

## **Incompetent Science: Part One**

(Updated July 2009)

Carel van der Togt

[carelvandertogt@gmail.com](mailto:carelvandertogt@gmail.com)

In 1905 Einstein published his first paper on Special Relativity Theory (SRT). While not the most obvious solution, it became the most acceptable in view of the scientific assumption that space was absolutely empty.

Had this not been the case, the theory would not have been conceived, since the idea of the relativity of time and space with all-prevailing ether would be ridiculous. The famous Michelson and Morley experiment precluded the possibility of absolute ether. The other possibility considered, the *dragged ether*, was discounted because of an inability to imagine how it could explain stellar aberration. Yet after 100 years SRT provides no more than a possible explanation. Scientists are still unable to explain the observed stellar aberration of any star for any time of the year.

The prevailing philosophy of *positivism* allowed science to accept SRT but only under the presumption of an absolutely empty space. *Positivism* occurs however simultaneously with *negativism*; any legitimate argument not consistent with SRT is claimed to be bogus without justification. Scientists who purposely ignore the serious omissions of the past practice *incompetent science*.

The article [Stellar Aberration and the Unjustified Denial of Ether](#) (Galilean Electrodynamics **16**, 75-77 July/August 2005) proves without any doubt that dragged ether is completely consistent with stellar aberration and the Doppler-effect. It is therefore a far more acceptable explanation than that provided by SRT and is not plagued by the inconsistencies inherent in that theory.

In spite of all this, the paper has been completely ignored since 1998 and publication by journals has been refused under the pretext it being not topical; **not relevant**.

***How could it ever be possible that an omission that shaped physical science so profoundly would be not topical?***

***Comment added November 2007: the falsification of SRT***

*The above mentioned article was written for publication in a physic journal. Out of respect for theoretical physicists the theoretical consequences of this article were not stated. However since it is clear, after 9 years, theoretical physicists are unwilling to address the omission I now explicitly mention the arguments as non-expert readers cannot be expected to deduct these conclusions by themselves.*

*Since Bradley measured stellar aberration in 1727 scientists were looking for an explanation. In the 19<sup>th</sup> and the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century scientists looked explicitly for the possibility of dragged ether. They concluded however that dragged ether could not explain the phenomenon “stellar aberration”.*

***How is it possible these scientists weren't able to deduce that dragged ether was completely consistent with stellar aberration as is demonstrated in the above article?***

*It is theoretical possible to imagine two forms of dragged ether; 1) an ether that is dragged by the Earth around the Sun where the ether also drags the light and 2) an ether that is dragged but where the photons are not dragged by the ether.*

*Scientists have only been analyzing the possibility of dragged ether where the light is also dragged. They **did not** consider the possibilities of dragged ether where the light is **not** dragged. This is the reason why science denied dragged ether being a viable explanation for stellar aberration and concluded that ether could not exist.*

*Lorentz deduced his famous Lorentz-transformation for relativistic corrections without a*

*physical explanation. In 1905 Einstein published his first paper concerning SRT; a possible explanation was at hand. After almost 200 years SRT offered science a possible explanation for stellar aberration resp. the Lorentz-contraction. This possibility was embraced,*

**However:**

- 1) *Scientists did not take into consideration the fact that the observed stellar aberration on Earth is dependent on the inclination angle of the star with the plane of the Earth around the Sun. Einstein's SRT can only "explain" the observed stellar aberration of stars with an inclination angle of 90 degrees with the plane of the Earth around the Sun. Stars have observed stellar aberration that is **dependent on the inclination** angle. Explaining stellar aberration of stars, where the inclination angle is relevant, is not possible with SRT, because the inclination angle cannot be introduced or explained with SRT. The relative speed  $V$  is the **only** theoretical explanation SRT offers. Scientists are not able to explain with SRT the dependence on the inclination angle. **This observation by itself is enough to disqualify SRT** as a viable theory for explaining stellar aberration resp. the Lorentz-contraction.*
- 2) *Stellar aberration can, according to the Theory of Relativity, only be dependent on the relative speed  $V$ . So with double stars, where one star orbits another star, the relative speed of the Earth to and from this double star must depend on the combined cycle of the orbit of the Earth around the Sun **and** the orbit of the double star. Therefore the observed stellar aberration, when SRT is a valid theory, **must** be dependent on the combining speed of the Earth circling the Sun **and** the speed of double star circling its companion. **SRT is in basic very simple; the only factor of influence is the relative speed  $V$ .** Astronomers do not measure that the stellar aberration is in any way dependent on the speed of the double star. Only the speed of the Earth around the Sun is of influence. This observation experimental **disqualifies** SRT as a valid theory.*
- 3) *With SRT there are many contradictions. When scientists "explain" even the most simple Twin-contradiction (They call it the Twin-paradox) they induce other contradictions they cannot explain. They are hopelessly lost and because of that they cannot give answers to valid questions. For their own peace of mind they call the contradictions "paradoxes". Their only "defense" is that their explanations are too difficult to understand for laymen. With these arguments Theoretical Physics entered the "Twilight Zone".*

