecting light paths. On page 93 he clarifies it further by saying that in General relativity the velocity of light depends on the coordinates of when a gravitational field is present. And that gravity defines the coordinates.

So, light speed is not constant !

AETHER

If you read most any standard modern physics text book, then you find that it says something like Einstein disproved the ether (aether), when it talks about the Michelson Morley experiment.

However if you look at the book: *Sidelights on Relativity* - Einstein says he did not disprove the ether, just showed that one version of it was wrong. [18] Einstein has been frequently misrepresented by the physics establishment who want him to say what they want to believe, such as a belief that the ether does not exist, and they then revise their version of history accordingly.

What Einstein actually did was refine what could be meant by the 'ether' concept. But the Physics Establishment have redefined what Einstein meant by the words that he used, so that what Einstein said could fit in with their preconceived beliefs. So, we now have the situation today that physicists are taught that the 'ether' concept is nonsense, and we have another 'ether' concept being reinvented in Quantum Mechanics, but renames it as : quantum fluctuations of the false vacuum, zero-point energy, and other names.

Really the "ether" concept evolved in General relativity and became called "space-time." But that interpretation gets lost in confusion as people try to think from Quantum Mechanics , and reinterpret General relativity in the wrong way.

There has been a great deal of revisions as to what Einstein actually meant. It is one of the difficulties of science that when new abstract ideas appear, the necessary words to describe those ideas are not available. I have noticed in the context of Tesla that he was trying to describe his experiments, with a lack of a big enough vocabulary, and so was often using the same word in different sentences, but that word could take on different meanings. Einstein was trying to be much more precise with words that were available to him, but still his scientist contemporaries decided to reinterpret. ' They' did not want to accept Einstein's theory in its original form, and altered it to suit their own tastes.

The absence of barking dog

It is obvious why the physics establishment revised Einstein's theory of physics. It is because they wanted to bring Einstein's theory in line with the 1925 theory, which Einstein rejected.

The physics community proceeds in its enterprise by losing the original meaning attached to theories by the theories' originators. It then professes that the theories' originators are its heroes, and makes the claim of defending them. But what they are really do is defending its reinterpretation of those heroes. The people that it defends itself from can be people that have rediscovered the original meaning of their hero, but these people are labeled as cranks by some in the physics establishment, because they are unaware that they have a myth as to what their hero actually said.

There should be a clear record kept of how the physics community is deviating from the original meanings of its heroes. Because everyone is being left in a state of confusion as to what is real and what is myth.

The physics community wants the myth of their hero, and not the actual history. This is not made clear anywhere.

Where is it written that the physics community is no longer in Einstein's original theory of physics? Everyone acts as if it is Einstein's original theory. Everyone is taught that this is Einstein's original theory. They misquote Einstein to maintain that belief. They never admit to it being revised.

Now the clincher that points it out as being a conspiracy for me. Sherlock Holmes pointed out in one case that the most significant clue was the dog that did not bark, when a crime was being committed. There is no ' barking dog' in this case, and that is most peculiar. Einstein has been revised, and no one jumps up and down saying I have proven Einstein wrong. No one gets the rewards and public recognition for making the next major advance in physics after Einstein. Einstein's theory gets revised, but no one indicates where are the experiments that have disproved Einstein's original theory. It can mean only one thing - ' cover up.'

Alarm bells should be going off. We have been denied a highly significant theory from Einstein around 1927. We have been denied a theory that is contrary to modern theory. We have had experiments suppressed that can show modern theory to be wrong, because of national security considerations. In short we have been denied the ability to do proper

scientific research. But I with by little stick can knock over this 'can of worms.'

The conspiracy against Einstein has evolved into the conspiracy that exists in science in the present day. It takes a great leap in mind-set to realize that what we believed was Einstein's theory is not the original theory as which he was advocating, and that we have been subjected to a very clever advertising campaign to accept a revised theory as the original. Becker explains how the conspiracy in science works in the present day: experimental research is suppressed which has national security implications. This is easily achieved by controlling the funding of research. If a scientist finds results that do not agree with the orthodoxy he is subjected to ridicule. The experts that the establishment want are essentially 'yes men' who do as they are told and have lost their sense of originality, if they had any, i.e. 'dummies'. So, the system that is set up in the public science research sector is anti- "true scientific method" of free enterprise, and creates a deep prejudicial atmosphere against anyone of true original ideas. In other words it is an "anti- genius" atmosphere, which seeks to promote people of lesser intellect, who then masquerade and pretend to be clever.

The restrictions placed on public sector science prevents that sector from knowing what is the true theory of physics. As Professors Hawking and Penrose have described it, the fact that General relativity and Quantum Mechanics cannot be combined into a single theory, is a scandal. [19] The reason why it cannot be joined, is because the public science sector is refused permission to do experiments that would lead to such a theory. What the Black Ops science sector is involved in, who can say. (I suspect that 'they' have succeeded in deluding themselves.)

Every now and again, we hear of things like : 'the speed of light has shown to be exceeded' by some experiment or other. But when you check into these claims, you find that they are not in general being made by the orthodox science community funded from the public sector, but rather from maverick scientists with independent funding. And these mavericks find that their claims are placed under a long review by the orthodoxy, after which the orthodoxy then dismisses the mavericks' claims as being invalid. (Exactly the same methodology as Dr. Becker describes the science conspiracy works from.)

W Macneile Dixon said: "Before you can examine things you must first become aware of them." [20] We have not been aware of this 'can of worms'.

Physics has dominated our rational thoughts, and many of our beliefs are centered around it, such as a belief in temporocentrism. (See Box.) Physics being wrong means that these beliefs such as temporocentrism are delusions. For instance many of us believe that a theory that has been rejected could not then turn out to be right. Our delusional prejudices prevent many of us from seeing that much of our 'common held beliefs' are now wrong. We are as much in the dark as medieval man when faced with the Copernician theory. If Copernicus was correct, then nearly everything that medieval man believed was therefore wrong. Medieval science had been building upon one core central idea namely that the "earth was the centre of the universe". If you said this idea was wrong, then all the ideas that were developed from that idea were themselves wrong. It was too much a shock for medieval man. Is it too much of a shock for 21st century man to realise that the so-called rational scientific man of the 20th century, has built everything upon one 'core central idea' that is wrong and hence lived a life of delusions?

BOX - Temporocentric Delusion

There is a common belief among some people that science is about replacing old scientific theories with new ones, and not about what I am saying here that the correct theory has been discarded. This sounds like a step backwards, when these people believe only in steps forward. This has been called the temporocentric delusion by Peter James and Nick Thorpe, and is a hangover from 19th century ideas of progress. It is the result of a misunderstanding

of Darwinian evolution, which believes that progression is always upwards never backwards. (This has led to many misinterpretations of the archaeological evidence.) [21]

Temporocentrism can be shown to be a delusion, for instance in the case of cosmology most of the possible universes were argued over by the ancient Greeks, and so our modern cosmologists can hardly be said to be covering new ground with their ideas, most of their time. The Greeks had five different cosmological theories: [22]

- (1) the universe is one and eternal (for example, Aristotle);
- (2) the universe is one and created (Plato, at least on one construction of his views);
- (3) the universe is one and alternately, and everlastingly, created and destroyed (Empedocles, again according to one interpretation);
- (4) there are innumerable universes that exist in succession (a view attributed to Anaximander in Simplicius, for example)
- (5) there are innumerable universes that exist co-existent (the atomists)

N.B. the word ' world' was most likely used to mean the same as the word ' universe', that we use now.

It is by common beliefs that are in fact delusions, that enables the science ' cover up' to be carried out. People through their misconceptions believe that certain ideas are obviously wrong, and are then blind to seeing them as possibilities to be investigated. The easiest way to cover up a ' crime' is to commit it in front of people's eyes and to tell them with authority that it is not a ' crime'. People's willingness to comply will enable them to see what they want to see: the ultimate delusion, and assist with disposing of the evidence. People work to their optimum efficiency when engaged in a shared state of mass hypnotic delusions. It takes a great deal of effort to break through this ' conditioning'. Medieval man faced the same problem with Copernicus, as we face today.

REFERENCES AND NOTES

Allowances should be made for the following books, because most of them assume that modern physics is correct, while my perspective is contrary to that, namely I take Einstein as being right from 1925 onwards:

[1] Cross Currents by Robert O Becker, Jeremy P Tarcher USA p 299

[2] Alain de Botton on British tv Sunday 30 April 2000 channel 4 at 7 pm Philosophy: A group of people that Socrates upset conspired together and arranged to condemn and convict Socrates, giving him a poisoned drink.

[3] The View from planet Earth by Vincent Cronin, Collins, UK 1981, p 121

[4] *ibid.* p 117

[5] How scientists falsify their science is dealt with in *Betrayers of the Truth* by William Broad and Nicholas Wade, Century Publishing, London, 1982. Described on the blurb by *New Scientist*: ' A commendable effort.. a scientific rogues gallery ... an excellent job of documenting the countless ways in which careerism has corrupted every field of science.' From my perspective the book does not go far enough in its expose. From my perspective, science has been corrupted by the events of 1925/1926 in its handling of Einstein. The framework of modern science is falsified by these ' Betrayers of the Truth'.

[6] Dealt with in a lot of detail in Einstein: The Life and Times by Ronald W Clark, Hodder and Stoughton, UK 1973.

[7] Ronald W Clark p 494

[8] Jung for beginners, Jon Platania, Ph.D., Writers and Readers publishing inc., UK 1997, p 28.

[9] *ibid.* p 35.

[10] *ibid.* p 37

[11] *ibid.* p 40

[12] The Born - Einstein Letters : correspondence between Albert Einstein and Hedwig Born from 1916 to 1955 with commentaries by Max Born, translated by Irene Born, MacMillan , UK 1971, p 96

[13] Einstein during much of the latter half of his life got involved in trying to find a theory that combined gravity and electricity, and would appear to have lost interest in trying to find a theory to the subatomic realm. It seems most likely that he was trying to place his quantum theory on a firmer footing.

[14] Albert Einstein: Historical and Cultural Perspectives edited by Gerald Holton and Yehuda Elkana, Dover USA 1982, p 243-244

[15] Albert Einstein: a biography by Albrecht Folsing, Penguin books, USA, 1998 p 648

[16] *ibid.* p 695

[17] Einstein A relativity: the special and general theory, This translation first published 1920 Fifteenth Edition Enlarged on January 1954 . Note from Einstein on 1952 , 1996 by Routledge London, p36.

[18] Sidelights in Relativity, Albert Einstein

[19] A Brief History of Time, Stephen Hawking Guild Publishing, UK 1999, p 12
Einstein's Miraculous Year, J Stachel Princeton University Press, UK 1998, p xiii- comment by Professor Penrose

[20] The Human condition, W Macneile Dixon, Edward Arnold, UK, original 1937, 1964, p 160

[21] Ancient Inventions by Peter James and Nick Thorpe, Michael O'Mara books, UK 1995.

[22] Ancient Cosmologies edited by Carmen Blacker and Michael Loewe, George Allen, UK, 1975, p 207

We are ' puppets of our beliefs' according to:

The Meme Machine by Susan Blackmore - But she seems to overlook that modern science could be as much an erroneous meme (or belief system), as the other memes she talks about.

For how Maverick scientists are dealt with and their heresy suppressed, see:

Suppressed Inventions and other discoveries, Jonathan Eisen, Avery publishing, USA 1999

I can partially reconstruct Einstein's lost theory, or at least find something very similar to it.

Taking the view that Einstein had been right and misinterpreted from 1925 onwards. I then looked at the similarities to what Einstein was saying with what Tesla was saying.

Tesla's theories have been dismissed because they do not agree with the 1925 theory of Quantum Mechanics. Tesla was working from classical electromagnetic theory.

The orthodox version of history would have it - that Tesla was not working from any existing 'complete' theory of physics. But I found a quote from him mentioning a Roger Boscovich. Tesla said that Boscovich had found Einstein's theory in the 18th century.

I looked up Roger Boscovich. According to the orthodox version of history: Roger Boscovich is an anachronism i.e. a man of mystery as much as Tesla was, because he had ideas that were far in advance of his time. Orthodox physics' history then likes to ignore Boscovich.

According to what I have found out about Roger Boscovich - he was highly influential with his ideas. The great scientist Michael Faraday got his ideas about electromagnetic fields from Boscovich's ideas, and this was then turned into maths by Clerk Maxwell for the equations of electromagnetism.

Boscovich had ideas about atoms, and this inspired researchers to look along those lines. Eventually Dalton got the credit for the modern idea of atoms. And Boscovich was ignored for any credit in the theoretical side by the orthodox version of the history of atomic physics, because Dalton + co were deemed to have developed their theory of atoms based on experiments. While Boscovich was working out ideas about atoms beyond the experimental ability of his day to test them, hence deemed as speculating.

All of Boscovich's ideas get deemed as speculation because they were beyond the ability of experiments to test in his day. But Boscovich's ideas had a great influence in inspiring the experimenters to research along the lines that they did take.

So, he influenced the development of physics, but gets written out of physics history as others make the experimental discoveries.

Now Boscovich was a Jesuit mathematician priest, who was looking at the ideas of Newton and Leibniz. Newton left at the end of his Principia and Optick books some queries that he did not know the answer to. Boscovich worked on Newton's ideas and came up with a theory in 1750 where particles act in a non Euclidean universe.

Einstein's 1915 theory was non Euclidean physics i.e. based on the idea that parallel lines do not exist - which translates to the idea that light rays bend under gravity

The 1925 theory of Quantum Mechanics is really about subatomic particle physics.

Boscovich's 1750 theory was thus combining these two theories into one theory.

Actually more accurately the 1750 theory would be called a prototype theory, i.e. it needed experimental work to fully develop it.

Boscovich has been mostly ignored by Western science, although he is famous in his country. He has written a great deal about science, but it has not been translated into English.

I believe Boscovich is the 'missing link' in physics theory. Newton built on Galileo. But there is not supposed to be a link between Einstein's 1915 theory and Newton, where Einstein was revolution in physics not evolution. Yet add Boscovich to the historical picture and there is a progression from the theoretical ideas of Newton as they turn into the theoretical ideas of

Einstein. And not only that, in this scenario: theoretical physics is one complete framework theory and not the orthodox physics problem of being unable to combine Quantum Mechanics and General Relativity.

Lancelot Law Whyte has this to say about Roger Joseph Boscovich [1]:

....Boscovich was the true creator of fundamental atomic physics as we understand it, for he was the first to introduce a clear conception of structure into physics and chemistry. Since a hundred years or more had to pass before adequate atomic observations would become available, his doctrine was not a theory tested by experiment, but a programme for atomic physics suggesting a way in which a unified theory might one day be reached.

Boscovich's 'new world' was an ideal atomic cosmogony, involving a new structural attitude to space and time. Moreover it was fundamental in the sense of being atomic and concerning itself with ultimate structure, Boscovich absorbed Descartes, Locke, Newton, and Leibniz, and fused what he needed into a unified structural interpretation of all known physical phenomena. He was the geometer of atomism, the Euclid of Democritus, thinking in terms of visual images of spatial patterns of particles.

The following names include some of the most influential of those who used Boscovich's ideas , in most cases giving him credit were [2] :

In Britain: Priestley, Young, Davy, Faraday, Clerk Maxwell, Kelvin, J. J. Thomson.

In France: Clairault, de Lalande, Laplace, Gay-Lussac, Ampere, Cauchy, Seguin, Saint-Venant.

Elsewhere: Fechner, Weber, Helmholtz, Hertz, Lorentz.

Finally, here are some of the tributes paid to Boscovich by British physicists:

Young (1807), while regarding Boscovich's theory as speculative said it 'has prevailed very widely among algebraical philosophers' and 'been considered by some candid judges as deserving the highest commendation'.

Faraday (1844): 'the safest course appears to be to assume as little as possible, and that is why the atoms of Boscovich appear to me to have a great advantage over the more usual notion'.

Clerk Maxwell (1877): 'the best thing we can do is to get rid of the rigid nucleus and substitute an atom of Boscovich'.

Kelvin (1889) considered 'Hooke's exhibition of the forms of crystals by piles of globes, Navier's and Poisson's theory of the elasticity of solids, Maxwell's and Clausius's work in the kinetic theory of gases . . . all developments of Boscovich's theory pure and simple'. 'He referred to the inevitable theory of Boscovich.' Kelvin's views changed often, but he wrote finally (1905): 'My present assumption is Boscovichianism pure and simple.'

To which we may add the words of a fellow-Slav:

Mendeleeff (1870): 'Boscovich together with Copernicus is the just pride of the Western Slavs'; he 'is regarded as the founder of modern atomism'.

There is then a history of physics that connects all of these scientists, that forms an alternative physics.

The 'true' history can thus show that orthodox physicists are working from a false theory, backed up by a false history. Hence the problems that orthodox physics has imposed on the

world: electromagnetism causing health problems, damaging world's environment, creating the UFO mystery etc., are the result of their false theory.

The Einstein Conspiracy

SUPPRESSED HISTORY OF AN ALTERNATIVE PHYSICS AND THE CONSPIRACY AGAINST EINSTEIN

1. Overall Introduction

1.2 So, who was Roger Boscovich?

2.1 Suppressed Science : Introduction

2.2 Indications of Conspiracy against Einstein

2.3 Climate of hatred at the time in Germany against Jews especially against Einstein

2.4 Einstein's lost theory

2.5 The general public recognised Einstein as a great man, but physicists ridiculed him after 1925

2.6 Light Speed

2.7 Aether

2.8 Unified Physics Theory

2.9 Conclusions on Einstein

2.10 Temporo-centric Delusion

2.11 Chomsky

2.12 Einstein subjected to anti-Semitism from 1919

2.13 Boscovich

2.14 Tesla

2.15 References and Notes

3. 1 The Revised Einstein versus the Original Einstein

3.2 Einstein's theories misunderstood

4. Newton - Boscovich Research programme

5.1 The Split between Classical (Newtonian) and Modern (QM) Physics

5.2 Max Born on the Ether

5.3 Ether as metaphor

5.4 Maxwell supports Ether

5.5 Occam's Razor and the Ether

5.6 Waves

5.7 Quantum Tunnelling and Resonance

6. Boscovich's Theory the foundation of Quantum Theorising

7. Musical Appreciation of the Universe

8. The Founders of Modern Physics were working from a Unified Physics

9. Logical Positivism and Scientism

10. Feynman on the Corruption of Physics

11.1 MOBILE PHONES CAUSE CANCER DUE TO ETHER

11.2 How the Ether - Cancer Effect of Mobile Phones will be covered up in Experiments

12. The Gravity Conspiracy

13. Compartmentalisation methodology arising from Atom Bomb Development

14. Hidden Science from Operation PAPERCLIP

15.1 Modern Science as derived from an Ancient Wisdom, that was subsequently forgotten.

15.2 Copernicus

15.3 Galileo

16. Serpents of Wisdom: Religious reasons behind the Suppression of Science

17. Suppression of Ancient History

18. Conspiracy against Daniken

19. Conspiracy against Spinoza

20.1 Pole Shift

20.2 Pole Shift and the Ether

20.3 Einstein - Hapgood Conspiracy

21.1 CHALLENGER EXPLOSION - EXAMPLE OF THE UFO CONSPIRACY IN OPERATION

21.2 Introduction

21.3 The Challenger Explosion

21.4 Conclusion

21.5 Footnote

22.1 The Temporo-centric Delusion : The influence of Hoaxing in history

22.2 Introduction

22.3 The Ancient Greeks

22.4 Columbus

22.5 Ancient Greek maps

22.6 The Ptolemy hoax

22.7 What were the Medieval Science beliefs?

22.8 Mandeville's book

22.9 Mandeville's hoaxed life

22.10 Mandeville's Stories

22.11 The Prester John Hoax

22.12 Mandeville's Message

22.13 Mandeville's evidence that the world can be circumnavigated

22.14 The Mystery of Mandeville

22.15 Mounds in America

22.16 Conclusion

22.17 Further information

22.18 References

1.1 Overall Introduction

Modern physics has been corrupted. The reasons for this are very complicated. This web site is devoted to some of the reasons for that corruption. History is a collection of people doing lots of strange things, forming into groups and trying to impose their will. There was a conspiracy set up against Einstein, by anti - Semites, and there was a corruption of science turning it into a religion by a strange philosophical movement.

Physics was unified into one complete theory by a genius called Roger Boscovich (which is the Unified Theory that Einstein was looking for, and said to have never found). In the beginning of the 20th century, Modern Physics was based upon Boscovich, but the complete theory was rejected, leaving a disunited physics, with Boscovich and many other scientists such as Tesla deleted from mainstream physics history.

It is not unusual for History to get distorted, In section 22, I give an example of where history (as presented to the general public) around Columbus, is also distorted. Denis Alexander in Rebuilding the Matrix tells us:

"It is a well-known story that the sailors who sailed with Columbus on his epic voyages westward across the Atlantic were afraid to sail due to the possibility that they might fall off the edge of the flat earth. I have to admit that I believed this paradigmatic account concerning the convictions of medieval people until quite recently. The paradigm was enforced by occasional jocular allusions to 'flat-earth societies' in press, and by the use of the term 'flat-earthier' as a form of abuse..... The problem with the 'flat-earth' paradigm is that it is certainly false. Historians have been telling us for some time that the commonly held belief that people in medieval times thought the earth was flat is without historical foundation..."

Despite the 'true' history being repeatedly told to us by scholars (in their books that are unread), the media persists in giving the delusion that medieval people were 'flat - earthers'. The Media likes giving a distorted version of history. So, Mainstream Physics History (as presented by the media) being wrong along with everything else, should not be too surprising. The unfortunate thing is that this version of history is taught to science students. Many physicists in the 20th century have spent their time looking for a unified theory and failing, when such a theory was discovered in the 18th century and then promptly hidden by the distorted account of history, that they are taught.

All these and other events lead to the modern world being a 'mess', with reality being very different from what we have been deceived into believing, creating the UFO Mystery. Clues to the real history of mankind gets covered up by the distorted accounts that are presented for such people as Columbus and Einstein. And when we look at the 'proper physics' as given to us by Boscovich, then things that were once thought impossible, suddenly become possible.

1.2 So, who was Roger Boscovich? Well see this article from New Scientist in 1958:

New Scientist 6 March 1958

Roger Boscovich: a 20th century mind in the 18th century by Dr A L MacKay

Blurb: This year has brought the two hundredth anniversary of publication of his chief work. Some of his ideas were so advanced that it has been possible to appreciate them properly only in the past two decades.

On the rising ground behind the city of Zagreb in Yugoslavia, just where the trees begin, one can see a modern glass and concrete building in which research in physics and chemistry is carried on by the energetic post war generation of Yugoslavs. A notice board announces that this is the Boscovich Institute and in the garden in front there is a bronze statue, by Yugoslavia's most celebrated sculptor Mestrovic, of a figure wearing priest's robes and deep in thought with his elbow on a globe. The inscription reads "Rugjer Josip Boskovic, 1711 - 87."

Most younger scientists have never met the name of Boscovich and only a few of the older school remember having heard of Boscovichian atoms. Yet, 60 years ago and for 150 years before that, Boscovich had been widely known as a natural philosopher and astronomer. Serious estimates by some historians of science put Boscovich among the dozen greatest scientists, the equal of Newton, Leibniz, Euler and Franklin. Certainly he was the greatest scientist of Yugoslav origin.

Boscovich's principal work, his Theory of Natural Philosophy, was published 200 years ago last month. Unfortunately Branimir Truhelka, who had begun a definitive biography of Boscovich and was editing the collected works, died prematurely, but his sister has just published a short life from her brother's notes.

What did Boscovich do, how did he come to be forgotten and how should his work be estimated today?

Born on 18 May, 1711, the son of a Serbian trader [ME - error in article S/B Croatian], in Dubrovnik, the then independent state of Ragusa (whose merchant adventurers gave us the word "argosy"). Boscovich went to Rome at the age of 14 to study mathematics, astronomy and theology at the Collegium Romanum. It was at this college that Matteo Ricci had in 1571 - 77 learnt the astronomy with which he tried to convert all China to the Jesuits.

In 1728 Boscovich finished his novitiate and became a Jesuit and in 1740 he succeeded his teacher Borgondio as professor of mathematics. From his first dissertation on sun spots, in 1736, until he left Rome in 1760, he published about 50 papers on astronomy, optics, mathematics, geodesy and the philosophy of science. He became the principal adviser on technical matters to the Holy See. He set up an observatory, advised on the draining of the Pontine marshes, saw to the repair of St Peter's when the dome cracked, went on diplomatic missions, visited the site of Troy, made archaeological studies in Italy and measured the length of the 2 degrees of latitude along the meridian between Rome and Rimini.

As this is now the International Geophysical Year Boscovich should be especially remembered for the latter task. He worked particularly for the production of accurate maps and surveying and was active in three directions, the invention of instruments (he invented a circular eye piece micrometer), the theory of instruments and observations and, most important, the international organisation of scientific enterprises.

He agitated for the accurate measurement of the length of a degree of latitude in various

places and to this end approached the Royal Society, Maria Teresa and other authorities and intended to go to Brazil himself, but was persuaded to work in the Papal States instead.

The Royal Society later urged him to go to Pennsylvania but an arc there was measured by Mason and Dixon (of the line). The Royal Society then wished to send Boscovich to California to observe the transit of Venus in 1761, but he eventually went to Constantinople for the same purpose, although he arrived too late and became ill for some months.

The principal Academies of Science in Europe competed to make Boscovich a member, and in 1760 he visited England for several months, where he was made a Fellow of the Royal Society on 26 June. He dedicated a long Latin poem "On the defects of the Sun and Moon" to the Royal Society and this was printed in London by Andrew Millar. His supporters called it "Newton in the mouth of Virgil" but others said it was "uninstructive to an astronomer and unintelligible to anyone else."

Boscovich met many of the leading figures of the day, besides just scientists. He disputed with Dr Johnson. Boswell reports: "In a Latin conversation with Pere Boscovich at the house of Mrs Cholmondely, I heard him (Dr Johnson) maintain the superiority of Sir Isaac Newton over all foreign philosophers with a dignity and eloquence that surprised that learned foreigner." Boscovich was in Cambridge on Guy Fawkes night 1760 and was very displeased by the anti - Catholic nature of the festivities.

After working temporarily in Pavia and Milan there was a dispute with Lagrange, and trouble with the Austrian government, and on top of that the Jesuit Order was disbanded. Following this, in 1773 Boscovich obtained the Directorship of the "Optique Marine" in Paris and became a French citizen. He continued to write prolifically on astronomy and optics, making bitter enemies (D'Alembert and Laplace) and equally enthusiastic friends (Lalande), but in 1785 he retired to Bassano in Italy to see his works through the printers; but his health was broken and he died two years later in Milan at the age of 75. He is buried in the cemetery of Santa Maria Podone in Milan.

All the works mentioned were of solid, last value and contributed greatly to the science of the day, establishing Boscovich as a leading figure, but it is his general Theory of Natural Philosophy, published in Vienna in 1758, which is of greatest importance.

Important papers by L L Whyte have recently explained how Boscovich's theory was 200 years ahead of its time and could not be properly appreciated until modern ideas on relativity and quantum theory had replaced the billiard - balls and elastic jellies of the last century.

Boscovich's explanation is unusually clear and he says that it "does not go beyond the capacity ... of classes even far below the level of mediocrity." But he claims to "have advanced, in his kind of investigation, much further than Newton himself even thought open to his desires." Basically, Newton said in his Optics, that "to derive from the phenomena of Nature two or three general principles, and then to explain how the properties and actions of all corporate things follow from those principles, this would indeed be a mighty advance in philosophy, even if the causes of those principles had not at the time been discovered."

[NB Philosophy in those days meant what we call Physics. Philosophy has science split away from Physics, to mean something else in the modern context.]

Boscovich claimed to have done better than this by postulating one single law of forces. Boscovich did not consider masses and forces - his description was purely kinematic and related to the mutual accelerations of particles. His atoms were rather like what are now called nucleons (protons or neutrons) and the mass of any particle of matter was simply the number of these atoms in it.

Two atoms had a mutual acceleration given by the curve in the figure shown here (which comes from Boscovich's book). "A" represents the centre of one atom and the ordinates show the acceleration of another atom with respect to the first at different distances. For very close approach the atoms experience a very strong repulsion so that matter cannot have an infinite density although the atoms occupy no space.

The law of continuity prohibiting the occurrence of infinite accelerations is one of the foundations of the theory. At large distances the curve approximates to the inverse square law of Newtonian gravitation, but at the intermediate distances there are a number of stable inter-atomic distances (at F, K, O and S) which make the system remarkably like the quantum view of the atom held today.

From this model the basic properties of matter - density, volume, mass, mechanical strength, thermal properties (attributed to agitation of the particles) and gravitation are explained. Optical properties (due to the very rapid motion of particles) are also accounted for in terms of Newton's showers of particles with alternate fits of reflexion and transmission. These follow plausibly from the wave packet nature of the Boscovichian atoms.

Unfortunately Boscovich seems to have few disciples to publicise his work. His thought was last influential when Maxwell and Kelvin were formulating their ideas of the atom before atoms and electrons were experimentally demonstrated (see "Atom" by Maxwell in the 9th edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica), but since the rise of experimental nuclear physics older theories constructed on very slender evidence have been hardly more than historical interest.

The death of Boscovich's biographer is a double loss because Boscovich's life would provide a microcosm of European science at its most active period and because his work and thought are of importance in themselves.

[I am unable to copy the picture for:] Diagram of Boscovich's "Theory of Natural Philosophy reduced to a single law of forces" showing the type of interaction between point atoms. There is a very large repulsion for close approach and approximation to the inverse square law at large distances with several stable inter-atomic distances in between.

[It looks like a damped sine wave: a wave of large amplitude petering out to smaller amplitude.]

[Note along with everything else mentioned above that: Boscovich's particles have a wave nature. So, much for the wave/duality problem of Quantum Theory, if you follow Boscovich's theory.]

So, who was Boscovich? He was the greatest theoretical physicist of ALL TIME. And you never heard of him? Well now read some of the reasons why!

2.1 Suppressed Science : Introduction

The physics that was taught in the 20th century was supposedly based on Einstein. In fact this is not the case, there was a conspiracy against Einstein and his theory was replaced by the physics establishment in 1925/ 1926 by a false theory that is still called Einstein's theory. The conspiracy started before World War II, and was maintained after the war because of Cold War tensions of wanting to keep atomic secrets from the Russians, and after that it evolved into a doctrine that prevents certain experimental research being carried out that can prove the 1925 theory as being wrong.

Changes in science are supposed to come about when an experiment shows a theory to be wrong. My investigation into the theoretical structure of 20th century physics reveals to me that it is wrong. I then looked for the experimental evidence to support my views, and I found that research into the experiments that would reveal 20th century physics to be wrong, have been suppressed.

Robert O Becker MD pioneering researcher in the field of biological electricity, twice nominated for Nobel Prize, has pointed out the harmful effects of the misuse of electromagnetism. He explains in his book *Cross Currents* that research into this is suppressed by a Conspiracy in science [1] :

The military organism was designed on the 10 mW standard and, once in place, it had to be defended against the possibility of non thermal bioeffects. The recognition and validation of these effects would mean the collapse of the total organism and the death of [the US defence doctrine] "command, control, communications, and intelligence". My work on electrical control systems and the bioeffects of electromagnetic fields involved me in this controversy early in the 1970s. It quickly became apparent to me that evidence for non thermal effects was viewed as a threat to national security. Safety was not a consideration, because the military mind-set of the time held that despite the lack of actual hostilities, we were in a state of war with the Soviet Union. It was believed that our ability to prevail in that conflict required the virtually unlimited use of electromagnetic energy for all four facets of the "command, control, communications, intelligence" doctrine. This led to the policy of denying any non thermal effects from any electromagnetic usage, whether military or civilian.

Becker then goes on to explain that researchers are not allowed funding for certain topics. This is very interesting, it is within this area of physics that my theorising has led me to become interested.

We have been greatly deceived. We have been led to believe that modern theory is supported by experiments, but we have not been told that the experiments that can disprove modern theory have been denied from being conducted.

This now requires a complete change in our mind-sets. What we have been led to believe about science has been a delusion. We are denied the experiments to prove modern theory wrong. It requires a complete break with the myths that we have been led to believe in the 20th century as regards Einstein and the development of modern physics theory. Bear in mind that having been denied experimental evidence in my theorising, by what has turned out to be a conspiracy, I have had to abandon theorising, and instead play the role of a detective in piecing together the clues left from history as to the real events at a scene of a crime. The relevant events start from 1925 which resulted in the physics community rejecting the physics that Einstein was advocating, in favour of another theory.

Consider the possibility that when Einstein in 1925/1926 said that Quantum Mechanics was wrong, that Einstein was correct. The physics community at the time did not believe him. The events leading from 1925/1926 left Einstein practically alone in his physics beliefs, and the

rest of the physics community believing something else. Modern physics is based on the perspective that Einstein was wrong from 1925/1926, either implicitly or explicitly. To every side of an argument there are two sides. We have not been told Einstein's side of events. I now reconstruct them:

History records sorry fates for heretics such as Socrates, Bruno and Galileo. These heretics upset the majority of people by telling them that their belief system is totally in error. Socrates was forced to drink poison. [2] Bruno was put on a bonfire [3] and Galileo was threaten with torture to recant. [4]

Whether people talk about science or religion, they are still talking about belief systems. When Einstein popped up, on the surface it appears that he was treated much more leniently than the heretics of the past. But when you care to look deeper into the subject, below the superficial surface presented to science students, you find a much more different picture.

On the surface it appears to be just democracy in operation, as the physicists take a vote as to which path theoretical physics should take, with Einstein's approach losing the vote. It is presented to physics students as such. But when you care to really look. There is a completely different picture that emerges, which has all the hallmarks of a conspiracy.

What appears democracy can easily turn into conspiracy. Both activities involve groups of people, if people engage in fair and open debate and reach a majority agreement without prejudice then it is called democracy. But if a group of people gang up and decide to persecute one individual, because of prejudices then it is conspiracy.

The political climate in Germany at that time, was a great deal of hatred being stirred up against Jews by Hitler in particular against Einstein. In 1925 it does not seem a very favourable time or environment to be voting on the direction in which to take physics. There was so much hatred being stirred up against Einstein, by so many prominent scientists wanting a different theory than Einstein, it is highly suggestive that may be the vote was not conducted fairly.

Well surely physics is a self correcting process, and if physics had become corrupted before World War II then after the war it would be corrected? You might naively think that, but consider the situation after World War II, it was the start of the Cold War, the fear of the Atomic Bomb. The conspiracy that corrupted physics before the war, became the reason for continuing the conspiracy after the war: America wanted Russia to have as few atomic physics secrets as possible. This then ties into the conspiracy of science that Dr. Becker is talking about. A pre- World War II conspiracy in physics becomes a self perpetuating conspiracy for other reasons after that war.

In 1925/1926 the science community rejected the path of physics that Einstein was advocating. Based on their beliefs from these events, the science community have put their interpretation onto history. Thus the history of 20th century science is itself a lie.

Scientists believe they follow Einstein's physics, when really their understanding of Einstein's physics is now all wrong, because of the events around 1925/ 1926. Through schooling and college and university, scientists are being trained in an incorrect interpretation of physics. They are being taught to think in an erroneous way, effectively conditioned to think in this way, to believe in it and be unable to think in other ways. It is near impossible for them after all this training to then abandon practically everything they have been taught and believe. Any perspective presented to them that conflicts with their conditioned beliefs, now seem nonsense to their false way of thinking.

In order to find that the Physics Establishment is into revising history of physics, you have

to dig back to older texts on physics to find out what they are really doing.

In more modern revised versions of physics, you don't get any mention of revision to Einstein. Instead you get some fiction about them still following Einstein's 'original General Relativity.' But if you look at old books such as Britannica printed 1971 you find an account where it states that Einstein's General Relativity has been revised: -

... For, according to the Heisenberg relations [of Quantum theory], it is not possible to measure the position and momentum of a particle simultaneously and precisely. On the other hand, if the gravitational field of the body can be measured, the General Theory permits just that. Thus, the General Theory must be modified to make it consistent with quantum theory..... [5]

The physics conspiracy works by being a battle over beliefs, where only one belief is allowed to be the physics establishment's belief system and the other is suppressed. Modern science can be demonstrated to be wrong, merely by looking at the relevant literature regarding its development.

However, Modern Physicists in general, do not believe that 'they' need to pay any attention to their history. For instance top Theoretician David Deutsch in his book *The Fabric of Reality* says:

...The reverence that philosophers show for the historical sources of ideas is very perverse, you know. In science we do not consider the discoverer of a theory to have any special insight into it. On the contrary, we hardly ever consult original sources. They invariably become obsolete, as the problem - situations that prompted them are transformed by the discoveries themselves. For example, most relativity theorists today understand Einstein's theory better than he did. The founders of quantum theory made a complete mess of understanding their own theory. Such shaky beginnings are to be expected..... [6]

Deutsch is telling us that he does not care about the history of his subject, and does not care what theory Einstein originally had because he believes Theorists now know better than Einstein. It is interesting to note that he also believes that the founders of Quantum theory did not understand their subject properly. Einstein said that Quantum Mechanics was wrong, and Deutsch saying this about Quantum Mechanics is in close agreement with Einstein upon that matter. Now if he looked at what Einstein was really saying, before it was altered to fit in with Quantum Mechanics, then he might deduce that the original theory was correct. But he does not pay attention to history, and Historians know that those who do not pay attention to history are doomed to repeat the mistakes of the past.

A similar situation occurred after Newton. There was a fight between believers in the wave theory of light and the particle theory of light. The wave theory of light was suppressed for over a century. The reason given by *Electromagnetic: History and Applications* by Robert S Elliott :

... Although neither theory [wave and particle theories of light] were adequate, the esteem in which Newton was held by his contemporaries and followers was so great that the wave theory was rejected and allowed to remain unnourished for over a century. If the fact that Newton found the corpuscular hypothesis more acceptable retarded the growth of the theory of light, as some have claimed, the fault lay with those who blindly espoused all his views... [7]

History repeats itself, with the Establishment defending the founder of its mainstream theory, but having in this instance revised its founder Einstein, and disguised this by rewriting their officially cited history given to Physics students. For instance I was never told at University that the theory of Einstein I was being taught was a revision. This makes the defenders of

Einstein think they are defending the 'original Einstein' when they are in fact defending a 'revised Einstein.' Similarly the opposition to Establishment physics are unaware of the revision to physics history. Thus the fight between the two factions: the Establishment and those opposed to Einstein's theory, is really over a 'strawman' that NEVER existed.

It is diversion in physics that is being played out, that draws attention away from the real issues in physics, and ensures that physics cannot solve the UFO Mystery.

Scientists make claims such as saying their science is based on experiments changing their theories. However, if we merely look at the history of science, without considering the conspiracy now in science research (as pointed out by Dr Becker earlier), their claims are demonstrated as clearly false. Scientists like to speak in flattering terms of how perfect they are, but when a comparison is made with the historical record one find that on numerous occasions 'scientists say one thing and do the complete opposite'. The lies are clearly shown in the history of science. No matter how much scientists bodge their experiments and theories to uphold their erroneous beliefs, modern science fails the test of history. [8]

There are major inconsistencies in the history of science, as scientists have attempted to revise history so that it agrees with whatever is the prevalent set of mythologies that scientists like to claim is science.

Small conspiracies involving only a few people are easy to spot, because this small group is not able to cover its tracks very well and leaves big clues behind. However, when a conspiracy gets bigger then more people are involved and the misdemeanours are covered up by more people, leaving only small clues behind that they exist. The bigger the conspiracy the harder it is to detect.

Science is the quest for truth, but human interactions corrupt that process. Science is being pursued in an environment where people can place a greater value on emotions and other factors, than they do for scientific truth. No 'real' allowance for this is made in the scientific process.

2.2 Indications of Conspiracy against Einstein

There was a hate campaign set up against Einstein, and one of his theories was hidden. And from 1925 onwards he was ridiculed by the Science Community, which never abated. All of this indicates a vast Cover up in Science.

2.3 Climate of hatred at the time in Germany against Jews especially against Einstein

When Einstein became famous in 1919, Germany had just lost World War I, and the Germans were looking for someone to blame for losing that war. Einstein was an easy target for what became anti-Semitism. The Nazis built themselves up from a campaign of hate directed first at Einstein. It was not helped by Einstein who as a pacifist disliked the Germans, his own people after World War I, because he viewed them as the aggressors who had started the war. [9] Certain people then perceived physics as being governed by a Jewish theory. [10] These people then attempted to steer physics away from the direction that Einstein was taking. When in 1925 / 1926 Heisenberg brought out a theory that Einstein disagreed with, these people would then have found have a theory to support against Einstein. The climate of anti-Jewish feeling in this conspiracy is one part of this corruption of modern physics.

Psychologists have addressed their problems with their theories in this period of history. There was a split between Freud's psychology and Jung's psychology starting from 1913, and both camps had different followers. [11] Freud was a Jew and Jung was a Christian. [12] As Nazism spread, Jewish analysts were systematically harassed, driven out of scientific and psychological associations, replaced by their Aryan counterparts and eventually forced to flee for their lives. Freud's theories were seen as part of "Jewish science", which the Nazis were trying to get rid of. [13]

Jung was trying to create an Aryan version of psychology to replace Freud's theories during this period. Adolf Guggenbuhl - Craig, a Jew and a renowned Jungian analyst said of Jung during this period : "Jung certainly was anti-Semitic. But everyone in Europe was anti-Semitic. The Jews were considered to be Christ killers. Europe was dominated by appeasers." [14] (Later Jung realised how he had been duped into following the Nazi movement.)

Psychologists have reassessed their science in the light of the Nazis trying to destroy Freud's theories and replace it with something else. But physicists like to think that their science is immune to these historical events. Physicists seem to display an amazing naiveté. I propose that the Nazis movement had their first victory with trying to destroy "Jewish science" with Einstein. When Einstein stood practically alone in saying the 1925 theory was wrong, this was in the same atmosphere that later faced Freud.

The individual intentions of people is difficult to gauge. But there was this strong group of people that were opposed to Einstein because of racial hatred, and would not base their reasoning solely on the physics. Some physicists could have been voting from prejudices, while others could have been voting from trying to appease the racists. Many of the physicists voting against Einstein must have been trying to appease the anti-Semitism, the same situation as Freud faced. I have looked at the main players in the voting process, some were bullied to follow the majority, some were confused by the issues involved, and some were carried away with their own erroneous beliefs. It was just that the momentum propelling these main players was a background of hatred directed at Jews and Einstein in particular, that distorted the physics. Einstein's version of physics was the first science that fell in this misguided attempt at appeasement.

2.4 Einstein's lost theory

Einstein's arguments against the 1925 theory have been portrayed as being only philosophical, and he did not have a contra theory to put in its place. But consider the following undated letter to Max Born around 1927, Einstein says:

.....Last week I handed in a short paper to the Academy, in which I show that one can attribute quite definite movements to Schrodinger's wave mechanics, without any statistical interpretation. This will shortly be published in the minutes of the meetings.

Max Born says that he cannot remember what the theory was about, and says that it has disappeared without trace. [15] Now Heisenberg +co's Quantum Mechanics is based on a statistical interpretation. Thus Einstein had a different theory to Quantum Mechanics. [16]

The conventional explanation that the physics establishment would like us to believe is that - Einstein rejected Quantum Mechanics purely for philosophical reasons. But from this single scrap of information above, we now know that Einstein had a different theory, and so that part of conventional belief is wrong. And Einstein's quantum theory mysteriously disappearing is very suggestive of something being covered up.

The people who want the history of science to reflect their beliefs have had a long period in which to cover their tracks. They appear to have been a bit lazy in places. Oh, well to err is to human.

2.5 The general public recognised Einstein as a great man, but physicists ridiculed him after 1925

Einstein said that the physicists who believed in the 1925 theory were wrong, eventually he made famous quotes like ' God does not play dice with the universe.' Bohr replied ' Einstein don't tell God what to do.' There were many exchanges like this, which if you look at them carefully were making Einstein the ' butt' of a joke, and belittling him. Once you start doing that to a person it becomes easier to ignore what that person is saying, and that is what happened to Einstein. Eventually the majority of the physics community ignored what Einstein had to say.

Physics students were taught a reinterpretation of Einstein's theory, and discouraged from following Einstein's approach to physics. After Einstein rejected the new theory of 1925, the physics community reacted in rejecting Einstein as a ' crank'. Einstein was aware of being viewed as an old fool. [17] In 1931 Einstein's colleagues were no longer enthusiastic about his ideas. The older ones kept silent; the younger ones were beginning to make jokes about Einstein. [18] Despite the rejection of Einstein by the majority of the physicists, there were a number of good young physicists who sought out and appreciated proximity to him. But these young physicists had to ignore the widely accepted advice that for career reasons "it would be better not to work with Einstein." [19]

To the population at large, Einstein was still perceived as a genius, but to young people engaging in learning physics, the establishment was managing to indoctrinate into them the belief that Einstein was wrong in his beliefs from 1925 and those ideas from 1925 were not worth pursuing. This process of indoctrination has carried on into today with ever more elaborate advertising campaigns carried out by the many popular physics books claiming that Einstein's ideas after 1925 are not worth pursuing.

All of this is so far very suggestive of a conspiracy, so I think I am justified from this evidence for reaching for the idea that there was a conspiracy against Einstein. What starts to make that suggestion a strong possibility is the activity of misquoting Einstein.

The establishment wants Einstein's support for its belief system, because Einstein is perceived as a hero, so engages in misquoting him, and making this the common knowledge for what we believe Einstein said.

Everyone knows that Einstein said that the speed of light is constant, that the aether does not exist etc., it is common knowledge. Everybody is wrong. It takes a big shift in the way that we think to realise that Einstein did not say the things that he is deemed to have said. This is a great psychological barrier to overcome. It means that most of what we think is Einstein's physics is NOT his theory, but a revision.

Now let us look at some of the things that Einstein was really saying:

2.6 Light Speed

2.6 Light Speed

Einstein in a book that he revised in 1952, *Relativity: the special and general theory* [20] on page 76 he makes his important statement - that in General relativity, the law of the constancy of the velocity of light in vacuo, which was a fundamental assumption in Special relativity, cannot claim any unlimited validity. And that Special relativity can only hold when there is no gravity affecting light paths. On page 93 he clarifies it further by saying that in General relativity the velocity of light depends on the coordinates of when a gravitational field is present. And that gravity defines the coordinates.

So, light speed is not constant !

2.7 Aether

If you read most any standard modern physics text book, then you find that it says something like Einstein disproved the ether (aether), when it talks about the Michelson Morley experiment.

However if you look at the book: *Sidelights on Relativity* - Einstein says he did not disprove the ether, just showed that one version of it was wrong. [21] Einstein has been frequently misrepresented by the physics establishment who want him to say what they want to believe, such as a belief that the ether does not exist, and they then revise their version of history accordingly.

What Einstein actually did was refine what could be meant by the 'ether' concept. But the Physics Establishment have redefined what Einstein meant by the words that he used, so that what Einstein said could fit in with their preconceived beliefs. So, we now have the situation today that physicists are taught that the 'ether' concept is nonsense, and we have another 'ether' concept being reinvented in Quantum Mechanics, but renames it as : quantum fluctuations of the false vacuum, zero-point energy, and other names.

Really the "ether" concept evolved in General relativity and became called "space-time." But that interpretation gets lost in confusion as people try to think from Quantum Mechanics, and reinterpret General relativity in the wrong way.

There has been a great deal of revisions as to what Einstein actually meant. It is one of the difficulties of science that when new abstract ideas appear, the necessary words to describe those ideas are not available. I have noticed in the context of Tesla that he was trying to describe his experiments, with a lack of a big enough vocabulary, and so was often using the same word in different sentences, but that word could take on different meanings. Einstein was trying to be much more precise with words that were available to him, but still his scientist contemporaries decided to reinterpret. ' They' did not want to accept Einstein's theory in its original form, and altered it to suit their own tastes.

Now consider the absence of barking dog:

It is obvious why the physics establishment revised Einstein's theory of physics. It is because they wanted to bring Einstein's theory in line with the 1925 theory, which Einstein rejected.

The physics community proceeds in its enterprise by losing the original meaning attached to theories by the theories' originators. It then professes that the theories' originators are its heroes, and makes the claim of defending them. But what they are really do is defending its reinterpretation of those heroes. The people that it defends itself from can be people that have rediscovered the original meaning of their hero, but these people are labelled as cranks by some in the physics establishment, because they are unaware that they have a myth as to what their hero actually said.

There should be a clear record kept of how the physics community is deviating from the original meanings of its heroes. Because everyone is being left in a state of confusion as to what is real and what is myth.

The physics community wants the myth of their hero, and not the actual history. This is not made clear anywhere.

Where is it written that the physics community is no longer in Einstein's original theory of physics? Everyone acts as if it is Einstein's original theory. Everyone is taught that this is Einstein's original theory. They misquote Einstein to maintain that belief. They never admit to it being revised.

Now the clincher that points it out as being a conspiracy for me. Sherlock Holmes pointed out in one case that the most significant clue was the dog that did not bark, when a crime was being committed. There is no 'barking dog' in this case, and that is most peculiar. Einstein has been revised, and no one jumps up and down saying I have proven Einstein wrong. No one gets the rewards and public recognition for making the next major advance in physics after Einstein. Einstein's theory gets revised, but no one indicates where are the experiments that have disproved Einstein's original theory. It can mean only one thing - 'cover up.'

Alarm bells should be going off. We have been denied a highly significant theory from Einstein around 1927. We have been denied a theory that is contrary to modern theory. We have had experiments suppressed that can show modern theory to be wrong, because of national security considerations. In short we have been denied the ability to do proper scientific research. But I with my little stick can knock over this 'can of worms.'

The conspiracy against Einstein has evolved into the conspiracy that exists in science in the present day. It takes a great leap in mind-set to realise that what we believed was Einstein's theory is not the original theory as which he was advocating, and that we have been subjected to a very clever advertising campaign to accept a revised theory as the original. Becker explains how the conspiracy in science works in the present day: experimental research is suppressed which has national security implications. This is easily achieved by controlling the funding of research. If a scientist finds results that do not agree with the orthodoxy he is subjected to ridicule. The experts that the establishment want are essentially 'yes men' who do as they are told and have lost their sense of originality, if they had any, i.e. 'dummies'. So, the system that is set up in the public science research sector is anti- "true scientific method" of free enterprise, and creates a deep prejudicial atmosphere against anyone of true original ideas. In other words it is an "anti- genius" atmosphere, which seeks to promote people of lesser intellect, who then masquerade and pretend to be clever.

The restrictions placed on public sector science prevents that sector from knowing what is the true theory of physics. As Professors Hawking and Penrose have described it, the fact that General relativity and Quantum Mechanics cannot be combined into a single theory, is a scandal. [22] The reason why it cannot be joined, is because the public science sector is refused permission to do experiments that would lead to such a theory. What the Black Ops science sector is involved in, who can say. (I suspect that 'they' have succeeded in deluding themselves.)

Every now and again, we hear of things like : 'the speed of light has shown to be exceeded' by some experiment or other. But when you check into these claims, you find that they are not in general being made by the orthodox science community funded from the public sector, but rather from maverick scientists with independent funding. And these mavericks find that their claims are placed under a long review by the orthodoxy, after which the orthodoxy then dismisses the mavericks' claims as being invalid. (Exactly the same methodology as Dr. Becker describes the science conspiracy works from.)

W Macneile Dixon said:

Before you can examine things you must first become aware of them. [23]

We have not been aware of this 'can of worms'. Physics has dominated our rational thoughts, and many of our beliefs are centered around it, such as a belief in temporocentrism. (See Box.) Physics being wrong means that these beliefs such as temporocentrism are delusions. For instance many of us believe that a theory that has been rejected could not then turn out to be right. Our delusional prejudices prevent many of us from seeing that much of our 'common held beliefs' are now wrong. We are as much in the dark as medieval man when faced with the Copernican theory. If Copernicus was correct, then nearly everything that medieval man believed was therefore wrong. Medieval science had been building upon one

core central idea namely that the "earth was the centre of the universe". If you said this idea was wrong, then all the ideas that were developed from that idea were themselves wrong. It was too much a shock for medieval man. Is it too much of a shock for 21st century man to realise that the so-called rational scientific man of the 20th century, has built everything upon one ' core central idea' that is wrong and hence lived a life of delusions?

2.8 Unified Physics Theory

Einstein's Unified Field Theory has connections to the 18th century Unified Physics of Roger Boscovich: a Scientist the equal of Newton, that the Science Establishment chooses to forget as part of its Cover Up.

I can partially reconstruct Einstein's lost theory, or at least find something very similar to it. Taking the view that Einstein had been right and misinterpreted from 1925 onwards. I then looked at the similarities to what Einstein was saying with what Tesla was saying.

Tesla's theories have been dismissed because they do not agree with the 1925 theory of Quantum Mechanics. Tesla was working from classical electromagnetic theory.

The orthodox version of history would have it - that Tesla was not working from any existing 'complete' theory of physics. But I found a quote from him mentioning a Roger Boscovich. Tesla said that Boscovich had found Einstein's theory in the 18th century. I looked up Roger Boscovich. According to the orthodox version of history, as related in Charles Scribner's Sons Dictionary of Scientific Biography:

Boskovic, Rudjer J. (b. Dubrovnik, Yugoslavia 18 May 1711; d. Milan, Italy 13 Feb. 1787) natural philosophy, maths, astronomy, physics, geodesy.... perhaps last polymath to figure in an important way in the history of science, and his career was in consequence something of an anachronism and presents something of an enigma.... [24]

Roger Boscovich is an anachronism, and need I remind you that anachronism means something that seems out of place in time. Boscovich's theory of physics was too advanced for its 18th century setting. He was a man of mystery as much as Tesla was, because both had ideas that were far in advance of his time. Orthodox physics follows the method of Deutsch and ignores its true history, particularly when that history has people in it like Boscovich, who do not fit into their version of events.

According to what I have found out about Roger Boscovich - he was highly influential with his ideas. The great scientist Michael Faraday got his ideas about electromagnetic fields from Boscovich's ideas, and this was then turned into maths by Clerk Maxwell for the equations of electromagnetism.

Boscovich had ideas about atoms, and this inspired researchers to look along those lines. Eventually Dalton got the credit for the modern idea of atoms. And Boscovich was ignored for any credit in the theoretical side by the orthodox version of the history of atomic physics, because Dalton + co. were deemed to have developed their theory of atoms based on experiments. While Boscovich was working out ideas about atoms beyond the experimental ability of his day to test them, hence deemed as speculating.

All of Boscovich's ideas get deemed as speculation because they were beyond the ability of experiments to test in his day. But Boscovich's ideas had a great influence in inspiring the experimenters to research along the lines that they did take.

So, he influenced the development of physics, but gets written out of physics history as others make the experimental discoveries.

Now Boscovich was a Jesuit mathematician priest, who was looking at the ideas of Newton and Leibniz. Newton left at the end of his Principia and Optick books some queries that he did not know the answer to. Boscovich worked on Newton's ideas and came up with a theory in 1750's where particles act in a non Euclidean universe.

Einstein's 1915 theory was non Euclidean physics i.e. based on the idea that parallel lines do not exist - which translates to the idea that light rays bend under gravity

The 1925 theory of Quantum Mechanics is really about subatomic particle physics.

Boscovich's 1750's theory was thus combining these two theories (non - Euclidean geometry and particles) into one theory. (Actually more accurately, we might say that the 1750's theory was a prototype theory, i.e. it needed experimental work to fully develop it.)

Boscovich has been mostly ignored by Western science, although he is famous in his country. He has written a great deal about science, but it has not been translated into English.

I believe Boscovich is the ' missing link' in physics theory. Newton built on Galileo. But there is not supposed to be a link between Einstein's 1915 theory and Newton, where Einstein was revolution in physics not evolution. Yet add Boscovich to the historical picture and there is a progression from the theoretical ideas of Newton as they turn into the theoretical ideas of Einstein. And not only that, in this scenario: theoretical physics is one complete framework theory and not the orthodox physics problem of being unable to combine Quantum Mechanics and General Relativity.

Lancelot Law Whyte has this to say about Roger Joseph Boscovich [25]:

....Boscovich was the true creator of fundamental atomic physics as we understand it, for he was the first to introduce a clear conception of structure into physics and chemistry. Since a hundred years or more had to pass before adequate atomic observations would become available, his doctrine was not a theory tested by experiment, but a programme for atomic physics suggesting a way in which a unified theory might one day be reached.

Boscovich's 'new world' was an ideal atomic cosmogony, involving a new structural attitude to space and time. Moreover it was fundamental in the sense of being atomic and concerning itself with ultimate structure, Boscovich absorbed Descartes, Locke, Newton, and Leibniz, and fused what he needed into a unified structural interpretation of all known physical phenomena. He was the geometer of atomism, the Euclid of Democritus, thinking in terms of visual images of spatial patterns of particles

2.9 Conclusions on Einstein

I have read many books on the biographies of Einstein and in them it says that there was a Conspiracy against Einstein. (Just never explicitly said it in those words.) I checked the mathematics of Relativity, and checked with many respected authorities' books on Relativity, and found that there are numerous different theories all claiming to be Einstein's Relativity. I found that the reason for this is to be that in the 1920s Einstein said Quantum Mechanics was wrong. The Physics Community then took this to mean that they could then ignore Einstein, and proceed with believing in Quantum Mechanics regardless. Students were then taught to ignore General Relativity, being told that it was of little practical use, and to concentrate instead on Quantum Mechanics, which was said to be more practical.

After Einstein died, the Physics Community then took another look at General Relativity. In the 1960s there was an era called the Renaissance of General Relativity, [26] with the Physics Community suddenly paying attention to the theory. When they did this they did not have to worry about Einstein telling them that they were doing it wrong, and they proceeded to interpret General Relativity based on their beliefs acquired from Quantum Mechanics. This resulted in them rewriting and reinterpreting General Relativity to agree with their Beliefs in Quantum Mechanics - a theory that Einstein said was wrong. The result was that they rewrote (or reinvented) General Relativity, making it different from what Einstein originally intended it to be understood. So, from the original perspective, the Physics Community has misunderstood General Relativity.

But what adds to the confusion is that the rewrite of General Relativity from the 1960s is not very well advertised. General Relativity is taught to students, and the students are not told it has been a rewrite. Instead they are told that they are being taught Einstein's General Relativity, leaving them to form a delusional belief that the theory is unaltered from when Einstein wrote it. Whereas the differences between Einstein's General Relativity and the modified General Relativity, these students are taught is profound and deep.

Looking at the true theory of Einstein, I found that it sat within a whole tradition of physics that has been discredited and debunked. Einstein's true General Relativity is part of the Ether theory tradition. The modified theory is not part of that tradition. And believers within the perspective of the modified theory, denounce and mock Ether theory, citing their belief in this matter as being: the Ether does not exist, because Einstein proved it did not exist. But that is a lie. Einstein's true theory sits within the Ether theory tradition.

Checking the unfairly discredited Ether theory tradition, one of the great highlights is the work of Nikola Tesla. Conspiracy Theorists link Tesla in many ways with the UFO phenomenon. But from the Mainstream Physics community, there is a conceited belief that such physics is wrong, and dismiss all such links with a mocking laugh. Their laughter is unfounded. The physics that they believe in is unfounded, and is not as they claim it to be. It is not based on the true Einstein. Their physics is rather based upon their misunderstanding of Einstein. A misunderstanding of Einstein that filters out to all people. So, that when pro- Ether believers try to make their point of view expressed, they then are led to believe that Einstein is an 'anti-Ether' physicist, and then set about trying to attack his theories. The Physics Community which is then protected by several layers of wrongs, then responds by mocking these dissidents that try to prove Einstein wrong.

The true theory of Einstein sits within a physics tradition stretching back to Newton, and is linked by an 18th century genius called Roger Boscovich. Boscovich foresaw the improvements to Newton's theory that would lead to Relativistic and Quantum ideas. The correct history of physics is thus roughly Newton to Boscovich to Einstein, with Einstein's theorising not being as complete as Boscovich's 18th century theory.

Whereas the mainstream physics history that is fostered upon us is that there was Newton theory, followed by Einstein's revolution overturning Newton's theory with no continuity between Newton and Einstein. i.e. Mainstream physics history overlooks the missing link between Einstein and Newton, that would show continuity of the framework physics theory, and so presents the fictitious 'sudden break' in theorising. After this artificial mistaken history, the Physics Community decided to have a genuine physics revolution and broke with the Newton - Boscovich - Einstein physics tradition, when they decided to believe Quantum Mechanics, and called it a Quantum Revolution in physics.

The Physics Community not content with rewriting physics history, rewriting Einstein' theory etc., to fit in with

their beliefs that arise from their Quantum Revolution, then proceeds to rewrite all the other sciences to agree with its beliefs.

(Incidentally, many of the claims for the wonderfulness of the Quantum Revolution giving us computers etc., is entirely misplaced, and can really be traced back to geniuses like Tesla, who were not working from Quantum Mechanics.)

The only compatible event to this was the scenario that Galileo faced when he challenged medieval physics - where the Academics of his day had managed to either:

1. fit an observation into their religious Beliefs,

or 2. failing to fit an observation into their Beliefs they then ignored that observation.

Various methods were used to discredit any observation that did not fit with religious Beliefs. This is the same scenario as the Modern Physics Community is now engaged in, especially with respect to UFOs. The Physics Community by its influence persuades the other sciences to follow this same methodology, with the risk to its members that if they do not follow the Dogma of their science, then they lose respectability within their Peer group, to lose that and you become unemployable (i.e. with a ridiculed point of view one's CV looks bad.)

This filtering of facts to believe only those that are convenient and tally with one's existing Beliefs is called the Knowledge Filter. By the use of the Knowledge Filter, Academics are able to reject ideas that they consider to be wrong. And how they know that maverick ideas are wrong, is because they recognise that those ideas do not fit with what that they already believe in.

However, the real reason the maverick idea does not fit is because the existing Beliefs are wrong. When this is pointed out, Academics then face a 'credibility gap,' they cannot understand a claim that their existing Beliefs could be wrong, because those beliefs now seem to them to be Facts: checked by others. They exist in the belief that surely science is a building process where facts get fitted together, and question how can so many 'seeming facts' be wrong? And the answer is that what Science has been building upon is a misunderstanding of Einstein! And in order to make that misunderstanding of Einstein consistent, anything that does not agree with that misunderstanding gets rejected by this building process. If Science can be compared to building a gigantic structure, then the foundations of science are extremely shaky. Whenever there has been a problem with the structure of the building, the problem has stemmed from the foundations, but the foundations have always been assumed to be 'sound' no matter what happens, and so successive 'boggles' gets added to the structure and the work proceeds ever upwards. In other words, the physics structure is a vast collection of 'fictions' that have been added together, and that give the illusion of working together.

Mainstream Science thus chooses to Cover up UFOs and other anomalies. When faced with an anomaly, it chooses to ignore it or else generate an explanation that agrees with its misunderstanding of Einstein, in other words generate another fiction to add to its existing structure of fictional beliefs.

Reality is not as Mainstream Science would have us believe. When witnesses have reported incredible things, and were mocked by an Academia trained in the belief of an erroneous science, the question now is how much of what the witnesses said was really true?

2.10 Temporocentric Delusion

There is a common belief among some people that science is about replacing old scientific theories with new ones, and not about what I am saying here that the correct theory has been discarded. This sounds like a step backwards, when these people believe only in steps forward. This has been called the temporocentric delusion by Peter James and Nick Thorpe, and is a hangover from 19th century ideas of progress. It is the result of a misunderstanding of Darwinian evolution, which believes that progression is always upwards never backwards. (This has led to many misinterpretations of the archaeological evidence.) [B1]

Temporocentrism can be shown to be a delusion, for instance in the case of cosmology most of the possible universes were argued over by the ancient Greeks, and so our modern cosmologists can hardly be said to be covering new ground with their ideas, most of their time. The Greeks had five different cosmological theories: [B2]

- (1) the universe is one and eternal (for example, Aristotle);
- (2) the universe is one and created (Plato, at least on one construction of his views);
- (3) the universe is one and alternately, and everlastingly, created and destroyed (Empedocles, again according to one interpretation);
- (4) there are innumerable universes that exist in succession (a view attributed to Anaximander in Simplicius, for example)
- (5) there are innumerable universes that exist co-existent (the atomists)

N.B. the word ' world' was most likely used to mean the same as the word ' universe', that we use now.

It is by common beliefs that are in fact delusions, that enables the science ' cover up' to be carried out. People through their misconceptions believe that certain ideas are obviously wrong, and are then blind to seeing them as possibilities to be investigated. The easiest way to cover up a ' crime' is to commit it in front of people's eyes and to tell them with authority that it is not a ' crime'. People's willingness to comply will enable them to see what they want to see: the ultimate delusion, and they will then even assist with disposing of the evidence. People work to their optimum efficiency when engaged in a shared state of mass hypnotic delusions. It takes a great deal of effort to break through this ' conditioning'. Medieval man faced the same problem with Copernicus, as we face today.

2.11 Chomsky

Noam Chomsky is a very respected Social and political critic, in the book *The Chomsky Reader*, James Peck says:

To confront a mind that radically alters our perception of the world is one of life's most unsettling yet liberating experiences. Unsettling because it can undercut carefully constructed rationales, liberating because at last the obvious is seen for what it is. However troubling reality may be, human dignity is not affirmed in fleeing it. Rather, dignity lies in seeing reality for what it is - and acting responsibly in the face of it. [B3]

Chomsky enlightens us about the nature of politics in a democracy. I hope to have enlightened the reader in similar manner about the nature of science practiced in a democracy. Showing that the Science Community has built itself on misunderstanding Einstein. Once the reader realises this, then he / she can know the truth of the 'real' physical reality that has been hidden.

As to how the Science Community can foster a delusion of physical reality on us, it is the same methodology that Chomsky has highlighted in the content of how the truth is hidden in politics, where the only opinions in debate are controlled by an intelligentsia:

... these debates are shaped by a group he calls the "secular priesthood", the intellectuals, technocrats, and the propagandists whose task it is to make the actions of the state palatable, its lofty, transcendental ideals believable. [B4]

It is this 'secular priesthood' that tries to control the opinions that can be voiced in any debate, not just in political debates, and so in Science 'they' censor the truth from being told. Hence this is how the Science Community is forced to build upon a misunderstanding of Einstein. This 'secular priesthood' has forced its interpretation of Einstein onto us as the object to be built upon, and it ties to the politics that demands: science must be of such a nature "to make the actions of the state palatable." Science is subservient to political demands, and the part of the intelligentsia paid for by the state, do as their pay-masters demand and alter science to fit those political demands.

2.12 Einstein subjected to anti-Semitism from 1919

Dennis Overbye in his book Einstein in Love, says what happened to Einstein after he became a celebrity in 1919, he was not liked by everyone:

Not everybody was enraptured by this general trend of celebrity and idolatry. If you were a conservative, or a German physicist who had won the Nobel prize (as Einstein had not yet done) without having your face decorate magazine covers and being anointed a new Copernicus, there was something vaguely ominous about the brown-eyed face staring out from the newspapers and magazine covers. It was, after all a Jewish face. And the word "relatively" was being heard entirely too often these days in contexts that had nothing to do with moving trains and the speed of light. It was a joke, it was a code, a shorthand for a certain kind of corruption, a moral rot, "the purest subjective idealism", in the words of the London Times, substituting for the pillars of culture and knowledge. [B5]

This was anti-Semitism directed at Einstein, and he noticed:

Berlin, Albert had told Ehrenfest late in 1919, was rife with anti-Semitism, adding that "political reaction is violent, at least among the intelligentsia." Soon he began to see it everywhere. [B6]

There was a large part of the population who were racists, and Einstein had presented himself as a prominent figure for these racists to direct their attention to. Einstein from 1919, he began to notice anti-Semitism wherever he went in the world, by this racist faction.

Overbye reports that from 1919:

Albert's relativity lectures at the University of Berlin had become a tourist attraction. [B7]

But there was a down side to this:

In February his students began to complain to university officials about the presence of these unregistered freeloading visitors and the ruckus they caused. Albert felt his classes should be open to anybody, but the university insisted on its rules. Representatives of the students' committee disrupted the class on Feb. 12, and the issue was hashed out, with Albert agreeing to waive all fees and reconstitute the course as a set of public lectures. In the accounts of this incident nasty things were said, including an anti-Semitic jab at Einstein in a Nazi newspaper. Albert supposedly referred to the protesters as "outcasts of mankind," and a left wing student newspaper, Vorwärts, made allusions to an "anti-Semitic mob". [B8]

The Ministry of Education's put out a statement assuring people that the protests had been neither political nor anti-Semitic in nature. It was all a misunderstanding. Einstein went along with this, more or less, in his own statement quoted in Vorwärts: "There can be no question of a scandal said to have taken place yesterday: nevertheless, a few remarks that were made testified to a certain animosity toward me. There were no anti-Semitic utterances as such, but their undertone could be so interpreted." Albert quietly cancelled plans to teach the course again in the summer. [B9]

It was not just Einstein being affected from 1919 onwards in Germany:

.....things were getting out of hand throughout Germany. In early March of 1920 a Vorwärts article summed up the last two weeks' worth of atrocities: A republican teacher horsewhipped by an army officer in Königsberg; a Jewish student named Kahn shot and killed in Baden - Baden; Einstein the target of anti-Semitic riots; troops busting up an amateur labour union theater in the Ruhr; a pacifist rally in Osnabrück invaded by thugs from the notorious Freikorps Lichtschlag shouting insults at Jews and "vermin", and killing a young man who tried

to stop them; and marines beating the speaker at a pacifist rally in Berlin almost to death.
[B10]

It is not a climate to do physics, and we are expected to believe from mainstream history that the rebellion against Einstein in the 1920s had no anti-Semitism overtones, and was decided purely on the physics issues. This sort of unpleasantness one never really escapes from. When Einstein was in America after WWII, he was caught in the McCarthyism attacks on Communists, and was suspected of being such, as were many other people. No way can physics be properly assimilated in such an atmosphere of deep racism, hence it became corrupted.

2.13 Boscovich

The following names include some of the most influential of those who used Boscovich's ideas , in most cases giving him credit were [B11] :

In Britain: Priestley, Young, Davy, Faraday, Clerk Maxwell, Kelvin, J. J. Thomson.

In France: Clairault, de Lalande, Laplace, Gay-Lussac, Ampere, Cauchy, Seguin, Saint-Venant.

Elsewhere: Fechner, Weber, Helmholtz, Hertz, Lorentz.

Finally, here are some of the tributes paid to Boscovich by British physicists:

Young (1807), while regarding Boscovich's theory as speculative said it `has prevailed very widely among algebraical philosophers' and `been considered by some candid judges as deserving the highest commendation'.

Faraday (1844): `the safest course appears to be to assume as little as possible, and that is why the atoms of Boscovich appear to me to have a great advantage over the more usual notion'.

Clerk Maxwell (1877): `the best thing we can do is to get rid of the rigid nucleus and substitute an atom of Boscovich'.

Kelvin (1889) considered `Hooke's exhibition of the forms of crystals by piles of globes, Navier's and Poisson's theory of the elasticity of solids, Maxwell's and Clausius's work in the kinetic theory of gases . . . all developments of Boscovich's theory pure and simple'. `He referred to the inevitable theory of Boscovich.' Kelvin's views changed often, but he wrote finally (1905): `My present assumption is Boscovichianism pure and simple.'

To which we may add the words of a fellow-Slav:

Mendeleeff (1870): `Boscovich together with Copernicus is the just pride of the Western Slavs'; he `is regarded as the founder of modern atomism'.

There is then a history of physics that connects all of these scientists, that forms an alternative physics.

H G Gill in his book on Roger Boscovich, during WWII (book published 1941) says [B12] :

This small volume contains a simple account of the remarkable way in which a theory proposed by Roger Boscovich two hundred years ago is now found to be in harmony with conclusions arrived at by methods of modern scientific research.

After WWII it was all change, the physics text books taught to Physics Students was rewritten, because of the A Bomb exploding physics was centered on new concepts. But the main originator of these ideas Boscovich was no longer mentioned (at least in the West).

Boscovich was left to the philosophers, who had to think of a reason why the physicists were suddenly ignoring him after WWII. They came up with the following explanation:

Lancelot Whyte tells us that if we expect history to be simple, then we find anomalies like Roger Boscovich, and describes him as:

...a twentieth-century mind in the eighteenth century, and ... the creator of an idea-the point

particle-so necessary that many scientists now find it unnecessary to think about it, allowing it to do its work unconsciously. [Boscovich is] an example of what we lack: simplicity and lucidity in fundamentals. Where the physics of our day is abstract and difficult, Boscovich's atomism is simple and clear, but wrong. [B13]

He does not offer any reasoning as to why Boscovich is 'wrong'. I presume that he believes in the modern theory of Quantum Mechanics. It is made slightly clearer when Whyte goes on to say:

By an historical irony no sooner did the full significance of this principle [of Boscovich's theory] become clear than it was proved to be inadequate by the success of the de Broglie-Schrodinger wave particle. [B14]

What Whyte calls 'de Broglie - Schrodinger wave particle' he really means the standard version of Quantum Mechanics interpreted as per Bohr, Heisenberg etc.

So, Boscovich's theory was abandoned in favour of Quantum Mechanics. It did not agree with Quantum Mechanics and was merely assumed wrong, because if you look there is no experiment that proves Boscovich wrong.

Now let me re-cap the situation- there was a physics tradition linking the ideas of Einstein with Newton, through Boscovich, which was thrown away after WWII, with no reasoning given. In Modern Physics we now have the anomaly that Quantum Mechanics does not combine with General Relativity, but Boscovich's discarded theory links these ideas.

His theory is described as:

Boscovich presented a comprehensive theory of physics based on

the principle that all phenomena arise from the spatial arrangements and relative displacements of identical point particles interacting by pairs under an oscillatory law determining their relative accelerations. This principle in his theory reduced to a Single law of the actions existing in nature. [B15]

It was quite a thing to throw away. I have personally look at Boscovich's theory and I am convinced that he was right. However, we live in a very sceptical society, and someone's word is no longer considered worth anything. Which leaves us with the Physics Establishment managing to perform any action they choose without justification, such as throw away a theory that is comprehensive (i.e. unified) without giving an adequate reason. (A point that I wish to raise repeatedly - the Establishment likes to throw away ideas and evidence that does not fit in with its beliefs, without giving any adequate reason.)

And the theory of Boscovich connects to Ancient wisdom, because it is a Pythagorean theory of physics:

One half of Kepler's mind was Pythagorean; the whole of Boscovich's was, if we may credit to that school the great principle of blending number and nature. For Boscovich discarded 'massy matter', and developed a vision of the entire cosmos as a changing tapestry of points, an open network. [B16]

Do you realise the consequences of this? The theory discarded after WWII was based on Pythagorean ideas. A unified theory of physics based on Ancient ideas, was discarded; very suggestive of knowledge coming down to us from either a lost civilisation or Ancient Astronaut/ Aliens. But since such ideas do not fit in with the perspective of orthodoxy, then the orthodoxy throws away such evidence. (Or if one believes in deliberate conspiracy, then

the orthodoxy might be destroying other such evidence as this on purpose.)

2.14 Tesla

I have been interested in the perspective that Albert Budden had on the UFO Mystery, [B17] and have been to a lecture delivered by him. It was very interesting, but there were many points that seemed very mysterious. From his theories - the UFO phenomenon is the result of electromagnetic pollution affecting people that he calls electro- hyper- sensitive (EH), who then experience strange hallucinations and other associated strange phenomenon. In the lecture he fervently argued his case that UFOs had nothing to do with aliens, and could be explained instead by his theory or collection of theories. He then showed a video of objects moving by what he claimed was a poltergeist created by electromagnetic experiments of maverick scientists Hutchison. I talked to several of the audience afterwards and they were sceptical that the poltergeist was real, and not some conjuring trick. To Budden this was an 'electromagnetic poltergeist'. But it left the audience baffled on many issues, not least of which is - if the video is genuine and it was a demonstration of antigravity, what is then to stop possible aliens from visiting us using a science based on such a technology?

In the UFO literature that has been going back since its beginnings there has been talk of supposed aliens visiting us using antigravity. It is even a theme of many science fiction B movies. It seems very mysterious that Albert Budden should be introducing this concept and be claiming that it supports his theory that no aliens are here.

My interest has been in physics, and if one looks at the history of physics then one finds many anomalies that have been written out of the revised physics history that is often presented to physics students. For instance there was no mention of Tesla, when I did physics, but many maverick scientists claim that the physics side of the UFO Mystery is centered around Tesla.

Just how great Tesla was can be illustrated by some of his discoveries [B18] :

1. Electron microscope. This was invented by Tesla before the electron was discovered. He assumed that the effect was due to electrically charged atoms.

2. X- rays : Tesla reported in his 1892 lectures, "visible light black light and a very special radiation." He was experimenting with this radiation which, he reported, produced shadow graph pictures on plates in metal containers, in his laboratory when it was destroyed by fire in March, 1895. When Prof. Wilhelm Konrad Roentgen, in Germany, in December, 1895, announced the discovery of X-rays, Tesla was able immediately to reproduce the same results by means of his "very special radiation," indicating that these and X-rays had very similar properties although produced in somewhat different ways. Immediately upon reading Roentgen s announcement, Tesla forwarded to the German scientist shadow graph pictures produced by his "very special radiation." Roentgen replied: "The pictures are very interesting. If you would only be so kind as to disclose the manner in which you obtained them." Tesla did not consider that this situation gave him any priority in the discovery of X-rays.

3. Cosmic rays

4. Artificial radioactivity

5. Disintegrating beam of electrified particles, or atom smasher;

O'Neill tells us that at least four of these innovations, when "rediscovered" up to forty years later, won Nobel Prizes for others; and Tesla's name is never mentioned in connection with them.

It is surprising that such a great scientist is hardly ever mentioned, or at least not mentioned as much as he should be by the Physics Establishment.

The UFO conspiracy theorists have jumped on Tesla and connect him with all sorts of strange ideas. But just sticking to the facts on Tesla, David Hatcher Childress tells us:

Tesla was unquestionably a visionary and a mystic. Anti-gravity airships were typically depicted in illustrations of his interviews and advanced predictions. He often spoke of the coming world in which antigravity aircraft will carry cargo across the continent, drawing power from centrally located power stations along the earth grid. [B19]

Since Tesla was such an extraordinary man with at least 5 major discoveries (that he did not get proper credit for), such seemingly outrageous claims cannot be so easily dismissed. When Albert Budden starts bringing in antigravity to his theorising, how can we then overlook the claims of Tesla, in this subject?

But putting aside the question of antigravity, Budden is concerned with the damage to health caused by electro pollution. I have been looking into such matters, and formed a theory as to how such an effect might be produced. In an earlier draft of this paper, a reviewer asked for more details about such a theory, he failed to miss the point being made that theories of how electromagnetism could cause health problems, were not being properly looked into by the scientific community. The reason, because there is a conspiracy, as mentioned earlier by Dr. Robert O Becker MD pioneering researcher in the field of biological electricity, twice nominated for Nobel Prize. He points out that there are harmful effects in our modern misuse of electromagnetism, it causes an increase in cancer, AIDS, and other modern diseases.

This is quite extraordinary from what appears at first to be a rational scientific approach by Albert Budden to solving the UFO Mystery rapidly ends up embroiled in CONSPIRACY. It is only supposed to be from the aliens issue that there is a supposed conspiracy in UFOlogy. Both from investigating Anti- gravity, and investigating health problems due to electromagnetism, you end up with Conspiracy.

Believers in the 'aliens are here' make seemingly outrageous claims that they cannot back up with physical evidence, i.e. such cases as the famous Roswell where there was a supposed UFO crash, and where alien dead bodies were allegedly found and covered up by US Military.

Shouting "Conspiracy" in these cases, makes it seem like the 'aliens are here' idea is not a serious scientific question, because it makes it seem like just an excuse for there not being anything 'solid' to study.

Budden's theory seems at first more scientific, because at first there seems to be claims that can be investigated. But Becker who has been into this issue of electro pollution causing health problems, cries "Conspiracy." Something seems very odd with Western Society. Whichever way the UFO Mystery gets investigated, there suddenly appear claims of cover - up. And even if there is no physical evidence, there is very clear evidence that something is drastically wrong with what we are supposed to believe, if we merely take a small look at history, it becomes apparent that scientists rewrite their popular account of history.

Historian John Ralston Saul (holds a Ph.D. in history from King's College, London)

in his book Voltaire's Bastards, has looked into the history of physics and other sciences, and blames much of the breakdown in Society upon these people he calls ' technocrats.' He says that the technocrats in control of society: [B20]

.....[technocrats in charge] do not understand why their talents fail to produce the intended

results. Their abstract view of the machinery of human society prevents them from understanding the natural flow of events from remembering when they themselves have erred and why.

The reason for this he says is:

That is to say they don't seem to understand the historical process. Instead they seem actually to believe that their definitions of the world will become both real and permanent simply because they are the result of applied logic. When these formulae refuse to stick, the technocratic mind, rather than deal with failure, simply wipes the slate clean and writes a new definition. They are, in that sense, slaves of dogma.

To hide the mistakes they make when they are in charge, they rewrite history, as Saul says:

..... they tend to avoid the maintenance of linear memory. An accurate picture of recent events would prevent the constant reorganizations which they use as a means of erasing the past and justifying current actions.

Under these people, popular history is constantly being revised. It needs digging around in the actual historical records to discover that the popularised version of physics history as presented to physics students has been drastically revised. Tesla's ideas are seen as irrelevant in the context of modern physics ideas, and is not mentioned.

In their revised popular physics history, physics students are presented with how brilliant orthodox modern science. One reviewer made the claim that ' we have been duly using orthodox science in our lives for centuries.' I deny this. If we just take a small look at physics history we find - that most of the modern scientific advances come through scientists such as Nikola Tesla, whose ideas we no longer follow. And after WWII a false popular history of science was presented to scientists.

For instance in the revised physics history we have - computers as supposedly an amazing invention from modern physics (i.e. Quantum Mechanics). But - if you care to take a little look under the surface you find that Tesla was patenting logic gates in the 19th century, and he would have been using classical theory not Quantum Mechanics. (AND logic gate filed in Tesla's United States patent No. 577,670 of February 23, 1897 (application filed Sept. 3, 1896).) [B21] The ' hype' for Quantum Mechanics seems unjustified. The real foundations of modern advances come from scientists such as Tesla, who have been unfairly suppressed.

It is from physics as per Tesla and the rest of the suppressed physics, that the UFO Mystery can be made sense of. While it is from this false Modern Physics created after WWII that the cover up can proceed unhindered, because of the misguided fanatics who now do their best to defend it

2.15 References and Notes

Allowances should be made for the following books, because most of them assume that modern physics is correct, while my perspective is contrary to that, namely I take Einstein as being right from 1925 onwards:

[1] Cross Currents by Robert O Becker, Jeremy P Tarcher USA p 299

[2] Alain de Botton on British TV Sunday 30 April 2000 channel 4 at 7 pm Philosophy: A group of people that Socrates upset conspired together and arranged to condemn and convict Socrates, giving him a poisoned drink.

[3] The View from planet Earth by Vincent Cronin, Collins, UK 1981, p 121

[4] *ibid...* p 117

[5] Britannica, 1971 UK vol. 20 p 1074

[6] The Fabric of Reality, David Deutsch, Penguin, UK 1997 p 157

[7] Electromagnetic: History and Applications, Robert S Elliott p 10

[8] How scientists falsify their science is dealt with in *Betrayers of the Truth* by William Broad and Nicholas Wade, Century Publishing, London, 1982. Described on the blurb by *New Scientist*: 'A commendable effort.. a scientific rogues gallery ... an excellent job of documenting the countless ways in which careerism has corrupted every field of science.' From my perspective the book does not go far enough in its expose. From my perspective, science has been corrupted by the events of 1925/1926 in its handling of Einstein. The framework of modern science is falsified by these 'Betrayers of the Truth'.

[9] Dealt with in a lot of detail in *Einstein: The Life and Times* by Ronald W Clark, Hodder and Stoughton, UK 1973.

[10] Ronald W Clark p 494

[11] *Jung for beginners*, Jon Platania, Ph.D., Writers and Readers publishing inc., UK 1997, p 28.

[12] *ibid...* p 35.

[13] *ibid...* p 37

[14] *ibid...* p 40

[15] *The Born - Einstein Letters : correspondence between Albert Einstein and Hedwig Born from 1916 to 1955 with commentaries by Max Born, translated by Irene Born, MacMillan , UK 1971, p 96*

[16] Einstein during much of the latter half of his life got involved in trying to find a theory that combined gravity and electricity, and would appear to have lost interest in trying to find a theory to the subatomic realm. It seems most likely that he was trying to place his quantum theory on a firmer footing.

[17] *Albert Einstein: Historical and Cultural Perspectives* edited by Gerald Holton and Yehuda Elkana, Dover USA 1982, p 243-244

[18] Albert Einstein: a biography by Albrecht Folsing, Penguin books, USA, 1998 p 648

[19] *ibid*... p 695

[20] Einstein A relativity: the special and general theory, This translation first published 1920 Fifteenth Edition Enlarged on January 1954 . Note from Einstein on 1952 , 1996 by Routledge London, p36.

[21] Sidelights in Relativity, Albert Einstein, Dover, USA 1922

[22] A Brief History of Time, Stephen Hawking Guild Publishing, UK 1999, p 12
Einstein's Miraculous Year, J Stachel Princeton University Press, UK 1998, p xiii- comment by Professor Penrose

[23] The Human condition, W Macneile Dixon, Edward Arnold, UK, original 1937, 1964, p 160

[24] Dictionary of Scientific Biography vol. II, ed. Charles Coulston Gillispie, Charles Scribner's Sons, NY 1970 p 326

[25] Roger Joseph Boscovich S.J., F.R.S., 1711 - 1787 on the 250th Anniversary of his birth, edited by Lancelot Law Whyte, published by George Allen and Unwin, UK 1961 p 121-2

[26] The New Physics, ed. Paul Davies, Cambridge University Press, UK 1989 p 7 Renaissance of general relativity by Clifford Wills : "During the two decades 1960 - 80, the subject of general relativity experienced a rebirth. Despite its enormous influence on scientific thought in its early years, by the late 1950s general relativity had become a sterile, formalistic subject, cut off from the mainstream of physics. It was thought to have very little observational contact, outside of cosmology and a few tests....." i.e. Physics Community did not decide to look at general relativity properly, until after Einstein's death, and considered it 'sterile' when he was alive, conveniently waiting for his death before reinventing it.

[B1] Ancient Inventions by Peter James and Nick Thorpe, Michael O'Mara books, UK 1995.

[B2] Ancient Cosmologies edited by Carmen Blacker and Michael Loewe, George Allen, UK, 1975, p 207

[B3] The Chomsky Reader, Noam Chomsky, ed. James Peck, Serpent's Tail, USA 1987, 1992 p vii

[B4] *ibid*.. p xiii

[B5] Einstein in Love: a scientific Romance, Dennis Overbye, Bloomsbury, UK 2000, 2001 p 369

[B6] *ibid*.

[B7] *ibid*.

[B8] *ibid*.

[B9] *ibid*. p 369 - 370

[B10] *ibid*. p 370

[B11] Roger Joseph Boscovich S.J., F.R.S., 1711 - 1787 on the 250th Anniversary of his birth, edited by Lancelot Law Whyte, published by George Allen and Unwin, UK 1961 p 121-2

[B12] Roger Boscovich, S J (1711 - 1787): the forerunner of Modern Physical Theories, H G Gill, S J, M H Gill and Sons Ltd., Dublin 1941, Foreword

[B13] Roger Joseph Boscovich, ed. Lancelot Law Whyte p 13

[B14] ibid. p 102

[B15] ibid. p 102

[B16] ibid. p 107

[B17] The lecture was given by Albert Budden in 1999 for the Institution of British Telecom Engineers. His theories are explained in the book: Psychic Close Encounters, Albert Budden, Blandford, UK 1999

[B18] John J O'Neill, Prodigal Genius : The life of Nikola Tesla, inventor extraordinary, Neville Spearman, London, 1968: The author - John J O'Neill from blurb - was inspired to write the first full length life of this great Yugoslav- American inventor, after the death of Nikola Tesla in 1943. He is eminently fitted for this task, not only by his record of scientific writing, which won him the Pulitzer Prize, but also by his many years of personal friendship with Tesla. p 153-154.