*Science claims there are many more observations that verify SRT. This is not true. All experimental data claiming to verify SRT are indirect observations where the Lorentz-contraction is significant. All these so called other verifying experiments concern observations where SRT is **not contradicted**.*

*SRT has already been disqualified for explaining stellar aberration resp. the Lorentz-contraction. If these indirect observations “verify” SRT, than these observations also “verify” **all other** theories that incorporate the Lorentz-contraction. (Examples of these observations are the correction for global position satellites, all astronomical data, etc)*

*Dragged ether on the other hand predicts exactly the stellar aberration of any star any time. This is **very strong first order experimental data verifying dragged ether**. The observed stellar aberration of any star is in all circumstances exactly matched by the theoretical calculated stellar aberration with dragged ether. SRT doesn't explain stellar aberration and therefore there are no experimental data of the first order that support this theory. All experimental data supposedly verifying SRT are merely **circumstantial**.*

*Scientists embraced SRT because it could “explain” the stellar aberration of stars right angled with the plane of the Earth around the Sun. On the other hand scientists ignored unambiguous experimental data disqualifying SRT.*

*For several years I have been trying to communicate with many expert scientists about these theoretical inconsistencies but no one was willing to discuss them.*

*Expert scientists **know** that SRT is experimental disqualified by these observations, but they do not want to discuss this. Because if they did, they would have to admit they had been wrong for more than 100 years and that is too embarrassing. Scientists prefer to ignore and be dishonest.*

## **Incompetent Science: Part Two**

Before Einstein “discovered” relativity, physical science concluded that the “field momentum” of a moving charge could not explain the mass of the electron (R.P. Feynman, Lectures on Physics Volume II, chapter 28-2 and 28-3). The false assumption that the electromagnetic mass of a charged bulb cannot explain the mass of the electron results in the addition of a “mechanical” mass.

The article [The Equivalence of Kinetic and Magnetic Energy](#) (Galilean Electrodynamics 17, 110-114 November/December 2006) proves that the above mentioned mathematical derivation of the electromagnetic mass is invalid since the *conservation law of energy is violated* when that mass is calculated. This omission casts very serious doubt on *Quantum Mechanics's* treatment of (charged) particles and its ability to “explain” the electron and other particles within electromagnetic theory. Attempts to modify Maxwell’s theory of electrodynamics failed dramatically (R.P. Feynman, Lectures on Physics Volume II, chapter 28-4 and 28-5).

The positivistic attitude of science elevates the empirical science of QM to a theoretical absolute. The empirical mathematical solutions of QM are considered to be the exact truth! Scientists, science journalists, referees and editors are again not prepared to consider the possible consequences of this very early omission that shapes the perspective of QM so dramatically. They reject the above paper on magnetic energy also on the argument that it is not topical; *not relevant*.

*How could an omission that shaped physical science so profoundly ever be not topical?*

*Comment added November 2007: the falsification of QM*

*QM assumes that electrostatic-, electromagnetic- and magnetic fields are conservative. One of the implications of this assumption is that these fields must be radial. In the above mentioned article it is proven that this assumption is physically incorrect, because with the premise that the fields are conservative the conservation law of energy is violated. (Section 4. “The Electromagnetic Mass”).*

*When J.J. Thomson (1881) derived that the EM-theory could not explain the electromagnetic mass of an electron, during which he brutally violated the energy conservation law, no one questioned the correctness of his conclusions. His false analysis was completely copied by QM and serves them as **proof** that the EM-theory is inadequate to describe elementary particles. Feynman copied Thomson’s mistake in his Lectures on Physics to which article I refer above.*

*Why did QM-physicists never question Thomson’s fundamental false derivation?*

*The answer to this question is to my knowledge the relentless faith of physicists in Maxwell’s*

equations.

Maxwell's equations describe the **assumed** interrelationship between the electric field, the magnetic field, electric charge and electric current. Although Maxwell's equations are mathematically correct, apparently no physicist ever verified whether these equations are also valid in physical sense!