[B19] The Fantastic Inventions of Nikola Tesla, David Hatcher Childress, Adventures Unlimited Stelle, Illinois, 1993 p 278.

[B20] Voltaire's Bastards, John Ralston Saul, Sinclair - Stevenson, UK 1992 p 107.

[B21] Nikola Tesla: Lecture before the New York academy of Sciences - April 6, 1897 by Leland I Anderson, editor, Twenty first century books, USA 1994, p 9 AND logic gate filed in Tesla's United States patent No. 577,670 of February 23, 1897 (application filed Sept. 3, 1896).

3. 1 The Revised Einstein versus the Original Einstein

Modern Physics is based on a misunderstanding of Einstein, and does not follow what Einstein originally said.

In Einstein's theory of special relativity - light speed (in vacuum, free of forces) is constant. But if you read the 'original Einstein' and not the 'revised Einstein' you find that in the general theory of relativity - Einstein says that the speed of light is variable and depends upon its frequency and other factors.

Its only in the restricted - incomplete theory of relativity that light speed is constant; that theory is Special Relativity, where 'special' is referring to the 'restriction.'

But Modern Science is NOT based on the 'original Einstein' its based on a revision. The Establishment accepted Special Relativity, but did not accept General Relativity.

In the 1920s Heisenberg +co came up with their Quantum theory based on Special Relativity and not on Einstein's General Relativity. Einstein said that this Quantum Theory was wrong. But everyone in the Physics Community conspired against Einstein, and mocked Einstein for believing that "God does not play dice with the universe." (Conspired in this sense - meaning ganging up against Einstein.)

The Establishment now works from Einstein's Special Relativity and NOT his General theory - which is Einstein's proper physics.

But the Establishment is into revising history of physics, and you have to dig back to older texts on physics to find out what they are really doing. In more modern revised versions of physics, you don't find this account above. Instead you get some myth about them still following Einstein's 'original General Relativity.' If you look at things like Britannica printed 1971 vol. 20 p 1074 you find an account where it states that Einstein's General Relativity has been revised:

"... For, according to the Heisenberg relations [of Quantum theory], it is not possible to measure the position and momentum of a particle simultaneously and precisely. On the other hand, if the gravitational field of the body can be measured, the General Theory permits just that. Thus, the General Theory must be modified to make it consistent with quantum theory....."

If you read more modern REVISED versions of physics history, it does NOT tell you that Einstein's General Relativity as taught physics students has been revised.

The Establishment suppresses the ' Original Einstein' in favour of the ' Revised Einstein'.

A similar situation occurred after Newton, where the Science Establishment suppressed one point of view in favour of another point of view. There was a fight between believers in the wave theory of light and the particle theory of light. The wave theory of light was suppressed for over a century. The reason given by Electromagnetic: History and Applications by Robert S Elliott p 10:

"... Although neither theory [wave and particle theories of light] were adequate, the esteem in which Newton was held by his contemporaries and followers was so great that the wave theory was rejected and allowed to remain un-nourished for over a century. If the fact that Newton found the corpuscular hypothesis more acceptable retarded the growth of the theory of light, as some

have claimed, the fault lay with those who blindly espoused all his views..."

History repeats itself, and the Science Establishment once again upholds one point of view, while suppressing the other point of view.

But now has made the situation far more complicated with its revision made to Einstein's theory. It leads to Establishment defending a version of Einstein that has been revised, and disguised this by presenting a fictional version of history taught to physics students.

Thus those who believe the fictional version of history are then deceived into thinking that they defend the 'original Einstein' when they are in fact defending a 'revised Einstein.'

Similarly the opposition to Establishment physics are often unaware of the revision to physics history. Thus one of the fights between the two factions in physics, when it comes to Einstein, is over a strawman that NEVER existed.

This is one the many diversions from the real issues in physics still being played out, so as to ensure the UFO Mystery stays unsolvable.

3.2 Einstein's theories misunderstood

The word 'relativity' in Einstein's Special Theory of Relativity, and General Theory of Relativity, diverts the student from what the theories really mean.

David Bodanis, in his book $E = mc^2$, tells us:

"Einstein never especially liked the label relativity for what he'd created. He thought it gave the wrong impression, suggesting that anything goes: that no exact results any longer occur. That's not so. The predictions are precise." [1]

"The label is also misleading because all Einstein's equations are cohesive and exactly linked up. Although each of us might view things in the universe differently, there will be enough synchronisation where these different views join to ensure that it all fits. The old notions that mass never changes and that time flows at the same rate for everyone made sense when people only noticed the ordinary, slow - moving objects around them. In the wider universe, however, they're not correct - but there are exact laws to explain how they change." [2]

"..Einstein never used the phrase 'theory of relativity' in his original 1905 paper; this was only suggested by Planck and others a year later. The name he really liked came from Minkowski, in 1908, who referred, accurately, to Einstein's "Invariant Postulates". If that had been taken, we'd talk about Albert Einstein and his famous "theory of invariants". But by the time there was a wider move to make such a change, in the 1920s, the original, unwanted label had stuck." [3]

"....."The meaning of relativity has been widely misunderstood," Einstein explained in 1929. "Philosophers play with the word, like a child with a doll.... It [relativity] does not mean that everything in life is relative. Einstein was misinterpreted, in large part, because many people were ready to misinterpret him." [4]

Einstein's theories of Relativity, is not about everything being relative, which would make it Relativism, rather it is about how different observers have different perceptions of the same thing, an idea that ties in with Ancient Mysticism's idea about the Absolute, of Unity etc.

Reference

[1] $E = mc^2$, David Bodanis, Macmillan, UK 2000 p 84

[2] p 84

[3] p 258

[4] p 258 - 9

4. Newton- Boscovich Research programme

Newton set in place a research programme that led to Boscovich's theory (a theory that unified Relativity and Quantum Ideas in its own version of physics). It is another part of History that the Science Community chooses to ignore, because it does not want to believe in a Unified Theory any more.

In the A Historical Introduction to the Philosophy of Science, John Losee tells us: [1]

"...In Query 31 of Opticks, he [Newton] set forth a research programme to uncover the forces that govern the interactions of the minute parts of bodies. Newton expressed the hope that the study of short-range forces would achieve an integration of physico - chemical phenomena such as changes of state, solution, and the formation of compounds, in much the same way as the principle of universal gravitation had achieved the integration of terrestrial and celestial dynamics. Subsequently, Newton's research programme received theoretical development from Boscovich and Mossotti, and practical implementation in the electromagnetic researches of Faraday and the various attempts to measure the elective affinities of the chemical elements."

Here the queries left by Newton in his book Opticks is seen as a research programme. This research programme was Newton- Boscovichian and was what many scientists were using up to circa 1920s. After the Physics Revolution, the Boscovich bit was dropped, leaving Newton theory defined with its queries becoming its assumptions and the Modern Physics as taking a different stance to that Newton theory.

The theory Newton- Boscovich disappeared. Parts of Boscovich's theory were used in Modern Physics and other parts were not used.

The progression of Newton theory to Boscovich theory - call this History 1

Under the belief of Modern Physics, Newton theory was redefined, without the Boscovich tag-on, and it was made to appear as a Revolution against Newton from 1919. - call this History 2.

Thus some books will describe Newton's queries as his assumptions i.e. those believing History 2, and other books describe it as research programme that would be History 1.

In History 1, Physics is unified, but in History 2 physics is not.

Many mavericks opposed to mainstream physics go back to working from Newton, and whether they are aware of it or not they are often rediscovering the physics of Boscovich, as per Newton's Research programme.

The response of the Mainstream is to try to debunk the mavericks. And this concerted attack against the mavericks has destroyed a proper account of their History 1, leading them to keep going over the same old theoretical groundwork which was covered in the 18th century by Boscovich.

Reference

[1] A Historical Introduction to the Philosophy of Science, John Losee, Oxford University Press, UK 1993, p 98. The role of Newton's research programme in 18th century science has been discussed by A Thackray in Atoms and Powers (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970).

5.1 The Split between Classical (Newtonian) and Modern (QM) Physics

When Newton came up with his theory of gravity, it had the problem of how did the force of gravity operate over empty space, this was called Action at a distance (AAD), it was conceived that there was a hidden mechanism at work. Berkeley criticised this as an 'occult' force (occult meaning hidden). The usual mechanism was conceived as waves through a medium, or as particles (Newton's term 'corpuscles'). There were lots of mediums conceived for different waves, light was conceived by some as waves on a medium called the 'luminous ether.' The Newtonian Research Program was set up to investigate this and other questions that Newton in his day did not know the answer to.

Maxwell established some of the characteristics of the light medium, and SR was based in part on Maxwell's theory. Under the conditions of Michelson Morley experiment, this theory Maxwell and SR predict that no aether drift will be detected, i.e. it is a property of this aether.

The Physics Community however decided that the absence of aether drift in the Michelson Morley experiment proved that the aether did not exist. This was despite Maxwell basing his theory on the existence of aether, and Einstein claiming that the aether existed.

After deciding that the aether did not exist, the Physics Community then dropped Maxwell's description of the aether from his theory of electromagnetism, and taught that theory ever afterwards without mention of the aether. Einstein who claimed that the aether existed, was cited as proving the aether did exist through his theory SR, and was then often misquoted as saying the aether did not exist.

In summary:

1. Maxwell who was establishing the existence of the aether, had his theory amended to claim the opposite of his intentions.
2. Einstein was misquoted to cover up the fact that he was saying the opposite of what the students are expected to believe about Relativity.

In this manner the history of Physics is falsified: The Physics Community wants its students to believe its heroes such as Maxwell and Einstein were saying the opposite to what they were really saying.

i.e. Modern Physics requires the rewrite of its history to make it consistent with what it wants Modern Physicists to believe.

This falsification of its History spreads out in ever increasing amounts from this point.

In GR it is established that space itself has some of the properties of what was assigned to the aether: space is supposed to curve under gravity etc., so is acting in a sense like a substance.

What one thinks is 'empty space' is not really 'empty', instead it really acts like a 'medium.' Nothing has happened in Physics to establish anything else. Unfortunately, what has happened is that the concept of 'empty space' has been retained and the concept of 'aether/medium' has been dropped. It was probably by the use of Occam's Razor that the concept of 'aether' was seen as superfluous, and then deleted from the accepted terms to be talked about in Modern Physics, leaving just the term 'empty space.' This would be acceptable, if it was emphasised that 'empty space' was not really 'empty' and was acting instead as a medium/aether. But this is often not emphasised. And the concept that most people are left with is that such a thing as 'empty' - complete absence of any type of substance can exist, when in fact the ideal of 'emptiness' is now by GR etc., impossible.

Space, time, energy, matter etc., become intermingled so closely that one cannot talk of 'space' divorced from energy, matter etc. In other words there is always a 'medium' in existence even in what we might think to be emptiness.

If a person thinks of the ideal of 'empty space' (i.e. as complete nothingness) as existing, then he can be led into numerous errors. For instance he can be led into failing to recognise that 'Quantum Tunnelling' is the same as 'Resonance'.

When we usually think of 'Quantum Tunnelling', we think of a particle at one side of a potential barrier able to penetrate that barrier to get to the other side, despite Classical Physics saying that the particle does not have enough energy to do that.

There is however another way of describing this phenomenon, when we remember the wave-particle duality nature: a particle can behave like a wave, and vice versa. So, we can also describe this phenomenon by a wave able to get from one side of the barrier to the other. And when we think of waves in Classical Physics, we naturally think of Resonance.

In early physics text books 'Quantum Tunnelling' was also known as 'Resonance', but in later books calling it 'Resonance' was dropped.

Resonance is a well understood effect in Classical physics. The usual example of Resonance is to think about is a skilled singer maintaining a certain musical note that shatters a glass.

This phenomenon of resonance occurs for all types of classical waves. In the case of a wave on one side of a barrier, a classical description suggests that resonance creates a wave on the other side of the barrier. And further in classical physics the transfer of the energy would happen through a medium.

Calling the phenomenon 'Resonance' instead of 'Quantum Tunnelling', then suggests that Classical Wave theory can explain the phenomenon, contrary to what we are supposed to believe.

Now, QM has the description of a Probability wave, where there are particles, but how the particles move is described by a wave that gives the probability of the positions and momenta of particles subject to Heisenberg Uncertainty. Max Born received a Nobel Prize for this description, but admitted that it was philosophy and not physics. What Born means by this is that the description of Probability wave was not proven. The description of probability wave was deemed necessary to make sense of the description that QM in the 1920s was developing, but it was a description that could not be proved through experiment. Given that QM probability wave description need not be true, we then have licence to think that the classical wave description might be true. Before QM, the classical wave description would still have been the Mainstream belief of what waves were, and no experiment has ever proved since that such a description is wrong.

This enables us to do the following, namely create two different descriptions of QM. The first based on probability waves, as normal, and the other based on a more classical understanding. Call the first version QM1 and the second QM2. The main difference between the two theories is that the first theory takes the stance 'no aether' and the second theory takes the stance 'aether exists.' The Mainstream version of QM is QM1, but there is talk of a medium-like substance from some theorists of that theory, so the difference between QM1 and QM2 is not too vast.

Einstein claimed that QM was wrong, or at best incomplete. The version of QM he was talking about was QM1. It seems to me, that add 'aether' to QM1 making it nearer to QM2, and Einstein would have been more willing to accept it. Just adding 'aether' to QM1 does not

immediately change it into QM2; other things would also need amending, but adding the 'aether' concept goes a long way in making the step to QM2.

The followers of QM1 have been corrupting physics, first by their need to falsify history, because their heroes (Maxwell, Einstein et al) do not agree with what they want their heroes to say. But second because the 'roots' of QM come from classical physics via the Newtonian Research Program, and it involves the deleting of classical concepts such as 'aether,' which the QM1 perspective has deemed obsolete.

The QM1 approach to physics seems to be heavily based on the use of Occam's Razor. First use of the Razor was to erroneously deem that the concept of 'aether' was obsolete, and then delete that term, leaving only the term 'empty space.' It would have been more appropriate to have deleted the term 'empty space' and left instead 'aether', to avoid the erroneous idea that space of 'absolute nothingness' can exist. But this was not done.

When first the idea of 'Quantum Tunnelling' was introduced to the Physics Community, it was also known by the name 'Resonance.' This was probably done to try to help the old generation of physicists following Newtonian physics accept the new way of thinking about things through the new physics of QM1. When told the relevant phenomenon was 'Quantum Tunnelling,' it would not have made much sense to the older generation still thinking in Newtonian terms. But when told it was really 'Resonance,' they could ignore QM1 and continue to think of it in their usual Newtonian description. However, as time passed then Occam's Razor came into effect once again, and calling the same effect by two different names was deemed unnecessary, meaning the old term 'Resonance' was then cut from what was being taught the next generation.

In this manner the followers of QM1 have been continuing to use their Razor, and slowly deleting the connections of their physics to its classical 'roots', making physics a more and more disunified description of nature.

A brief look at Modern Physics under its QM1 description reveals that phenomenon that would be described simply by QM2 as due to aether, has instead from the QM1 perspective been inventing numerous new terminologies, calling things quantum 'this' and quantum 'that.'

A study of how Modern Physics came about, reveals that it arose from a change in Philosophy. Physics before 1920s (classical) was based on a different philosophy from that used after 1920s (Modern Physics - QM1). There is talk of thirty years that revolutionised physics: the Quantum Revolution; what it really was about was a change in the Philosophy of Science.

Up until the 1920s Classical Physics as per the Newtonian Research Program was based upon the acceptance of numerous concepts such as the aether, which were not directly proven to exist from any experiments. Indeed the research program was set up to find these experimentally unproven concepts. Maxwell was following that research program, so for him he was discovering the properties of the aether which he already assumed existed. He was not working from an assumption of 'no aether', looking for proof of aether. He was operating from the opposite way round to the philosophy of science developed after the Quantum Revolution.

The Philosophy of QM1 was the fairly newly developed Logical Positivism. The pure philosophers of Logical Positivism eventually were discredited, because their philosophy was a proven failure: it led to contradictions. (Like QM1 leads to contradictions, that its followers do their best to ignore.) However, the philosophy of Logical Positivism lived on in Modern Physics, because it was a radical form of Empiricism. The Sciences like to pride themselves as being Empirical, i.e. the acceptance of concepts that can be directly proven by experiment. And with Logical Positivism, many scientists found what it thought was its natural bedfellow.

But two things went wrong:

1. Logical Positivism does not work

2. The over zealous use of Occam's Razor meant the deletion of the wrong concepts from Modern Physics

The End result of all this was the creation of a 'false' physics. The correct approach to physics was initiated by Galileo, based on a different philosophy. When Galileo followed the Copernican sun-centred theory, the Church allowed Galileo leeway so long as he only said that it was a 'working hypothesis'. When Galileo tried to claim that the theory was more than a 'working hypothesis' and was in fact true, he ran foul of the Church who accused him of spreading falsehoods. (The Church also seems to have other upsets with Galileo e.g. that they thought he had insulted the Pope etc.) When Newton made the major step of his gravitation theory based on the work of Galileo, he then set up the Newtonian Research Program for questions that he did not have the answers to; so the physics was still little more really than a 'working hypothesis' in the hands of Newton. In classical physics therefore there exist things that one assumes to exist, without experimental proof to back up those assumptions, and one then proceeds to try to discover those 'things.' In the 1920s philosophical revolution, this approach was reversed, and 'things' not yet proven by experiment were assumed not to exist. Hence the big break between Classical and Quantum Physics. In other words what has become Modern Physics is based on a complete failure to understand what Physics is properly about.

As Modern Physicists strive to find the unification of their concepts. One needs merely to look back in Physics History to the Newtonian Research Program, and discover that the working hypothesis that Newton's Queries led to was Boscovich's theory.

Boscovich was an 18th century genius that was recognised on the Continent as the successor to Newton, and was cited as being in the top 12 physicists up until the Quantum Revolution. After the Quantum Revolution he was deemed redundant by Occam's Razor and deleted as have many other things have been.

It was the investigation of Boscovich's theory that led to QM, Electromagnetic theory and Relativity:

1. Thomson based his model of the atom on Boscovich, and Bohr's model of the Atom came from Thomson, which in turn led to many of the ideas of QM.

2. Maxwell based his investigation of Electromagnetism on Boscovich.

3. The mathematicians development of non Euclidean geometry, was partially because Boscovich's theory deemed that such a geometry was necessary. Einstein then used that maths in his theory of GR.

The main strands of Modern Physics come from Boscovich via the Newtonian Research program, with roots back to Newton and Galileo. But in the 1920s the philosophy of Physics changed, and the unified part of that physics description was deleted by the over zealous use of Occam's Razor. Leaving Modern Physicists trying to reunify physics along a path that they do not realise ultimately comes back to Boscovich's theory.

5.2 Max Born on the Ether

Clerk Maxwell created his electromagnetic theory based on the belief that the Ether existed. Max Born was one of the creators of Modern Physics, and reinterpreted what Maxwell was saying for a future generation of physicists. Born also reinterpreted what the mission of the Physics Community was.

Max Born was a Nobel Laureate, who was deeply involved in the Quantum Physics Revolution. One of his books *The Restless Universe*, is described as:

"... a Nobel Laureate takes you step by step through modern developments in our understanding of molecules, atoms, subatomic particles, and nuclear physics, providing his own remarkable insights and expressing matters normally considered too technical for all except the specialist, not only clearly but also graceful and in the language of intelligent laymen."

Modern Physics comes through the work of people like Max Born, and his word cannot be easily dismissed by a person who claims to be a follower of Modern Physics. On p 115 he considers electromagnetic waves (light), and asks:

"The question is, what is vibrating?"

He then continues:

"This question led physicists to assume the existence of the ether. A hundred years ago the ether was regarded as an elastic body, something like a jelly, but much stiffer and lighter, so that it could vibrate extremely rapidly. But a great many phenomena, culminating in the Michelson experiment and the theory of relativity, showed that the ether must be something very different from ordinary terrestrial substances."

Note: He does not say that the ' ether does not exist', merely that it must have strange properties. He continues:

"Now an ether is also required for electricity and magnetism; for these phenomena can also travel through a vacuum. Formerly physicist had no hesitation in filling space with all manner of different ethers. But the urge to unification of the concept of the universe, is a powerful spur to research, forbade them to be content with this. Faraday's experiments led Maxwell to the idea that light is just a vibration of electromagnetic force."

Now, Maxwell in his books *A Treatise on Electricity and Magnetism* discusses the medium /ether of light in great detail and concludes vol. II on the last page with the medium/ether of light being an important hypothesis for further investigation: (p 493)

".....the question naturally occurs - If something is transmitted from one particle to another at a distance, what is its condition after it has left the one particle and before it has reached the other? If this something is the potential energy of the two particles, as in Neumann's theory, how are we to conceive this energy as existing in a point of space, coinciding neither with the one particle nor with the other? In fact, whenever energy is transmitted from one body to another in time, there must be a medium or substance in which the energy exists after it leaves one body and before it reaches the other, for energy, as Torricelli remarked, ' is a quintessence of so subtle a nature that it cannot be contained in any vessel except the inmost substance of material things.' Hence all these theories lead to the conception of a medium in which the propagation takes place, and if we admit this medium as an hypotheses, I think it ought to occupy a prominent place in our investigations, and we ought to endeavour to construct a mental representation of all the details of action, and this has been my constant

aim in this treatise."

Maxwell stated his aim and the representation of his electromagnetic theory is that of an ether/Medium. This is not how Born describes it, he says: ".....led Maxwell to the idea that light is just a vibration of electromagnetic force." So, Born is giving his interpretation of Maxwell's theory, and not using Maxwell's descriptive words. To make sense and consistency of Maxwell's ideas with Born's, it means that through Born the idea of ether evolves into 'light as a vibration of electromagnetic force': Born and Maxwell merely have two different ways of talking about the same thing.

(Side note: Einstein's Special Relativity was derived from looking at Maxwell's theory. Einstein's theory describes the results of the Michelson Morley experiment. So, the ether that Maxwell is constructing is consistent with that experiment, let us call that 'Ether 1'. If an ether is defined that has ether drift, call it 'Ether 2' with the Michelson Experiment requiring to confirm that drift then that ether was failed to be proven to exist. i.e. if we believe the Michelson experiment's results then 'Ether 2' does not exist. But 'Ether 1' as per Maxwell is still obeying the experiment's results.)

If one likes then one could think of Maxwell's description and Born's description of electromagnetic waves, as being two different theories.

Born describes what happens when there are two different theories for the same phenomena: (Restless Universe p 139 - 140)

"Many people say that the only use of a theory is to spur on the investigator to fresh researches. I am not of this opinion. As I have already emphasised repeatedly, no experiment has any meaning at all unless it is interpreted by 'the theory.' I do not say 'a theory', but 'the theory'. For it is only to onlookers that contradictory theories appear to contend with one another and to have their spells of authority. Granted, this contradiction often appears to occur; but this is only due to the fact that, at the moment, the facts are not sufficient to permit a definite decision. So long as this is so, both theories are really equally justifiable, and so far as the realm of observable phenomena is concerned they are just different forms of the same theory. The mathematician says that one can be "transformed" into the other.

Applying this to Maxwell's description of electromagnetism and Born's description of electromagnetism, they are both the same 'essential theory' because they are both based on the same mathematics, namely the mathematics that Maxwell derived in his Treatise.

Born continues and takes his own example of 'two theories describing the same phenomena,' and they just happen to be two different descriptions of electromagnetism (again), this time 'ether' theory (which can be taken to be Ether 1 defined above) and Action at a distance (AAD):

"As an example we may take the dispute over the question whether electrical force act at a distance (AAD) or through a medium. At the beginning of the nineteenth century most physicists, particularly on the Continent, asserted that the electric force acts through empty space between two charges: AAD. Faraday, however, developed the idea that the electric field is due to something which happens in the space between the charges ('action through a medium.')

Now, hold on a moment. I have read accounts that talk of AAD and medium/ether theory in different ways to this, particularly when I have been reading the biographies of Newton's thoughts on this matter. One problem is that there is no real way to label people as 'this' or 'that.' If person 1 believes in idea A, he might be in agreement with another person, but 'they' might both have different names for the same idea. Whereas a third person might have idea B

and being calling it by the same name as person 1 uses for idea A. This results in major confusion, and breakdown in communication. All of this confusion happens in a specific country, and also happens on a larger scale breaking down between countries.

So, what Born is saying is a generalisation, whereby those physicists on the Continent tended to think one way, namely to AAD, and the physicists in Britain tended to follow Faraday as per the 'ether/medium.' But 'things' in reality, were probably never that simple, with divisions in the British physicists etc. However, accepting Born's generalisation, and letting him continue, he says:

"The controversy over this question was a bitter one, as always happens with matters which cannot be settled once and for all."

i.e. the pro- AAD believers were in bitter conflict with the pro-Ether believers.

And the big question is who was right? Born answers:

"For the mathematicians proved beyond any doubt that both representations are exactly equivalent and must always give the same results."

A 'Big Fight' over who was right, and result was a 'Big let down'! Both descriptions were describing the same phenomena.

So, what we have is: AAD description = Ether description = vibration of e-m force description.

There can be any number of different descriptive theories of the same phenomena, which are mathematically equivalent, and hence are 'essentially' the same theory.

In further reading of Born, (in other books) I think I remember him referring to the Ether as a 'mathematical convenience.' What that means, I am not precisely sure. But if Ether is a mathematical convenience, then one might as well say that AAD and 'vibration of e-m force' are all mathematical conveniences as well. They are all different descriptions of the same thing. AAD exists, Ether exists and they are the same thing.

It seems that Mainstream Physics imposes the restriction that one cannot use the Ether description, and wants everyone to use the AAD description. (I find this restriction to be the result of a deviant philosophy called Logical Positivism.) This does not make sense to me, the Ether description is more visualisable than the AAD description as to what is happening. The AAD description is still really using a mechanism of medium to carry a force, except that the mechanism is hidden - not directly seen, and not allowed to be talked about. Hence AAD description is unnecessary difficult to come to terms with.

If one talks of Ether then it is equally as valid as the AAD description.

Considering Theories in Conflict:

When there are two descriptive theories based on the same mathematics, then neither of these theories can be said to be better than the other. What is required is for progress is two theories predicting different results, and testing which prediction conforms to experiment. The theory that fails the test, can then be discarded.

In the case of the Ether. One could define Ether as Ether 2 and then claim that it predicts aether drift in the Michelson Experiment, but fails the test, and is to then be discarded. But

Ether can also be defined as consistent with Maxwell's theory: Ether 1 as per Maxwell, and that version of Ether has not been disproved.

It seems that Mainstream Physics has decided that Ether Theory should be defined as Ether 2, and discarded the Ether Theory entirely from its description, which takes with it Ether 1.

But the theory that is left : AAD still has a hidden Ether mechanism, that one is not allowed to talk about if one wants to be considered as part of the Mainstream Physics Community. And that Ether seems to be Ether 1.

This is a ridiculous state of affairs to be in. It is a historical accident that the full descriptive terminology that goes along with AAD theory has been thrown away, because of this false belief that all Ethers have been disproved.

Born talks about theories in conflict:

"It often happens that a theory has astonishing results, namely, it can predict quite new phenomena, of which the experimenter would never have thought. The theoretical physicist must also consider the possibility of improving and refining the still incomplete and ambiguous theory. This 'refinement' is a curious thing: in actual fact, a sort of aesthetic feeling plays no small part in the deliberations of the theoretical physicist. Thus, for anyone who has a command of mathematics, Einstein's theory of relativity seems more complete and satisfying, intellectually, and so more beautiful, than Newton's mechanics. I believe that this feeling arises from the removal of an arbitrariness and ambiguity in the older ideas, which were felt a disturbing influence."

Let me point out, something important - the existing theory can be amended.

A theory can be ambiguous. If one looks at Newton's theory; what Newton wrote in the Principia and the Opticks, along with 'things' that he could precisely talk about, there are ambiguities. Newton did not know what speed light was, and many other things. He admitted in his Queries at the end of his last book. Newton did not know how light would behave under gravity. When the 1919 astronomical observation of straight bending under the sun's gravity was made by Eddington, presumably Newton's theory could still have been amended to fit in with that new observation. But that did not happen, instead Einstein was proclaimed as having a new theory replacing Newton's.

This creation of two different theories, is an entirely arbitrary process. If the existing theory is ambiguous in a certain area, then what can happen is:

- 1. A new phenomenon happens and existing theory has to be amended.**
- 2. The existing theory is defined in a certain way, and a new theory can be created to predict the opposite in that area. There is then a test made between these two theories, and one is declared the winner.**

In the scenario of case 1, the existing theory can survive seemingly forever. While scenario 2 seems to be about a 'select group' of scientists deciding to define the existing theory in such a way, that a new theory can be created to predict differently. It seems not possible for an outsider to suddenly make a breakthrough to prove the existing theory wrong, if he does not have agreement with this 'select group' that the existing theory will be defined one way, and his theory allowed to be defined the other way. Without the consent of the 'select group', the

existing theory can always be amended to meet any new discoveries, and exclude the outsider who might have been making prior claims for a lot longer.

The theories in conflict seem to be a bit of a Con. The contest seems ‘rigged.’

But there is an added problem when it comes to Ether 1 theory and AAD theory. Granted that AAD has a hidden Ether mechanism, which is Ether 2. This mechanism one is not allowed to talk about; it has been swept under the carpet. Ether is not supposed to exist, so one is not allowed to talk about it. It is a Catch 22 scenario:

1. One is not allowed to talk about Ether 2 theory, because it is supposed to have been disproved. i.e. one cannot readily get papers on Ether 2 theory published in reportable science journals. One cannot start theorising about this theory. Because Ether is supposed to have been proven not to exist, the journals discard such theorising as crackpot.

2. One cannot get experiments using Ether descriptions published in science journals, one is supposed to use the existing terminology of the accepted theory.

The theory that one could construct to be in conflict with AAD, one is not allowed to talk about, and one is not allowed to talk about experiments in terms of that theory. AAD bans any one being allowed to try to get a better description into the Mainstream Physics Community. Everything has been defined in the Physics Community to oppose any different description from the flawed one that the orthodoxy they have set up.

5.3 Ether as metaphor

Dr Roger Jones has a PhD in Physics has worked in high energy physics in Italy and Brookhaven National Laboratory, then in 1967 went into teaching.

In his book *Physics as Metaphor*, 1983, after talking about mass as inertia he moves on to gravity and GR. On p 138 he says:

1. "We first equated mass with inertia and then inertia with geometry in the relativity metaphor. There is a profound and irreducible confusion between mass in space and mass as space. Space is inseparable from its mass content, and we no longer have a description of space as empty. Space is substance; substance is space. The old idea of a luminiferous ether, long ago rejected by the triumphs of relativity theory, has returned to haunt us once again. The ether, although never detected, had been assumed to permeate the whole universe, like a kind of extremely rarefied transparent fluid, to explain how light could travel through space."

The next bit he gets wrong and says:

2. "But Einstein had explained the behaviour of light without the assumption of ether, and it had been tossed into the waste bin of theoretical physics."

If one checks Einstein then one finds that Einstein still talks about ether in terms like (1), so did not throw away ether. It was merely the rest of the Physics community that threw away ether.

Roger Jones continues:

"Now it seems that space itself is like a material substance whose curved geometry describes for us its grain and contour, or perhaps its blood vessels and sinews."

"Of course, there is a marked difference between the case of the luminiferous ether. The spacetime substance of general relativity is highly abstract and mathematical, not a material substance at all."

May be Jones means that this 'new ether' : 'spacetime substance' is a mathematical convenience?

He continues:

"But then all of modern theoretical physics seem to consist of mathematical abstractions whose only connection with concrete reality is numerical prediction."

If this 'new ether' is a 'mathematical convenience, then may be all (or most) of the main concepts of modern theoretical physics are 'mathematical conveniences'?

He continues by explaining what is meant by 'mathematical abstraction':

"The predicted numbers may be verified by following certain empirical procedures that are tacked on to the laws. In effect the laws say, "Do not ask what the symbols in my equation mean, but if you perform the measurements I prescribe, your answers will confirm my predictions." The whole universe is like a black box with dials and meters on its outside. We have found some equations that can predict the meter readings, but what connection these equations might have to the unobservable contents of the box remains a mystery. Our modern spacetime ether is but a mathematical artifice, a model for thinking about and describing the world, but having nothing to do with physical reality."

So, one can talk about ' spacetime ether' and it has maths associated with it that describes a feature of physical reality, but he says it does not describe physical reality. One wonders how he deduces such an absurdity. But he continues:

"In fact, there's a serious question as to whether physics describes anything physical."

So, in rejecting ' ether' as being physical, he recognises that all of physics is probably not really about physics. Earlier he was saying that mass as substance is unphysical. Most people accept mass as substance, so they may as well accept the rest of the unphysical parts of modern physics. In trying to reject ideas, physics just goes round in circles. In trying to reject ' ether' it has to eventually reject all of itself.

Hence modern physics is wrong. If Physics is not actually dealing with the subject of physics, then it is wrong. By trying to reject ' ether' what we get is ' not physics' and my personal preference is to call this things that pretends to be physics: a ' pseudo religion.'

5.4 Maxwell supports Ether

Modern Physics seem to try to imply that Maxwell's electromagnetic theory, is not based upon the Ether. But if you check Maxwell, what he says is actually supporting the existence of the Ether.

In A Treatise on Electricity and Magnetism vol. II James Maxwell concludes on the last page in favour of the Ether:

".....whenever energy is transmitted from one body to another in time, there must be a medium or substance in which the energy exists after it leaves one body and before it reaches the other, for energy, as Torricelli remarked, ' is a quintessence of so subtle a nature that it cannot be contained in any vessel except the inmost substance of material things.' Hence all these theories lead to the conception of a medium in which the propagation takes place, and if we admit this medium as an hypothesis, I think it ought to occupy a prominent place in our investigations, and that we ought to endeavour to construct a mental representation of all the details of its action, and this has been my constant aim in this treatise."

If you are interested in the lead-up to Maxwell's conclusion it is as follows:

"There appears to be, in the minds of these eminent men, some prejudice, or a priori objection, against the hypothesis of a medium in which the phenomena of radiation of light and heat and the electric actions at a distance take place. It is true that at one time those who speculated as to the causes of physical phenomena were in the habit of accounting for each kind of action at a distance by means of a special aethereal fluid, whose function and property it was to produce these actions. They filled all space three and four times over with aethers of different kinds, the properties of which were invented merely to ' save appearances', so that more rational enquirers were willing rather to accept not only Newton's definite law of attraction at a distance, but even the dogma of Cotes, that action at a distance is one of the primary properties of matter, and that no explanation can be more intelligible than this fact. Hence the undulatory theory of light has met with much opposition, directed not against its failure to explain the phenomena, but against the assumption of the existence of a medium in which light is propagated."

"We have seen that the mathematical expressions for electrodynamic action led, in the mind of Gauss, to the conviction that a theory of the propagation of electric action in time would be found to be the very keystone of electrodynamics. Now we are unable to conceive of propagation in time, except either as the flight of a material substance through space, or as the propagation of a condition of motion or stress in a medium already existing in space. In the theory of Neumann, the mathematical conception called Potential, which we are unable to conceive as a material substance, is supposed to be projected from one particle to another, in a manner which is quite independent of a medium, and which, as Neumann has himself pointed out, is extremely different from the propagation of light. In the theories of Riemann and Betti it would appear that the action is supposed to be propagated in a manner somewhat more similar to light."

"But in all of these theories the question naturally occurs:- If something is transmitted from one particle to another at a distance, what is its condition after it has left the one particle and before it has reached the other? If this something is the potential energy of the two particles, as in Neumann's theory, how are we to conceive this energy as existing in a point of space, coinciding neither with the one particle nor with the other? In fact, whenever energy is transmitted from one body to another in time, there must be a medium or substance in which the energy exists after it leaves one body and before it reaches the other, for energy, as Torricelli remarked, ' is a quintessence of so subtle a nature that it cannot be contained in any vessel except the inmost substance of material things.' Hence all these theories lead to the

conception of a medium in which the propagation takes place, and if we admit this medium as an hypothesis, I think it ought to occupy a prominent place in our investigations, and that we ought to endeavour to construct a mental representation of all the details of its action, and this has been my constant aim in this treatise."

Maxwell's statement that "There appears to be, in the minds of these eminent men, some prejudice, or a priori objection, against the hypothesis of a medium...." is most enlightening ' these eminent men' with their ' prejudice' see it as their duty to ignore any evidence that they are wrong, and hence when they get their greasy little hands on science they corrupt it. They start asking for evidence that Ether exists if they are to believe in it, and ignore that Ether is required to make sense of the physical theories created by the ' greats' such as Maxwell.

My further researches lead me to find that these 'eminent men' who take upon themselves the task of ignoring anything that contradicts their cherished beliefs, follow what is called Scientism. And Scientism is well known by some people as a corruption of Science that is really a ' pseudo religion.' With so many ' eminent men' following their religion of Scientism and pretending it to be Science, it is little wonder that the world is in a very ' sorry state' of affairs.

5.5 Occam's Razor and the Ether

If we have a theory call it X and an idea call it A, then let:

Theory Y = theory X plus the idea A

and theory Z = theory X minus the idea A.

If we put this as simple algebra, then $Y = X + A$, and $Z = X - A$.

Now if $Y = Z$, then

$$X + A = X - A$$

$$X - X = 2A$$

$$0 = 2A$$

A then equals zero. If we say that A is then redundant, we are forgetting that zero exists.

Occam's Razor is about deleting ideas that are unnecessary. In this case above, if we are careless then we can end up cutting away the idea of 'zero', because of thinking of it as 'nothing' we then erroneously think that it is not needed.

The Romans did not have the number 'zero'. It was a concept that came to the West from India. Questions like $1 - 1 = ?$, $2 - 2 = ?$, $3 - 3 = ?$, etc., would not have an answer in a maths system without zero. Zero is a useful concept. Misuse of Occam as this example shows, can lead to deleting useful concepts. Our maths would be the much poorer for using Occam too viciously.

Occam's Razor fails when dealing with 'zero' if we mistake it for 'nothingness.' Bear this amazing fact in mind as we proceed further that: that if we shave too closely with Occam's Razor then we cut our throat, and may even chop off our head.

5.6 Waves

Given a wave; modern physics would have us believe that a wave does not necessarily move in a medium; especially electromagnetic waves (i.e. light), unlike sound waves.

So, a wave:

1. moves through a medium, or
2. it does not move through a medium.

A medium = some sort of substance, and 'no medium' = 'no substance.'

If a wave moves in 'no medium' then it means that a wave moves in 'no substance' which then means that the wave has no substance. What is then to stop us thinking that such a wave does not exist?

But we can rethink this and recognise that 'no substance' means 'nothing', and 'space' is supposed to be 'nothing'. So, that a wave travelling in 'no substance' can mean a wave travelling in 'space.'

From Einstein (Sidelights in Relativity), space as used in General Relativity becomes the medium for light. So, for light travelling in a medium, we could say that 'space' becomes the 'medium' and stops being 'nothing' and becomes a 'substance.' Wave moves in 'space acting as a medium', instead of 'space = nothing.' And this is what GR tells us: matter/energy defines the structure of space, and makes it curve, hence 'space' becomes 'substance' and in the old terminology would be called 'aether.'

Definition 1 of a wave becomes valid for all waves: 'space' becomes 'substance' no longer 'nothing.'

Occam's Razor for X- $A = X + A$ could erroneously lead us to forget 'zero.' With 'space' defined as 'nothing', it becomes another failure point of Occam when dealing with semantics, leading us to definition 2 for some types of waves.

Calling space = medium, emphasises that there is 'substance' to 'space' and it is not 'nothingness'.

Calling 'space' = 'nothingness' leads one to a fallacious use of Occam in arriving at definition 2, and the deletion of a useful concept 'aether/medium'.

Modern Physics as pursued by some people seems to be based upon a misuse of Occam, and the deletion of useful concepts, and the adoption of definitions like that of definition 2, that are less useful.

It is non-trivial the emphasis on definition 1 being better than definition 2, because it can lead to a greater understanding of physics:

5.7 Quantum Tunnelling and Resonance

Technical words have been invented that seek to hide understanding of Physics. For instance Quantum Tunnelling used to be known as Resonance. The term Resonance leads one to tie the phenomenon into Classical existing ideas, but calling the phenomenon Quantum Tunnelling hides the classical connection, and leads many people to not understand it.

Quantum tunnelling is where a particle on one side of a large potential barrier can suddenly seem to get through that impenetrable barrier and appear on the other side of it. Barriers can be such things as potential energy of a nucleus. Working from supposed classical theory dealing with particles, a particle would be unable to acquire the energy to penetrate through such barriers. But in QM a particle can tunnel through a barrier which it does not have sufficient energy to get through if one works from classical particle theory.

One can think of a particle being on one side (call it side A) of a barrier and then suddenly appearing on the other side (side B), QM says it tunneled through the barrier without at any time existing in the points between A and B.

According to Physics for the Inquiring Mind, by Eric M Rogers, this Quantum Tunnelling was at one time also known as Resonance, and says " the atomic particle that tunnels unexpectedly into a nucleus as it sails by seems to trade on resonance between its own wavy nature and some natural modes in the nucleus...."

Thinking of the effect as due to Resonance gives a different perspective on Quantum tunnelling, one thinks instead of a particle, but in terms of a wave. The vibrations on one object can travel to a neighbouring object, is what the Resonance Effect is all about, and happens a lot in the world around us. For instance, a singer's voice if hitting the right frequencies can cause glass to vibrate and shatter.

Thinking again of the particle on side A of the barrier seemingly appearing later on side B, it makes more sense from thinking instead of a 'particle' to think of it as a wave. A wave on side A disappearing on side A and creating a wave on side B. In classical wave theory on the everyday scale the wave travels through a medium, extrapolating to the subatomic scale, there would not be anything special there, and the wave would be travelling through a medium: namely what was once called the aether.

So, we have two descriptions of what happens (1) particle and (2) wave. Description (1) is an unnatural way to think about it because it requires a particle to suddenly what is called Quantum Leap between two points without existing in the intermediate points. While description (2) requires something like 'aether' which some physicists are in denial about accepting existing, thus trying to force description (1) upon people as the only allowed description.

What we then have is Modern Physicists thinking of the description as Quantum tunnelling of a particle magically jumping from one side of a barrier to another. They have tended to drop calling it a Resonance Effect, which means dropping the wave description of what is happening. In the wave description, it is more obvious that what one is dealing with is classical wave theory.

As corruption has occurred from the original 'message' from the founders of QM, (because of the Logical Positivism movement) the description (1) which is minus the 'aether' has been imposed as dogma by many physicists, hence stunting the development of physics.

In description (2) it would be more natural to think of a particle as being the amplitude (or peak) of a wave. One cycle of a wave would correspond to one particle, and in the case of

such a thing passing through a barrier, it would be like a standing wave of one cycle slowly passing through the barrier and becoming the same standing wave pattern on the other side of the barrier.

When the orbits of electrons was worked out by Thomson, then later by Bohr and others; what it was originally based upon was Boscovich's theory, where this theory was treating the scenario as being like music. Boscovich's theory is a Pythagorean theory of physics, and Pythagoras based his description of the universe as being based upon maths and upon musical harmony (the music of the spheres etc.). Within this description one has waves that form into standing patterns around the nucleus, and hence giving the appearance of allowed and forbidden positions around the nucleus.

If Physics had been developed properly then from description (2) then a different emphasis would have been placed on what was really meant by 'particle'. Thus the QM description (1) of 'particle' (1), is a misinterpretation of the proper particle description.

With the continuation of Modern Physics based upon the faulty description of particle, entailing the denial of 'aether', the 'aether' still gets reinvented. As theorists look for unification with the five or so different versions of 10-D Superstring theory, they introduced an extra 11th dimension, creating what they call M - theory. The M stands for Membrane. This membrane is conceived as connecting everything into one unity. Our universe is conceived as connected to other universes through the membrane. The membrane is just another reinvention of the 'aether'. It has however, been built up from an unnatural beginning, namely description (1), and description (2) would be far better.

Description (1) in denying 'aether' is forced to invent numerous terms such as Quantum Tunnelling, Quantum Leap, Quantum Entanglement etc., to compensate for this denial, whenever the physics of the 'aether' puts in an appearance. And when it comes to unifying the physics description across macroscopic scale, microscopic scales etc., the 'aether' has to be reintroduced, often as a name change.

In description (2) we can see the effect of what is called Quantum Tunnelling happening all the time in the world around us: vibrations pass from one object to another at a condition we call Resonance; glasses break when a certain sound is made etc.

Werner Heisenberg when he first talks of Quantum Tunnelling calls it Resonance, in his 1926 paper. (Mentioned in The Physical Principles of the Quantum Theory, Werner Heisenberg, p 142.) So, the fault is not with the founders of Modern Physics, but instead with those who decided to reinterpret since then.

What has been hidden by this reinterpretation is the fact that the world/universe follows the Pythagorean description of there being music all around us.

Applying this to Mobile phones: A mobile phone for instance is vibrating at a certain frequency range of electromagnetism, like any other musical device. If we use a mobile phone too near a land-line telephone then we get a horrible noise, which we think of as interference, but what is in part happening here is resonance. Where the phones are transferring their harmonics through Resonance. This is happening at low frequencies and there should be no great effect on health from this. But what happens at low frequencies is also happening at higher frequencies. And in the case of mobile phones, the higher frequency range is within the microwave bandwidth. As the mobile phone market expands, the frequencies are being pushed more and more closer to the microwave end. In the world around us there are many microwave links being used for communication and used for radar. A person using a mobile phone when getting too near one of these microwave devices dotted around the landscape, has the Resonance effect then transmitting those microwaves to him, and thus giving himself

a big dose of cancer inducing radiation.

This radiation does not just cause cancer, because what we are talking about is damage to the genetic code. Sometimes that damage can cause cancer, on other times it will cause other damage and create a different illness. Hence this effect causes a wide range of different illnesses, and only certain users of mobile phones are at risk, because of where they use their mobile phone, making the effect seem intermittent and random, because not every user is affected with illness, and not everyone who gets ill gets the same illness. A simple statistical test showing all users get one specific illness does not show up from the data gathered. Also there are many other mechanisms at work now causing illness in our modern environment. Any electrical device such as television, computer etc., could potentially cause the same effect if too near microwave links. We live in an environment with excessive electrical pollution, as well as chemical pollution and Ozone Hole damage etc etc. It is then very hard to definitely connect one part of this pollution causing one specific ailment. And the response of the science community seems to be to ignore, when faced with an environment with numerous sources causing illnesses. This plays right into the hands of entrepreneurs who like as few restrictions on the commodities that they bring out and sell to the general public. They do not want a science community that tells them ' hold on a minute this new commodity might cause such and such a health problem.' They much prefer a science community that ignores all the numerous commodities being sold that cause numerous ailments. (see also Mobile Phones.)

6. Boscovich's Theory the foundation of Quantum Theorising

Thomson used Boscovich's theory to get the 'allowed' and 'forbidden' orbits of an electron round a nucleus.

Book Reference: Roger Boscovich, S J (1711 - 1787): the forerunner of Modern Physical Theories, H G Gill, S J, M H Gill and Sons Ltd., Dublin 1941, p 18 - 19, 30

"Between 1903 and 1906 Thomson gave a course of lectures at the Royal Institution of London, which were published in the following year under the title *The Corpuscular Theory of Matter*. Much work had been done during these years in investigating the number of electrons in an atom. In the preface of this work we read :"

"I give reasons for thinking that the number of corpuscles in an atom is not greatly in excess of the atomic weight of the element, thus in particular that the number of corpuscles in an atom of hydrogen is not large " (Thomson, *The Corpuscular Theory of Matter*, Constable : London, 1907, p. vi)."

"At this time, then, it had not been established that there is but a single electron in an atom of hydrogen. It is, however, clear that the evidence was pointing in that direction. It is also clear that short of contact, the only stable way in which a single negative electron could be associated with a positive nucleus is when one revolves about the other in some definite orbit. It had already been determined that the mass of an electron is only about 1/1800 that of an atom of hydrogen, so that it would be reasonable to conclude that the electron in an atom of hydrogen is revolving about a nucleus of which the mass is practically the whole mass of the atom of hydrogen. That there was some such relation between the atom and the electron was supported by Zeeman's work on the lines of the spectrum. It is significant that Thomson discusses the case of a single corpuscle revolving around a positive nucleus. The spectrum of hydrogen shows many well-defined bright lines, which seemed to demand electrons situated at certain definite distances from the nucleus. As has been pointed out, since the charged electron has an acceleration towards the centre of its orbit, it would move in a spiral path and could at most be supposed to give rise to a continuous spectrum. It was necessary to introduce into the theory some hypothesis to account for the restriction of the electron to one or more special orbits."

"There was, then, about this time-1906-an effort to devise a theory in which the electron could only revolve in what we shall call " allowed " orbits. It may be said at once that no theory has ever yet been devised in which, according to the recognised laws of electro-dynamics, electrified particles can be restricted to or excluded from any orbit. J. J. Thomson deduced his hypothesis directly from the theory and curve of Boscovich, and showed that the notion of " allowed " and " forbidden " orbits follows from it, and thus laid the foundations of the theory developed later by Bohr and others."

The relevant point to Boscovich is:

".....J. J. Thomson deduced his hypothesis directly from the theory and curve of Boscovich, and showed that the notion of " allowed " and " forbidden " orbits follows from it, and thus laid the foundations of the theory developed later by Bohr and others."

i.e. Bohr and others Quantum Theorising arises from Boscovich's Theory.

The strange thing to note above is:

"It may be said at once that no theory has ever yet been devised in which, according to the recognised laws of electro-dynamics, electrified particles can be restricted to or excluded

from any orbit."

But one must bear in mind that Gill's book was in 1941, and the situation is now not quite like that.

Back to the main issue: Boscovich's theory unifies Relativistic and Quantum ideas. But the theory from Bohr and others, namely Modern Quantum Theory is not unified with Relativity. So, there is some difference between Modern Quantum Theory and Boscovich's Theory, i.e. Modern Quantum Theory does not adopt all the assumptions of Boscovich's theory. So, although Boscovich's theory gave rise to being developed as Modern Quantum Theory, they are NOT the same theory.

Gill says:

"In all departments of physical science progress is so rapid that theories put forward to-day are forgotten tomorrow. In the case of all the great discoveries and theories something remains for all time, even though the originator be forgotten or passed over. when the history of atomic theory is being written, it is right that the part played by Father Roger Boscovich should not be overlooked."

But Boscovich's theory has been forgotten, it predicted the 'allowed' and 'forbidden' positions of the electron about the nucleus. Modern Quantum Theory came later and gets credited with this, but was really only predicting in retrospect; after the observations were made, and not before the observations were made.

7. Musical Appreciation of the Universe

Boscovich's Theory is a Unified Pythagorean theory of physics, and the Pythagoreans viewed the universe as obeying the rules of music and number, so in other words Boscovich's Theory is a Musical description of the universe. Waves play a very big part in music, and resonance has a very big part to play with waves. Tesla's physics is based on resonance. So, all is interconnected: Tesla, Boscovich, Pythagoras, Music.

Michael Hayes in his book *The Infinite Harmony*, also makes the connection that music is the fundamental nature of the universe. He was looking at the work of Francis Crick and James Watson on the DNA molecule and noticed its musical pattern, and then noticed that this pattern was also in the I Ching- a compilation of 64 line signals known as hexagrams from the Chinese Book of Changes written circa 1100 BC by King Wen of the ancient Chou dynasty. He then says:

"..I became convinced that God Himself was a musician. Not only that, in being able to use the inner composition of DNA to draw together the diverse talents of such as Crick and Watson, Pythagoras and King Wen, I began to suspect that, over the centuries, many others have shared the very same conviction." [1]

Boscovich's perspective is not unique, others have discovered it. Michael Hayes continues:

"Observing the world as I now see it - that is, from a musical perspective - first requires that the reader accept a hypothesis." [2]

He then starts to outline his musical theory for the universe:

"All phenomena, whether physical or metaphysical, owe their very existence in space and time to the harmonious interaction of two fundamental laws." [3]

I am not that much interested in the outlines that Hayes then gives for his musical theory, he admits to acquiring it by intuition. Basically any musician can have a intuitive understanding of music, without consciously understanding what he is doing. Its like the fingers know what they are doing when playing a stringed instrument, and the musician does not need to think what the fingers need to do, he just does it. It is the same for all human activities; when first learning to do a task like ride a bike, drive a car, it is difficult, and then we do the task unconsciously and don't have to consciously think about it. Musicians have an intuitive understanding of how the universe operates. But if you pointed out that electricity for instance operates by the same rules as they play their music, they would not be able to apply their musical ability to be an electrician. It is an unconscious understanding and not a conscious understanding. If you ask them to think what they are doing, then most often they wouldn't be able to say what it was.

There are different tone systems, the one based on Pythagoras gives us the Octave system:

"Pythagoras of ancient Greece is considered to have discovered that the tones produced by a string vibrating in two parts with simple length ratios such as 2: 1, 3:2, or 4: 3 sound harmonious." [4]

This musical scales gives us the seven notes: Do, re, mi, fa, so, la, ti; and to make eight notes, the ' Do' of the next scale up is added. Looking at nature this way, then one can find these number patterns everywhere, such as in the structure of the Great Pyramid. One can find numbers such as pi, but:

"In his book *The Riddle of the Pyramids*, Dr Kurt Mendelsohn, a former prize-winning physicist

who studied under Planck and Einstein, states that the Egyptians of the Old Kingdom had only a rudimentary knowledge of mathematics and that the formula pi wasn't know in Egypt even a thousand years after the Great Pyramid was constructed. The pyramid- builders, he insists, discovered the transcendental number pi without trying and without knowing." [5]

So, these ancient Egyptians might have known their knowledge unconsciously, (like some modern musicians with their music ability) and not been consciously aware of what they were doing. This encoding of numbers into Pyramids is dismissed by the mainstream science community as crankish, as Hayes notes some pyramid theorists go too far in the patterns that they think they can see:

"In 1926, an Englishman, D Davidson, published a lengthy volume, Great Pyramid: Its Divine Message, the central theme being that the internal system of passages and chambers, indicated to the scale of one pyramid inch to a solar year, embodied a prophetic history of the world, starting in 4004 BC and ending around AD 2045." [6]

This received almost universal contempt from modern historians, and earned these pyramid theorists to be thought of as ' cranks' and named ' pyramididiots'. Yet Hayes and others see the musical numbering encoded into such ancient structures. He also sees the musical numbering encoded in such religious books as the Bible, with it transmitting the Hermetic (Ancient Egyptian) knowledge through Moses.

He emphasises that the Hermetic pattern of ' as above so below', and sees this pattern everywhere, such as in the human body:

"The human body comprises eight individual biological systems, each of which is integrated and harmonised by the life-giving action of the heart. Each system extends throughout the whole organism, and over each, one of the endocrine glands functions as a kind of regulator, transforming the general life energy produced by the organism (from the intake of food, air and light) into the degrees of biochemical resonance needed for its own particular function." [7]

Most interestingly he says that the periodic table of the elements is formulated on the overall basis of an octave squared, and dealt with in Rodney Collin's book The Theory of Celestial Influence. [8]

My interests are with the physics of Einstein, and he has this to say:

"Einstein apparently liked to unwind by playing the violin and was a passionate lover of the works of Mozart. The Greeks would have approved. An intellectually active scientist who can experience a genuine appreciation of great music is privately a person with a distinctly receptive, or passive, side to nature - a necessary prerequisite, one might think, for anyone wishing to make direct intuitive contact with ' the Old One' (Einstein's pet name for the Creator)." [9]

Another interesting idea that Einstein understood his physics intuitively, because of his love of music, and might have known physics best unconsciously:

"Finally one should not forget that, as a physicist, Einstein must have been familiar with the periodic table of atomic elements, formulated schematically on the overall basis of an octave squared. He would have understood therefore - if only subconsciously - that the square of the constant (order of materiality) produces an infinity of variety and form."

"Clearly, therefore, whether Einstein himself was aware of it or not, his whole individual psyche must have been saturated with hermetic data, with the ' signals of Thoth.' A sensitive,

passive man such as he would in a manner of speaking have fed upon such data. They would have been his spiritual and psychological sustenance, and every time he chanced to absorb one or another of their otherworldly influences, it would have struck a harmonious note somewhere deep within him." [10]

And this man claimed QM was wrong, or at best incomplete, hence Modern Physics has been building on an incorrect perspective ever since then, according to this Musical appreciation of the universe.

References

[1] *The Infinite Harmony: musical structures in science and theology*, Michael Hayes, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 1994 p xv.

[2] *ibid.* p 1

[3] *ibid.* p 1

[4] *The Science of Sound* second edition, Thomas D Rossing, Addison Wesley Publishing company, USA 1990, p 155.

[5] *The Infinite Harmony* p 17

[6] *ibid.* p 13

[7] *ibid.* p 230

[8] *ibid.* p 4

[9] *ibid.* p 217

[10] *ibid.* p 217

8. The Founders of Modern Physics were working from a Unified Physics

The Founders of Modern Physics (in the 1920s), were working from a Unified Theory (i.e. Boscovich). But this Unified Theory is no longer taught to Students. It has been deleted from their education, because of a strange philosophical movement (logical Positivism) that has rejected such a unified approach to physics, and making modern Physics (from the 1940s) a collection of unconnected theories.

Niels Bohr was one of the main founders of Quantum Mechanics, and he was working from Boscovich' Unified Theory. This can be inferred from the praises that Niels Bohr gave for Boscovich (also spelt ' Boskovic.') At the International Symposium in 1958, attended by many of the top physicists, Niels Bohr gave this speech:

"Ruder Boskovic, whose life-work is receiving greater and greater attention in the scientific world of today, was one of the most prominent figures among the 18th century philosophers who enthusiastically elaborated the fundamental conceptions of Newtonian mechanics. Indeed, he did not only make important contributions to mathematics and astronomy, but strove with remarkable imagination and logical power to develop a systematic account of the properties of matter on the basis of interactions of mass points through central forces. In respect, Boskovic's ideas exerted a deep influence on the work of the next following generation of physicists, resulting in the general mechanistic views which inspired Laplace and, perhaps less directly, even Faraday and Maxwell."

Bohr is downplaying Boskovic's contributions; other sources refer to Boskovic as being the 18th Century's version of Newton. But he says that Boskovic is receiving greater attention in the scientific world, indicating Boskovic's importance to Physics. This speech was in 1958, and the West did not pursue that interest. Bohr waffles on :

"It is true in our days the approach to such problems has undergone essential changes. Above all, it has been recognised that the consistent description of atomic processes demands a feature of indivisibility, symbolised by the quantum of action and which goes far beyond the old, much debated doctrine of a limited divisibility of matter. This development has revealed an unsuspected limitation of the scope of mechanical pictures and even of the deterministic description of physical phenomena. However, it has been possible, through a most efficient collaboration between physicists from many countries, gradually to develop a rational generalisation of the classical theories of mechanics and electrodynamics, which has proved capable of accounting for an ever increasing wealth of experimental data concerning the properties of matter."

When, against this background, one reflects on the development of natural philosophy through the ages, one appreciates the wisdom of the curious attitude towards atomic problems, which reigned until the last century. I think not only of the belief that, owing to the coarseness of our tools and sense organs, it would never be possible to obtain direct evidence of phenomena on the atomic scale, but also of the often expressed skepticism as to the adequacy of pictorial models in a domain so far removed from ordinary experience. Although the marvellous development of experimental technique has permitted us to record effects of single atomic objects, we are here in a novel situation which has necessitated a radical revision of the fundamentals for the unambiguous use of the elementary conceptions, like space and time, and cause and effect, embodied in the language adapted to our orientation in practical life.

The elucidation of the situation with which we are confronted in atomic physics has been obtained by raising anew the old problem of what answers we can receive to questions put to nature in the form of experiments. Of course, no physicist from earlier times has ever thought that he could augment physical knowledge in any other way than by accounting for

recordings obtained under well-defined experimental conditions. While, in this respect, there is no change of attitude since Boskovic's time, we have in our days, as is well known, received a new lesson regarding our position as to analysis and synthesis of such knowledge.

Now, this is the important bit about Boskovic:

"Our esteem for the purposefulness of Boskovic's great scientific work, and the inspiration behind it, increases the more as we realise the extent to which it served to pave the way for later developments. In friendly and fruitful international co-operation physicists are working today, in Yugoslavia as in all other countries, for the progress of our knowledge of the atomic constitution of matter and for the application of this knowledge, which holds out promises surpassing even those of the technology based on classical physics. In the pursuit of such novel developments, it is essential that we not only keep an open mind for unforeseen discoveries, but that we are conscious of standing on the foundations laid by the pioneers of our science."

Boskovic was the main pioneer for what became Modern Physics (as created in 1920s) by Bohr and his contemporaries. But Bohr is trying to be rather 'vague' in saying this. He finishes his speech by saying:

"The 200th anniversary of the publication of Boskovic's famous *Theoria Philosophiae Naturalis* could hardly be commemorated in a more fitting manner than by an international congress in the country of his birth, convened on the occasion of the opening of the museum in Dubrovnik with its historical treasures. In pointing to the future, it is also a most fortunate omen that the great occasion could be combined with the inauguration of the modern research institute in Zagreb, which bears Ruder Boskovic's name and where Mestrovic's impressive statue will daily remind students of the traditions on which they are building and inspire them to fruitful contributions to common human knowledge."

There is a Physics Research Institute in Yugoslavia, which is dedicated to Boskovic. This speech was given in 1958. Yugoslavia was in the Soviet Union then, and the Soviets were well aware of the importance of Boskovic to modern Physics, but the West decided to ignore him. This is suggestive of some Cold War Cover-up in Physics. We can see why Bohr in 1958 thought that the scientists were getting more interested in Boskovic, and the West's subsequent lack of interest, as indicating that the West was curtailing certain physics information.

In the USSR, there was less personal freedom, and it appears that there might have been no suppression of information on Boskovic in connection with Modern Physics. But in the West, where there is personal freedom, it appears that this freedom requires certain information to be denied people, else they know too much and present too big a security risk.

In WWII, scientists were placed into a compartmentalisation approach to scientific research, because of national security reasons they were not allowed to communicate with scientists outside of the speciality they were working on. This was to try to keep scientists with no overall picture of any science project that they were working on, so as to prevent them leaking too much information if they were to defect. If they had knowledge of a Unified Theory of physics (a la Boskovic) then they could have worked out all of the details of the projects they were working on, and presented a bigger security risk. Hence giving people personal freedom, meant that people must not be allowed to know too much, or they could present too big a danger, if they did deviate and go 'bad'.

One wonders how much of this is still going on today. From certain Conspiracy Theorists, we are told that Secret Agencies are often engaged in deliberate Disinformation Campaigns. There is freedom of information, so there must be a lot of truth out there, which if people

believed in, would make them dangerous, and so in order to combat this, the Secret Agencies then engage in spreading disinformation. A person then seeking the truth, has the truth hidden within layers of lies. Personal freedom in the West leads to these sorts of actions by the Authorities. There seems a positive and negative aspect to all matters. Personal freedom entails a dark side.

Reference:

**Actes Du Symposium International R J Boskovic 1958, Beograd, Zagreb, Ljubljana, 1959, p 27
- 28**

9. Logical Positivism and Scientism

Modern Science has been corrupted by a philosophical movement called Logical Positivism, which is not Logical and is not Positive, which led rise to Scientism a pseudo religion that pretends to be a Science. The followers of Scientism, do not realise it is Scientism that they follow, and mistake it for Science.

In Unwin Hyman Dictionary of Philosophy, Logical Positivism is described as:

"the doctrine of the Vienna Circle, so called because it recognises only the positive sciences (as against systems of metaphysical speculation) as valid sources of human knowledge, and in this process attends to the logical structure of scientific (that is, acceptable) statements. Thus, the doctrine insists on the empirical approach (Empiricism), in some ways continuing the tradition that goes back to Locke and Hume. However, the thorough-going rejection of abstract theorising went too far: theoretical science seemed itself inadmissible."

Science likes to see itself as being Empirical, hence the Logical Positivism Movement tied itself to that, making it seem a Scientific Philosophy upon that matter. But Logical Positivism went too far and rejected Theories that went beyond what was directly provable by Empiricism. This Philosophical Movement which became powerful in the 1920s, the same time as Modern Physics (Relativity and Quantum) were taking hold, started to reject the parts of those theories that were not directly proven by experiment.

It is very unfortunate that this rejection happened, because it was a rejection of ' Proper Science.' Physics as started by Galileo and Copernicus, and extended into the Newtonian Research Program, was never anything more than a Working Hypothesis, which culminated in Boscovich's theory that was predicting phenomenon that was beyond experimental testing when that theory was created. Logical Positivism then sought to destroy that Theory (that connected Relativity and Quantum ideas) as speculation, leaving unconnected pieces of theory. Physicists such as Bohr were working from the Unified Theory of Boscovich, but the Positivists rejected the unified theory, leaving only the bits of that theory which had so far been tested.

What is worse, the Positivists in their rejection of ' Proper Science' Under the Newtonian Research Program, then rewrote history to suit what they wanted to believe. If one looks at what is said about Boscovich in the mainstream physics history, he is dismissed as an anomaly, when previously he was very prominent in the development of Modern Physics. Positivists corrupt everything, so that their point of view seems to be the only point of view, and the way they do this is to ignore the evidence that indicates that they are wrong. Anything that does not fit into their point of view, is either dismissed as an anomaly or there is found some other reason to reject it. Compare this to what Galileo faced. He tried to get the intellectuals of his day to accept his telescopic observations for the Copernican theory, but the intellectuals rejected the evidence as anomalies. Logical Positivism is thus a reinvention of the biased religious beliefs of the medieval intellectuals, and is thus a pseudo religion. It hung onto science like a parasite, and converted much of that science into what is called Scientism. Many scientists follow Scientism, in the mistaken belief that it is Science.

Dr Denis Alexander, Chairman of the Programme of Molecular Immunology at the Babraham Institute and a Fellow of St Edmund's College, Cambridge, gives more information on Logical Positivism and Scientism in his book *Rebuilding the Matrix: science and faith in the 21st Century*.

Science should be based on rational thought. But Alexander notes:

"..... sociological insights suggest that the adoption of many of our beliefs occurs, in the first

instance, not by rational argument at all, and least of all by evidence, but by a very different set of social processes." [#]

i.e. Beliefs such as Scientific Beliefs are often not based on rational thought. When Scientists are informed of this, their response is:

"Scientists are generally wary of sociologists, and often downright hostile. The reasons for such hostility are not difficult to unravel. Sociologists who study science sometimes give the impression that the acquisition of scientific knowledge can be explained in purely sociological terms. Thus it appears that the main determinants of scientific theories are not the properties of the universe around us, but rather the power wielded by a certain school of scientists, or their ideological concerns, or economic forces which control scientific programmes. According to such sociological accounts, scientific knowledge is just one more type of human construct which has no more claim to our assent than any other form of knowledge. Not surprisingly, scientists become rather huffy when they read such material, for virtually all scientists believe that, in carrying out their research, they are gradually generating better descriptions of the physical world" [#]

i.e. Scientists like to believe that they are involved in discovering the 'truth', and do not like to be told that they are in fact adopting a Belief System that has no more validity than other Belief systems.

Many scientists recognise that their Belief System is incomplete, but believe that they are getting closer to the 'truth' as time passes.

"..... [Scientists believe that Science] while certainly incomplete, over time correspond more and more closely to reality Those descriptions are certainly not complete, but they are improving. Scientists point out that, while it is quite clear from the history of science that all kinds of economic, political and religious factors have played important roles in determining the direction of science, and even the content of some scientific theories, nevertheless, ultimately, scientific knowledge does provide reliable 'maps' of the world around us. Science is not merely a social construct." [#]

The main point of this web site is that Modern Physics was working to a Unified Theory (under the Newtonian Research program), which was the 'truth', but then all the sociological, economic, philosophical factors etc., came into operation and science moved away from the 'truth.' A fact that many scientists would probably distasteful. But that is the way things are.

Alexander has an interesting comment about passionate emotions influencing belief:

"It is sometimes thought that the beliefs which are held most strongly by societies are those which are expounded with great passion, But a moment's thought will show that this is not the case, Passionate beliefs tend to be minority beliefs. The smaller your voice, the louder you need to shout in order to make yourself heard. The really strong beliefs in societies are those which are tacitly maintained, The strength of the belief is in direct proportion to the degree to which discussion of it is felt to be unnecessary The assumption that the belief is true runs so deep that to unearth it and critically discuss it would be like digging up the foundations of the Tower of London to show that the stones underneath were really as big as everyone knew they must be anyway." [#]

"How do we come to accept such deeply held assumptions? Most of them are simply 'given' to us as the earliest data of our lives. At the beginning we are presented with a language in which everything is already labelled. Language is not a matter for discussion, only something to be learned. Yet language is not a neutral medium to express meanings about objects and concepts that exist in the world around us. Words are loaded in different directions by

connotations that derive from their use against the background of a particular history and/or geography The word `wicked' to my generation means something quite different from its meaning for my students." [#]

The influence of Logical Positivism has run so deep that the basic science and the language that we now speak, has been altered, so as to try to lead itself to the Belief System of the corrupted Science. Alexander tells us about Logical Positivism:

"According to Logical Positivism - an anti-metaphysical movement influential in the earlier half of the 20th century, promoted in Britain by A.J. Ayer in his Language, Truth and Logic (1936) - a sentence can only be true or false either if it can be justified as being true on the basis of sensory experience, i.e. it is empirically verifiable, or if it can be shown to be true or false on the basis of meaning alone, i.e., it is logically consistent, The `scientific method' came to be the arbiter of what was designed as rational. The Positivists had a field day in declaring to be nonsense (in the strict sense of that term) all kinds of claims and statements that did not seem meaningful according to these stringent criteria, not least in the arts

and in religion." [#]

This must have been when they were also deleting the parts of Physics, that they did not like. But after inflicting such damage, they then found:

"... they finally found themselves hoist by their own petard with the realisation that their own stringent criteria for meaning; rendered the criteria themselves meaningless as they could not be empirically supported. As it happens, the more extreme tenets of Positivism proved very stale for science, as men like Mach tried to eliminate reference to all unobservable entities from scientific discourse, a process that would rapidly reduce most laboratories to a state of complete silence!" [#]

i.e. Logical Positivism was nonsense, but was discovered too late, after it had inflicted its damage to Science.

Alexander continues:

"Although Positivism as an organized philosophy is no longer with us, its ghost still lives on in popular culture under the label of 'scientism'" [#]

And Scientism is the corrupted science that masquerades as Proper Science. Alexander explains that it is :

"a view of scientific knowledge which lingers on in popular culture and which is also actively promoted by some scientists and philosophers of science, This comprises a rather amorphous mixture of beliefs, the mixture varying somewhat in emphasis depending on who is propounding it, but the beliefs are linked sufficiently to subsume them under the general title of 'scientific naturalism' or less formally, `scientism', In a way this latter term is ,

an unfortunate title since it implies that this is a philosophy which is inherent ,

in the scientific enterprise itself whereas it would be far closer to the truth to say ,

that 'scientism' is parasitic upon science but certainly not part of it, Scientific naturalism, or scientism refers to the view that only scientific knowledge is reliable and that science can, in principle, explain everything." [#]

And Scientism has a strong hold because it enforces that things should be discussed in only

that it deems fit, with many science journals following Scientism beliefs rather than Proper science. Alexander tells us:

"It has been suggested above that the price to be paid for the construction of a body of universally reliable scientific knowledge, fit to be published in reputable scientific journals, is the imposing of certain restrictions - restrictions on the type of questions addressed, restrictions on the language employed and restrictions on the methods used....." [#]

The corruption of science runs very deep, creating ' Scientism' and then the corruption sets up its defences, by denying the evidence that proves that ' Scientism' in all its many forms is wrong. Hence why we have dropped out from the Proper Science of the Newtonian Research Program.

Reference:

Unwin Hyman Dictionary of Philosophy, G Vasey and P Foukles, 1999, p 176 - 7

Rebuilding the Matrix: science and faith in the 21st Century, Denis Alexander, A Lion book, UK 2001, p 13 -14, 231 - 2, 272

10. Feynman on the Corruption of Physics

One needs to look at the History of Physics to find that Physics as left by the Founders of Modern Physics, is very different from what is now taught as Modern Physics, because there has been a corruption of what has been transmitted. How this was achieved, can be surmised from what Feynman has said about Physics education.

Richard Feynman in his book *Surely You're Joking Mr Feynman*, reports that he sat for a while on a committee choosing science text books for schools. The committee he was on, did not pay much attention to actually looking at the text books, and seemed to have based their picking on 'what looked pretty' etc. Feynman spend the time looking at the books. He says:

"It was a pretty big job, and I worked all the time at it down in the basement. My wife says that during this period it was like living over a volcano [of books]. It would be quiet for a while, but then all of a sudden, 'BLLLLLLOOOOOOOWWWWWW!!!' - there would be a big explosion from the 'volcano' below. [as Feynman got angry.] The reason was that the books were so lousy. They were false. They were hurried. They would try to be rigorous, but they would use examples (like automobiles in the street for 'sets') which were almost OK, but in which there were always some subtleties. The definitions weren't accurate. Everything was a little bit ambiguous - they weren't smart enough to understand what was meant by 'rigor.' They were faking it. They were teaching something they did not understand, and which was, in fact, useless, at that time, for the child."

School science text books are rubbish, and no body cares, as Feynman found out. And if you check, you find that this is happening right across the science education system. There has been corruption from what the pioneers on Modern Physics were saying, and what has ended up in the text books. And lots of people have science beliefs from different misinterpretations. (Our whole society is structured so that this sort of thing happens everywhere, as people care more only for money.)

Feynman explains how a panel of experts can pick bad physics text books, as follows:

"This question of trying to figure out whether a book is good or bad by looking at it carefully or by taking the reports of a lot of people who looked at it carelessly is like the famous old problem: Nobody was permitted to see the Emperor of China, and the question was, What was the length of the Emperor of China's nose? To find out, you go all over the country asking people what they think is the length of the Emperor of China's nose is, and you average it. And that would be very "accurate" because you averaged so many people. But it's no way to find anything out; when you have a wide range of people who contribute without looking carefully at it, you don't improve your knowledge of the situation by averaging."

1. Much of what is supposed to be science is now using methods akin to finding the 'length of the Emperor's nose.' Physics is not just corrupted in the education area, but also in areas such as the methods it now uses.
2. That explains how the experts can cock it all up, in everything.
3. People are trained from an early age to accept a corrupted version of physics.
4. There is a big discrepancy between what the Founders were doing, and what their inheritors are doing. For instance, 'they' were working from a Unified Theory, whereas their inheritors are not. That Unified theory, being Boscovich's theory. (see Bohr's praise of Boscovich.)

11.1 MOBILE PHONES CAUSE CANCER DUE TO ETHER

Daily Mail Saturday Jan 26, 2002

Front Page Headline: Top scientist damns companies for targeting the young - and putting their health at risk: CYNICISM OF THE MOBILE PHONE FIRMS, by James Chapman

Mobile phone firms are cynically targeting children despite fears they are most at risk from radiation, a leading scientist claimed yesterday.

Sir William Stewart, who led the world's biggest investigation into mobile phone safety, said those who encouraged under - 16s to buy hand- sets were irresponsible. There were also warnings that boys who use phones to send text messages could be putting their fertility at risk.

An expert said they should hold mobiles away from their bodies, rather than in their laps, to avoid the threat of radiation affecting vital organs.

The warnings came as Sir William unveiled a £4.7 million research programme into the effects of mobile phones on user's health.

Children's brains are thought to be particularly vulnerable to mobile phone radiation because their skulls are thinner than adults'.

The skull of a five year old, for example, is as thin as $\frac{1}{2}$ mm at the ear whereas the skull of a 21 year old adult is about 2 mm.

What we have is some Scientists thinking that Mobile Phones could be unsafe for children to use, but who cares about the adults, but still there is a large portion of the Science Community in denial that Mobile Phones present a Health Problem.

A large part of this ability to deny that mobile phones can cause health problems is connected with the stupidity of Mainstream Physics Beliefs in denying the existence of the Ether. (By Ether I mean an electromagnetic medium.)

Without the acceptance of said ' electromagnetic medium', one cannot apply what is obvious from Wave Theory which deals with waves in known mediums such as air and water.

Herman Helmholtz wrote a Classic book on waves and sound in 1877. So, what I am talking about is really old physics, but with the methodology of the Quantum Revolution in the 1920s, Modern Physicists find it easy to ignore the works of physicists pre - 1920s, and feel that their modern perspective is superior. In their arrogance they talk about this Paradox or that paradox in Quantum Theory about quantum objects that can appear one moment as waves and the next as particles. In their ' stupidity' - unable to understand Quantum Theory and being forced to bluff it, they ignore what has been firmly established in Classical Physics.

If the Physics Community were basing their beliefs on Classical Physics, they would be saying that certain electrical products were obviously dangerous. But the Physics Community does not follow Classical theory, and is in chaos unable to agree on anything, because no one understands quantum Theory. (Even the great Feynman admitted to this!)

This plays right into the hands of the exploiters of commerce, whose motto is ' let the buyer beware'. The Exploiters then sell dangerous products such as mobile phones, and say with all innocence their is no proof that the products they are selling are dangerous.

When it then comes to testing such products, it is just another scenario of being in denial whenever the tests produce some results, that the Exploiters do not approve of.

Forget the Quantum Theory nonsense, accept the electromagnetic medium, and these electrical products are clearly dangerous:

Herman Helmholtz's book On the Sensations of Tone, republished as Dover Classics of Science and Mathematics, explains about Sympathetic Resonance when talking about sound waves from page 36:

".....sympathetic resonance. This phenomenon is always found in those bodies which when once set in motion by any impulse, continue to perform a series of vibrations before they come to rest. When these bodies are struck gently, but periodically, although each blow may be separately quite insufficient to produce a sensible motion in the vibratory body, yet, provided the periodic time of the gentle blows is precisely the same as the periodic time of the body's own vibrations, very large and powerful oscillations may result."

What this is talking about is - a seemingly insignificantly weak vibration, can sometimes be the Natural frequency of a body (called Resonant Frequency), and when this happens it causes a BIG EFFECT. For instance a singer can hit a certain note, and this can cause glass to shatter, because the Note is the Resonant Frequency of the glass causing the glass to vibrate. There is a famous case of a big suspension bridge that collapsed in a gentle wind, because the wind was blowing at the Resonant frequency of the Bridge. When large soldiers march in unison they are supposed to stop marching in unison when they come to a foot bridge, else the frequency that they set up might accidentally be the Resonant Frequency of the Bridge.

There are Resonant Frequency effects everywhere, and what they rely on are waves acting through a medium.

Helmholtz has a lot to say on this, such as:

"....it is known that the largest church bells may be set in motion by a man, or even a boy, who pulls the ropes attached to them at proper and regular intervals, even when the weight of metal is so great that the strongest man could scarcely move them sensibly....."

The effects of Resonance can appear to be Magic, where the effect produced exceeds the perceived energy used; a small boy can demonstrate strength greater than the strongest man, if he applies Resonance properly.

Helmholtz continues:

".....Musicians are well acquainted with sympathetic resonance. When, for example, the strings of two violins are in exact unison, and one string is bowed, the other will begin to vibrate....."

In other words the vibrations from one string can transfer themselves to another string, by Resonance. All of this incidentally was known to Pythagoras, who thought that the Universe was Music and Number.

Apply this reasoning to Electromagnetism, and think on the Mobile Phones:

Due to the shortage now with the Electromagnetic Spectrum (e.g. frequency range) being used by all sorts of users, the frequencies used for Mobile Phones have had to be placed near the Microwave end of the Spectrum.

What does it matter, think the Physicists now thoroughly confused by Quantum Thinking, no

longer thinking in the old Classical way. They know, or at least deceive themselves into thinking that 'they' know that only ionising radiation can cause Cancer. So, they reason by their 'stupidity' that the Mobile Phone frequencies being in the non - ionising frequencies are safe. As is their methodology to ignore the Electromagnetic Medium and thus to ignore Sympathetic Resonance, they ignore that the vitally important Third Harmonic of the Mobile Phone Frequencies that places them well within the ionising radiation of the Microwaves. Then by the example of the violin strings, the ionising radiation can pass itself down through the same channel as being used by the Mobile Phone; result causing Cancer on the Phone user. (Something totally unexpected to a Quantum Theorist, but obvious to a Classical Theorist.)

Its all one vast Cover Up; 'let the Buyer Beware', the sellers don't care that their products are unsafe, they just don't want it proven that their products are unsafe, and the Quantum Physicists willingly help in covering up the evidence that the products are unsafe, by entering into denial about the Validity of Classical Physics. The Classical Physics was initiated by Newton with his Research Programme and continued by scientists such as Boscovich. It is a long tradition of Classical Physicists. And the Quantum Physicists choose to ignore them, and even say History is unimportant to try to discourage anyone looking at what the Classical Physicists had to said.

History is not unimportant, contrary to what Quantum Physicists would like to believe. Historians are well aware that people who do not learn from history, are doomed to repeat the same mistakes of the past. We have entrusted our Science to a Physics Community that chooses to ignore its history, so that it can ignore the Classical Physics results that are in conflict with its Quantum Beliefs. We thus have Scientists in charge that have the same mentality as the people who created for us the Great Disasters in our past such as the Titanic ('no need for too many life boats'), the Hindenberg ('lets use an easily flammable gas, so that there can be a big explosion') etc.

The World is a mess, and we place in charge those who can ensure that a little mess can be turned into a Big Disaster, because these people will deny that there is any problem right up until the end when the Problem explodes like the Challenger. And after the Disaster, the Public Relations Cover Up Exercise begins. There are lots of little problems waiting to explode in our faces, being ignored and put on the boil, thanks to our Quantum Physicist friends.

11.2 How the Ether - Cancer Effect of Mobile Phones will be covered up in Experiments

The Scientific Method as nowadays used by many scientists is idiotic, and is a corruption of the proper scientific method. Their method is to try to suppress all influences on an experiment that they think are superfluous to what they are measuring. They do not take a Holistic approach, rather they take an approach that is often called Reductionist.

How some Scientists might overlook the Sympathetic Resonance Ether Effect on causing cancer (and related illnesses) in Mobile phones is as follows:

The idea of modern science is to reduce all factors to become negligible in an experiment, bar the one factor under investigation. The Sympathetic Resonance effect I mentioned, is basically an Interference effect acting on the mobile phone radiation. And the intention of the scientists will be to get rid of or reduce Interference and Noise to a minimum when they do their mobile phone tests.

A lab will be probably be set up in a building that is like a Faraday cage; by which I mean a building that has been has outside electromagnetism blocked as much as possible from entering it. The same level of radiation as from a mobile phone, will then be applied to lab animals, and their illness rates noted as the data.

This experiment will then have suppressed the Ether Effect, and the data will hence show no illnesses in the lab animals (or very little illness), and the scientists will conclude that mobile phones are safe from this study.

It is the general method of such scientists to suppress the ' effect' that they are looking for, hence the data they get does not show that ' effect' and they conclude that the ' effect' does not exist.

Whereas if the tests were conducted properly with taking into account this Interference Effect then a relationship between Mobile phones and Cancer might more likely be found.

Modern Scientists are hence demonstrating ' gross stupidity' in their actions, and an erroneous approach to experimentation that did not exist before the Quantum Revolution of the 1920s. (i.e. Classical Physicists in the 19th century etc., were generally not so ' stupid.' This scientific ' stupidity' is a modern invention.)

Einstein and Heisenberg said about a scientist only being able to observe what he believes exists from his theory. Many Modern Scientists have completely ignored this and related warnings.

Hence an erroneous scientific approach exists, whereby one seeks to ignore anything that does not conform to what one wants to believe. Experimental scientists often apply this methodology to their investigations. And this ' suppression of the effect' experiments have become to status quo of what experiments are acceptable in peer reviewed journals. Stupidity is built upon Stupidity, until there is a vast body of Stupidity to refer to that pretends to be Science. A person that then looks at this vast body of data, unaware of its origins in Stupidity is impressed, and erroneously believes it has proven something. And being impressed, he then proceeds to adopt the methodology of it, namely to ' ignore' anything that does not fit in with it. He then makes contributions to this Mountain of Stupidity for later followers. If he is honest with himself, then he admits that this Mountain he is helping to build does not quite make sense to him, and he then applies the methodology of this Mountain to try to find out what has gone wrong. A methodology that is guaranteed to prevent him finding any fault with the Mountain.

12. The Gravity Conspiracy

Boscovich's Theory where the Forces of Nature are Unified into one force has been suppressed. And then Modern Physics badly defines its words dealing with these forces, so as to hide by word-games the achievements of pioneers such as Townsend Brown into Antigravity.

Modern Physics talks of four forces of Nature: gravity, electromagnetism, weak and strong forces. The weak and strong forces are merely different aspects of the electromagnetic force, thus there are only two forces: gravity and electromagnetism. Einstein was looking for a way to unify these two forces. Now, in Boscovich's Theory there is only one unified force: where electromagnetism and gravity are merely aspects of that single unified force. That unified force acts as both attractive and repulsive. The artificial way that Modern Physics talks about Forces, hides the true nature of gravity.

Townsend Brown's work on antigravity has been suppressed by the Establishment. Little wonder as it is connected to UFO physics. An abbreviated account of Anti-gravity from The Lost Journals of Nikola Tesla, Tim Swartz gives us :

Thomas Townsend Brown, who discovered in 1923 what was later called the Biefeld-Brown Effect --- that it is possible to create an artificial gravity field by charging an electrical capacitor to a high-voltage.

He built a special capacitor which utilised a heavy, high charge-accumulating (high K-factor) dielectric material between its plates and found that when charges

with between 70,000 to 300,000 volts, it would move in the direction of its positive pole. When oriented with its positive side up, it would proceed to lose about one percent of its weight.

He attributed this motion to an electrostatically-induced gravity field acting between the capacitor's oppositely charged plates. By 1958, he had succeeded in developing a 15 inch diameter model saucer that could lift over 110% of its weight. Brown's experiments had launched a new field of investigation which came to be known as Electrogravitics, the technology of controlling gravity through the use of high-voltage electric charge.

As early as 1952, an Air Force major general witnessed a demonstration in which Brown flew a pair of 18 inch disc airfoils suspended from opposite ends of a rotatable arm. When electrified with 50,000 volts, they circled at a speed of 12 miles per hour.

About a year later, he flew a set of 3 foot diameter saucers for some Air Force officials and representatives from a number of major aircraft companies. When energised with 150,000 volts, the discs sped around the 50 foot diameter course so fast that the subject was immediately classified.

Interavia magazine later reported that the discs could attain speeds of several hundred miles per hour when charged with several hundred thousand volts. Brown's discs were charged with a high positive voltage, on a wire, running along their leading edge and a high negative voltage, on a wire, running along their trailing edge.

As the wires ionized the air around them, a dense cloud of positive ions would form ahead of the craft and corresponding cloud of negative ions would form behind the craft. Brown's research indicated that, like the charged plates of his capacitors, these ion clouds induced a gravitational force directed in the minus to plus direction.

As the disc moved forward in the response to its self generated gravity field, it would carry

with its positive and negative ion clouds and their associated electrogravity gradient. Consequently, the discs would ride their advancing gravity wave much like surfers ride an ocean wave.

The saucers made by Brown have no propellers, no jets, no moving parts at all, They create a modification of the gravitational field around themselves.

They act like a surfboard on a wave. . . the electrogravitational saucer creates its own hill, which is a Local distortion of the gravitational field, then it takes this hill with it in any chosen direction and at any rate.

The occupants of one of [Brown's] saucers would feel no stress at all no matter how sharp the turn or how great the acceleration. This is because the ship and its occupants and the load are all responding equally to the wave-like distortion of the local gravitation field.

Although skeptics at first thought that the discs were propelled by more mundane effects such as the pressure of negative ions striking the positive electrode. Brown later carried out vacuum chamber tests which proved that a force was present even in the absence of such ion thrust.