**The consequence of the energy conservation violation is that QM assumes fundamentally false EM-properties for all elementary particles.**

All formulas/equations of QM/QED/QCD are based on the assumption that these fields are conservative. When it is proven that this assumption or premise is false **all** formulas/equations of QM/QED/QCD lose their **theoretical** significance, because **all** the derived particle formulas of QM/QED/QCD are physically **impossible**. The derived QM-particles equations only possess mathematical/experimental significance. The QM-particles cannot exist in reality because their assumed physical properties violate the most important physics law: the energy conservation law.

QM states that it is the most successful science ever. **The empirical/mathematical significance of QM is undisputable.** An empirical/mathematical derived formula that describes a particle doesn't imply that the equation is correct in physical sense. It is proven in the above mentioned article that the mathematical presentations of the QM-formulas are physically false.

The consequence of this article for QM is that QM-scientists are not allowed to deduce theoretical conclusions based on these formulas. To be able to deduct valid theoretical conclusions the formulas **must also** be valid in physical sense.

The above mentioned "radial" aspect of the electromagnetic field is just one of the physical entities "fields" **must** possess to qualify to be "conservative". Further analysis of this violation of the energy conservation law by QM demonstrates that the Maxwell equations are physically incorrect. **The theoretical basis for QM/QED/QCD collapses entirely.**

Scientists cannot believe that QM is invalid. They argue that it would otherwise be

*impossible to derive such cunning formulas. They say the experimental proof of QM overrules the theoretical flaws! For a theoretical science the fundamental laws **must always be the basics**. A science degrades to a pseudo-science when basic theoretical fundamentals are ignored.*

*The reason why QM is empirical so successful is that thousands of scientists search every day for many years for formulas that fit the experiments. Statistically stunning formulas **have to be found**. Statistical “Luck” is the basis for QM’s experimental success; not theoretical insight. Claiming QM is a theoretical science degrades it to pseudo-science.*

*I tried to communicate with many expert scientists about these theoretical inconsistencies but no one was willing to discuss them.*

*Expert scientists **know** that QM is **theoretically disqualified** and that the famous **Standard Model** is merely **fictional science**. They do not want to discuss this because then they have to admit they have been wrong for more than 100 years, and that is too embarrassing.*

*Expert scientists prefer to ignore and to be dishonest.*

*For those who want to verify that the QM-derivation of the electromagnetic mass is fundamentally false:*

**Electromagnetic Mass** *Lectures on Physics Volume II*, Feynman

Chapter 28-1 <http://www.paradox-paradigm.nl/feynman28.1.bmp>

Chapter 28-2 <http://www.paradox-paradigm.nl/feynman28.2.bmp>

Chapter 28-3 <http://www.paradox-paradigm.nl/feynman28.3.bmp>

Chapter 28-3 <http://www.paradox-paradigm.nl/feynman28.4.bmp>

# Incompetent Science: *Part Three*

The physical perspectives of SRT and QM are seriously flawed because of these omissions. Although omissions are a common occurrence in all fields, deliberately ignoring them when discovered is **unacceptable**.

Attempts at publication, or even evaluation of the papers since 1998 have proven to be fruitless. It is clear that no valid arguments have been raised against them, but it appears impossible to have them published. They are dismissed for reasons that have nothing to do with science. The most prevalent argument (implicit or otherwise) is that theories already exist which provide “perfect” solutions for everything and there is no need to look for alternatives. ***Scientists are afraid to discuss these topics.*** Science has taken on the infallibility of religion and because of that scientists believe they are not accountable anymore. Only faith and obedience are required to practice physical science nowadays.

Technical progress over the last 100 years has been enormous. The mathematical solutions are stunning. The omissions however, distort the theoretical perspectives in such a way that the ***imagined*** physical process of nuclear fusion is seriously flawed. Scientists consider this to be impossible because the mathematics of QM accurately describe reality. In their “infallibility” physicists forget that there are in principle, infinite mathematical solutions for any observed data. ***Are the infinite solutions all absolute correct?*** A mathematical correct solution does not necessarily apply to a physical process, to think it does is a mistake, and to think the preferred mathematical solution describes the exact physical process is ***incompetent science***; *especially when these “absolute correct physical equations” already contain at least two very serious fundamental omissions.*

After 6 years being denied answers on legitimate questions I have no choice than to address science disrespectfully, because it is possible that science through ignorance, incompetence and arrogance withholds society of nuclear fusion as a viable alternative.

The present perspective is a world where the ***scientific reality*** is even more fantastic than any known fairytale. Science proclaims the reality of relativity of time and space, unimaginable paradoxes to be true, parallel worlds to exist and more. If the omissions are addressed all this fictional “science” will disappear.