According to the novel physics of subquantum kinetics, gravity potential can adopt two polarities, instead of one. Not only can a gravity field exist in the form of a matter-attracting gravity potential well, as standard physics teaches, but it can also exist in the form of a matter repelling gravity potential hill.

Moreover, it predicts that these gravity polarities should be directly matched with electrical polarity; positively charged particles such as protons generating gravity wells and negatively charged particles such as electrons generating gravity hills.

Thus contrary to conventional theory, the electron produces a matter-repelling gravity field. Electrical neutral matter remains gravitationally attractive because of the proton's G-well marginally dominates the electron's G-hill. Consequently, subquantum kinetics predicts that the negative ion cloud behind Brown's disc should form a matter repelling gravity hill while the positive ion cloud ahead of the disc should form a matter attracting gravity well.

Now the use of the word ' gravity polarities' is interesting. In conventional physics we think of electric charge as being positive and negative, while gravitational charge (i.e. mass) as having only one sign. Saying ' gravity polarities' suggests that ' mass' like ' electric charge' can be both positive and negative. All the other ' goobley gook' in the above article is trying to overcome the restriction placed by conventional physics on talking about mass as being only positive never negative.

Conventional physics has been talking about things in the hard way. After deciding to define mass as being only positive, and making this a restriction when then faced with anti-gravity has to create complicated gobble gook to overcome the restrictions placed on it by this ill advised use of word definition.

' Clever clogs' who like being sceptics and are trapped within the framework of how their words are defined, then like to point out the gobble gook that the use of their words are being put to, thinking this then justifies their continued beliefs. When in fact the bad definitions of their words have trapped them within an erroneous or at best an overly complicated way of thinking about things.

In the Copernican Revolution, the Aristotelians defined Force in such a way that it was dependent on Velocity. While Galileo wanted to define Force as dependent on Acceleration.

Persisting with their ill-defined Force the Aristotelians were able to come up with a theory to describe certain observations, while other observations (which were an embarrassment to their theory) were ignored. The physics was better described by Galileo's Force definition, but he was faced with ridicule by the 'clever clogs' trapped within their ill-defined words.

Things don't change much in a few hundred years. Deny Einstein's physics description in the 1920s, and a physics community can define their words in an ill-chosen way, so that the 'clever clogs' can maintain the Conspiracy over the UFO physics.

13. Compartmentalisation methodology arising from Atom Bomb Development

Compartmentalisation of physicists so that they only know the physics relevant to a small part of the project they are engaged in, and not having an overall understanding of the entire project has resulted in corruption of physics, and is part of why Scientists are unable to put the pieces together to solve the UFO Mystery i.e. they are denied access to all the information needed to solve what is going on. Compartmentalisation was created in WWII as a need for National Security in Atom Bomb Research.

General Groves when he took over the Manhattan Project - the US project to create the Atom Bomb in WWII imposed Compartmentalisation to try to keep Security. If a scientist only knew a small part of the project, and not an understanding of the overall project, then Groves believed this would be the best way to keep secrets. If there was a 'leak' from a scientist, then the scientists could not 'leak' the entire project details.

However, one scientist Szilard in particular was opposed to this, and wanted open discussion on all aspects of the Project among all scientists, believing that this was the best way for science progress in building the Atom Bomb.

Thus there was conflict between the interests of maintaining security and the ability to do the science. General Groves instantly took a dislike to maverick scientist Szilard. In the book *The Making of the Atomic Bomb*, Richard Rhodes says :

"The kind of man that any employer would have fired as a troublemaker." Thus Leslie Groves described Leo Szilard in an off - the - record post-war interview, as if the general had arrived first at fission development and Szilard had only been a hireling. Groves seems to have attributed Szilard's business to the fact that he was a Jew. Upon Groves' appointment to the Manhattan Project he almost immediately judged Szilard a menace. They proceeded to fight out their profound disagreements hand to hand. The heart of the matter was compartmentalisation." [1]

Where compartmentalisation is the restriction of how much a scientist is allowed to know about the Project he is engaged. Szilard was the "ideas" man behind the Atom Bomb. It was Szilard who told Einstein about the Atom Bomb being possible:

"...Szilard told Einstein about the Columbia secondary - neutron experiments and his calculations toward a chain reaction in uranium and graphite. Long afterward he would recall his surprise that Einstein had not yet heard of the possibility of a chain reaction. When he mentioned it Einstein interjected, "I never thought of that!" He was nevertheless, says Szilard, "very quick to see the implications and perfectly willing to do anything that needed to be done. He was willing to assume responsibility for sounding the alarm even though it was quite possible that the alarm might prove to be a false alarm. The one thing most scientists are really afraid of is to make fools of themselves. Einstein was free from such fear and this above all is what made his position unique on this occasion." [2]

This eventually led to Einstein informing the president of the possibility of making the Atom Bomb. [3] Szilard became part of the US Project to build the Atom Bomb, and was one of the main scientists involved:

"If the Project could have been run on ideas alone, says Wigner, no one but Szilard would have been needed. Szilard's more staid scientific colleagues sometimes had trouble adjusting to his mercurial passage from one solution to another...." [4]

However:

"..... his army associates were horrified," [5]

Because he (Szilard) was breaking compartmentalisation rules and knowing everything about the whole A Bomb Project.

".....and to make matters worse, Szilard freely indulged in what he once identified as his favourite hobby - baiting brass hats [i.e. Army Officers]." [6]

The response of General Groves was to be:

"..... outraged by Szilard's unabashed view that army compartmentalisation rules, which forbade discussion of lines of research that did not immediately impinge on each other, should be ignored in the interests of completing the bomb." [7]

"The issue for Szilard was openness with the project to facilitate its work. "There is no way of telling beforehand," he wrote in a 1944 discussion of the problem, "what man is likely to discover and invent a new method which will make the old methods obsolete." The issue for Groves, to the contrary, was security." [8]

".....Groves put Szilard under surveillance. The brigadier still harboured the incredible notion that Leo Szilard might be a German agent. The surveillance was already months old in mid - June [1943]" [9]

Compartmentalisation restricts the openness within projects, and hence restrict what can be learnt. It is still the methodology used today. National Security considerations are considered more important than allowing physicists to have complete understanding of the projects they are engaged in. Hence ' they' cannot make all the connections that lead to certain new discoveries, or to work out where their specialism sits in the complete picture of the UFO Mystery.

Reference

[1] The Making of the Atomic Bomb, Richard Rhodes, Simon and Schuster, London 1986, p502.

[2] p 305.

[3] p 306.

[4] p 502

[5] p 502

[6] p 502

[7] p 502

[8] p 503

[9] p 506

14. Hidden Science from Operation PAPERCLIP

In Operation Paperclip, America derived secret technology and science from the Nazis, that is now uses at Area 51.

According to Tom Bower's book *The Paperclip Conspiracy*:

"The Paperclip Conspiracy was the climax of an astonishing battle between the Allies in the aftermath of war to seize the spoils of Nazi Germany: a successful plot by senior officers in the Pentagon to rewrite the wartime record of brilliant German scientists. Men who were classified as 'ardent Nazis' were chosen - just weeks after Hitler's defeat - to become 'respectable' American citizens." [1]

"Some in Britain, too, conspired to employ Nazis, seeing that as their last hope for economic recovery, but were opposed by outraged politicians and officials. While they argued, their erstwhile Allies advantageously hired the most incriminated Germans - the French and the Russians took on anyone regardless of their crimes, and the Americans through a taut web of deceit, sanitised the murderous record of Nazi scientists.... reveals for the first time the despair, lies and calculating ruthlessness of Allied politicians, officers, civil servants and businessman who, after five years of bitter war, openly began fighting amongst themselves about the plunders and profit of victory. The pawns in the middle were the men, machines and secrets of the Third Reich, but the ultimate victors were the Germans themselves." [1]

"Neil Armstrong's epic landing on the moon in 1969 was courtesy of two groups of Germans: Werner von Braun's rocket team, which approved the use of slave labour to build the V2 rocket, and the German aviation doctors whose pioneering experiments had included fatal tests on the inmates at Dachau..."[1]

".....Keeping the operation totally secret was impossible, since the Germans were scattered around the country and were mingling with American citizens. Because the government's first announcement had, deliberately, never been contradicted, the public believed the Germans were just temporary visitors. Yet the rest of the operation was top secret, and it fell to the army to deflect attention away from the secret long - term immigration and denial policies. This policy of deception would soon be extended towards the State Department and the White House. In the spring of 1946, however, it simply amounted to emphasising the harmlessness of the Germans and their potential benefit to America." [2]

I wonder the 'diversion of public attention' was the UFO topic? Where public wondered if strange objects in the sky were alien craft, when more likely they were aircraft being tested. But because these Nazi scientists were working on these secret aircraft, it was too close to being the truth, if one made the connection Nazi instead of Alien. And so it was a deception campaign that got out of hand? Later the topic of UFOs may have turned into a more complicated set of different phenomenon? Bower continues:

"Gruhn hoped to control potential criticism by arranging a visit for journalists to Wright Field to meet 'representative German scientists.' In a lengthy press release, he described the recruits as 'comparable to Prof. Einstein', and cited the new denial policy as evidence that the government was 'using vacuum cleaner methods to acquire all the technical and scientific information that the Germans have.' Had the press been more alert, Gruhn could have been seriously embarrassed. Einstein had vigorously protested to President Truman about allowing German scientists into America, and apparently no one realised that there was a possibility of large numbers of Germans arriving in the USA." [2]

The press in 1946, were too 'dumb' to add two and two together, and deduce there was a scandal going on with large numbers of Nazi Scientists suddenly starting to work long term in

America.

If someone had been clever, and added together ' large numbers of Nazi scientists working at Wright Field on aircraft,' with ' sightings of strange crafts in the sky,' the answer then would have been man made crafts not alien crafts, but the public found the idea of aliens more exotic and got diverted.

But what about this "...lengthy press release, he described the recruits as ' comparable to Prof. Einstein'," mere ' hype'? Or could he have been telling the truth? The scientific environment that led to the creation of Einstein, could have easily led to scientists of his calibre, and it did! Einstein was not some lone genius coming from nowhere, he was in a community of German scientists that were of his same calibre. How else, would Germany suddenly make a leap in technology during the war? It had to make that leap, because:

"Germany's declaration of war against America and the abortive invasion of Russia had forced Hitler, at the beginning of 1942, to change his strategy from a short - to a long - term war. Admiral Donitz's submarine designers began a crash programme which pushed technical frontiers far beyond anything envisaged two years earlier. New U - boats were designed to dive to six hundred feet, a specification which the Admiralty found incredible since British designers were unable to produce anything similar; special supply - submarines , ' Milch Cows', which could replenish the U - boats at sea, were sent out into the Atlantic, permitting the packs to sustain longer operations" [3]

And we all know about the V- weapons etc. Germany just stepped up its technological capability because it had the potential to do so, it had Einstein calibre scientists and engineers. The result:

"On the eve of the Normandy landings, both American and British army chiefs privately acknowledged that their soldiers, fighting with inferior weapons, would suffer an enormous disadvantage....." [4]

And the Allies suddenly became engaged in a ' mad rush' to acquire Nazi technology and science:

".... all four wartime allies, the Americans, British, Russians and French, became involved in the frantic and at times ruthless competition for German scientists [because] the use of Germans was simply not contemplated until as late as 1945. On the contrary, until the eve of peace, the notion of associating on equal terms with the men who had helped Hitler's regime perfect weapons to kill Allied citizens was totally unthinkable.....But that sudden reversal in policy happened at the same time as the concentration camps and the worst crimes of the Nazis were discovered." [5]

"It remains a very unpalatable fact that at the very moment when thousands of determined Allied officers began the hunt for German scientists, only a very few were charged to seek out the war criminals." [6]

Originally, a small number of ex- Nazis were supposed to be imported, but more were wanted:

Officially, Paperclip was terminated on 30 September 1947. In a public statement, the army announced that during the ' procurement phase', 457 scientists and 453 dependants had been brought to America. But with so much unfinished business and so many demands from the military for more scientists, the pressure for continuation was overwhelming. [7]

In order to achieve that object, the air force orchestrated a public chorus of praise extolling the genius of the German genius. Two hundred and nine scientists owned by the air force, it

was claimed, had begun to open up new horizons in weapons technology, hitherto undreamed of. In the Air Staff's opinion, they were 'superlative specialists ... the best available in the world today', and they were saving the air force millions of dollars and up to ten years' work. 'These German engineers,' they asserted, 'are industrious, have technical and scientific training second to none, have production and operational experience in all types of advanced aircraft power plants and have demonstrated initiative, invention and practicability of design.' [7]

The air force proceeded to inundate Washington with an endless series of secret reports which listed projects masterminded by the Germans. Already under way were trials and experiments designed to test the feasibility of diesel engine, new fuels and lubricants, guided missile control, helicopters, high - temperature alloys, precision optics, infra-red detectors, in-flight refuelling, pilot's equipment for high- altitude flying, ribbon parachutes and a gun sight for night - fighters 'of epoch - making importance'. Most astounding of all were the advances in jet aircraft development which the German scientists had allegedly achieved. Zobel, Goetheret and Walther Boccius had delivered amazing calculations regarding aeroplane structures and delta- wing configurations and aerodynamics, which finally convinced the air force of the superiority of German over Allied designs. Other impressive achievements included pioneering work on engine test stands, optic developments for high-altitude reconnaissance, mapping, gun sights and evapographs. In the revolution of air warfare, the German contribution seemed paramount. [8]

From the ordnance laboratory in Maryland, the navy reported that the German mathematicians, aerodynamicists and experts in heat transfer had proved that 'their professional education and training' were 'superior to that of any US personnel available.' The Kochel wind tunnel was running at Mach 8, three times the speed and ten years ahead of the best American wind tunnel. Other Germans had produced original research on acoustic weapons, counter- devices and explosives, and the Signal Corps reported that the Germans had 'made contributions of an unusual and fundamental nature' in the realms of equipment design and development, generators, microwave techniques and crystal structures. [8]

To critics, the general euphoria seemed suspect. Later analysis would, in fact, suggest that some of the research was little more than a year ahead of the field, and the Germans' true value was their availability as highly experienced technicians and engineers - cheap labour for the military, who could not afford to hire Americans with similar qualifications. Equally, the assertion that the Germans were more security- conscious than Americans and could consequently be trusted, did not correspond to the alarm with which the news of German scientists' duplicity in France was received. Throughout 1947, British and American intelligence reported the fears of General Libessart, the head of the French Ballistics and Aeronautics Research Centre in St Louis, about the Germans working for their own ends in a conspiracy with other German groups working both for Britain and Russia. [8]

Most Nazi scientists became American citizens:

"..Quietly operating behind a screen of misinformation, JIOA officers were plotting the perfect solution: to rewrite and sanitise the Nazi's wartime activities by falsifying the security reports which were a vital preliminary for the scientists' visas and their eventual citizenship." [9]

So, there we have it, a good part of the solution to UFOs when 'they' first started 'they' were part of a misinformation diversion from Operation Paperclip, but it then soon got out of hand. The 'diversion' was too close to what was really going on. With time the UFO phenomenon evolved into encompassing a much wider range of things. It started as strange crafts in the sky, and became strange encounters with possible aliens and numerous other related topics.

But these reports from witnesses of aliens, how reliable are they? There are a larger number

of people today that have a Spiritual New Age outlook on life, and these sort of people believe that dreams are just as important as waking experiences. So, how many reported alien encounters are merely from witnesses that believe dreams are reality, and how many are 'real' waking experiences? I have no idea. From the humble beginning of diversion from Operation Paperclip, the UFO phenomenon now encompasses a great many things than what it originally was all about. To the word UFO there has been stuck numerous other mysteries than what it originally started as. And there still might be aliens out there. We were easily diverted in the past from what was 'really' going on, so how much misinformation do we get today that diverts us from knowing what is 'really' going on now?

The corruption of this misinformation could run very deep. It might have fostered upon us New Age Religious ideas that are nonsense, and given us a false science, while the science practised at Area 51 is very different from that taught at public access Universities.

Reference

The Paperclip Conspiracy, Tom Bower, Michael Joseph, London, 1987

[1] blurb

[2] p 212

[3] p 213

[4] p 52

[5] p 66

[6] p 3

[7] p 269

[8] p 270

[9] p 252

15.1 Modern Science as derived from an Ancient Wisdom, that was subsequently forgotten.

Modern Physics is based on Empiricism: matching theory to observations. We might then think that the Copernican Revolution had its beginning from Empiricism. It did not! Instead it was a rediscovery of Ancient Wisdom.

Naively we might think that Galileo's astronomical observations confirmed Copernicus's theory of the Earth moving around the sun, and then Newton derived the mathematical theory. It is often presented to Scientists that this is what happened for their shortened version of Science history. However, it did not happen that way!

The shortened Science history as presented to Scientists takes as its assumption a belief in Empiricism, and then rewrites its History to match its belief in Empiricism.

What really happened was completely different. When the events happened and there was no Modern Empiricism in existence to equate those events to. The philosophy of Empiricism as Modern Science knows it, was created much later after the historical events.

It is only now from a Modern Perspective based upon a belief in Modern Empiricism, that the historical events get interpreted in terms of Modern Empiricism. In other words we look back at the beginnings of Modern Science and interpret those events through what is called a 'Knowledge Filter'. The events as they happened were dependent upon a belief in the Pythagorean approach to Science. As noted in other articles: the Pythagorean tradition is part of the Ancient Egyptian Thoth religion. So, the events regarding the origin of Modern Science were based on a rediscovery of Ancient Wisdom.

The Pythagorean beginnings of Modern Science were replaced by Modern Empiricism, so that is why Scientists now look back at the origin of Modern Science and reinterpret what really happened through a different Belief than the Belief that Modern Science was really based upon.

History gets rewritten, or rather our perceptions of what happened change, because we believe differently to people that actually lived through the historical events. Today, it is obviously from our beliefs that Galileo was right about the Earth moving, and anyone who says otherwise is a 'fool'. But as the events actually happened it was not so obvious.

The reason: People living at the time of Galileo based their beliefs on Empiricism, and the theory that Galileo was advocating had no Empirical evidence to support it, instead Galileo based his ideas on some strange Mystical philosophy called Pythagoreanism. The Medieval Empiricist perception of Galileo was that Galileo was a 'fool', and talking some nonsensical Mysticism.

A complete reversal of what we expect to have happened. To simplify the teaching of Science we are most often taught that the Science we use today is based on Empiricism, and that before Galileo, the intellectuals did not base their Beliefs on Empiricism. Which is complete corruption!

So, when we look back we say to ourselves the intellectuals in Galileo's days were 'fools.' They were not foolish, in that sense! The intellectuals based their beliefs on Medieval Empiricism, they paid attention to observations, the same as Intellectuals do in the 20th and 21st Century. If they were 'fools' then Modern Intellectuals are capable of achieving the same foolishness.

And further, I say Modern Scientists have managed to recreate the same achievement as Medieval Scientists, namely foolishness. The reason they managed to achieve this, is because

they have not paid proper attention to history. They have taught their students a corrupted History of Science, and thus repeat the same mistakes: Modern Science has re-created the same scenario, as happened in Medieval Science before the appearance of Galileo.

Medieval Science was based on Medieval Empiricism. Modern Science is based on Modern Empiricism.

Modern Science has abandoned the proper approach to science namely : Pythagoreanism, Modern Science has gone back to Pre Galilean stupidity.

15.2 Copernicus

The simplistic history of Modern Science is completely wrong. Modern Physics did not start from Empiricism. Arthur I Miller, in his book *Insights of Genius* tells us:

"The very basis of Copernicus's and Galileo's research which Newton elaborated and deepened in his magisterial 1687 book, *Philosophiae Naturalis Principia Mathematica*, is a universe in which the Earth moves around the sun. There would be no evidence of this until the middle of the 19th century and by then it was a moot point. But is this not amazing? If science is a rational enterprise, how could such eminent practitioners as Galileo and Newton have based a spectacular theory of motion on an assumption for which there was no direct evidence?" [2]

Did you digest that? Newton and Galileo built physics on an assumption that there was no evidence to support. So, much for a belief that Modern Physics started from Empiricism.

We are usually told that Science is a rational process, which usually is taken to mean that Science progresses from Empiricism: testing theories against observations of experiments, and rejecting theories that do not agree with those observations. BUT modern science is based on the Copernican Revolution, and that was an assumption that there was no observational evidence to support.

Does this agree with what you think Science is about? May be you are under the impression that Galileo made some astronomical observations that confirmed the sun centred theory? He didn't!

Rather Modern Physics is based upon a methodology that Scientists have been trying their hardest to expel from Science and denounce as Pseudo science.

Arthur I Miller, tries to explain the discrepancy between Modern Physics as it is ' now' and as how it started:

" The reasons lay partly in the theory's predictive and explanatory powers: It predicted the existence of unknown planets and explained fearsome comets, whose appearances it also predicted, merely as wayward members of our solar system. Newton succeeded in unifying motions in the heavens and Earth within a single theory. This was the first great unification in modern science." [2]

The only problem is that when Copernicus proposed his sun centred theory, the theory had no predictive power. The predictive power came much later with Newton. So, what was the motivation of Copernicus, if there was no predictive power in the theory when he created it. The predictive power only came later with lots of people working on the theory. Why did these people after Copernicus work on it? The theory did not start as fitting into the Empiricist philosophy. It had to be developed so that it fitted in with Empiricist outlook, and along the way the ' real' method was exorcised as non scientific by a prejudiced Science Community believing in Empiricism.

The Copernican Revolution was based on a Pythagorean approach to understanding nature. (And Pythagoras is connected to the Hermetic tradition (a.k.a the Ancient Egyptian: Thoth Religion).) So lets look at the proper origin of modern science:

John Losee in his book : *A Historical Introduction to the Philosophy of Science*, tells us:

"The ' Pythagorean Orientation' is a way of viewing nature which has been very influential in the history of science. A scientist who as this orientation believes that the ' real' is the

mathematical harmony that is present in nature. The committed Pythagorean is convinced that knowledge of this mathematical harmony is insight into the fundamental structure of the universe." [1]

Galileo followed this approach, as it can be seen summed up in his declaration:

"...philosophy is written in this grand book - I mean the universe - which stands continually open to our gaze, but it cannot be understood unless one first learns to comprehend the language and interpret the characters in which it is written. It is written in the language of mathematics, and its characters are triangles, circles, and other geometrical figures, without which it is humanly impossible to understand a single word of it." [1]

Before Galileo, there was Copernicus a follower of Pythagoreanism, as John Losee tells us:

"Copernicus ... as a committed Pythagorean, he sought mathematical harmonies in phenomena because he believed that they were ' really there.' Copernicus believed that his sun - centred system was more than a computational device." [1]

"Copernicus recognised that the observed planetary motions could be deduced with about the same degree of accuracy from his system, or from Ptolemy's system. Hence he acknowledged that selection of one of these competing models was based on considerations other than successful fit. Copernicus argued for the superiority of his own system by appealing to ' conceptual integration' as a criterion of acceptability. He contrasted his own unified model of the solar system with Ptolemy's collection of separate models, one for each planet. He noted, moreover, that the sun- centred system explains the magnitudes and frequencies of the retrograde motions of the planets. The sun - centred system implies, for instance, that Jupiter's retrograde motion is more pronounced than that of Saturn, and that the frequency with which retrogression occurs is greater for Saturn than for Jupiter. By contrast Ptolemy's Earth - centred system provides no explanation of these facts." [1]

Copernicus had no Empirical evidence to believe in his sun- centred theory, he was NOT a Scientist as we would nowadays define the word. Instead he based his beliefs on Pythagoreanism.

The response of the Status Quo to Copernicus was summed up by Osiander:

"Osiander argued that Copernicus was working in the tradition of those astronomers who freely invent mathematical models in order to predict the positions of the planets. Osiander declared that it does not matter whether the planets revolve around the sun. What counts is that Copernicus had been able to save appearances on this assumption. In a letter to Copernicus, Osiander tried to persuade him to present his sun -centred system as a mere hypothesis for which only mathematical truth was claimed." [1]

By claiming that Copernicus's sun centred model was hypothesis and not a theory, Osiander was claiming that there was no Empirical proof for Copernicus's idea, that it was mere Speculation. A 'hypothesis for which only mathematical truth was claimed' meant that although the mathematics could be created for a sun - centred model, it did not mean that the sun- centred model was true. It took a Pythagorean (as which Copernicus was) to believe that mathematics described reality: so that if a mathematics could be created for a sun- centred model, then that model was reality. It was this Pythagorean belief that Copernicus worked to, and not Empirical observations.

So, what of Galileo:

15.3 Galileo

15.3 Galileo

".... Bellarmine [representing the Church] informed Galileo on 1615 that it was permissible, from the standpoint of the Church, to discuss the Copernican system as a mathematical model to save appearances. He indicated, moreover, that it is permissible to judge that the Copernican model is better able to save the appearances than is the Ptolemaic model. But Bellarmine insisted that to judge one mathematical model superior to another is not the same thing as to demonstrate the physical truth of the assumptions of the model." [1]

The Church was telling Galileo that there was no proof for Copernicus, to make his hypothesis a theory. And the Church was concerned with Truth.

"Bellarmine warned Galileo that it would be dangerous to defend the position that the sun really is stationary, and that the Earth really does revolve around it." [1]

One reason it was dangerous, was because the Church saw itself as the Defender of the Truth, and to claim Copernicus's model was a theory, was seen as a falsehood, because there was no Empirical evidence for it.

Losee continues:

"Galileo, as is well known, overplayed his hand. Despite his disclaimers to the contrary, his Dialogue Concerning the Two Great World Systems was a thinly veiled polemic on behalf of the Copernican system. Galileo did not regard the heliocentric hypothesis as a mere computational device to save appearances." [1]

Galileo was a Pythagorean and believed the Copernicus's model was a theory. The Church saw this as propagating a falsehood. Galileo did not offer any Empirical evidence to prove Copernicus's model was a theory, instead Losee says:

".....he [Galileo] advanced a number of arguments in favour of the physical truth of the Copernican system." [1]

i.e. Galileo was arguing that Copernicus was true, but had no Empirical evidence to back up his arguments. However, he did offer suggested experiments to back up his Pythagoreanism:

" It was of great importance for the subsequent development of science that Galileo supplemented his Pythagorean commitment with the conviction that suitably chosen experiments can establish the existence of mathematical harmonies in the universe." [1]

In other words Galileo was offering ideas that could be Empirical tested to back up a belief in Pythagoreanism.

Eventually Medieval Science and with it Medieval Empiricism collapsed under Galileo's successors. Modern Science was created, which then proceeded to create Modern Empiricism, and after creating Modern Empiricism then dropped Pythagoreanism.

So, what happened was : ' all change: need a new way of thinking and a new Science ' then followed by 'change back to the old way of thinking'. Thinking in the old way, then led

in the 20th century to the rejection of what Einstein was really saying, and a recreation of the old style of Science, making the cycle complete, namely : abandon the Thoth approach to philosophy and science.

After Modern Science rediscovered Ancient Wisdom, it then proceeded to lose it again.

Reference

1 A Historical Introduction to the Philosophy of Science, John Losee, fourth edition, Oxford University Press, UK 1972, 2001

2 Insights of Genius, Arthur I Miller, Copernicus, USA 1996

16. Serpents of Wisdom: Religious reasons behind the Suppression of Science

UFO Science has its roots in Pythagorean ideas, and Pythagoras can be associated with Satanism. Hence Religious zealots attempt to suppress the progress of Science.

As well as the usual reasons for the censorship and suppression of certain technologies in the public sector, because of big business interests of wanting to monopolise the market, and National Security considerations, there are also religious reasons.

In the Book Let Newton Be by John Fauvel +co, it goes into detail about the influences on Newton that enabled him to develop his Physics. He had a secret life as an Alchemist following Magickal ideas etc.:

"... in his secret thoughts Newton held a vision of history which would very much have astonished ... It reduced all he had discovered to a rediscovery of scientific truths well known to some of the great thinkers of the ancient world. One of the few public hints of this attitude was conveyed in a letter which Newton's young protégé, the Swiss mathematician Nicholas Fatio de Duiller, wrote some five years after the publication of the Principia... In 1692 he wrote to the great Dutch physicist and Cartesian, Christiaan Huygens, that Newton had discovered that all the chief propositions of the Principia had been known to such ancients as Pythagoras and Plato...."

"Huygens' scepticism did not deter Newton in the slightest degree. He continued to search for anticipations of his work in the writings of the ancients. When the Scottish mathematician David Gregory visited him two years later, spending several months at Cambridge, Newton acknowledge to him his intention, in the forthcoming revised edition to 'spread himself' in proving the agreement of his own findings with those of the ancients and 'principally of Thales', the legendary founder of Greek philosophy. He would demonstrate that what Epicurus and Lucretius had affirmed was true and valid, and that the charge of atheism laid on him was unjust. Thoth, the Egyptian Hermes or Mercury, had been a 'believer in the Copernican system', while Pythagoras and Plato had 'observed the gravitation of all bodies towards all'."

i.e. Modern Science was founded upon trying to rediscover Ancient Wisdom.

If you look at Copernicus, and other 'greats' like Kepler then you find that they were acknowledging the Ancients as well.

So, what went wrong?- Answer : It was opposed by Christian beliefs.

Frances Yates in book The Rosicrucian Movement says about Newton :

"The more recent Newton scholarship has emphasized the Renaissance type of thinking at the back of Newton's scientific efforts, his belief in the traditions of ancient wisdom concealed in myth, and his confidence that he himself discovered the true philosophy behind mythology."

The associated religion of this scientific movement was preached by Giordano Bruno :

"Giordano Bruno as he wandered through Europe had preached an approaching general reformation of the world, based on return to the 'Egyptian' religion taught in the Hermetic treatises, a religion which was to transcend religious differences through love and magic, which was to be based on a new vision of nature achieved through Hermetic contemplative exercises. He had preached this religion, enveloped in mythological forms, in France, England, and Germany...."

Bruno ended up before the Inquisition, and Frances Yates book Giordano Bruno says:

In 1599 an effort was made to clarify the situation by the famous Jesuit, Robert Bellarmine, who assisted by Tragagliolo, drew up eight heretical propositions taken from his works which Bruno was required to abjure, and he said that he was prepared to do so, But later in that year he withdrew all his retractions, obstinately maintaining that he had never written or said anything heretical and that the ministers of the Holy Office had wrongly interpreted his view. He was therefore sentenced as an impenitent heretic and handed over to the secular arm for punishment. He was burned alive on the Campo de' Fiori in Rome on February 17th, 1600.

Now what did Bruno believe?

Arthur Koestler in his book The Sleepwalkers says:

"His teachings of the infinity of the universe and the plurality of inhabited worlds, his pantheism and universal ethics exerted a considerable influence on subsequent generations.."

Further he says that Giordano Bruno became a victim of religious intolerance because of his religious opinions.

Bruno's science beliefs were based on his understanding of Ancient Wisdom, but that Ancient Wisdom was based on a religion that the Establishment disapproved. In response the Establishment engaged in a ' smear campaign' against the Religion associated with this Science, and thus called it Satanism. The Establishment then started its witch hunting Inquisition activities to root out the heretics. The heretics were those whose religious beliefs led them to believe that there were planets inhabited by aliens.

In other words in the Middle Ages there was Religious actions aimed at UFO Cover up of the Alien Hypothesis. The Alien Hypothesis was part of the Church's condemnation of scientific ideas connected with heretical religious beliefs, in the same way that it condemned Galileo for believing that the Earth moved. It was not so much the science behind such ideas as ' the Earth moved,' which the Church disapproved of, it was instead the religious ideas behind those scientific ideas that the Church disapproved of.

The religious side of the Ancient Wisdom as Yates points out was connected with the Rosicrucian Movement. After the burning of Bruno, other people with similar heretical beliefs then went into hiding, one group was called the Rosicrucians. Or did they really exist? The Inquisition could not find them, and so some sceptics think the Rosicrucians never existed and were a hoax.

This demonstrates one of the many easy methods of covering up things. In this case the steps are :-

- 1. The religious fanatics demonstrate what happens to people with heretical beliefs, destroying the evidence as much as possible. And the remainder of such heretical movements go into hiding.**
- 2. Result - one more piece of suppressed, hidden history.**

And what was this Ancient Wisdom? Yates describes the persecuted beliefs in the Renaissance as:

The belief that Egypt was the original home of all knowledge, that the Greek philosophers had visited it and conversed with Egyptian priests, had long been current

The belief was that Ancient Greek Science was based on older Wisdom - Ancient Egyptian Science. One of the greatest Greek philosopher was Pythagoras, his name means according to Pythagoras: lover of wisdom by Ward Rutherford:

His name means 'Mouth of Apollo', links him with the god and his sanctuary at Delphi. Originally the oracular shrine of the earth goddess Gaia, Apollo appropriated the sanctuary after slaying the guardian serpent - hence, the honorific title Python was given to him while his prophetic mediums were called the Pythia.

In other words Pythagoras means 'Mouth of the Python' and 'Python' was a name that the god Apollo took on himself.

In the Ancient Pagan World, the symbolism was to associate Serpents with wisdom. The bearers of Ancient Wisdom were associated with the Serpent Cult. Pythagoras was one of these Serpents of Wisdom.

But if you look at Judeo - Christian religion the Serpent is associated with Evil. We are now on the track of why Ancient Wisdom was persecuted. In Genesis, Adam represents Mankind, and upon eating the Apple, he was punished by God. This is The Fall of Man.

The Apple represented Forbidden Knowledge, and the Serpent told Adam via Eve to take the Apple.

In Judeo - Christian belief: God was very upset, and did not want Mankind to have Knowledge. The Serpent was cursed as deceiving Man, and being the cause of all of Mankind's problems. In this Belief - if only Man had followed God's orders and stayed in blissful ignorance.

Believers in this Mythology have been attempting to turn back Knowledge ever since, trying to suppress knowledge, trying to stop it etc. And since Science is the quest for knowledge, there has been a large religious faction working to try to stop that quest for a very long time. And even if they cannot stop that quest, they can at least 'throw a very large spanner in the works', and cause corruption - divert science onto the wrong track.

The arguments engaged in during the 1920s as regards to the direction that Science should next go, were religious. Einstein was mocked for saying that God does not play dice with the Universe. His approach to physics was abandoned, and the Quantum Revolution started as a counter -revolution to overturn the Copernican Revolution. Science was once more put on the wrong track by religious fanatics. Academia being no different in social structure than the Academia that Galileo fought against, is able to maintain by its arrogance of superiority over mere mortals, to keep science on the wrong track, and suppress the evidence that the assumptions that it builds upon are wrong.

The Judeo- Christian fanatics see all of this as the work of the Devil, but it is a Devil that they have managed to manufacture. 'They' believed in the Devil and so created him.

Certain New Age Followers are also able to see this Corruption also, but not the cause and they too think it as the work of the Devil or at least as aliens that are themselves Devils. Some of these people are then able to create new fanatical religions that are still based upon the same delusional theme:---- Some people are afraid of progress and try to stop it, and in so doing create the Terror that they are afraid of .

Science now progresses like a Juggernaut with ever increasing speed heading to its final confrontation with Reality. A Reality that will now be a monumental disaster in keeping with the Titanic tradition of ignoring all danger signs and go faster. If there are any aliens watching, then they probably watch in amusement as we create our next big disaster along the same

lines of creating an 'inflexible' infra structure (as represented by the Tower of Babel) that can only collapse with disastrous consequences.

Why should it collapse? Answer because there are two types of people -

1. Those who give the orders and refuse to look at the consequences of those orders, and
2. The other group that sees the disaster and works against the first group, and hence hastens the disaster, or creates another disaster in its place.

The only question being which group will achieve its objective and when?

BANG, HAY PRESTO and that's MAGICK.

History has a nasty habit of repeating itself. Anyone want to see that trick again? Given a few thousand years we might have rebuilt ourselves up again, argue over Ancient Wisdom and Aliens with some for and against the ideas and recreate the same scenario for BANG again. Personally I'm bored by all this mindless activity that pretends to be Intellectual. Anyone interested in how Telepathy works, based on Ancient Wisdom?

I suppose not? No one showed an interest in how the Ancients deduced the workings of gravity by their observations of the electrostatic effects of amber.

17. Suppression of Ancient History

Ancient History that has UFO Science links to Ancient Wisdom gets suppressed. For instance Academia covers up evidence of Ancient Egyptians in Britain.

Ancient Egyptians fleeing the backlash against heretic pharaoh Akhenaten, came to live in Britain around 1354 BC. The archaeological evidence is being ignored by Academia so as to maintain the existing dogmatic view of history that the Ancient Egyptians had never travelled that far.

An Egyptian boat was found at Ferriby, nearly fifty years ago, and promptly ignored by Academia.

Lorraine Evans puts together the pieces of ignored evidence that exists in Museums, in her book Kingdom of the Ark, claiming the ancient British race is descended from the Pharaohs.

As to why Academia ignores the evidence that contradicts their dogma, she concludes:

"The fact that I had unearthed so many pieces of evidence, archaeological and historical, to show Egyptian settlement in the British Isles raised one question. Why had this all been ignored in academic circles? One of the main reasons, I felt, was that if such information was readily accepted then academia would rapidly have to rewrite huge chunks of history. This would throw certain traditional 'historical facts' into tremendous doubt. It is important to stress that many academics' careers are based on these 'facts' and to disprove them overnight would make these people redundant. During the research for this book, I soon discovered that some academics were quite willing to share their work off the record, but when it came to committing it to print they soon backed down and a wall of silence greeted me. None of them, it appeared, wanted to put their jobs on the line, to tell the truth. The sad reality of the matter is that we are relying on these people to tell us our history, but they seem content to operate under a veil of academic censorship.

On a Saturday afternoon in the British Museum, hordes of tourists walk nonchalantly by some of the greatest collections of artefacts from the ancient world. As cameras flash and people pose by the more famous exhibits, there stands, in the Medieval Gallery, possibly the most important piece in the entire museum. By a dimly lit case rests the ancient stone of Llywel. Unearthed in a farmer's field in Wales in 1843, it was sold to the British Museum for the meagre sum of £10.00. An ornately carved piece of rock, its true importance appears to have been belittled by its placement. The most significant carving on this stone seems to have been deliberately obfuscated by the powers that be. Turned facing the wall, and impossible to view, there is a clear representation of a person dressed in Egyptian garb leaving the pyramids of Egypt on his journey to the west. ..."

We rely too much on Academia to tell us the truth, when 'they' are not really interested in the 'truth'. The version of history 'they' give us is a fiction, which 'they' are quite happy to support because it's their money-earner.

Why do people waste their time trying to make sense of the UFO phenomenon within the context of the Belief system that these Academics have set up for us? The whole of history is wrong. And these Academics are contented to maintain that illusion.

If you accept that Ancient Egyptians were in Britain, then our history needs a great deal of amending.

When Christianity was imposed on Europe, we underwent a history rewrite, and ever since that time people have tried to maintain that false history imposed upon us, ignoring the

evidence to the contrary.

The Renaissance was started by the rediscovery of Ancient texts from the Greeks etc. One of the most influential was the Writings of Thoth - Hermes, which was religion, philosophy and science. It influenced scientists such as Newton, Leonardo da Vinci etc.

Then in the 17th century the writings were all declared a hoax, and one of the most important reasons it was thought a hoax, was because the religious message in the writings were too much a mixture of Christianity, Islam, Buddhism, Judaism etc., that if true it meant all the existing religious beliefs were wrong.

Over the past 2000 years it has all been about religion. Some people want to believe such and such, and will alter the facts or ignore the facts so that they can continue to believe their delusions.

Long before Daniken, there were some people saying that the Ancients were far more advanced than they should have been. For instance:

Dr. Soddy, a scientist famous for his researches into Radioactivity, saw the links between his Radioactivity researches and Ancient Wisdom. He delivered a series of lectures in 1908 explaining the latest discoveries of radioactivity to the general public and in his 1909 book Interpretation of Radium, he wondered if the Ancients had already known about radioactivity. He says as follows:

"The world probably being of much greater antiquity than physical science has thought to be possible, it is interesting and harmless to speculate whether man has shared with the world its more remote history.

i.e. wonders if mankind has as long a history as our planet's. And continues:

In this connection it is curious how strangely some of the old myths and legends about matter and man appear in the light of the recent knowledge. Consider, for example, the ancient mystic symbol of matter, known as Ouroboros-" the tail devourer "- which was a serpent, coiled into a circle with the head devouring the tail, and bearing the central motto, " The whole is one." This symbolizes evolution; moreover, it is evolution of matter-the very latest aspect of evolution-the existence of which was strenuously denied by Clerk Maxwell and others of only last century. The idea which arises in one's mind as the most attractive and consistent explanation of the universe in the light of present knowledge is, perhaps, that matter is breaking down and its energy being evolved and degraded in one part of a cycle of evolution, and in another part, still unknown to us, the matter is being again built up with the utilisation of the waste energy. If one wished to symbolise such an idea, in what better way could it be done than by the ancient tail-devouring serpent ?

i.e. recognises that the Ancients talked in symbolism, and was a universal symbolism across the Ancient world. Tie that back to Evan's discovery of Ancient Egyptians in Britain, and Academia wanting to deny the evidence.

Some of the beliefs and legends which have come down to us from antiquity are so universal and deep rooted that we are accustomed to consider them almost as old as the race itself, One is tempted to inquire how far the unsuspected aptness of some of these beliefs and sayings to the point of view so recently disclosed is the result of mere chance or coincidence, and how far it may be evidence of a wholly unknown and unsuspected ancient civilisation of which all other relic has disappeared. It is curious to reflect, for example, upon the remarkable legend of the philosopher's stone, one of the oldest and most universal beliefs, the origin on which however far back we penetrate into the records of the past, we do not probably trace to

its real source. The philosopher's stone was accredited the power not only of transmuting the metals, but of acting as the elixir of life. Now whatever the origin of this apparently meaningless jumble of ideas may have been, it is really a perfect and but very slightly allegorical expression of the actual present views we hold today. It does not require much effort of the imagination to see in energy the life of the physical universe, and the key to the primary fountains of the physical life of the universe today is known to be transmutation. Is, then, this old association of the power of transmutation with the elixir of life merely a coincidence ? I prefer to believe it may be an echo from one of many previous epochs in the unrecorded history of the world, of an age of men which have trod before the road we are treading today, in a past possibly so remote that even the very atoms of its civilisation literally have had time to disintegrate.

Let us give the imagination a moment's further free scope in this direction, however, before closing. What if this point of view that has now suggested itself is true; and we may trust ourselves to the slender foundation afforded by the traditions and superstitions which have been handed down to us from a prehistoric time ? Can we not read into them some justification for the belief that some former forgotten race of men attained not only to the knowledge we have so recently won, but also to the power that is not yet ours ? Science has reconstructed the story of the past as one of a continuous Ascent of Man to the present-day level of his powers. In face of the circumstantial evidence existing of this steady upward progress of the race, the traditional view of the Fall of Man from a higher former state has come to be more and more difficult to understand, From our new standpoint the two points of view are by no means so irreconcilable as they appeared. A race which could transmute matter would have little need to earn its bread by the sweat of its brow. If we can judge from what our engineers accomplish with their comparatively restricted supplies of energy, such a race could transform a desert continent, thaw the frozen poles, and make the whole world one smiling Garden of Eden, Possibly they could explore the outer realms of space emigrating to more favourable worlds as the superfluous today emigrate to more favourable continents, The legend of the Fall of Man, possibly, may be all that has survived of such a time before, for some unknown reason, the whole world was plunged back again under the undisputed sway of Nature, to begin once more its upward toilsome journey through the ages."

Dr. Soddy makes the connections that the Ancients were talking in a symbolic manner as regards their science. That there could have been a forgotten civilisation. That our science could be rediscovering their Ancient knowledge.

Surely an interesting area for Academia to investigate? And does Academia decide to investigate? Answer - no they do not. Instead they choose to wait for amateurs such as Daniken to investigate this subject, and then set up a campaign to mock him and his followers.

Academia is not interested in anything other than maintaining their existing dogma.

All attempts to explain UFOs within existing Academic Beliefs are doomed to failure. The framework of beliefs that UFO investigators are expected to agree with and earn the title of being Scientific in their studies is an illusion.

And the science that really works, get dismissed as superstitious nonsense - Magick, paranormal, supernatural. The nature of that science, Tom Lethbridge managed to tie in with the possibility that we had been visited by Aliens in our remote past, or that we ourselves might be aliens to this planet. He works out a possible way as to how Stone Circles could be used as markers for aerial crafts as follows:

" It is hard for us today to visualize the Britain of, for instance, five thousand years ago. The vast extent of natural woodland is unknown today, except in tropical vegetation. Brambles and

fallen trees made paths through it extremely difficult and it covered the bulk of the country. Only on some downlands was passage relatively easy and that was not free from large patches of juniper trees, thorn bushes, gorse and bramble. The wide vistas of rolling grassland did not exist. One can assume that exploration parties would be dropped at the edges of all this and traces of them would be found, if at all, in the kind of situations where we do find these stone set rings and alignments today. A stone ring would be noticeable from the air, just because such things do not often happen in nature. Neither would straight lines be frequent.

But there may have been another reason for setting up the stones, even if its object were the same. For untold generations it has been believed, especially by the devotees of the old witch religion, that by means of exciting people to execute wild circular dances, power could be generated and stored in stones and trees. Actually this appears to be scientific fact. It has been demonstrated by Mr P. Callahan in America that moths generate bio-electricity by the heat caused by the movements of their wings and they use this to locate their mates or food such.I detected the same thing with beetles This is observed fact and no longer something on the fringe of knowledge, Now if you have a large number of people dancing wildly round in a ring, you obviously generate a great deal of this bio-electricity, living electricity. If you carry out this performance in rings formed of stones with gaps between them, you have a form of dynamo. It has been shown that the electromagnetic fields of stones, trees and water will absorb bio-electricity from outside and this is the probable reason why some people see ghosts in situations which were favourable to such impressions being preserved. I have elsewhere suggested the names of oread fields for those of stones, dryad fields for those of trees and naiad fields for those of streams in accordance with the Greek belief that nymphs with these names were to be found in such places.

.....my wife and I experienced electric shocks when trying to date the stones of the circle of the Merry Maidens in Cornwall. The bio-electronic force had been stored at one time by the exertion of dancers in that circle and it had never been taken out again. The circle is still complete. But why did anybody wish to store up electronic power in such places? What possible use could it be put to?

Well, experiments with the pendulum have shown that the electronic fields about an object are double cones of limitless height and depth. It has also been shown that a pendulum length of the same radius as the base of the double cone will register contact with that cone. If, then, you had an apparatus in a flying machine set to the right wave-length, you could pick up the rays from the stored energy in the stones and home in it like the moth to its mate. These rings of stones could have been used both as visible and invisible navigational beacons."

Lethbridge, I think was onto something, but that line of science inquiry by Academia is suppressed as much as Academia suppresses the proper history. .

That's why Academia like to ignore the evidence that Ancient Egyptians came to Britain, it would mean everything else they have been building up for so long is a house of cards waiting to fall down. Everything that Academia likes to suppress fits together to give a different perspective on UFOs, and starts to look like it could be true.

So, how can 'they' maintain this deception any longer? Easy - offer out the 'carrot' to UFO researchers, if you want respectability then you need the title of being Scientific, and to get that title you have to agree to maintaining as much of the 'house of cards' delusion as possible. If a lot of people are given the task of preventing these cards from falling over, then it may be the delusion can be propped up for a few more thousand years.

Its amazing what humans are capable of achieving when they set their mind to it. They can maintain delusional belief systems through untold generations by teaching it as dogma,

setting it as exams and allowing progress in Society's pecking order, only if you believe the lies.

The truth is out there? And the truth is WE have been expected to swallow an enormous amount of lies.

18. Conspiracy against Daniken

Along with other factors involved in UFOlogy, there has been an ongoing campaign by people with a religious fervour to promote their point of view and try to subvert Science to their own beliefs. This has led to the pieces of the jigsaw that add up to solving the UFO Mystery being unfairly discredited. One of their targets has become Daniken.

Ignoring the book *Gold of the Gods*, where Daniken admits to being deceived by certain information. He tries to reclaim his reputation that was debunked on such topics as the Nazca Lines, and demonstrates how the Truth can be covered up by people. [1] The Truth - namely being the possibility of alien visits going back a very long time.

(Personally I wonder if the hoax that Daniken was deceived by in *Gold of the Gods*, was not some unknown group once again engaged in trying to deceive the public. Similar groups seem involved in other UFO issues such as crop circles - diverting attention from making possible genuine phenomenon seem like hoaxes and so forth.)

Respected scholar Maria Reiche who has spent most of her life studying the Nazca lines from about 1946, compared the Nazca lines to being like a landing strip, in *Secret of the Desert*

[2] :

"Looking down from the plane upon the flat surface of the desert, the traveller will discover, etched into the high terraces and slopes, gigantic triangles and squares whose outlines look as though they have been drawn with a ruler, and whose light surfaces contrast clearly with the dark ground. One could almost believe they were airstrips."

Daniken got 'slagged off' for saying much the same thing in *Chariots of the Gods*:

"The 60 kilometre long plain of Nazca, seen from the air, has the undoubted look of an airport - Is it really too far fetched to suggest that lines were drawn down here to give the message to the gods: 'Land here! Everything has been prepared as you ordained it!....'"

Maria Reiche is a respected part of the Science Establishment, but Daniken gets labelled a 'crank' for saying much the same thing. Reiche says it looks like an airstrip, Daniken gets 'slagged off' for speculating if it is an airstrip. The Establishment applies 'double standards.'

Daniken then goes on to complain that he is misquoted as saying that the Nazca plain was once a 'landing station' for spaceships.

When he was trying to make the idea out 'speculation', the debunkers wanted to take the 'idea' as making a statement of belief from him.

He cites an example of his being mis-cited in a recent scientific magazine Felix Legare, *La Revue Quebec Science* 1995:

"At the beginning of the seventies, a certain Erich von Daniken announced that the lines were landing strips for spaceships. His pseudo - proofs were pictures of geoglyphs with a startling similarity to modern airstrips. He added that it was impossible to create such large signs and markings without the help of aeroplanes."

Daniken replies:

"The scientific literature is full of such bath - tub toys purporting to be truth. Not only have none of these clever writers read the book in question - let alone the ones which followed,

instead copying down nonsense from each other - but they also maliciously invent and attribute to me things which cannot be found anywhere in any of my books...."

In other words this is how the Establishment covers things up, and can be thought of as a textbook example of how falsely interpreted statements get carved in stone then placed in archives to be cited again at every opportunity, covering up the Truth. (To be fair see note [3])

This methodology of unfair debunking goes back a very long way, and has been used time after time to cover up pieces of the UFO jigsaw. As will be revealed the reasons behind this campaign are because of Religion. One important example is the unfair debunking of Spinoza. Spinoza is surprisingly another piece of this Gigantic Suppressed UFO Jigsaw puzzle going back to the 17th century, as will become shown anon:

19. Conspiracy against Spinoza

Benedict Spinoza (1632 - 1677), a Jewish - Dutch philosopher, [4] is recognised as one of the great philosophers, but he was subjected to the same debunking campaign as Daniken faced. And the religious ideas associated with Spinoza are connected with Einstein and his Physics.

Spinoza's philosophy was not approved of by the Establishment, and in 1697 a scholarly refutation of it was published in Pierre Bayle's Dictionary. [5]

"Leibniz expressed relief that Spinoza's ' pitiful or unintelligible' arguments were not only ' well held up to ridicule,' but thrown into serious philosophical disrepute." [6]

However, it was not ' really' a refutation of Spinoza, as Margaret Gullan - Whur notes:

"Yet in his Dictionnaire Bayle effectively conceded the persuasive power of Spinoza's principles by calculatedly playing down their potential for religious and political agitation... Bayle set out to massage the beliefs of the orthodox and to assure the impressionable, or already impressed that the greatest danger to them from Spinoza was of making themselves look foolish by defending him...." [7]

Bayle's Dictionary was an unfair debunking of Spinoza, but it got continually referred to by other philosophers, such as David Hume:

"David Hume... hastily dismissed in 1739.... Spinoza's ' hideous hypothesis' of ' two different systems of beings presented.' By speedily referring readers to ' Bayle's dictionary, article of Spinoza' for further enlightenment, Hume affirmed both his own lack of interest and Bayle's still potent and damaging authority [on Spinoza's philosophy]" [8]

Margaret Gullan Whur notes that thanks to Bayle's Dictionary:

"By the late 18th century Spinoza had, thanks largely to Bayle, little following among European literati, and his doctrine was treated mainly to flippant, sketchy and inaccurate second - hand interpretation...." [9]

Spinoza was subjected to the same debunking as Daniken was subjected to. For over a hundred years the debunking of Spinoza's philosophy discouraged any followers taking up his ideas. Margaret Gullan Whur notes the further smear campaign against Spinoza and says:

"Spinoza was thus denied the thoughtful readership he sought." [10]

In the late 18th century, his philosophy became incompatible with Scepticism:

"... the stigmas of atheism and incoherence which had flung his work into ignominy were beginning to fade in relation to the incompatibility of his philosophy with the late 18th century scepticism. Spinoza's battery of quasi - scholastic arguments for the necessary existence of God, and for the necessary self - containedness and all - inclusiveness of the one substance, God or Nature, were now considered worthless speculation." [11]

So, Spinoza was unfairly debunked in the 17th century, and when he escaped the smear in the late 18th century his message was seen as ' worthless.' Does that not strike you as ' odd'?

Spinoza was writing in the 17th century in the context of what his contemporaries believed in, and his contemporaries were so upset by what he said that they unfairly debunked him, to discourage others from reading him. Eventually people decided to follow different ideas in the

18th century, so the ideas that Spinoza was talking about in the 17th century seemed antiquated. He was writing to a different audience, and only when his 'message' no longer meant what it once meant to his audience, was his 'message' allowed to be freed of the debunking. For an audience more than a hundred years after his death, his ideas would have needed rephrasing in the new context.

Thus Daniken and Spinoza are linked by this Debunking method. They are also linked by another means, they both pronounced Heresies.

Spinoza was a heretic, led into his heresy by intellectual process. [12]

In his day, heretics could expect very harsh treatment. The Christians had Inquisitions and witch hunts against heretics. The Jews, from the Christian perspective were often considered to be heretics. Spinoza was a Jew. He lived in Holland, where there was a fair amount of religious tolerance. The Jews lived in their own close knit communities, and tried to defend themselves from Christian persecution. But what is not widely appreciated is that the Jews had problems with Heretics among their own ranks, and dealt with their Heretics as severely as severely as the Christians dealt with Heretics.

One example of how Jews dealt with Heretics against their Faith was Uriel d' Acosta. He came to Amsterdam from Spain in 1618 as a law student, yearning to take up his ancestral religion. However, he became seriously disillusioned by the rabbinical Judaism, and by challenging the Jewish religion, he insulted the authority of the synagogue leaders. The leaders banned him from their community, and he fled to Hamburg, but a German - Jewish expulsion sent him back to Amsterdam. He upset the Jewish leaders again, and was condemned to public confession and 39 lashes: a terrifying street flagellation. Margaret Gullan Whur describes from d'Acosta's diary what happened next:

"The Amsterdam Jews set their children upon me in the streets, who insulted me in a body as I walked along, abusing and railing me, crying out, there goes a Heretic... They spit upon me as they passed by me in the streets, and encouraged their children to do the same... During the time of the whipping they sang a psalm ... I Prostrated myself [at the synagogue door] whilst all both old and young, passed over me, stepping with one foot on the lower part of my legs...." [13]

Margaret Gullan Whur then says d'Acosta shot himself.

D'Acosta's crime was 'free thinking.' The Jews did not approve of 'free thinking' among their own, and the Christians did not approve of 'free thinking' either. Spinoza committed the same crime, and was excommunicated by the Jewish leaders, but was more fortunate than d'Acosta and fled his Jewish community. Unfortunately the Heresy he committed against his Jewish Faith was still Heresy in the Christian Faith, and so he upset the Christians as well. Hence we see the reason why Spinoza was unfairly debunked. He was saying things that upset religious leaders.

Now Daniken asked the Big question: 'Was God an Astronaut?'. This was Heresy also, if you happen to believe in the Judeo - Christian tradition. Spinoza was persecuted for his Heresy, would Daniken be persecuted for his? Or would modern Society be more open minded than the 17th century and allow 'free thinking' even when it upsets certain peoples' religious beliefs?

My surprising answer is: that 'things' haven't changed that much since the 17th century in society, and if you commit Heresy you are still subjected to the same 'old' religious persecution.

In the Middle Ages it was more obvious when a heretic was being subjected to religious persecution, because it was more easily seen that this was happening: heretics quite often ended up on the Bonfire, so a casual onlooker could see that Society did not like Heretics. It is true that no more Heretic Burnings go on, but that does not mean that the persecution has stopped. It just means that the religious persecutors are more subtle in their operations, they are no longer overt in their operations, they are now covert. The debunking that was successfully used against Spinoza, was used once more against another heretic Daniken: the same old methods.

Now, lets get to Spinoza's philosophy:

Scholastic was the philosophy taught in the schools in monasteries and abbeys in the Middle Ages, it had is ' Golden Age' in the 13th century. [14]

The labours of the scholastics, was to try to state Christian doctrine in as literal a language as they could command or as the doctrine itself would permit. They obtained partial success and accumulated a series of definitions of the term ' God'. But had left the term somewhere - about- half way between metaphor and literal statement. They had defined God as a being that needs nothing else in order to exist, or as a being which possesses all possible attributes (i.e. everything that can be said about God), or as a being whose very nature implies existence. [15] The efforts of the Scholastics can be listed as definitions for God such as:

1. God is the being that needs nothing else in order to exist.
2. God is the being of which all possible assertions can be made.
3. God is the being of which the very nature implies that it exists.

If we change this list into questions and ask ' what is God' or ' what being is there' we turn the list into:

1. What being is there that needs nothing else in order to exist?
2. What being is there of which all possible assertions can be made?
3. What being is there of which the very nature implies that it exists?

The answer to each of these questions seems obvious, namely the Universe.

Spinoza jumped to this answer for these questions, and concluded that: God and the universe are identical.

A rather crude deduction, but a valid answer to the definitions. Thus Spinoza decided that the Universe was God. This is belief is called Pantheism: Pan meaning ' all' , Theism meaning ' belief in god or gods', so Pantheism is the belief that God is everything i.e. God is the Universe.

Barrows Dunham points out that Pantheism is heresy:

"..... all Western religions regard pantheism as heretical. Judaism needs a personal God to validate the Law, Christianity needs a personal God to validate the Church's authority, and Mohammedanism needs a personal Allah to validate Mohammed's prophetic mission....." [16]

Hence we have the reason why Spinoza's philosophy was persecuted, he used Logic on Religion and deduced an answer that Religious leaders did not want to believe. He was

debunked for over a hundred years, so that no philosophers would pay attention to his conclusion, and after peoples' attitudes changed and they no longer had a 17th century outlook, he was allowed to be 'undebunked' - allowed to be a reformed philosopher, that was allowed to be studied. But in the new attitude that people had adopted since Spinoza's time, his method of deducing Pantheism was meaningless, and so it no longer had the ability of

changing any one's beliefs. i.e. it had been rendered harmless with the passing of the centuries.

All was safe once again for the Judeo - Christian Religious Cult to continue believing whatever it liked, with the Heresy of Spinoza's Pantheism having been neutralised. That was until the early 20th century when the Heresy threaten to raise its head once again, with a new Heretic : Einstein.

Einstein became world famous in 1919, which was not a very good time to become famous, if you were a Jew, as notes Dennis Overbye in his book Einstein in Love:

"Not everybody was enraptured by this general trend of celebrity and idolatry. If you were a conservative, or a German physicist who had won the Nobel prize (as Einstein had not yet done) without having your face decorate magazine covers and being anointed a new Copernicus, there was something vaguely ominous about the brown - eyed face staring out from the newspapers and magazine covers. It was, after all a Jewish face. And the word "relatively" was being heard entirely too often these days in contexts that had nothing to do with moving trains and the speed of light. It was a joke, it was a code, a shorthand for a certain kind of corruption, a moral rot, "the purest subjective idealism", in the words of the London Times, substituting for the pillars of culture and knowledge."

"Berlin, Albert had told Ehrenfest late in 1919, was rife with anti Semitism, adding that "political reaction is violent, at least among the intelligentsia." Soon he began to see it everywhere."

Einstein was subjected to a hate campaign by anti Semites who became the Nazis. He had to be defended by his friends, who were fellow Jews and Christians. But, what if he had upset them as well? A way of doing this would be if he upset their religious beliefs and propose say an old Heresy such as Pantheism. So, would he do this? The answer is yes, from the book, Albert Einstein: Historical and Cultural Perspectives:

"In the spirit of Spinoza's logic and pantheistic thought; Einstein defined religiosity as faith in the 'rationality and intelligibility of the world,' a faith based on the cognitive assumption that the world is rationally comprehensible. The religion was not conceived as a set of dogmas, rituals, or authoritative institutions, nor was the concept of God conceived as a 'personal God who concerns himself with the fates and actions of human beings.'" [18]

Note that this last statement is blasphemy according to Christian and Jewish religious dogma. The article continues:

"Rather - and here too Einstein was close to Spinoza - God is a rational, logical concept, sometimes even metaphoric, as necessitated by the basic notion that the world is constructed according to the 'orderly harmony of what exists.'" [19]

Note that Einstein now commits the same heresy as Spinoza, and is his influence on his outlook to physics. If you reject Einstein's approach to physics, then it is possible to reject the religious heresy that goes along with it. A big motive for trying to make an alternative approach to physics, which indeed was achieved in the 1920s.

Religious ideas more in keeping with Eastern Mysticism (and Native American, aboriginals etc.) than Western Religion, giving a big reason for Religious Cover up. In the philosophical criticisms of Spinoza's Pantheism it is accused of being a big step to Atheism. If God is the Universe, then God is a redundant term, because one might as well just call the Universe the Universe, then there is no place in it for the old use of the word ' God' , which is atheism.

All heretics before the 20th century were dealt with harshly, so why not treat a heretic in the 20th century in the same manner. There could only have been Religious persecution against Einstein's Relativity, because there had always been religious persecution against heresies since the beginning of Christianity. Loren R Graham notes:

"Einstein's theory of relativity was such a radical break with common- sense notions possessed by lay people of all societies - whatever the prevalent philosophies, religions, or ideologies - that it caused great concern. In England and America in the twenties, underneath the fascination with Einstein and the titillation with popular lectures on relativity, there lurked an anxiety about how this new theory could be fitted in with conventional beliefs, particularly religious ones." [20]

The Establishment was faced with a problem, a physics theory that was Religious Heresy. Its response was to usurp Einstein from his throne as the head of physics theory, and in the 1920s Quantum Mechanics was created to replace Einstein's physics and reject his philosophical approach to physics.

It was a rejection of an approach to physics that is summed up by Einstein as:

"“ My views are near Spinoza: admiration for the beauty of and belief in the logical simplicity of the order and harmony which we can grasp humbly and only imperfectly. I believe that we have to content ourselves with our imperfect knowledge and understanding and treat values and moral obligations as a purely human problem - the most important of all human problems...” [21]

The approach to physics by Einstein is to try to unify concepts. His religious heresy means that problems created by humans have to be solved by humans, and there is no Personal God to come to save them. Something that the Judeo - Christian religious Dogma does not want to believe.

The Scientific methodology that arose from the Copernican Revolution led to the Heresy of Spinoza in Religion, mirrored by support in physics by Einstein. The only way to cover up was to change the methodology of Physics, as has been done.

Under the old scientific method in the old philosophy we have unification under Boscovich. (Roger Boscovich had a unified theory of physics, and has been seen as a forerunner of modern physics theory, but the popular account of modern physics unfairly dismisses him.) [22] But the new scientific method does not give us unification. There are many more links that just this, which lead back to a long tradition of other persecuted Heretics. Links that connect to Pythagoras and through him Ancient Wisdom coming from Egypt and beyond.

For the sake of Judeo - Christian Religious Beliefs physics has been corrupted. A major attempt was made to deviate from the approach to physics that underpinned Einstein's version of physics, because it was the Heresy of Pantheism.

The Proper Scientific approach that leads to solving the UFO Problem is religiously unacceptable, and has been Debunked, and replaced by a corrupt approach that has now been applied to all Sciences. A methodology that now prevents anything offensive from being proven, because it takes as its starting position the assumption that such offensives things do

not exist. It prevents any lone scientists from solving the puzzle and upsetting the religious fanatics, because the proof that he must provide to get any piece of the UFO jigsaw accepted by the Establishment is unreasonable.

Further we can now seek to answer Daniken's question: "Was God an Astronaut?" From Pantheism - God is the Universe, and the Bible describes a very different God, namely a Personal God, where Man is in the image of God. The God of Spinoza and Einstein cannot be the same as the Biblical God. It therefore seems likely that something like a UFO encounter happened in very ancient times and was interpreted in religious terms. Carl Sagan has described a scenario where some primitives met someone or something from a more advanced civilisation, and founded a religion on that encounter, what he calls a "UFO Cargo Cult". We thus see the link now as : the foundations of our Society is based upon a UFO Cargo Cult Mentality.

It seems likely that we were visited by aliens, then some of our ancestors converted this into a religious cult based on mistaken ideas, that their descendants vigorously defend, and now impose upon their children in State Education.

Einstein was exploring many unorthodox ideas such as Professor Hapgood's Pole Shift ideas, and according to Peter Kolosimo:

"Einstein, for instance, believed in a plurality of inhabited worlds, and is said to have maintained that the navigators of "flying saucers" are human beings who left earth 20,000 years ago and return to see how their descendants are getting on." [23]

And if we are visited by 'cousins', why not other aliens? All these ideas the Status Quo tries to debunk, and a major step on its way to debunk is to misrepresent Einstein's theory and his approach to physics, i.e. to corrupt it.

The Establishment does not want to consider the UFO - ET question seriously and has already defined it as a non-question. And when faced with heresies such as Daniken, it uses any means at its disposal to debunk, going as far as mis-citing the things it is debunking to 'muddy' the waters, and I suspect even go as far as to hoax UFO - ET type evidence so as to throw into any possible genuine evidence into doubt.

The Establishment does not work from proper science, where different ideas are supposed to be tested. Instead it works from religion, because it has already decided what to believe, and won't genuinely consider alternatives. But when you look at the human race in more detail, you find it true of most people, that they are Homo Religious. They all have their different beliefs based on Faith. It is just that the Establishment pretends it works from science, but is really a religion masquerading as Science.

All UFO related jigsaw pieces such as the phenomenon of poltergeist, telepathy, telekinesis, demonic possession etc., issues that are ignored by Mainstream Science because it cannot explain them, fit within the Proper Science Scheme of Einstein, based on the unifying approach of Spinoza. But worse: We now have a Science so badly corrupted from this Religious Controversy, that it cannot properly solve problems such as AIDS, Cancer, BSE, the failure of antibiotics etc., and instead of solving these problems it is now creating new problems.

There are two versions of History, the one the Establishment tells us and the Conspiracy version. The Conspiracy version of History has been suppressed by the Establishment for a very long time, because of its Religious significance.

UFO Investigator Timothy Good notes that the Military treat the UFO Subject as being above

Top Secret, higher than the Secrets of the Atom Bomb. The reason it is so secret is because it is the reason for Wars, namely Religion. Religion has been used as an excuse for war for centuries. There can be no deadlier threat than a Reason for War. Hence this is why the UFO issue is such a delicate one of National Security. Religious people must not be upset, or else they find another excuse for War.

So, for the benefit of Religious Fanatics we die from an increasingly polluted Environment, prevented from using a proper effective Science. Religious fanatics are convinced that this is the way it is supposed to be, namely that the World should end so that they can meet their Saviour. Thus they create the self-fulfilling prophecy. The world ends either through the misuse of Science or through religious fanatics starting war. Both scenarios are created by the corrupted beliefs of Modern Religion. Which means that the Status Quo UFO Cargo Cult Mentality is a Suicide Cult. The foundations of Christianity were laid by Christians who were willing to martyr themselves against the Roman Empire. The Christian Martyrs died believing it was a quick and instant way to Heaven. The Mentality still persists after two thousand years, and has set in motion steps to martyr us all.

It requires people to start to show a little bit of Sense and take charge of their destiny.

Additional: Religious Fundamentalists try to corrupt Biology, because they dislike the Theory of Evolution. They succeeded in corrupting Physics, but were less successful with Biology, and proceed to point out flaws in Evolution Theory. The flaws in Evolution Theory appear to have been created by these Religious Fanatic's corruption of Physics. From the Proper perspective it appears that there is most likely artificial manipulation of mankind's evolution. And the Theory of Evolution as it stands assumes 'natural selection' no 'artificial intervention', hence its flaws, which the Religious fanatics try to capitalise upon. Thus after corrupting one science they then proceed to corrupt the next.

References and Notes

[1] Arrival of the Gods, Erich von Daniken, Element, UK 1998

[2] Secret of the Desert, Maria Reiche, Stuttgart, no date.

[3] Daniken accuses the Establishment of unfairly treating him. The alternative side of this is: Daniken in his first books states the vast majority of his ideas about Aliens visiting us in the remote past, as questions. In other words he is stating his ideas as speculation: as 'open ended' questions that do not allow themselves to be criticised. Instead they 'beg' the Establishment to test his ideas. But, these ideas are very difficult to test. However, it is quite obvious that Daniken himself believes in most of the speculation that he is stating, and is stating his questions in such a way that they appear like statements of fact inviting the readers to believe them. The critics when faced with this took the easier option of not testing his ideas, and instead tried to 'slag' him off, by criticising his beliefs, and ignoring that Daniken was not explicitly stating facts of belief. The end result of the smear campaign against Daniken is to associate the Ancient Astronaut hypothesis with him, and thus also smear the Ancient Astronaut Hypothesis itself and discouraging others investigating such ideas. Something which is unfair to the Hypothesis as well as to Daniken.

[4] Dictionary of Philosophy, G Vesey and P Foulkes, Unwin Hyman, UK 1999 p 273

[5] Within Reason: A Life of Spinoza, Margaret Gullan - Whur, Pimlico, UK 2000, p 305

[6] ibid.

[7] ibid.

[8] **ibid. p 306**

[9] **ibid.**

[10] **ibid. p 307**

[11] **ibid.**

[12] **The Heretics, Barrows Dunham, Eyre and Spottiswoode, London 1963, p 334**

[13] **Within Reason p 37**

[14] **Dictionary of philosophy p 262**

[15] **The Heretics, Barrows Dunham, Eyre and Spottiswoode, London 1963 p 334 -5**

[16] **ibid. p 335**

[17] **Einstein in Love, Dennis Overbye, Bloomsbury, UK, 2001, p 369**

[18] **Albert Einstein: historical and Cultural perspectives, ed. Gerald Holton and Yehuda Elkana, Dover, USA 1982 p 308 -9**

[19] **ibid.**

[20] **ibid. p 129**

[21] **ibid. p 308 - 309**

[22] **Roger Boscovich : the forerunner of modern physical theories, H V Gill, M H Gill and Son, UK 1941 Foreword: "This small volume contains a simple account of the remarkable way in which a theory proposed by Roger Boscovich two hundred years ago is now found to be in harmony with conclusions arrived at by methods of scientific research."**

Nexus vol. 8 no 5 Roger Boscovich article.

[23] **Timeless Earth, Peter Kolosimo, Garnstone Press, UK 1973, p 192 - 3.**

20.1 Pole Shift

Hapgood's theory of Pole Shift was ignored by the Science Community despite the support of Einstein. This is another example of Cover -Up.

Einstein gave his support to Hapgood's theory that the Poles have shifted several times in our past. John White in his book Pole Shift, tells us:

"In 1958 Hapgood published the results of the decade long joint inquiry. The Foreword to Earth's Shifting Crust was written by none other than Albert Einstein. Hapgood and Campbell had approached Einstein in 1954 and found, just as they had heard, that he welcomed new ideas. During the following months, before he died in 1955, Einstein not only gave his reactions to their presentation but also offered suggestions for their further development." [#]

However:

.... Despite the endorsement by Einstein and by Harvard professor of geology Kirtley F Mather, who wrote a Foreword to the British and foreign - language editions of the book, the reception of Earth's Shifting Crust was, in Hapgood's phrase to a recent audience, "noteworthy in the negative sense." In other words, he said, "the silence has been deafening. There were very few reviews ... I can say that no crude errors have been found in the work, but it is clear that the basic challenge it presents to accepted geological ideas has been too extreme to be taken up by the Establishment." [#]

(The book was later revised as The Path of the Pole.)

Einstein supporting a theory gave it no special treatment in the Science Community, and the Science Community went ahead and ignored it. It supports my thesis that there was a conspiracy against Einstein. If there was no conspiracy against Einstein, then Einstein's support to a maverick theory such as Hapgood's would have been looked at by the Science Community instead of ignored.

Velikovsky also had a maverick theory that connected to the Pole Shift idea, but the Science Community did not ignore him like they did Hapgood, instead:

"Brown and Hapgood [both Pole shift advocates like Velikovsky] had also challenged dogma, but the response to them was principally silence and sequestration. Velikovsky was to experience something different: unbridled outrage. Whereas Brown and Hapgood were to be largely ignored, Velikovsky would feel the full wrath of some virtual (but not virtuous) pillars of the scientific community. In the process, much would be shown about the fragile assumptions and cliquish associations upon which presumed truth is often built. Much would also be shown about the state of mind prevailing in the scientific community - a state characterised by intellectual arrogance. Consciousness is the key to understanding new knowledge such as Velikovsky brought to light. The state of consciousness prevailing in the scientific community, as displayed in the Velikovsky Affair, was simply incapable of handling it, and was decidedly unbecoming." [#]

The Science Community effectively set about trying to debunk Velikovsky. Einstein entered the fray:

".....Years later, Einstein would enter the Velikovsky Affair as one who disagreed with Velikovsky's views but who defended his right to be heard without prejudice and abuse being heaped on him." [#]

This did not stop the Science Community. Which also supports my thesis that the Science Community did not respect Einstein. If they had respected Einstein, then they would have backed down from their attack against Velikovsky.

Velikovsky's theory was that Earth had undergone a catastrophe, and he formed this opinion from looking at Ancient mythologies:

"... Velikovsky began to reconstruct Middle Eastern history, Pensee tells us, taking this catastrophe - which brought the downfall of the Egyptian Middle Kingdom - as a starting point from which to synchronise the histories of Egypt and Israel....." [#]

".....A survey of other sources around the world convinced Velikovsky that a global cataclysm had indeed overtaken the Earth, and that Venus played a decisive role in the cataclysm." [#]

He asked himself why this catastrophe was not more widely known about and decided:

"With this discovery [of the catastrophe] , Velikovsky asked himself how a disaster of such magnitude could be blotted from human memory. His psychoanalytic training suggested the answer. If individual memories could submerge painful experiences from normal recall, so also might the human race blot out recollection of a devastating catastrophe that virtually destroyed society. "He called such a process collective amnesia," Fred Warshofsky reports... ' and began a monumental life's work, a reconstruction of ancient history according to his catastrophe theory.'" [#]

Velikovsky was :

"..... a scholar -psychologist reconstructing history from long ignored data found in myth and literature, and was supporting his reconstruction with an incredible array of evidence from the physical, biological and social sciences. " [#]

He interpreted it as a record of a catastrophe from the mythologies. However, he did not care that the idea of Venus coming close to the Earth and causing the catastrophe violated what scientists believed about celestial mechanics. He placed more emphasis on what the ancient people said in their mythologies than whether the account contradicted science beliefs. Hence Einstein although supporting Velikovsky's freedom of speech, did not believe his theory.

The general outline of some catastrophe happening in the past was still consistent with Hapgood and other 's Pole Shift theory.

Velikovsky was an easier target than Hapgood' theory, and the Science Community attacked his theory:

"... What seemed a campaign led by Shapley had begun among college professors and scientists to pressure Velikovsky's publisher, Macmillan, not to bring out the book at all. When it nevertheless appeared and quickly rose to sales prominence, the pressure tactic changed to threats of boycotting all Macmillan books. Fearing for its textbook sales, Macmillan took a step that was unprecedented in publishing history. While Worlds in Collision was holding the number one position on The New York Times list, Macmillan gave it to Doubleday, which had no textbook division and thus was immune to boycott threats. Macmillan also fired the editor who had purchased Worlds in Collision. He was one of several people who would be sacrificed by various institutions to appease the wrath of the high priests of science." [#]

".....the treatment given Velikovsky constitutes an ugly record of intellectual dishonesty,

moral cowardice and scientific hubris. Except for a handful of courageous men who stepped forth to defend Velikovsky's right to be heard in a fair and professional manner, without emotional attacks, Velikovsky was shunned by the scientific and intellectual communities for a decade." [#]

However:

"Velikovsky's work was primarily a reconstruction of early history based on the testimony of early civilisations. From that reconstruction he inferred certain astronomical events, which he claimed would be proven by scientific experimentation. In the 1960s, when space research began to give startling new data about the nature of the solar system, many of Velikovsky's predictions were shown to be correct." [#]

Which suggests that there was some truth in Velikovsky's theory, although he might not have got all the details right. He even seemed to have eventually got Einstein to think that maybe there was something in the theory:

"'Space,' Velikovsky had declared, 'is not a vacuum; and electromagnetism plays a fundamental role in our solar system and the entire universe.' Although some stars were known to give off radio waves, the idea of noisy space, crackling with radio waves, pressed by magnetic fields and riven by electrical charges and radioactivity, was not a widely accepted part of the astronomy of 1950. Thus, few astronomers gave any credence to Velikovsky's claim in a 1953 lecture at Princeton University that Jupiter was emitting radio noise."

"Our picture of Jupiter has been vastly expanded since then."

"Albert Einstein was sympathetic to some of Velikovsky's fundamental concepts, but vigorously opposed his theory that space was permeated by magnetic fields, that the sun and planets are charged bodies and that electromagnetism plays a role in celestial mechanics."

"In June 1954 Velikovsky offered in writing to stake the outcome of his debate with Einstein on the question of whether Jupiter emits radio noises, as he had claimed. Einstein replied, as was his custom, by making marginal notes, one of which discounted the idea."

"Ten months later, early in 1955, astronomers at the Carnegie Institution were shocked to hear strong radio signals pouring in from Jupiter. When Einstein heard the news, he empathetically declared that he would use his influence to have Velikovsky's theory put to experimental test. Nine days later he died - a copy of *Worlds in Collision* open on his desk." [#]

So, Velikovsky got Einstein to think that there was more to his theory, and that it needed a better look at, but alas too late.

It strikes me that it - took a rather long time from the invention of radio to 1955 to suddenly realise that there was radio signals coming from other planets.

If Einstein was going by what was being reported by the Science Community up to 1955, then he might have been under the impression that such an obvious things as radio signals from outer space would have been looked for. In 1955 it might have been a surprise to him that the Science Community had only just got around to thinking about looking for radio signals from outer space. When it came to theorising, such an observation would have been useful to know, because being under the impression that such things were not possible then he would have been looking for a theory which excluded it.

Radio pioneers such as Tesla and Marconi claimed that they were getting radio signals from outer space, but the Science Community claimed that these radio pioneers were mistaken. It

looks like observational and experimental data was being deliberately slowed down before its dissemination and acceptance in the Science Community.

Thus experimental and observational data was withheld from Einstein, and this would have hampered his approach to trying to find a Unified Theory of physics.

Einstein was trying to find a unification between gravity and electromagnetism. The physics that Velikovsky speculated in this area to fit with his catastrophe theory was : that electromagnetism played a fundamental role in the solar system along with gravity.

It suggests that electromagnetism and gravity are much more intimately connected than one might now suspect. With electromagnetism filling space, then may be gravity was using electromagnetism as a medium to travel along.

A rather simple idea, and one that Einstein would have easily thought of. But given no data about space being filled with electromagnetism (i.e. no radio signals from the planets), he might have quickly dismissed that theory as being wrong.

It is my contention that the electromagnetism and gravity are connected together in a very simple way by a very easy theoretical framework, that Einstein would have easily found if he had been given the relevant information. For some strange reason that information was very late in coming forward. (Was it deliberate -so as to stop Einstein getting his Unified theory?)

Reference

[#] Pole Shift, John White, ARE Press, USA, 1980, 1991 , 89 - 90, 25, 111 - 115

20.2 Pole Shift and the Ether

Hapgood's theory of Pole Shift connects to Ether Physics: physics that the Science Establishment ignores. But which the Secret Agencies use as Psychotronic weapons.

Hapgood's (and others) theory of Pole Shift was ignored by the Science Community. But if the theory is true then it connects to a different understanding of physics than Modern Physics community adheres to. A physics that enables control of earthquakes, flipping the Earth's magnetic field and other interesting phenomenon by much easier mechanisms than Modern physicists are led to believe exist. That physics is sometimes called: Etherian physics.

"According to Trevor James Constable, whose book *The Cosmic Pulse of Life* offers the best introduction to etherian physics, ' Nobody can speak with precision or accuracy about polar shifts without a knowledge of etherian physics.'" [#]

Fair enough, but there are a lot of Conspiratorial claims that go along with this physics.

In the book *Pole Shift*:

"..... The spectre of governmental and military applications of etherian physics is already a reality, according to persistent rumours circulating among researchers of the paranormal. The stories indicate that Soviet researchers have advanced far beyond their Western counterparts in developing technology that functions on psychic or etheric energy. Their creations are formally named psychotronic weapons, although these devices are unlike any weapons seen before because their operation is such a radical breakthrough in parascience." [#]

"One class of psychotronic, or PT, weapons is based on the pioneering work of Nikola Tesla, the Yugoslavian -born genius who revolutionised the field of electrical technology with his inventions. Early this century, Tesla demonstrated wireless transmission of electricity over 26 mile distance by sending through the ground. Apparently, Soviet scientists have progressed from Tesla's discoveries to the point where electromagnetic signals can be broadcast through the earth to form standing waves in the earth itself. By triangulating signals from transmitting stations (Riga, Gomel, Semipalatinsk and Novosibirsk), coherent patterns can be set up that, through an effect known as "kindling", are amplified by drawing energy from the core of the planet. The amplified energy in the standing wave can in turn be directed and focused to induce a variety of effects, including earthquakes and appear to naive observers as natural (rather than man-made) phenomena. It is suspected by one researcher that the Iranian earthquake of 1978 may have been created by this means." [#]

One claim that is rather old now, (but there are similar newer claims on the same use of Etherian physics that can be found on the web) is:

"The researcher, retired US Army Lieutenant Colonel Thomas A Bearden, a nuclear engineer and former intelligence officer, writes in a journal he edits, *Specula* (July - Sept. 1978), "It is the author's thesis that the foregoing ... [accounts] for some of the drastic weather effects that have occurred in the past two years, as well as some of the major earthquakes that have occurred throughout the earth in the last several years. The Soviets, I believe, have been orienting and aligning - and operationally testing - actual weapons systems to be used as precursors to war or during war. The recent Iranian earthquake, e.g., may well have been Soviet - induced." [#]

So, the idea that some catastrophe destroyed a lost civilisation is best explained by the Pole Shift Theory. But the physics of the Pole Shift theory is Etherian physics, and if that is true then the governments of the world have reason to conceal that fact, as it connects to a new class of weapons called Psychotronic.

Certain theories such as the Pole Shift by their very nature connect to national security issues, and have to be suppressed. Ether Theory would seem to be the Hidden Physics that is suppressed.

We can however, look at the Ether theory's history. The Ether idea goes back a long way in history:

"The ether theory of physics is another example of death and rebirth in scientific history. Derived from the Greeks and upheld by such giants of science as Newton, Faraday and Maxwell, the concept of the luminiferous ether - the medium that transmitted electromagnetic waves - fell into disrepute when the famed Michelson - Morley experiment in 1887 found no evidence of an ether. Einstein assumed in his theory of relativity that there was no ether, [- GROAN] and his developing scientific stature resulted, as with continental drift theory, in the abandonment of the concept by the scientific community for several decades." [#]

I don't like the statement "Einstein assumed in his theory of relativity there was no ether" above.

Einstein's Special theory of Relativity does not use the Ether idea to explain experiments like the Michelson - Morley experiment. So, in Special Relativity the Ether idea is a redundant concept. But Einstein also had another Relativity theory, namely General Relativity.

And in a lecture delivered on May 5th, 1920, in the University of Leiden, Einstein summarised the lecture by saying:

"Recapitulating, we may say that according to the general theory of relativity space is endowed with physical qualities; in this sense, therefore, there exists an ether. According to the general theory of relativity space without ether is unthinkable; for in such space there not only would be no propagation of light, but also no possibility of existence for standards of space and time (measuring-rods and clocks), nor therefore any space-time intervals in the physical sense. But this ether may not be thought of as endowed with the quality characteristic of ponderable media, as consisting of parts which may be tracked through time. The idea of motion may not be applied to it." [##]

In other words Einstein was saying that the ether exists, or rather a type of ether exists. (Ether idea got updated by Einstein and was called by him Unified Field.) General relativity has the Ether idea. Special relativity does not consider gravity, and has no need of the ether idea, but general relativity is considering gravity and reintroduces the ether idea.

So, when it was earlier said "Einstein assumed in his theory of relativity there was no ether", it needs the quantifier that it was in special relativity that the ether does not exist, while in general relativity the ether exists. The statement as it stands is misleading and seems to suggest that the ether does not exist in both general relativity and special relativity, which is wrong, because the more complete relativity theory of Einstein has the ether idea in it.

There have been many statements in many articles similar to: "Einstein assumed in his theory of relativity there was no ether", and people have taken this to mean the erroneous belief that general relativity does not have the ether idea.

This erroneous belief has led to the main conflict between promoters of Einstein's relativity and promoters of Ether Theory, both parties erroneously assume that the Ether idea is not in Einstein's general relativity.

One of the main confusions by some pro - Ether believers is to keep insisting that Einstein's

relativity is wrong. But when they say this they are really referring to Einstein's Special Relativity, and overlooking the fact that Einstein reintroduced ether back in General Relativity. When the Ether believers say Einstein's relativity theory is wrong, they are not making it clear that what they really should be referring to is only Einstein's special relativity.

But in a sense saying Special Relativity is wrong is itself a mistake. Because Special Relativity is merely a theory that is not considering gravity, and is thus not the more complete relativity theory of General Relativity.

It is over this confusion of words, that the battle lines have been drawn.

Mainstream Physics Community uphold Einstein's Relativity, but do not admit that Einstein's General Relativity has ether in it, and the Ether believers insisting Einstein is wrong.

Truth once again gets lost in the middle between two warring factions, squabbling over some nonsense. When what Einstein was really saying never corresponded to what either of this warring factions claimed he said. And these two warring factions 'hog the limelight' squeezing out any opinion different to the two polarised extremes that each warring faction is advocating i.e. the warring groups say 'you are either with us or against us'. Thus a person claiming that both groups are wrong, finds himself condemned by the Einstein believers as an Ether believer, and by the Ether believers he is condemned as an Einstein believer. In this manner the 'third point' of view is destroyed, because although both warring groups fight among themselves, they unite and condemn the 'third point of view', thus destroying it.

Similar scenarios occur like this in many areas of human conflict. Two warring parties decide to fight over some confusion they both share, and destroy anyone who tells them that they fight over a confusion in understanding.

Several attempts seem to have been made to bring the Ether idea back into Mainstream Physics. The book Pole Shift mentions:

"In 1957, however, the Nobel physicist P A M Dirac asked (as the title of a paper), "Is there an ether?" He answered affirmatively, and since then other atomic scientists have suggested that the ether may be defined as an energy - rich subquantic medium composed of neutrinos, pervading all space, interpenetrating all matter, and acting as the common denominator in all particle reactions. The question is still being debated, but my point is that the ether concept is another example of scientific thought returning to vogue in a modified form." [#]

Dirac's attempt seemed to have failed. There have been other attempts. But the two warring factions squabbling over nonsense, managed to block any such move in that direction.

In Quantum Mechanics, the Ether idea has been reinvented several times and has gone by several names such as zero point energy .