The arguments of physics journals not to publish the mentioned articles on basis of not being *actual*, prompted me to look for the link between traditional physics and QM. The paper "[Quantum Mechanics and the Ether: The Derivation of Planck's constant](#)", to be published in Galilean Electrodynamics (GED) in 2009, is the result. The previous papers are an integral part of this. GED is a so called dissident physics journal and is completely ignored by mainstream scientists.

Again this paper was rejected by all other journals on basis of not being *actual*. This prompted me to add this chapter concerning incompetence to the website.

### *Comment added November 2007:*

*The empirical significance of the QM-formulas is undisputable. The flaw of QM is that this science is theoretically incorrect, and that is also the reason why QM cannot explain sub-atomic physics with traditional physical concepts. The argument of scientists concerning this observation is that the sub-atomic (QM) physical reality obeys different physic laws not observable in our macro-world and therefore cannot be explained with traditional physics. This **can be** a valid argument but is not necessarily true.*

*The theoretical conclusions of QM are based on the physical entities of the derived particle formulas. The presumed physical entities of the QM-particles are false and therefore the theoretical conclusions based on this are too. Because the QM-formulas are based on invalid premises QM was directed on a false theoretical path. Science concludes incorrectly that traditional physics cannot explain sub-atomic physics.*

*The above mentioned article explains sub-atomic physics with traditional physical concepts. The derived sub-atomic physical processes are **completely consistent with the experimental/mathematical findings of QM**. The physical approach in the article uses valid traditional theoretical explanations for sub-atomic observations. This approach offers the **unique** possibility to eliminate the natural constant of Planck ( $h$ ), explain the Fine Structure Constant and the observed energy quantification of atoms with old fashioned physics.*

*Theoretical physics, with RT and QM as "theories", ends up with a physical "reality" of relativity of time and space, 7 to 12 (!) dimensions, parallel worlds, unexplainable contradictions etc.*

*Dragged ether theory on the other hand doesn't imply any discrepancies, needs only 3 dimensions and eliminates the natural constant of Planck ( $h$ ).*

*Which theory is favored by Occam's razor?*

*When science journals would publish this article they would have to recognize that subatomic physics can be explained with traditional physical concepts. Furthermore they have to discuss the previous mentioned fundamental omissions. This appears to be impossible.*

*Expert scientists therefore prefer to ignore and be dishonest.*

In the past 10 years I have sent many thousands of letters and emails to scientists, science journalists, editors etc to consider the possible unjust denial of ether. Theoretical evidence disqualifying Quantum Mechanics (QM) is however denied without any comment.

When Theoretical Physics ignores theoretical evidence the integrity of that science has been lost. When a Science discipline is corrupted correction of omissions has become impossible.

Nuclear fusion, a clean and abundant source of energy, is in the 21<sup>st</sup> century desperately needed for liable environmental, economic and social developments in the near and distant future. The corrupted state of the science Theoretical Physics makes it impossible to investigate the scientific possibilities ether physics offers to achieve nuclear fusion as an alternative energy source.

A [Fundamental Physic Experiment](#) should be performed. The performance of this experiment is out of my reach. I hope some experimental physicists can realize this experiment and will be able to publish the results.

Physics journals and science journalists have a social task and obligation to inform about developments in their respective fields. It is my opinion that they do not live up to their professional and moral duty when they arbitrarily ignore articles without giving valid

arguments. An editor cannot hide behind the anonymous referee, when that referee's arguments are bogus. Their arguments to refuse publication of articles that reveal serious omissions, on the basis of being *not topical* or *not relevant* must be considered *incompetent science* and for that I "honor" these institutions and editors with their own place of *incompetence* on this website.

The correspondence with physics journals is available for everyone who wants to know:

***De Volkskrant*** en de incompetente chef wetenschappelijke redactie ***Martijn van Calmthout*** [1](#)

The incompetence of ***Physics Letters A*** (editor Prof. Dr. Burkhard Fricke) a **Reed Elsevier** publication [5](#)

The institutionalized incompetence of ***American Physical Society (APS)*** and ***Physical Review A*** [6](#)

Volunteered Incompetence of ***Prof. J. F. Nye F. R. S.*** (H. H. Wills Physics Laboratory) concerning **Planck's constant** [7](#)

Convenience or Incompetence? ***Society for Scientific Exploration (SSE)/Journal for Scientific Exploration (JSE)*** [8](#)

*Monkey Business: Solid State Communications* a **Reed Elsevier** publication [9](#)

**24HOUR Service: European Physical Journal D** Prof. Dr. Jean-Michel Raimond [10](#)

**Het Standaard Model : wetenschap of fictie.** Prof. Dr. Saris decaan **W&N Universiteit Leiden** [11](#)