In the book Pole Shift it says:

"Dozens of terms exist for an all - pervasive life force, or vitalising principle, in nature. They come from cultures around the world ranging from ch'i (Chinese) and prana (yogic) to the Holy Spirit (Christian)." [#]

And John White claims to have listed more than one hundred of these terms in another book. [#]

Ether physics connects to the mechanism of how the paranormal works, another name for ether theory is biorelativity: the idea of the human body being itself an energy machine able to

influence ether :

"..... biorelativity is a term coined by Goodman to denote the psychokinetic interaction of people with their environment via psychic or mind energy - the energy of thought. From the psychic point of view, the energy upon which thoughts are impressed gives rise to thought forms. Thought forms are produced constantly, whether or not we are aware of it, the psychics say, and they constantly impress themselves upon the energy matrix sustaining the physical environment, including the planet itself. "The psychics [say]," Goodman reports, "that the thought forms given off and created by man interact with the factors behind earthquakes, volcanoes, and geological activities, as well as the factors behind climatic change". The effect of humans is there all the time, inescapably. The only question, therefore, is whether we are to have our thoughts affect the total process of the world's energy activity in a positive or a negative way." [#]

Biorelativity then gets all New Age mystical:

"The traditionally disapproved character traits of anger, greed, hatred, fear, self - aggrandizement, aggression, lust for power and so forth are powerfully negative influences on the energy processes of the earth. On the other hand, virtuous thought and behaviour act to maintain harmony and balance. Most important of all is to maintain a loving sense of relatedness to the planet and its life forms as a single living organism - a senior member in the community of life that extends upward in a great chain of being to the Creator. This is what Native Americans call "walking in balance on the Earth Mother". Violation of this biological - moral principle, the psychic sources say, will surely bring on our destruction. It has happened before, with Atlantis, Lemuria and other high civilisations before ours, they claim, and it can happen again. If there is atomic conflict and the human race survives it, those detonations could start chain reactions in the subsurface geology that build up just as other naturally occurring factors, including thought form influence, reach a critical state. In that case, we will have directly brought on pole shift and will have no one to blame but ourselves." [#]

"But it need not happen. From the psychic point of view, the choice is ours. The quality of our living can change at any time, and with that change will go all the positive effects upon the energy matrix of the earth. Consciousness is the key to intelligently controlling and directing psychic energy and thought forms." [#]

Ether physics thus connects to the paranormal and cultures such as native American being intuitively aware of how to use that physics. Thus making it another area that the Conspirators have to cover up.

I disapprove of some of these claims that the psychics make: ' balance with nature', descriptions of Lost civilisations of Atlantis and Lemuria, reincarnation and so forth. But given Ether theory - telepathy seems possible, and it then becomes a problem of whether some psychics are genuinely telepathic, and if they are where does the information transmitted to them come from. As highlighted in such books as The Hungry Ghosts by Joe Fisher, the entities channelled can tell lies, which raises the question how much channelled information is lies? It might be that religions based on beliefs in reincarnation are founded on being lied to by these entities. This sort of psychic phenomenon has got itself too tied up with religious perceptions, and has not been investigated by a proper science that believes in telepathy.

Anyway: All the anomalies connect into one Vast Cover Up, that the authorities have to keep denying for national security reasons. And the warring factions that squabble over misunderstandings manage to maintain that Cover up.

References

[#] Pole Shift, John White, ARE Press, USA, 1980, 1991, p 375 - 9, 53 - 4.

[##] www.evolutionday.com/

20.3 Einstein - Hapgood Conspiracy

More details on the Cover -Up connections between Hapgood's theory and the conspiracy against Einstein comes from Colin Wilson in his book *The Atlantis Blueprint*.

Rand Flem - Ath and Colin Wilson in their book *The Atlantis Blueprint*, mention Einstein's interest in Professor Hapgood's theory of pole reversals, lost civilizations that mapped the world etc.

To Hapgood's material on Pole Shift, Einstein replied:

"I find your arguments very impressive and have the impression that your hypothesis is correct. One can hardly doubt that significant shifts of the earth's crust have taken place repeatedly and within a short time." [1]

Hapgood's two famous books are: *Maps of the Ancient Sea Kings*, and *The Path of the Pole*, books that in part inspired Daniken with his 'Ancient Astronaut' beliefs, but were much more scholarly written.

Believers in these sort of ideas, however get split between two camps- those that believe ancient knowledge came from ancient astronauts, and those that believe it comes from a lost human civilization. In order to try to gain some respectability from the orthodoxy, these two groups are encouraged to fight among themselves. For instance: if you want respectability with ancient knowledge then the orthodoxy might not be so loath to listen to you, if you denounce ideas like Atlantis and ancient astronauts as being nonsense, as you try to get another scenario to fit the ancient wisdom hypothesis.

The question is why, would such a split be created? Answer it's all part of the conjuring trick to prevent any organized agreed alternative to the orthodoxy from being presented. Create dissent in the enemy's camp, stop them from uniting, and you prevent them from attacking you. Then the orthodoxy wins by default.

What if in the ancient past there was a civilization far more advanced than the 20th century's. It does not then really matter too much at first introduction to this 'lost civilization' hypothesis, whether the civilization was human or alien. At 'first investigation' it is merely an 'unknown lost civilization', that needs to be investigated to decide how much of the 'unknown' can be made 'known.' If such a human civilization existed, then it might have been capable of space travel and contact with aliens. If it was alien, then it might have been in contact with primitive humans coexisting at the same time.

All scenarios for ancient knowledge eventually merge into one, depending upon how advanced you think that lost civilization was. What does it then matter, which type of civilization it was? - it would still have had a profound effect on us. Rather than seriously investigate this, the Mainstream Academics leave it to the Unorthodox to be divided and split in their arguing as to the nature of the 'lost unknown civilization.' And being split, 'they' are not able to provide a unified front to attack Mainstream Beliefs, that then win by default as the Beliefs that get taught succeeding generations of students, with the Unorthodox being dismissed and unmentioned, or debunked and unfairly mocked.

Now Einstein was interested in these ideas of lost civilization, and related issues. The book reports, that when Einstein tried to get official backing to finance researches into Hapgood's theories, he failed - i.e. he was opposed. Wilson and Flem- Ath report:

"In spring 1954, Einstein supported Hapgood's application for a grant or research appointment at the Institute of Advanced Studies at Princeton., where Einstein was based.

Unfortunately, Robert Oppenheimer, the 'father of the atom bomb', who was an influential member of the committee, opposed Hapgood, and the request was turned down....." [2]

Having failed there, they tried again:

"...in November 1954, Einstein supported Hapgood's request for a research grant from the Guggenheim Foundation. Once again, it was turned down..." [3]

So, we note that the Establishment manages to put a 'block' on pursuing the ideas of Hapgood, refusing to allow them to be opened up to other Academics to investigate. One can wonder why this is so. From my investigations the hints are that whenever ideas threaten 'national security', then just mentioning these two words is sufficient for a block to be placed on the relevant science. Hapgood's ideas at first look harmless, but they connect to other ideas that look more and more threatening.

Anyway, ignoring those issues for the moment, and just looking at the issue of Pole Shift at face value. A 'block' was placed on testing that hypothesis, and Einstein's name was not sufficient to impress the orthodox science community to investigate this unusual idea.

Does this not strike you as odd?

When you check the biographies on Einstein you find that while Einstein was alive - although the public image of Einstein was that of a genius, the academic circles encouraged the new physics students to view Einstein as a 'fool.'

Then what do the orthodoxy do? They adopt Einstein as their hero, and make out that their science is based upon Einstein. If you check the history, you find that the orthodoxy rejected Einstein from 1920s onwards and put words into Einstein's mouth, that he never said.

Science students are usually discouraged from checking the real history of their subject, and are presented with myths. The greatest myth they are presented with is how Einstein fits in with the orthodoxy, because he does not. Einstein went his way, and the orthodoxy went their way.

One of the mythological attempts made to make sense of science history comes from Kuhn in his book *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. He talks some nonsense about scientists forming an emotional attachment to their theories, and refusing to consider alternatives. (All of what Kuhn is saying has been made up to try to find reasons why the science community engages in some changes of opinion in some subjects and refuses to do so in other areas.)

Wilson + co cite this in their book and say:

"This is why the great scientific revolutions - of Copernicus, Newton, Einstein and quantum theory - encountered such furious resistance." [4]

It is unfortunate that 'Einstein' is placed next to the words 'quantum theory', it makes out that Einstein's revolution to physics was the quantum theory. When in fact it was not the case. Einstein opposed the quantum theory that became the orthodoxy. The impression given by Wilson + Co is thus false. Many books give a similar false impression of history, making out that Einstein's contribution to physics "encountered furious resistance" before it was accepted. When you check the real history, you find out that what really happened: Einstein was "furious" in his resistance to the revolution in physics, while the majority of the rest of the physics community readily accepted the revolution. Einstein stood virtually alone in condemning the new physics as being wrong. A far different scenario than many myth-makers present for science students' history lesson.

If there was a revolution in physics coming from Einstein, the orthodoxy decided to not pursue it. And after not following Einstein's revolution, the orthodoxy have the 'cheek' to make out that Einstein is their hero and the 'source' of the physics they are pursuing.

With such a monumental twist in the facts (to believe whatever they like despite the evidence), the orthodoxy claim the 'high ground' of laying claim to undeserved authority (giving them the 'best of both worlds') and then have the fun of denouncing the ideas that Einstein was really interested in as part of the 'lunatic fringe.'

Einstein conspiracy was the start of the 20th century's attempt to cover up the UFO mystery and all its related topics.

There was never any 'real' freedom in science to open discussion. It is just another conjuring trick played upon us. The orthodoxy wanted to believe certain things, and then performed the conjuring that enabled them to create that illusion.

The science community has always held a set of religious beliefs (that it does not explicitly state) and refuses to accept ideas that contradict its core religion. If eventually an unorthodox theory can be adapted to fit in with that core belief, then it is eventually accepted, while the 'bits' of the theory that still contradict its religion is rejected.

An example of this is Wegner's theory of continental drift (talked about in Flem - Ath and Wilson's book). Wegner was ridiculed by the orthodoxy for such an idea, but eventually the orthodoxy came around to accepting it. However, the orthodoxy modified it to fit with existing ideas as the theory of Plate Tectonics. The full consequences of Wegner's theory with its connections to Hapgood's theories of Pole reversal has still been rejected so far by the orthodoxy. i.e the orthodoxy does its best to keep things much the same as they always were, admitting only reluctantly any heresy when forced to, and then modifying the heresy so that it does not upset the orthodoxy's core religion too much.

Science has never escaped religious restraint. It is just that the religious restraint on science, is more subtly controlled than it used to be.

Conjuring tricks like turning the heretic Einstein into a supporter of the orthodoxy, are now an easy feat to perform.

According to a TV programme on Conjuring tricks- in the Middle Ages, conjurers had to convince the Inquisition that they were not using genuine magick when performing their tricks, else they got burnt at the stake as witches. This entailed the conjurers having to explain all their tricks to the Church, with the Church writing them all down.

I wonder whether this vast wealth of conjuring knowledge has ever been used by an organized group of people?

I wonder if the Church eventually realized there was a better way at keeping control other than using bonfires for heretics? The use of a bit of conjuring would be far more effective, subtler and a more humane way to deal with heretics surely? Maybe the Spanish Inquisition never went away. Maybe they just got cleverer, and so we failed to notice that they were still going around, trying to deal with evidence and heretics they did not like, by a much more improved method.

If a genuine alien lands a ship, then do a bit of conjuring - flood the news with hoaxed copies, then reveal the hoaxes as being hoaxes. Then the genuine event gets lost within the hoaxed copies, and loses credibility due to 'guilt by association.'

Some one has demonstrated an incredible amount of conjuring skills within the UFO topic, or else there has been an amazing number of coincidences that conspire together to give the impression of such a conjurer.

UFO investigator John Keel was very interested in this ' conjuring trickery' part of UFOlogy.

UFO investigator Morris Jessup who tried to emphasis the importance of Einstein's physics in connection with UFOs became embroiled in any interesting conjuring trick of a ship that disappeared - The Philadelphia Experiment.

Its time to ' bite the bullet' - what we think is reality is simply a clever illusion. We are as much duped as medieval intellectuals who thought they were at the centre of the universe.

If aliens exist, that might have traumatised us too much at one time. Now a lot of the general public are coming around to the idea that aliens might exist, and might visit us.

The next consequences of such a scenario is - our orthodox science and religious beliefs are wrong.

A sudden meeting with aliens, and a revelation of such a nature, would still traumise a great number of people. If the scenario is - ' science and religion is wrong', then it might be far better for us to discover it for ourselves than be told by aliens, that we are "thickos".

One conjuring trick was ---- Daniken was slagged off by orthodoxy by a lot of heavy criticizing Hapgood's ideas seem to have been dismissed because of ' guilt with association' with Daniken. This was a good conjuring trick - can't dispute some hard scholarly work, so put up a ' straw dummy ' that says similar but with much weaker arguments, knock the stuffing out of the straw dummy, and claim to dismiss the hard evidence along with that dummy. it is a diversion trick from conjuring. Leaves people like Wilson + co trying to work out why Hapgood's theory is not looked at seriously by the orthodoxy. When the truth is - the orthodoxy have their religion, and never wanted to look at ' well presented' cases for alternatives to their erroneous beliefs.

Reference

[1] The Atlantis Blueprint, Rand Flem - Ath and Colin Wilson, Little, Brown and Company, UK 2000, p 15

[2] ibid.

[3] ibid.

[4] ibid. p 42

21.1 CHALLENGER EXPLOSION - EXAMPLE OF THE UFO CONSPIRACY IN OPERATION

The inadequacies of being human led to the Challenger exploding. People engage in complicated cover ups. The Challenger explosion illustrates how this cover up methodology operates, which is part of a larger picture of the UFO cover up.

21.2 INTRODUCTION

We are aware of the sad fate of the space shuttle Challenger exploding and killing all its astronauts, but we are not aware that this is part of the UFO conspiracy. However, my understanding of 'conspiracy' might be a lot different from your understanding of the word. The word 'conspiracy' in its normal usage is inadequate for the use I wish to use it to mean, but what other word can be used to mean: people forming into different groups and fighting over belief systems, or acting as 'yes men' and covering up their incompetences.

The roots of the UFO conspiracy is fairly droll, no super intelligence is required to coordinate it. Instead it is just a natural part of what humans engage in during their normal daily lives. With natural flair as this we can create disasters like the Challenger explosion.

The way human interactions are engaged in is very complicated. People need social skills or else they are disliked by others, and in order to be amiable and likeable, it is often necessary not to tell the absolute truth, instead it is preferred to tell 'little white lies.' For example if a lady asks whether she looks beautiful or not, the absolute truth is not what she wants to hear, if that answer is 'no', she would much prefer a different answer. It is the consequences of our human nature that makes science a very difficult enterprise. In science: absolute truth or something pertaining to be as near absolute truth would seem preferred. Nature does not respond to lies in the same way as humans do. Our species is built upon lines of deception. We engage in deception sometimes for good intentions, but there are many other numerous reasons. Thus we have a natural talent for failing to be able to follow the dictates of science.

Our prime motivation is money in our present age. Many of us require to earn a living and we work. In order to get our money we need to satisfy our boss, and in order to do that we need to engage in the complicated human interactions that often lead to deception. Our boss likes to hear good news, and not bad news. Once we associate getting the money we want with making our boss happy, we then start to engage in our deception techniques to try to keep our boss happy with 'white lies' rather than the 'absolute truth.' When this human ability is applied to great engineering feats such as the space shuttle, we then are no longer engaged in what science requires of us. A space shuttle might be sent up with major problems in it, but employees are engaged in a complicated cover up of that fact from the hierarchy of bosses. This is what happened to the Challenger. On previous space shuttle missions, the people who told 'white lies' (people that are commonly called 'yes' men) were lucky and on the Challenger mission they were unlucky. It takes an extraordinary person to come out and say the 'blunt truth' - which is what science requires, such a person was Richard Feynman.

The Challenger explosion illustrates the way that people operate in covering up the truth, because it interferes with the human condition. People in general cannot tell the absolute truth at work, because they risk losing monetary income. It is this human condition that then covers up the solution to the UFO mystery, because it operates in all spheres of human activity.

Richard Feynman prevented the Challenger accident being covered up. Richard Feynman is one of the world's greatest theoretical physicists, and winner of the 1965 Nobel Physics Prize. [1] Oppenheimer had privately noted that Feynman was the most brilliant young physicist at the WWII atomic bomb project. [2]

21.3 THE CHALLENGER DISASTER

The space shuttle Challenger on January 28, 1986, exploded after lift-off, killing astronauts aboard : Francis Scobee; Michael Smith; Ellison Onizuka, Judith Resnick, Ronald McNair; Gregory Jarvis; and Christa McAuliffe, [3]

An investigatory commission was set up under chairman, William P. Rogers, consisting of Major General Donald J. Kutyna, Sally Ride, Neil Armstrong, Chuck Yeager, and Richard Feynman. [4] The investigation would have been superficial if not for one man Feynman being on the commission.

During the investigation was discovered that the decision to launch had been made over the specific objections of engineers who knew of the critical danger from the O-rings, the final report did not attempt to hold senior space-agency officials responsible for the decision. Evidence emerged showing that the history of O-ring problems had been reported in detail to top officials, including the administrator, Beggs, in August 1985, but the commission chose not to question those officials. [5] In other words the commission was proceeding upon normal procedure of covering up, by ignoring the evidence presented to them and not investigating properly. It would have just probably ended up a mystery as to what had happened, except Feynman was on the commission.

Feynman alone among the commissioners, worked to expand the scope of the investigation to include issues of decision making, communication, and risk assessment within the space agency. He did so despite chairman Rogers's disapproval. [6] This led to uncovering the ' mess' in NASA:

After the moon landings missions had finished in the seventies, NASA lost a clear mission as to where it was going next, but had created a large bureaucracy with connections to the nation's largest aerospace companies, and hundreds of smaller companies. The shuttle project became defeated by its own technological complexity, and government mismanagement. Every major component had been repeatedly redesigned and rebuilt; every cost estimate offered to Congress had been exceeded many times over. [7] i.e. it had greatly over run its production budget

Unpublicised audits had found deception and spending abuses costing many billions of dollars. The shuttle had achieved being a reusable craft, but the cost of refurbishing it after each flight far exceeded the cost of standard rockets. [8] i.e. it was not cost effective

The shuttle could barely reach a low orbit; high orbits were out of the question. The missions flown were a small fraction of those planned, and-despite NASA's public claims to the contrary-the scientific and technological products of the shuttle were negligible.

[9] i.e. it was pretended to be a success when it was not really.

Faced with all this difficulties , NASA then systematically misled Congress and the public about the costs and benefits. As Feynman states it NASA , as a matter of bureaucratic self preservation, found it necessary "to exaggerate; to exaggerate how economical the shuttle would be, to exaggerate how often it could fly, to exaggerate how safe it would be, to exaggerate the big scientific facts that would be discovered." At the time of the challenger disaster the program was breaking down internally: by the end of the year both a shortage of spare parts and an overloaded crew-training program would have brought the flight schedule to a halt. [10]

The cumulation of this farce, was the failure of the O rings, which Feynman then demonstrated at a press conference. He explained that the material that the O rings were made from once

put in ice water, was slow to bounce back its shape after pressure was placed on it. i.e. for a few seconds at least and more seconds than that there is no resilience in this particular material when it is at a temperature of 32 degrees. [11] Thus letting a dangerous gap for fuel to come through. (Official tests later confirmed Feynman's TV demonstration, that the failure of the cold seals had been virtually inevitable not a freakish event, but a consequence of the plain physics of materials. [12])

The commission was not interested in highlighting the problems with NASA that had led to the disaster, bar one person : Feynman. The chairman Rogers ineptly said at the start of the investigation , "We are not going to conduct this investigation in a manner which would be unfairly critical of NASA, because we think-I certainly think- NASA has done an excellent job, and I think the American people do." [13] In other words it was seen as politically more important for the American public to perceive the space shuttle project being a magnificent success than expose any problems. It was a Personal relations exercise, if Feynman was not on the team. Or as General Kutyna put it Feynman was the only commissioner free of political entanglements [14]

This methodology of Feynman was however upsetting people. Or as Neil Armstrong described it, "Feynman is becoming a real pain in the ass." [15]

Despite Feynman, the commission still attempted to portray NASA in a favourable light (for public relations political reasons), and chairman Rogers still went on to ' sing the praises' of NASA, in the first draft saying:

The Commission strongly recommends that NASA continue to receive the support of the Administration and the nation. The agency constitutes a national resource and plays a critical role in space exploration and development. It also provides a symbol of national pride and technological leadership. The Commission applauds NASA's spectacular achievements of the past and anticipates impressive achievements to come. . . .[16]

Feynman protested at this draft, but to no avail, and Feynman's harsher findings were isolated in an appendix to the final report. [17] i.e. the important part of the report was marginalised as much as possible, as a seemingly incidental. If there was a summary required, from my experience the appendix would be ignored. People do not really want to know the truth. If truth appears, then attempts are made to remove it as much as possible, ' spin doctoring' is more important.

Feynman discovered that some engineers had a relatively realistic view of the probabilities involved-- guessing that a disaster might occur on one flight in two hundred, for example. Yet managers had adopted fantastic estimates on the order of one in a hundred thousand. They were fooling themselves, he said, They cobbled together such numbers by multiplying absurd guesses-that the chance of a turbine pipe bursting was one in ten million, for example. He concluded his personal report by saying, "For a successful technology, reality must take precedence over public relations, for nature cannot be fooled." [18]

21.4 CONCLUSION

The commission left to its own devices, did not really want to dwell on the problems, but instead would like say how wonderful the project was. If left to themselves it would have liked to push aside the findings of the maverick Feynman as much as possible. Then as now there very few people like Feynman that have no political ties. The commission was not properly interested to find out the root causes, they would have ignored the managers who were ignoring the risks, if they could.

All of this adds to the classic ingredients that go to make up conspiracies and cover ups, i.e. the group incompetence of people not interested in science but instead interested in political spin doctoring.

Feynman got to the root of the problem by asking the engineers and investigating it. The commission was trying to ignore the facts, and not find anyone to blame. It was an attempt at a political farce, other attempts are usually more successful. People like Feynman are now few, the pressures of the world we now inhabit creates mainly people that are interested in 'spin doctoring'. We look now at the modern projects of NASA such as the space probes to Mars that got lost. Should we be surprised that such failures are mysteries. It seems to me that we have got rid of the truth seekers like Feynman, and now have the 'cover up' people in charge. Our political climate favours these 'yes men', because of the engagement of activities under the eyes of the media circus (newspaper men, television reporters etc.). Everything then become political, where appearances become more important than truth. The majority of people are now engaged in presenting a false front to the media, covering up as much as possible, to please their bosses. True scientific inquiry as shown by Feynman has been almost destroyed. Truth is no longer what many people want to hear.

This infection has spread out to very area of our society. The physics community is now engaged in this cover up. No one wants to hear that electromagnetic fields from new electrical devices present a health problem. The research into such an idea is suppressed. But research into finding cures for these manufactured modern illnesses with the development of new drugs is encouraged. So, we have the farcical situation of produce a product that causes illnesses, make money from that and then make money from selling people the cure, once cure is found. It would be too logical and incompletely alien to human mentality to not cause the illnesses in the first place. To our mixed up minds: prevention cannot be better than cure, because there is less money to be made in that avenue.

Cover up, conspiracy, call it whatever you like is now a part of our normal lives. We can all now look at the strange lights in the sky, secure in the knowledge that we have all engaged in activity that prevents us from solving such a mystery. We do not want the truth, we much prefer myth and mystery. When we look at our history that's all we basically have is mysteries: a catalogue of strange events and no explanation as to what really happened. President JFK was assassinated, the Knights Templar were persecuted, the Cathars were exterminated, etc. we do not know why any of these happened. Now, strange lights are seen in the sky, just add that mythic mystery to all the rest of our history.

Every now again the conspiracy fails and the cover up is left incomplete. Without Feynman, the Challenger disaster would have been another myth to add to our catalogue. And when our natural human 'cover up' activity is exposed in these few instances, we just largely ignore it and carry on with our next cover up. There is something very odd in human nature when we ask for the truth, and we do not really want to hear it. We ask for one thing and really want something completely different. (We may not be consciously aware of what we are doing, but unconsciously we are all 'messed up'.)

21.5 Footnote:

Sadly Feynman after the commission, returned home dying from a rare form of cancer. Feynman himself refused to consider the speculation that it might have been caused by his work on the WWII atomic bomb project. [19]

Reference

[1] Surely you're joking Mr. Feynman, Richard P Feynman, Vintage, UK, 1985 - blurb.

[2] Genius: Richard Feynman and modern physics by James Gleick, Little, Brown and Company, 1992, p 6

[3] ibid. p 415

[4] ibid. p 416 - 417

[5] ibid. p 426 - p 427

[6] ibid. p 427

[7] ibid. p 425

[8] ibid. p 425

[9] ibid. p 425

[10] ibid. p 425

[11] ibid. p 423

[12] ibid. p 424

[13] ibid. p 417

[14] ibid. p 427

[15] ibid. p 423

[16] ibid. p 426

[17] ibid. p 427

[18] ibid. p 428

[19] ibid. p 428 and p 417

22.1 The Temporocentric Delusion : The influence of Hoaxing in history

A main feature of the UFO Mystery is hoaxes. There is a lot of squabbling over what are true facts and what are hoaxes. This feature of UFOlogy needs to be taken into consideration of its historical context. Throughout history there have been hoaxes that have created major changes in our history, when they were mistakenly believed in at the time. At the moment an answer to the UFO mystery seems difficult, may be by looking at historical instances of hoaxes we might find a hint as to how to find an answer. For instance there seems a lot of hoaxing going on around the events of Columbus.

22.2 Introduction

Much of the UFO Mystery is tied into hoaxing. Certain people feel compelled by their nature to perpetrate hoaxes, making it difficult to access reliable data that could prove an answer to UFOs one way or another. Once evidence arises that cannot be explained by known science, there often remains the possibility that the evidence is someone's idea of a joke.

An interesting question is: could the UFO phenomenon in its entirety be a complete hoax? Could there have been a group or groups that have been hoaxing us throughout our history causing us to believe certain lies as truths? Or is the UFO phenomenon a true phenomenon. And then it is the sceptics that dismiss everything as hoaxes whenever possible, the people that are living a lie?

This question seems unanswerable to us today. But it might seem interesting to look at a historical event: There was a lot of hoaxes around the historical events that led up to the discovery of the New world by Columbus and what happened afterwards. Many historians like to try to erase the hoaxes from the official record, and present us with the facts devoid of the hoaxes around that historical event. But that gives us a false impression of the past. These historians present to us their interpretation of the past, based on their beliefs as to what are hoaxes and what is truth, which is very different from what the people at the time believed. We look at our past history with our conditioned beliefs, while the people in the past were often 'taken in' by hoaxes and such like, and had a completely different version of how to interpret events.

By comparing looking at the hoaxes, and what was presumably false beliefs of people in medieval times, given to them by hoaxes, we might gain an insight into UFOs. What we believe about UFOs at the present time, might be looked back in hindsight by later generations as meaning something different to that which we think it means today.

Hoaxes have had a great influence upon historical events. The history lessons I remember at school about England was something like : Romans conquered England, then the Saxons and then the Normans. Between the Romans and the Saxons there was the legend of King Arthur. To the Celt- Romans : Arthur was a hero, but to the Saxons he was the enemy, the Anglo-Saxons gradually took over all of England, but then lost to the Normans. The Normans need some historical justification for taking charge, and reinstated King Arthur as a hero, making it seem like ' they' were continuing on that kingship line (in a sense) while it had been temporarily disrupted by the Saxons for a while. At least that was my impression of English history, that King Arthur was tied into some propaganda exercise conducted by the Normans, justifying why they had historical precedent for taking charge. It seems perfectly reasonable that history is a political tool. People in charge want justification for why they are in charge, and having history or any other means is a political propaganda exercise. And when true history is not sufficient for the task, then a bit of ' spin doctoring' is called for, by placing a different 'slant' on what happened in the past. at the extreme of this hoaxing of history is carried out to make the past appear the way that authority likes it to appear.

History is a ' hot potato' and people want it to agree with their beliefs, then a lot of squabbling happens, similar to a lot of squabbling over the UFO Mystery. In this light, the UFO phenomenon is undergoing the same human socio-political- what ever forces that seek to shape the public's perception of history. i.e. UFOs are a small part of a much larger phenomenon that of ' reshaping history.'

I want to deal with a specific part of history- the events around Columbus's discovery of America. To me its a complete mystery what happened. To many people there is no mystery, they are clear what happened: what the hoaxes are and what are the truths. To me these people seem to place their opinions of the historical events upon faith. I am open minded,

different people say different things about what was the hoax and what was not the hoax. I see no way to decide between them. To me history gets lost. The actions of people in their normal activities of altering the facts to fit whatever they want to believe, means that our true history gets distorted under a mess of arguing as to what is the truth, leading to various groups forming deciding that they know the truth, why the other groups are lying or deceived. No one has come up with a scientific method to test what is 'truth' upon all of the issues that historians can squabble over, as consequence the normal actions of humans means that knowing the true history becomes lost. We are quite a pitiful species, to many of us the 'truth' does not mean anything, instead fantasy is preferable. But what is truth and what is fantasy? Our group actions often prevent us from finding out.

The hoaxing that seems to have gone on in the Middle Ages pulls in too many directions and makes it very difficult to know what is going on. I will split it up as best as I can.

The scenario I have :

1. According to standard history the Romans were not much interested in pure science, they were more interested in technology, especially with technology applied to winning wars. They managed to take over a lot of the Greek Empire that Alexander built up.
2. The Greeks were very advanced in sciences and technologies, and were allowed to carry on in the Roman era.
3. The Greeks seemed to know a lot of science. But different Greeks were advocating different theories. Conventional interpretation would have us believe that the wrong theories were adopted from the Middle Ages onwards, if not from the Roman Times.
4. When Christianity took over the Roman Empire, was there some sort of deliberate campaign set up to destroy ancient knowledge? The Library at Alexandria was set alight by Christian fanatics, who identified all non-Christian writings as pagan, heretical and should be destroyed whether they dealt with pagan religions or pagan science or whatever.

The rise of Christianity seems to have been a deliberate attempt to turn back the 'clock of knowledge' and suppress certain knowledges.

When we look at the past, we like to think of things in terms of a straight line natural progression in knowledge, this is a temporocentric prejudice, whereby you erroneously believe that the further you go back the more primitive people's knowledge was. But what you really seem to have is - the Romans had a vast knowledge base from their ancient world, which they apparently were not too interested in, and which a campaign by anti-knowledge fanatics set about trying to destroy. So, we have a sudden down turn in science, and then a rediscovery period of the Renaissance.

How advanced some ancients were is an unknown question, and certain people like to force a version of history upon us where there was no sudden dip in knowledge acquiescence, with a false steady increase in knowledge throughout history. Viewing history in this way seems to have psychologically appealing aspects to them.

During the Middle Ages there still seemed to be a campaign in progress of suppressing this ancient knowledge, and certain unknown people were engaged in perpetrating hoaxes to maintain a false version of history and a false science upon the public. Presumably these people were working from a religious conviction that pagan ideas had to be removed general public thought? And was a progression of the earlier fanatics 'book burning' activities in the early stages.

It appears to me that in the West, we have inherited a big tradition of hoaxing to try to suppress certain truths.

22.3 The Ancient Greeks

When the Greeks began their map making, they had considerable experience to lean on - particularly from the Babylonians, who had already developed scales, cardinal points and the concept of global maps. A debt to both Babylonia and Egypt was acknowledged by the Ionian Greeks of the western coast of Turkey, who led the world in scientific research during the seventh and sixth centuries BC. While it is clear that the Greeks had already discovered that the world was spherical, the easiest way to represent it "on the flat" was by a circle. This led many geographers to idealise the shape of the continents to fit them neatly within a perfectly circular sea. Around 430 BC the great historian and traveller Herodotus (an Ionian Greek) mocked this geometrical school of map making: "it makes me laugh when I see some people drawing maps of the world without having any reason to guide them; they show the Ocean running like a river round the earth, and the earth itself to be an exact circle, as if drawn by a pair of compasses, with Europe and Asia just of the same size." Herodotus was clearly aware of better work; he describes a realistic map of the Persian Empire (reaching from the Balkans to India) used in 490 BC. The geographical knowledge of the fifth century BC was well ahead of that shown in the earliest Greek maps transmitted to us by one means or another. [1]

The greatest geographer of Roman times was a Greek-speaking Egyptian, Ptolemy of Alexandria (c. AD 90 - 168). Ptolemy made some major blunders. He ignored the evidence given by Herodotus and joined up southern Africa to eastern Asia by a strip of land called Terra Incognita. Worst of all, he seriously underestimated the size of the earth. In the third century BC, the Greek mathematician Eratosthenes had already calculated the world's circumference as 24,700 miles. Ptolemy, however, used an estimate of 17,800 miles. The real figure is 24,902 miles, meaning that whereas Eratosthenes was correct within an error of one percent, Ptolemy was way off the mark. Ptolemy's error meant that the land mass well known to him, from the west coast of Spain to India, occupied much too great a percentage of the globe's surface. This had far reaching consequences, influencing Christopher Columbus in making his own underestimate of the earth's circumference - hence his belief when he arrived in the Americas that he had actually reached India. The "West" Indies ultimately owe their name to Ptolemy's blunder. [2]

All of this can get confusing. The Ancient Greeks knew that the earth was a sphere, even though the Greeks squabbled over a lot of theories, this seems agreed upon by them. There was a sudden dip in peoples' knowledge in the Middle Ages. The centre of knowledge was the Library at Alexandria. When Christians took authority, this Greek learning was identified with paganism and attacked. The final blow to the library was when it was burnt in 640 by the Moslems. [3] The Christians adopted Greek theories that best fitted in with their beliefs, and the main Greek's beliefs they adopted was Aristotle. We are often told that people in Medieval times thought the world was flat, but Aristotle held the belief that the world was round. When did the Christians decide to rediscover that the world was round?

The Christians came up with a complicated reason why you could not travel all the way around a round earth. But the Christian mistaken beliefs, would not have been what the ancient pagans believed. So, what prevented a few of their adventurous explorers from mapping lots of it?

Evidence that supposedly shows Roman presence in America is disputed. [4] Maps that are copies from very ancient times are ignored as much as possible by the establishment [5] There are too many people who want to view the past as a natural progression of increasing knowledge, and it feels ' nice' to them that pagans before the Christian era knew very little about the world. But when you look at the facts there was this dip in knowledge/ science brought about by the christianisation process.

The fate of Hypatia, the last mathematician of the Alexandrian school, is seen as representing

the end of an era of knowledge. She refused to abandon her Greek religion, and Christian fanatics tore her limb from limb. This is seen as the end of Greek thought in the West for the many centuries of the Dark Ages. [6]

It seems that Greek knowledge was elitism. Christianity appealed to the general public, that was ignorant of most scientific matters, who stirred up by their new religion decided to destroy the old science of the pagan past, by disposing of these pagan scientists. Greek science was not rediscovered by the West until the Renaissance. During the Dark Ages, the old knowledge was lost.

And we are now have our temporocentric prejudices, where we like to think of ourselves as being cleverer than an ancient peoples. People want to impose their version of what history should be like dependent upon what they like to believe. Based on a belief in evolution, certain people like to see a straight line increase in knowledge acquisition from ancient times, and do not like to recognize the fact that there were some very clever ancient peoples.

Hoaxing appears to be going on by these squabbling people as they try to make history fit into their beliefs. People squabble over what were the hoaxes in past centuries and place new interpretations on the past. It appears our belief systems are being altered quite regularly as history gets rewritten.

I have stumbled onto an example of this in connection with Columbus's discovery of America: was Columbus the first European to visit America? (N.B. Columbus did not get as far as North America, but he was close enough.) Some people are now saying that Europeans such as Romans, Egyptians etc., had got to the Americas, or in general crossed the Atlantic. There is heated argument over this and a skeleton called the Kenswick man etc.

22.4 Columbus

Kenneth Feder tells us about Greek Eratosthenes calculation for the circumference of the earth being nearly correctly. [7] And then tells us that most people in the 15 th century did not believe the world was flat, and there was little expectation that Columbus would sail off the edge of the world. [8]

Giles Milton agrees that people did not believe the earth was flat, and says that it had long been disproved by the 14th century, and most geographers accepted that the world was a globe hanging in the filament. But there was a great geographical debate of this age concerning three questions: [9]

1. Was there land in the southern hemisphere?
2. If so, was it habitable?
3. And most important of all, could it be visited?

Giles Milton says that the majority of people, supported by church teaching, believed that sailing around the world was impossible, and Columbus's crew had a real fear that their ship was going to topple over the edge when they crossed the equator. [10] So, he disagrees with the last comment by Feder.

It strikes me as a bit odd that medieval people were thinking in terms of falling off of a sphere, instead of what my school days led me to believe that they feared falling off a flat surface. In Aristotle's physics his idea was that the earth was the centre of the universe, and all matter wanted to be near that centre, so even matter on the bottom half of the world would be wanting to fall towards the centre of the earth, and not away from it. It seems odd that medieval people were not taking this version of Aristotle. So, presumably they were misunderstanding Aristotle? Anyway:

Milton says that few people in those days could countenance the idea of there being land in the southern hemisphere -arguing that because land was heavier than water it would obviously fall off the world -and even well - travelled and educated men did not believe in the possibility of circumnavigating the globe. The devout John of Marignolli had voyaged thousands of miles across Asia yet mocked the idea that it was possible to travel around the world, while the few that argued that there was habitable land on the underside of the earth were held up for public ridicule. Sceptics joked about men living upside down and rain falling upwards towards the earth. [11]

Such ideas stemmed from the cloistered world of the Church which dismissed any theories that didn't conform with the biblical view of the world. as far as the Church was concerned, all mankind descended from Noah and if Noah had never been ' beneath' the earth then how and where did people in the southern hemisphere spring from? This was not the only objection: since the offer of salvation had been promised to the whole of mankind, how could an entire section of the world be cut off from this message. For if the apostles didn't go to the antipodes, that must surely mean that the antipodes could not exist. An inhabited southern hemisphere simply did not fit in with Christian teaching and fort this fact alone St. Augustine considered belief in the existence of the antipodes to be not only wrong, but heretical as well. [12]

This religious belief system of the medieval times was a big handicap in scientific progress. There seems much more freedom of ideas in Ancient Greeks era, deduced from the few records we have left from them. They had no Biblical inspired idea of falling off the earth, whether it was a sphere or a flat surface, so what would have prevented some of them from

finding out by exploring?

Herodotus' History includes accounts of the Phoenician circumnavigation of Africa (c. 600 BC) and of the voyage of Scylax down the Indus river, from this he concluded that the southern ocean extended from India to Spain. [13]

Herodotus thus knew that the Phoenician explorers did not fall off the equator, even if he thought of such a preposterous piece of speculation. The ancient Greeks and the Romans had none of the religious hindrances to their scientific knowledge. So, why do we still think it is impossible for them to travel across the Atlantic ocean, if they put their mind to it? It is our temporocentric nature!! We do not want to look for the evidence of such possibilities, because we are temporocentric. But as noted earlier the mediaeval people were basing themselves on Ptolemy's map and he ignored a lot of Herodotus' data, and presumably he distorted his map so that there was no land below the equator on it.

The maps of the ancient Greeks were much more advanced than medieval maps:

22.5 Ancient Greek maps

22.5 Ancient Greek maps

After the fall of the Roman Empire, in the sixth century AD, map making in the West, like so many other sciences, went into serious decline. The art of cartography also remained static among the Arabs. Only the Chinese made major strides in cartography during the early Middle Ages. In Europe the tendency to produce idealized maps fitting geometrical shapes returned, called 'mappae mundi' that conceptually were no more advanced than the Babylonian world map of 600 BC. However there exist extremely advanced maps from the Middle Ages, such as the famous Vinland Map. This map was discovered bound in a book of medieval manuscripts in 1957. It was drawn on fifteenth-century parchment but supposedly records much earlier information. The map shows the northern shore of Greenland, which became invisible after A.D. 1200, when it disappeared under the polar ice sheet. Surprisingly the coast of Greenland is drawn far more accurately than it is on the North Atlantic map prepared by Icelander Sigurdur Stefansson in AD 1590. It also shows Vinland, the farthest point of Henricus's journey and the Viking name for New England as we know from the Vinland Sagas, which record the discovery of North America by the adventurer Leif Eiriksson around AD 1000. [14]

The Vinland Map was first hailed by experts at Yale University as proof of the Vikings' familiarity with North America during the early Middle Ages. But in 1974 analysis of ink taken from the map appeared to show that it contained large amounts of titanium dioxide; ink pigments based on this substance were not manufactured until after 1920. The skeptics then proclaimed the map a modern forgery. However, a study undertaken at the University of California in 1985 shown that the original chemical analysis was quite inadequate, and the levels of titanium dioxide were consistent with amounts found in medieval inks. This result has reopened the controversy over the Vinland Map.

Sailors' maps from the late thirteenth to fifteenth centuries known as portolans (from an Italian word for "sailing directions"), are also controversial, even though the authenticity has never been in doubt. When they first came to attention of modern scholars at the turn of this century, they were enthusiastically greeted as "the first true maps." The portolans generally concentrate on the Mediterranean area, but some range as far as the Black Sea to the east and Britain and the Atlantic islands to the west. The outlines of the Mediterranean coast shown on an early portolan dating from A.D. 1311 were not improved on until the eighteenth century.

The 'mappae mundi' maps are very naive and the 'portolan' maps are very sophisticated. Both maps were made in the Middle Ages. The difference between them was that the 'mappae mundi' were made by the Church, and the 'portolan' were made for sea farers who needed practical maps not idealized maps.

The 'mappae mundi' development can be clearly traced from late Roman times through the Dark Ages, but the 'portolans' appear, as if from 'nowhere', fully developed around A.D. 1270. It has been argued that the 'portolans' are derived from a few key originals. But who, made the original 'portolan' maps? Suggested answers range from the Knights Templars, the Chinese, the ancient Phoenicians etc., but have no sound evidence to back the suggestions up.

The big clue comes from the Turkish admiral Piri, who also made portolan-style maps, stated clearly that among the sources he used were maps dating back to the time of Alexander the Great (336-323 BC.). But such a claim is disputed.

The temporocentrism of scholars leads to them having a prejudice from interpreting the evidence in the correct way, namely that the ancient world before medieval times was more advanced than medieval times.

The medieval world believed in Christianity and this laid them open to a hoax, the hoax of

Ptolemy. The medieval Christians too readily accepted the information that came from Ptolemy, because it agreed with their beliefs. But the information from Ptolemy was wrong.

22.6 The Ptolemy hoax

Poseidonius indirectly exerted an extraordinary influence upon the science of western Europe until the Renaissance, belonged to an age lacking in creative genius. Many of the best minds were engaged in synthesising and reconciling the more plausible views of the earlier Greek philosophers and scientists. Of these compilers Poseidonius proved to be the most apt at assimilating the work of his predecessors and embodying their findings in readable compendiums of knowledge in many fields. The Greek compilations of this period provided the bulk of the scientific material of leading Roman intellectuals, who in turn transmitted this body of handbook information to the Latin middle ages. And so, whereas Greek science went on to reach new heights at Alexandria in the second century AD and to flourish at a high level at Byzantium and among the Arabs during the middle ages, scientific studies in the Latin West stagnated for 1000 years in the hands of bookish laymen who were satisfied to copy or revise stock material largely originating in Greek compendiums from the Poseidonian age. Poseidonius made a revised calculation of the circumference of the earth, which Ptolemy accepted instead of the nearly correct one. Ptolemy's acceptance of a smaller figure of the earth's dimensions and his enormous reputation as a geographer in the 15th century afforded Columbus encouragement to attempt a westward sailing to the Indies. [15]

Geographical and astronomical research reached its apex in antiquity in the work of Ptolemy, whose *Geography* (c. AD 150), in eight books, culminated the researches of his predecessors. Ptolemy appeared to the ancient world to have fulfilled Hipparchus' scheme of constructing a map of the known world from geodetic positions located precisely upon a network of 360 degrees of latitude and longitude. Ptolemy's theory was excellent but his practice was shoddy. Actually he had almost no scientific cartographic data - a few latitudes determined astronomically and a token attempt to ascertain longitudes by timing of eclipses. Instead he depended mainly on dead reckoning from reports of travellers. A modern reconstruction of his world map, based upon his 8000 coordinates reveals glaring defects. Despite its defects Ptolemy's work had canonical authority for 1500 years. Maps in the "Ptolematic style" continued to appear in atlases more than a century after Columbus and Magellan had disproved Ptolemy's conceptions, and some of his errors persisted in maps even in the 18th and 19th centuries. [16]

Some books are less favourable on Claudius Ptolemy (c. 90 - 168) and call him a fraud, and accusing him of cooking the data to suit his theory, about the earth's position relative to the other planets. Goldberg calls him the most successful fraud in history, because he was believed for 1500 years before Copernicus, Galileo etc., claimed him to be wrong. [17] It seems strange that science at the beginning of the Christian era was based on a fraud, or if we are charitable upon a very big collection of errors. But the fact is: before Poseidonius, Ptolemy and all, the ancient Greeks had a much better science than in medieval times. Medieval science was based on a corruption of the ancient Greek sciences by many varied and complicated reasons, with the Christians all too ready to believe the corrupted versions because it seemed to be in agreement with their religious beliefs. I wonder if they were deliberately hoaxed? But it happened too long ago, to be able to find out?

But our temporocentric prejudices now prevent many people from contemplating the possibility that the ancient Greeks were far more advanced than medieval science: another sort of belief system, that lulls us into trying to interpret history in only one certain way.

When Galileo pointed his telescopic lenses at the night sky, he made many amazing discoveries. But consider this - according to Marshall Clagett: optics among the Greeks was a distinctly experimental and mathematical character. The geometrical aspects of optics were no doubt studied in the 4th century BC as Aristotle's curious and erroneous treatment of the rainbow indicates. [18]

Our temporocentric prejudices allow us to believe that these Greeks were 'dumb' enough not to think about using their optics on the night sky. So, that when we get evidence of may be ancient people had knowledge beyond what could be obtained by the naked eye, the orthodoxy can just ignore it by our prejudices. (I am thinking of Robert Temple's book on the Dogon tribe - The Sirius Mystery.)

There are major inconsistencies with our version of ancient history, one moment we allow these ancient scientists a great deal of wisdom, but the next moment we have to assume that they were very 'dumb' and would not make the next step in their progress. Orthodoxy assumes: Yes, they had optics, but they were not clever enough to think about using optics to observe the night sky. Who is 'dumber' us or them? By believing them dumb we ignore the evidence to the contrary. Einstein said something like: a theory determines what is observed. The orthodoxy assumes the ancients 'stupid' whenever it can, and ignores evidence to the contrary, because it does not fit in with their temporocentricism beliefs.

And when we accept that the ancient Greeks were clever, then consider this from Plato:

It was the method of Greek philosophers such as Plato to write a dialogue between characters, so as to present two different points of view. One character would argue one perspective, and another character(s) would argue another. In Plato's Laws, the two characters rapidly agree that there is truth in what was to them ancient stories of lost civilizations that had collapsed due to disasters such as floods, wars etc. The characters go on to discuss that it was natural that the survivors from these civilizations had lost the civilization's technology. knowledge etc. In another writing, Plato talked of Atlantis. [19]

The dialogues are supposed to be set up so that different characters argue different points of view. It was so obvious to Plato that there existed lost civilizations that he considered were as clever as his Greek civilization, that it was not worth arguing over.

We do not think it is so obvious, we like to argue over things. We argue over whether Atlantis was fiction or not, etc. But while we argue, we do not bother to look properly. The orthodoxy becomes the assumption that there were no lost civilizations, and searchers after the truth are discouraged from looking.

Temporocentrism allows us to not have to believe the sad nature of the human race, of building up civilizations that crumble into dust and get forgotten. If we drop out temporocentrism, then the past becomes a complete mystery. Modern homo sapien sapien started c.40,000 years ago. When was the first civilization of the calibre of ancient Greece?

22.7 What were the Medieval Science beliefs?

Society is always made up of a cross section of belief systems, and so the question is - what was the prominent belief that people had about the world in the 15th century. I think, that may be most intellectuals believed the world was round in the 15th century, while the ordinary person might have held erroneous beliefs like the earth was flat. But believing the world was round, instead of flat, still left people with the idea that 'you fell off the other hemisphere of the globe.'

This point that people then believed that you might fall off the edge of the world at the equator, I find hard to believe. Does it mean that sailors were too afraid to follow the land mass of Africa around, in case they fell off? There surely should have been some sailors brave enough to try such voyages and report back their successes?

When I looked at references to what people believed before Galileo, I found that the intellectuals based their ideas of physics on the great Greek philosopher Aristotle. Aristotle believed erroneously that the earth was the centre of the universe, but he was correct in believing the earth was spherical. So, Europeans basing their beliefs on Aristotle from Christian - Roman times will have known that the earth was spherical.

Now, Columbus based the plans for his sea voyage to the Orient based on Ptolemy's calculation, and so thought it was a far shorter distance to the Orient than it actually was, and also did not know that America was in the way.

I found it a mystery as to what caused Columbus to try his voyage, while other medieval people were not pursuing a similar line of thought. Then I found a book talking about Sir John Mandeville, and found that Mandeville was the inspiration for Columbus.

Giles Milton has written an interesting book about Sir John Mandeville who left England in 1322 for a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, and thirty four years later he returned claiming to have travelled half way round the world. Mandeville's book *The Travels* was the most popular book in the Middle Ages, that influenced Columbus's voyage to America and the great explorers who followed him. Yet in the 19th century what had been taken for 'true' for over five centuries was discredited by scholars who claimed that *The Travels* was an elaborate fabrication. [20]

Mandeville wrote outrageous tales and humorous mishaps, which captivated his readers. The most important part of the book which made the book different from other travellers' books was a startling passage, where Mandeville claimed that his voyage proved for the first time that it was possible to set sail around the world in one direction and return home from the other. This passage altered peoples' perceptions and set the chain of events in motion leading to the great expeditions of the Renaissance. Columbus planned his 1492 expedition after reading *The Travels*. Raleigh studied the book and pronounced that every word was true; while Sir Frobisher was reading a copy as he ploughed his pioneering route through the North-west Passage. [21]

The whole story of Mandeville gets 'bogged down' in hoaxes, which I will discuss anon. But the point now is that Mandeville brought out a book that inspired explorers to set out on their journeys. There was about a hundred years difference between Columbus's voyage and the date the book that inspired him, was published. Why did it not seem to inspire anyone else to try such a voyage, in those hundred years before Columbus?

A fairly simple strategy could be pursued sailors could then have at least taken a few trips to see what was out there. i.e.. gone a certain distance see if there was land, if they found nothing after a certain time, they would decide their rations were running out and return home,

reporting no land seen within certain limits. Try again if you dare when more equipped. If the fear was of falling off the world at the equator, then the best place to try this method across the Atlantic, would be in the North. The Vikings appeared to have pursued such a strategy in the north Atlantic, travelling to Greenland, Iceland and most likely America also. [22]

It sound odd that people in England, Scotland, Ireland etc., were not aware of America. The Scottish Chapel Rosslyn has plant motifs of aloe cactus and maize corn, both supposedly American plants that were unknown outside America, until well into the 16th century. This Chapel was finished being built in 1441, and Columbus did not take his 1492 voyage until 51 years later. [23] Things start look very peculiar with any official history, when one takes a little 'peek' below the surface.

If such a thing happened then it appears to have been covered up from official history. What is going on here? Could there have been different groups of people covering up their knowledge of a vast land mass across the Atlantic? And if 'they' whoever 'they' are can cover up something like this in the 15 th century, then who knows how much more sophisticated 'they' are today, if 'they' are still around.

Now let's look at Mandeville:

22.8 Mandeville's book

22.8 Mandeville's book

Mandeville's book was divided into two halves with the first part dealing with a description of Constantinople..he claimed to have travelled south to Cyprus, Syria and Jerusalem as well as visiting St. Catherine's monastery in the Sinai desert. The second half of his Travels - as Mandeville journeys across India and China towards Java and Sumatra - that his stories enter the realms of fantasy. The further east he travels the more gruesome the creatures he meets until he is mixing with women with dogs' heads, two-headed geese, giant snails and men with enormous testicles, which dangle beneath their knees... writes with relish about cannibals who eat babies and pagans that drink from their fathers' skulls. [24] .[i.e.. It is easy to get away with adding fantasy to places where other travellers had not been to, because it could not be disputed.]

Six centuries after he wrote his Travels, Mandeville lies discredited and forgotten, because Academics had demolished his reputation. His book was disputed as lies, and Sir John's life was mysterious. There were rumours that he was an impostor, a dabbler in black magic etc. Mandeville was believed in medieval times, and his book was very popular. But as the world was charted by geographers, his stories of magical valleys were shown to be nothing but figments of his imagination until, by the 17 th century, he was being mocked in stage satires as the archetypal lying traveller. [25]

Mandeville had a brief reprieve in Georgian London, when his revised tales appealed to the bawdy sense of humour. His story was stripped of its devotional material, and concentration was on the pygmies, monsters and cripples that Mandeville met in the east, with a lot more fantasy added. [26] The Victorians then dismissed it all as fabrication.

A similar sort of procedure seems to happen with some UFO cases, they get added to and amended, until the whole case is dismissed as fabrication, in the same way as Sir John's book and life was treated.

Mandeville's reputation was destroyed by Victorian critics, who assumed that he hadn't travelled at all and cited the tall stories as proof that his entire voyage was a fiction. But in doing so they overlooked the fact that even men who definitely did travel in the Middle Ages recounted marvels that they had clearly invented. They also ignored the fact that to sustain the fiction of having travelled - if indeed it was fiction - would have been no mean feat. Other writers who had attempted similar deceits have almost always come unstuck because of a simple error or foolish slip. Discrediting Mandeville's name by accusing him of copying from other travel books was similarly unfair. Mandeville had copied vast chunks of other writers. But medieval writers had a very liberal attitude to plagiarism and it was deemed perfectly acceptable to lift interesting passages from other books and incorporate them into your own. Chaucer himself had few scruples when it came to borrowing stories from his contemporaries. [27]

It is a situation of the establishment over looking the mistakes of the people they want to be their ' heroes' and condemning the people they do not want ' heroes' by exposing those self same mistakes.

Little remains as trace of Mandeville's life. History decided not to pick him as a hero, and has left no memorial, except an almost illegible inscription in St. Alban's Abbey. [28]

Britannica says that Mandeville was famous in the Renaissance as the greatest traveller of the Middle Ages, and also as the greatest liar. [29] Whether Sir John really made his journeys or not, is not that important, as the effect that of his short chapter in which he ' proves' that it is possible to circumnavigate the world had me scratching my head. For although he presents details of his theory and backs it up with scientific observations and astronomical

observations, the passage is seemingly plonked into the book at random and, once discussed, is never mentioned again.[30]

Robert Clutterbuck, 1815 in *History and Antiquities of Hertfordshire*, claims that Mandeville's account of his *Travels*, was falsified by monks who added in later editions with legendary tales and stories out of Pliny. [31]

People adding hoaxes to a story, distorting it, sound like life of Jesus again? Anyway the hoax of Mandeville's life was perpetrated by Outremeuse:

22.9 Mandeville's hoaxed life

22.9 Mandeville's hoaxed life

Giles Milton says : ' someone, for some unknown but possibly sinister reason, had at one time had a vested interest in concealing Sir John's true identity.' There is an epitaph to Sir John's epitaph in St. Albans Anney, and at one time there had also been an epitaph in a church in Liege, Belgium, with Liege claiming Sir John as a citizen of their town. [32]

The chronicle has it that Sir John was living in Liege under the assumed name of John of Burgundy, with a string of titles. A story of Sir John that has been the basis of Sir John Mandeville from 16th century to the present day. Secret came out from John on his deathbed confession to Jean d'Outremeuse, who was the sole witness. Outremeuse was probably lying. d'Outremeuse was a romancer who wrote fanciful tales using imaginary sources. On the rare occasions he had reliable sources he used them. When he didn't he made them up.[33]

The real life of Mandeville seems hidden by forgeries and fabrications. Giles Milton describes it as if Mandeville's detractors had deliberately scattered the path to find Mandeville's real life story with misleading clues in the hope that researchers would lose their way. [34] Now does that not sound interesting? There are similarities to this case and the problems that some UFO researchers have. A case that might be genuine, acts like a magnet for hoaxes, and these hoaxes then detract attention away from the topic, as it then enters the next stage of being ridiculed.

The added problem with Mandeville, is that it is very difficult to decide when Sir John himself is lying or telling the truth. By the 17th century people were beginning to recognize the anti-papal sentiments scattered throughout The Travels that helped spread across Europe the mentality that paved the way for the Reformation. Long after Purchas's book was forgotten, writers and antiquarians were still quoting this speech in their accounts, and Mandeville's criticisms of the Pope came to be seen as more and more important. Some Victorian scholars developed the idea that The Travels was nothing short of anti-papacy propaganda and came up with ever more startling theories to support their claims. Some went so far as to suggest that the alphabets scattered throughout his book were in fact a series of secret codes containing anti-papal messages. [35]

If Sir John was anti- papal, may be he was fearful of danger and deliberately went into some sort of hiding, that's why later researchers believed Outremeuse? Who knows? The rulers were trying to rule through religious beliefs, and just by saying something that was in conflict with those beliefs made you a rebel, so may be Sir John had something to be scared of and had a genuine need to hide, or may be he was just an imagined threat?

22.10 Mandeville's Stories

To modern ears, Sir John's fabulous tales about Java, Sumatra and Borneo sound more like fables than the eyewitness descriptions of a genuine traveller, but to his contemporaries such monsters were very real creatures. Giles Milton points out that it only requires a shift from the rational thinking to a lateral thinking to get some sensible explanations for many of Mandeville's more outlandish descriptions. Giant snails for instance could really have been referring to giant tortoises, and dog-faced men could have been baboons which have a dog type face. [36]

Witnesses of aliens might also be suffering from similar difficulties in describing the 'new'. Sir John might have been trying to explain the 'new' in terms that his contemporaries were familiar with, and hence it was a very distorted account. But then some of Sir John's accounts defy a sensible interpretation.

And then Sir John makes a big mistake he falls for a hoax, which indicates he did not travel to the Far East and was instead cribbing from accounts from other travel writers, adding extra with his imagination. Sir John describes reaching India and visiting the vast Christian kingdom of Prester John, a Christian wise ruler who had seven kings serving under him. Unknown to Sir John, Prester John was a hoax, so Sir John could not have gone to India, and instead made that story up. [37]

Mandeville seemed to have fallen into the trap of believing a complicated hoax about Prester John, and this discredits his claim that he really went to the Far East to a large extent. i.e.. he was tricked into believing a hoax, and that reveals he was hoaxing.

22.11 The Prester John Hoax

Mandeville was not the only person to believe the stories about Prester John. All the aristocracy in medieval Europe believed that a Christian emperor called Prester John ruled over the Indian continent. This was based on a hoaxed letter sent to Pope Alexander III in 1177, claiming to be from Prester John - who planned to recapture of Jerusalem, for the Christians. The apostle Thomas was believed to have gone to India and preached there, and died a martyr, laying the foundations for the powerful Christian state then ruled by Prester John. [38]

Prester John might have really existed, but not as a Christian king ruling a Christian empire but instead as a Mongol king called Gur-khan, who won a big battle in the Far East, and had Christian followers. Milton thinks that as news of Gur- Khan's victory spread back to the West, the name got distorted first phonetically into Hebrew as Yohanan, then in Syriac as Yuhanan, and becoming in Latin Johannes - or John. So, foundations were laid for this hoaxed letter to the Pope that made it believable.

Mandeville acted like a magnet for hoaxes, the same as UFOs do nowadays. This distorts the whole picture. Giles Milton has pieced together the message that Sir John was trying to give to his contemporaries, never matter that the travels themselves might be hoaxes, the message seems to be genuine:

22.12 Mandeville's Message

22.12 Mandeville's Message

Mandeville's book is split into two halves. In the first half of the book, this is about the Holy Land is fairly familiar ground to pilgrim travellers who made the effort in medieval times. Giles Milton reckons that Sir John was trying to get the reader in this half of the books to identify with the pious pilgrim of that half. After this half of the book, the second half of the book describes outlandish savages, pagans etc., in unknown lands that gets weirder and weirder. In doing this Sir John is throwing the spotlight back on the reader: showing the reader's version of reality to be a distortion, when seen by these other cultures. [39] A similar effect was being achieved by Jonathan Swift in Gulliver's Travels, i.e. it was a criticism of the reader's life style.

Sir John described these savages as far more pious than any Christian pilgrim could ever be, forcing the reader to see his own life as an ugly reflection of theirs. He even records a Moslem Sultan's blistering attack on the lifestyle of the Christians, showing that from the Muslim's perspective the Christian behaviour is not as pious, as Christians would like to believe. Giles Milton notes that the overall message of Mandeville is that love should be extended from just fellow Christians, to everyone : Muslims and pagans. As well as doing this Mandeville says that circumnavigation of the world is possible, in a believable way to the medieval mind set:

22.13 Mandeville's evidence that the world can be circumnavigated

22.13 Mandeville's evidence that the world can be circumnavigated

The importance of Mandeville's book to medieval explorers, lay in the 175 lines in which Sir John explains why he believes it is possible to circumnavigate the world. Sir John's Travels dismiss centuries of the Church's teachings in a characteristically down-to-earth anecdote and 'proves' the world is circumnavigable by telling a strange story of a man who inadvertently travelled around it: [40]

I have often thought of a story I heard, when I was young of a worthy man of our country who went once upon a time to see the world. he passed India and many isles beyond India, where there are more than five thousand isles, and travelled so far by land and sea, girdling the globe, that he found an isle where he heard his own language being spoken.. He marvelled greatly, for he did not understand how this could be. But I conjecture that he had travelled so far over land and sea, circumnavigating the earth, that he had come to his own borders; if he had gone a bit further, he would have come to his own district.

Such a story is not Mandeville's only proof. He includes calculations based on readings from the stars to demonstrate that the world is a globe, and suggests that he himself would have continued around the world if he had found the necessary ships. But most important of all is the theological proof that he offers to support his theory. For while travelling in India he stumbles across a tribe of pagans who, like Job in the Old Testament, have absolutely no knowledge of Christianity, yet worship God in a pure and simple way. For Mandeville, this is proof enough that God's law operates on every part of the globe. And if God is everywhere, it necessarily follows that man is able to travel everywhere and that the only difficulties are practical ones. 'So I say truly, ' he concludes, 'that a man could go all round the world, above and below, and return to his own country, provided he had his health, good company, and a ship. And all the way he would find men, lands, islands, cities and towns.'

It is difficult to know where Mandeville might have formulated his theory of circumnavigation but there is every likelihood that the medieval records indicating a John of sancto Albano studying at the University of Paris do indeed refer to him. If so, he would have certainly come into contact with John Buridan, who was central to these debates about the globe and had just put the finishing touches to this important treatise on whether the whole world was habitable.

Sir John was not the first to hold views about the possibilities of circumnavigation. But the writings by his contemporaries, in complex Latin, is technical, academic and extremely dull. John Buridan's treatise, too, is weighty stuff. The work of his fellow academics is so obscure as to be largely incomprehensible. What sir John does is make it all sound plausible, arguing his point in a way that was accessible to the layman.

Sir John's assertion that it was possible to circumnavigate the globe, and the proof that he offered, had a profound effect on the young Christopher Columbus. Columbus had long held the view that there was a quicker route to the riches of the East than the long and dangerous overland journey... he delved into obscure and apocryphal biblical texts looking for support of his theory that it was possible to reach the riches of the east by sailing west.

Sir John Mandeville's book The Travels inspired Columbus to go after the riches of China and India, by trying to sail across the Atlantic. Columbus never found the gold he so hungered for nor did he reach China although when his ship finally touched land in 1492 he was convinced that he had proved Mandeville to be right after all, recording that he was among 'the islands which are set down in the maps at the end of the Orient.' He wasn't. What Columbus never realized, to his dying day, was that Mandeville's Travels had led him to discover America.

Sir John gave a generation of explorers a justification, both theological and practical, for

setting out into the unknown. But the second point that Sir John was making of tolerance was either misunderstood or ignored. within years of discovering the new lands, settlers were colonising them and pagan natives that Sir John describes with affection were being indiscriminately slaughtered.

22.14 The Mystery of Mandeville

My reading puts the interpretation that - there were too many objections raised by learned people to the possibility of being able to circumnavigate the world, in Sir John's day. Some one hoaxed this book in the part about going to the Far East, cobbled together from reports from what the few travellers that had actually gone to the Far East, had reported. The intention was to get the reasons why circumnavigation of the world was possible across to the greatest possible public audience. The idea of circumnavigation was mocked in intellectual circles, and intellectuals then lost their reputations if they tried to pursue it. The book was presenting the case for circumnavigation to the general public in the most straight forward simplest terms possible, without all the intellectual complicated language that could distort the simplicity of the argument.

Whoever Sir John was, he seems to have been trying to create a hoax of a traveller that had evidence that it was possible to circumnavigate the world which the general public would pay attention to. But such a message was anti- authority of the Pope in its day, because it went against status quo version of beliefs. So, the author was presumably in fear of that? While the author was engaged in a hoax to get what the author perceived as the truth taken seriously by the general public, someone else seems to have been trying to create other hoaxes. Sir John attracted other people's hoaxes on him?

The inheritance we have received from the Christianisation of the Roman Empire, has meant that certain theories get squashed by the establishment for various political reasons. Certain intellectuals want to believe certain ideas for unknown reasons personal to themselves and take all steps possible in maintaining their ideas as the status quo. Hoaxing and other means, now seem a part of that tradition. If certain evidence comes to light that is too contrary to status quo beliefs, then it is subjected to ridicule and claimed to be a hoax etc. If it survives this ridicule, what can then happen is similar evidence then comes to light, but which turns out to be easily demonstrable as a hoax. The original evidence then gets ' tarred with the same brush' and status quo beliefs are maintained. Are certain people engaging in hoaxing activities to maintain status quo beliefs? Are certain people engaging in hoaxing activity to destroy status quo theories? The answer seems to be that both types of people exist, as well as people who just like to hoax for entertainment purposes of seeing how gullible the general public is.

It leaves historians looking back at the past and squabbling over what is true and what is hoaxes, and placing their interpretations on the past, based on their present day beliefs. And their present day beliefs might themselves be the product of being deceived into believing certain hoaxes. This is the ' sad' history that we have inherited.

Let's look at another question of hoaxing in connection with ' who discovered America.':

22.15 Mounds in America

22.15 Mounds in America

Feder talks about Mounds - earth works found in the Americas. He says that artefacts were found in these mounds in the 19th century by Americans, these artefacts had European alphabetic characters on them, such as Celtic, Greek etc.

He now dismisses all these artefacts as being obviously faked, he does not seem to talk too much of scientific testing on all these objects. He seems to have valid reasons for explaining away why the other 19th century evidence for European mound building is wrong, but he seems to slip in the statement : the artefacts are obviously fakes, because they look like fakes, without describing any testing.

In any case being sceptical, I wonder about ideas like - may be genuine artefacts with European characters were found and then later substituted for fakes. But never mind about that, for now.

Feder after saying the evidence for European mound building is all faked, then explains that the reason there was so much of this archaeological forgery going on in the 19th century. He claims that it was because the forgers wanted American people to believe that they were simply reclaiming their land (America) back from the Indians, who had stolen it, i.e. justifying the bad behaviour of the Americans against the Native Americans. [41]

Feder then tells us - Europeans that we should be ashamed about our behaviour in the way we have so cruelly treated the Native Americans.

I believe Feder when he says that ' we' should be ashamed about what ' we' did to the Native Americans. But he seems to miss the main point: the reason why Americans were treating the Native Americans so badly in the past, was because some one was controlling the majority of peoples' belief systems.

At the time, the Americans thought their actions were justified. And now from our modern perspective, archaeologists such as Feder are telling us that the evidence that these Americans were working to was faked.

This I think is extremely astounding! It means that some unknown group had organized itself to forge evidence so that it could control the majority of peoples' belief system.

Who was this mysterious group of forgers? How many such groups exist? And are they in operation today?

These forgers control our beliefs, or seek to control our beliefs, and through our beliefs then control our actions.

If some genuine phenomenon happens such as say ETI contact, and this group was opposed to having the public believe such a phenomenon. All they have to do is swamp the subject with forgeries of the ' real' thing. Then investigators investigate all of these incidents, find explanations for most of them as hoaxes, leaving a few anomalies that are argued to be forgeries as well. i.e.. hide the truth within blatant lies.

To control our beliefs, seems incredibly easy, if some unknown group has organized itself to that end.

And what do we get from sceptics such as Feder who dismiss what he would think as wild claims of ancient astronauts, we still get a wild claim from him, namely of a conspiracy by something unknown. Both believers and sceptics then have a common ground, they believe in

the cover up. But both groups end up arguing over what is covered up. Why argue over that? It is more vitally important, for both groups to find out who is doing the covering up, because those who do the cover up know the truth that they are hiding.

We cannot solve the UFO mystery, because since early times, some group (or groups) within Europe has taken it upon themselves to hide certain truths from the general public.

They appear to have hidden the knowledge of the Americas from the general public, until Columbus rediscovered it. They have covered up other things.

It gives a whole new meaning to what the Catholic Church were doing when they went to the Americas and started destroying everything they considered pagan. The people doing the destroying were given the belief that what they were doing was right. The unknown group that got the destroyers to believe what they were doing was right, what did they believe? Who were they?

David Hatcher Childress reports a story that the Smithsonian Institute in America, allegedly took a barge of unusual artefacts out into the Atlantic ocean and dumped it. [42] (Childress makes other claims of cover up by the Smithsonian.) I wonder if the people doing the dumping were under the impression that they were dumping archaeological forgeries.

I also wonder if archaeologists like Feder, if told by his mentors 'oh that artefact is a forgery dispose of it,' would then willingly do as told, because they believed what they were doing was right.

Who these forgers in archaeology are, I think is a more important subject to pursue in UFOlogy, than trying to chase after the elusive genuine case that can be 100 per cent proven to be genuine. Catching and cataloguing activities of hoaxers is far easier, and eventually should lead to determining what the hoaxers are trying to divert our attention from learning. Once we acquire an understanding of how to definitively determine if a phenomenon is a hoax, we are then able to look at other possible answers to the UFO mystery. It is only by the elimination of all possible answers bar one, can we know the solution to a mystery.

How successful have hoaxers been in controlling our beliefs in the past? How are they doing it today? What have we been tricked into believing, is really false? And how much of what is true have we been tricked into believing is false?

Hoaxes can be more interesting thing to look at than searching for genuine cases. Once we understand the nature of human hoaxers, we can ask whether there are alien hoaxers. I thought it was supposed to be: you can fool some of the people all the time, all of the people some of the time, but not be able fool all the people all of the time.

It now seems to me that it is possible to fool pretty much all of the people all of the time, because it is being organized. There is a pattern in these non- UFO books of history undergoing many anomalous revisions. (And these anomalous revisions of history seems to ensure that the solution to UFOs remains hidden.)

It also seems that it is easy for this unknown group to make people believe one thing in one century, and change the belief system in the next. It seems that 'they' got the Americans to believe the mounds were built by Europeans in the 19th century, because 'they' wanted the land cleared of Native Americans. Now after having done such evil actions, 'they' want us to feel sorry about what we have done, and change our beliefs again. Somewhere in all of this is hidden the truth of what is really going on, and what is really our true history. History is a lie, it keeps changing as our beliefs are changed by whatever this 'thing' is.

We thus have definitive archaeological evidence for a cover up, both sceptics (like Feder) and believers interpret archaeology in those terms. There is just disagreement over what is covered up. As long as we continue to argue over what is being covered up, and avoid looking for the hoaxers, we leave them to wander freely around and continue their games on us.

I have looked further into the context of hoaxing and forgery in UFOlogy in the present day, and found disturbing signs that there is a large sub culture of people that are bored and like to engage in such activities as entertainment. There is genuine UFO phenomenon occurring, but there is now a large group of people going to the pub, and thinking of playing pranks. UFO investigation has become increasing difficult, and will become more so as this group is growing.

I am becoming more and more discouraged with human nature, because of these pranksters. And if there is an organized group of forgers, then they now have plenty of places to hide behind this ' pub' sub culture.

22.16 Conclusion

History is arbitrarily decided upon by scholars and gets rewritten quite regularly. What was believed in one century gets changed into something else in the next century.

Mandeville has been largely written out of orthodox history, Columbus has been given other reasons for why he took his journey. [43] It has taken a long time for Columbus to get properly written into the orthodox history books. It was not until 1892 that Columbus attained his modern status as a world hero. [44] Columbus's public eclipse for almost 300 years was due to squabbling over money. He died complaining that he was cheated out of his money. People such as the Prinzon brothers came forward who claimed that they deserved the real credit for the discovery of the New World, that Columbus cheated etc. This meant Columbus's heirs were engaged in a lot of legal issues that took a lot of sorting out, so that they could get Columbus's money and proper recognition due to him. [45] Where there is money involved there always seems a lot of squabbling, causing different interpretations of history, creating an atmosphere inviting hoaxes. Around Columbus there seems a great deal of hoaxing. Hunter Davies notes that our view of what happened 500 years ago is different from a view taken 400 years ago, and will be different when we later look back from 600 years. [46]

How many myths are there in the 20th century, that we now need to define differently? There seem hoaxers that create hoaxes that have very important influences on historical events. And other instances of scholars choosing to label certain events as hoaxes, without sufficient justification. The results of squabbling over what is hoax or true, leads to reinterpretation of historical events. It is because of our human nature subverting the truth, that we cannot know the truth, we end up just believing what some authority tells us, or get tricked by some deception, or whatever. We end up most of the time believing in myths, just because we are following whatever everyone else has been tricked into believing.

We are now in the 21st century and the time has started for historians to start squabbling over what were the hoaxes in the 20th century. Was the UFO phenomenon a hoax? Was it someone's attempts to make us believe that we were visited by aliens? Or were we visited by aliens, and someone made hoaxed alien visitations, at the same time ' true' alien visits were happening, so as to divert us away from the truth? It may be that the UFO mystery will continue to be an ongoing anomalous piece of history throughout the 21st century , and may require historians looking back from the 22nd century to make judgements as to what is truth and what is hoax?

The best guess I can find as an answer to how this sorry state of affairs has come about in the Western civilization is the following course of events:

The Roman Empire was ruled by military superiority and allowed freedom of different religious beliefs, so long as they did not interfere with the state.

Christians set themselves as superior to other religions, and were prepared to die for religious beliefs and oppose earthly ruler etc., so were dangerous from that perspective, plus they upset other religions by taking on stance of being superior.

However with the fall of Rome's military might, Rome needed another way to keep control (or rather to try to keep control) and found the way was through religion. Rome seems to have adopted the religion that would best keep people under control. It was then ruling by a beliefs system, and was opposed to belief systems that were different to it, because that was a threat to its authority, thus started religious persecution of non conforming beliefs.

Constantinople was where the Roman Empire moved to for a while, and Constantine incorporated pagan ideas into Christianity, because he saw it as part of his sun god cult.

Intellectuals must have seen through Christianity as presented to the ignorant masses as being very naive. But they were no longer allowed the intellectual freedom in the new Holy Roman Empire that they had once held in the past in the old Roman Empire. Having to obey one belief system became a political issue, because it was through this that control was now being made instead of through military might.

If they wanted to disagree then they risked death, exile etc., and people in general (especially the non intellectuals) were used to just obeying authority's word for it rather than think for themselves, so it was very difficult to persuade ordinary people that they were believing nonsense:

- 1. Ordinary people obeyed their authority without question like they were hypnotised**
- 2. Ordinary people were not used to independently thinking for themselves**
- 3. If intellectuals tried to discuss anything with ordinary people, then they risked being denounced as heretic etc.**

There was no intellectual freedom of pursuing speculative ideas, as had been the tradition from the ancient Greek philosophers.

Maybe such intellectuals were then reduced to hoaxing the authority? Trying to show the common people that events that happened in the world did not conform to the dictated beliefs system from authority?

Those in authority must have realized that there was a subversive element acting against them causing hoaxes. But did not know who these subversives were. So may be this inspired the witch hunts and the like, to get rid of these subversives, it was deemed necessary to deal with people that were thought to be these subversives.

This tradition of hoax by one group and counter hoax by another group, has carried on into the present day world, and we now have UFOs.

People are fighting over belief systems the same way they have always done ever since the formation of Christianity, and probably before that. Hoaxing seems a big part of this continuing fight over beliefs.

I am not saying that Christianity or any religion is bad, or that its the Pope's fault, or any other nonsense like that. The Pope has been subjected to a large number of hoaxes such as the Prester John hoax. He has been a victim of hoaxing like everyone else. When there is authority, there is fighting among people as to having the power of that authority. Hopefully good people are generally more in charge today, than the bad people. But it still remains the same 'old' struggle of good against evil.

Christianity has done good and it has done bad, the same as any religion. On the whole it seems to balance out more in the good than in the bad. But from the roots of this history we have a bad tradition that has been opposed to gaining knowledge. People have been struggling to have their personal beliefs as the mainstream belief system of the masses for political reasons.

It is just unfortunate that Christians have been more gullible than most when Christianity spread in the western world. Forgeries of holy relics and the like were epidemic, and Christians appeared very ready to believe any evidence that supported their beliefs. They were sceptical when evidence did not support their beliefs, but when evidence supported their

beliefs, they were not sceptical and too readily accepted hoaxes.

As a result a lot of our two thousand years worth of historical beliefs are based on hoaxed evidence, where we have often been deceived into believing lies. It took a lot of effort by Galileo and others to break through the lies of Ptomley. Once lies become accepted as the truth, there is a great deal of resistance to having them exposed as lies.

This atmosphere has been against the pure spirit of scientific inquiry. Human nature has added a corrupting effect on science.

In order to solve the UFO mystery, one needs to first know what is the correct science. It is only from knowing the correct science, can one then decide what is possible and what is not possible from theory. I have checked the history behind 20th century science, and found it deeply flawed. A false interpretation of history has been offered as justification for the false science of the 20th century.

I was amazed when I made this discovery, and very upset to find out that what much of what I had believed to that point, was really lies. But looking at the situation in the bigger context of the whole of Western history, the false history of 20th century science fits into a large tradition of this human activity of hoaxing. One likes to think that one lives in an age where things are getting better, but the truth is - the same sort of muddling is going on, the same as it has ever done, just that some people have become more skilled at muddling, making it much harder to 'see through the mess' that they have created. I am disappointed that Galileo and others managed to get through the hoaxed lies of Ptomley, only for all that effort to be undone as science was once again corrupted by human actions in the 20th century.

If the history science was taught correctly, then we could get our science correct. The fictional Sherlock Holmes had some idea that if you eliminated the impossible, then whatever remained was the truth no matter how improbable. Well science is about telling us what is and is not possible. This 'mess' in science is there to prevent us from solving the UFO mystery. If we had the correct science, then we would have the means to find the UFO solution. Only someone has managed to muddy the waters' a great deal with 'red herrings', and not allowed us to start with the correct foundations for a methodology.

In the gossip (non substantiated) rumours there is supposed to be secret UFO bases in places like the remote areas of Brazil. David Hatcher Childress talks of this idea in connection with unorthodox science of Tesla. [47] Unfortunately he talks of many other possibilities, such as time travel. It is the ideas like time travel that act as a type of smoke screen thrown. Without the correct science we do not know if these ideas are more than speculation. i.e. cannot assess their validity. It is this that has prevented us from saying what is possible and what is impossible, thus preventing us from deducing the truth.

There seems a lot of UFO activity in Brazil, that Bob Pratt writes about. [48] People there are being injured and killed by such activity. In countries like America, there are some people that think the UFOonauts are friendly and are here to protect us. But in Brazil, Bob Pratt reports that no one thinks in that way about UFOs. It could be Brazil is a big base for UFO operators, and people there can get too close to finding out the truth and are subsequently dealt with in more harsh terms.

22.17 Further information

Timothy Freke and Peter Gandy's book *The Jesus Mysteries* claims that Jesus Christ was really a pagan cult based on mythology that became transformed into the Christian religion that erroneously took those myths to be real historical events. It seems that peoples' need to believe in a historical Jesus led to hoaxing of evidence to support such a falsehood. It may be that this was when Western civilization decided to adopt the habit of hoaxing so as to try to rewrite history into a form that agrees with whatever beliefs that they wanted to have?

What I particularly agree with Freke and Gandy is their point that whoever wins a conflict then rewrites history to suit their beliefs. This process is happening all the time, and I have found the same thing happening with respect to Einstein. In 1925 he lost an argument with mainstream physicists, and the mainstream physicists then decided to rewrite history etc., to match their erroneous beliefs. Nowadays the inheritors of this tradition will have naturally developed much more sophisticated methods.

There is an interesting book by Michael Baignet and Richard Leigh called *The Inquisition*, that explains the methodology of how this certain group had been able to impose its belief system on a large portion of Western people by the use of fear, terror, torture etc. A sort of prototype Nazi group that was far more successful. Nowadays the inheritors of this tradition will have naturally developed much more sophisticated methods. Dr. Robert Becker, a pioneering researcher, twice nominated for a Nobel prize reports that the conspiracy in science to maintain the scientific dogma of the establishment theories is to ridicule other contenders, withdraw their research funding and flood the media with disinformation whenever there is a threat. [49] I think the great Inquisitor Torquemada would have been pleased with how his craft has been perfected from physical torture into the psychological realm. In a society that has freedom of speech, and certain information is sensitive then disinformation is the most natural weapon for those who have national security issues to consider. If certain information gets too near to being the truth, then the subject under discussion gets flooded with false information to divert attention.

The book *Ancient Inventions* by Peter James and Nick Thorpe, is written by respectable people in archaeology - they attack the ancient astronaut hypothesis, and lay the foundations for a bigger case for the existence of very advanced lost human civilizations. But I think you can protest such a stance too much, and end up with the possibility that humans are alien visitors to this planet. Peter James is a professional writer on ancient history and archaeology. Dr. Nick Thorpe, an archaeologist in prehistory. The blurb says:

"A popular misconception exists that the builders of the pyramids or the cave painters were somehow less intelligent than we are. This simply isn't true: there is no evidence that the human brain has evolved at all in the last fifty thousand years, at least."

On page xvii they talk of a mistaken view of history best described as temporocentrism -the belief that our own time is the most important and represents a "pinnacle" of achievement. The temporocentric view is a hangover from 19th century ideas of progress. The result of a crude version of Darwinian evolution, where there is always progression upwards never backwards. This has led to many misinterpretations of the archaeological evidence for ancient technological and cultural achievements. James and Thorpe talk of archaeological evidence that has been often dismissed as hoaxes, but is really evidence of how clever ancient man was.

Anyway, hoaxing seems to be 'big' business by some one. First these people try to destroy the true account (e.g. Christians destroying the records at the Alexandrian Library), next they try to replace it by a hoax, and finally they pretend that the 'true' history is a hoax, so 'we' end up totally confused about our history. It's like something were trying to 'wipe out our

past', preventing us from learning from our mistakes, so as to force us to make the same mistakes again and again. The history around which the UFO mystery sits seems subject to a very big reassessment at the moment by many people that are studying history. Major new perspectives seem to be on the horizon.

22.8 References

- [1] Ancient Inventions by Peter James and Nick Thorpe, Michael O'Mara books, UK 1995, p 61
- [2] Ancient Inventions by Peter James and Nick Thorpe, p 62 - 63.
- [3] Mathematics in The Western Culture, Morris Kline, Penguin USA original 1953, my copy 1979, p 109 - 110.
- [4] Every now and then you hear something about Romans or whoever having been in America. For instance Daily Mail Feb. 10, 2000 p 25 Did Roman Explorers discover America 1300 years ahead of Christopher Columbus by David Derbyshire: A terracotta head unearthed from a burial site in Mexico was made by a Roman craftsman in 200 AD. The rest is squabbled over, as to how to interpret.
- [5] Maps of the Ancient Sea Kings: evidence of advanced civilization in the Ice Age By Professor Charles Hapgood- subjects Piri Re's map of 1513 to scrutiny. Rejected by academics in its day due to temporocentric prejudices.
- [6] Mathematics in Western culture, Morris Kline, Penguin, USA, 1979, original 1953, p 109 -110.
- [7] Frauds, Myths and Mysteries by Kenneth L Feder, second edition, Mayfield Publishing company, USA, 1990, my copy 1996-very sceptical author, denouncing the ancient astronaut hypothesis, but protests too much. p 74
- [8] *ibid.* p 73
- [9] The Riddle and the Knight: In search of Sir John Mandeville, by Giles Milton, Allison and Busby UK, 1997, p 217.
- [10] *ibid.* p 218.
- [11] *ibid.* p 218
- [12] *ibid.* p 218
- [13] Encyclopedia Britannica vol. 14, USA 1971, p 828.
- [14] Ancient Inventions p 67 - 70
- [15] Britannica vol. 14 p 829.
- [16] Britannica vol. 14 p 829.
- [17] The Book of Hoaxes. Stuart Gordon, Headline UK 1995, p 248 and The Crime of Claudius Ptolemy, Robert Newton, John Hopkins University Press 1977.
- [18] Greek Science in Antiquity, Marshall Clagett, Collier Books NY 1955, my copy 1963, p 102.
- [19] Greek and Roman Technology: a source book by John W Humphrey, John P Oleson, and Andrew N Sherwood, Routledge, London, 1998 p 5 - 7 : Plato, Laws: 3.677a - 679b.
- [20] The Riddle and the Knight - blurb

[21] **ibid. p 3**

[22] **Columbus for gold, God and glory by John Dyson and Peter Christopher, Madison Press, Canada 1991 says: there can be little doubt that Norwegian Vikings ... landed in North America and lived there briefly before being chased off by Indians, at least 5 centuries before Columbus set sail.**

Standard history books sometimes just causally mention that Vikings went to North America, like: History of the World by Plantagenet Somerset Fry, Dorling Kindersley UK 1994, p 126.

[23] **The Hiram Key by Christopher Knight and Robert Lomas, Century UK, 1996 p 79: refer to freemasons in Scotland, and American plant imagery on the Scottish Chapel Rosslyn, put there before Columbus's voyage. May be the information came from Vikings, so that there is no need for some of the elaborate freemasonry ideas that Knight and Lomas weave, or is there?**

[24] **The Riddle and the Knight p 4 - 5**

[25] **ibid. p 6-8, p 43**

[26] **ibid. p 43 - p 44**

[27] **ibid. p 44 and p 49**

[28] **ibid. p 49**

[29] **Encyclopedia Britannica, vol. 14., USA , 1971, p 772.**

[30] **The Riddle and the Knight p 52 -p 53**

[31] **ibid. p 54.**

[32] **ibid. p 82**

[33] **ibid. p 83 - 85**

[34] **ibid. p 123**

[35] **ibid. p 123 - 124, p 126**

[36] **ibid. p 199 - p201.**

[37] **ibid. p 203 - 4.**

[38] **ibid. p 205 - 207**

[39] **ibid. p 210 - 211**

[40] **ibid. p 217 - p 223**

[41] **Frauds, Myths and Mysteries p 135**

[42] **Suppressed Inventions and other discoveries by Jonathan Eisen, Avery publishing group, USA 1999: Archaeological cover ups by David Hatcher Childress p 217**

[43] In Search of Columbus by Hunter Davies, Sinclair Stevenson, UK, 1991, see p 34 - 43 for some of these reasons.

[44] ibid. p 286

[45] ibid. p 281 - 282

[46] ibid. p xi

[47] The Fantastic Inventions of Nikola Tesla by Nikola Tesla, additional material by David Hatcher Childress, Adventures Unlimited, USA, 1993, talks of flying saucer base created in Brazil by Marconi, using Tesla technology.

[48] UFO Danger zone, by Bob Pratt, Horus House Press, USA 1996 - Bob Pratt was a sceptic until he investigated the facts about UFOs.

[49] Cross Currents by Robert O Becker, Jeremy P Tarcher, USA, 1990 p 299- 300.

RJAnderton c.2002

[1] Roger Joseph Boscovich S.J., F.R.S., 1711 - 1787 on the 250th Anniversary of his birth, edited by Lancelot Law Whyte, published by George Allen and Unwin, UK 1961 p 105

[2] ibid p 121-2