

The quest for truth in science by the unified dissenting scientists

Thierry De Mees

How can we define whether a work is scientific or pseudo-scientific? Is it the "scientific method" and the content compatible with the mainstream only? Can we find in the "large" journals works that follow the "scientific method" but are nevertheless based on random truths or not directly verified? Can we find studies that completely deny experiences? That distort experiences and conclusions? Who are biased without evidence? Who claim issues that have not been proven? Who makes the *ad hoc* liaison without direct verification?

Imagine that there is a united people of impostors who have infiltrated all our political, scientific and media institutions little by little over the centuries, passing to each other the important positions by mutually supporting and protecting, and who have no ethical intentions, except cunning and lies, in order to conquer power from within, to subvert our institutions and our education, and then to overtake absolute power from us, which they see as cattle, as described by Plato in his *"Politeia Constitution"*, translated as: *"The Republic"*?

If the case were to arise, would we know? Wouldn't it be perfectly masked and invisible? Wouldn't that people, when persecuted once, try to obtain reparation and disguise themselves among the people again, faking to be clean, but without however putting aside the evil principles of their elder scholars, and infiltrate again with the same objectives?

Perhaps we can discover the truth with a broader analysis?

Could it be that the judicious placement of a few tiny lies has a disastrous consequence on humanity's scientific research?

Wouldn't we experience blatant stagnation for generations in some key areas of space exploration?

Let us turn to the details: how is it that the speed of light was declared constant, when the measurements, after the request of the French Institute of Norms and Standards, resulted in differences, having margins of measurement error that were finer than the differences between the measurements of the reciprocal laboratories? How is it that Princeton's tests with cesium vapor, allowing much faster light speeds, have never been published?

How is it that the limited theory of relativity resulted in the assumption of a speed-dependent inertial mass, while Louis de Broglie, in his book *"La Physique Nouvelle et les Quanta"*, in 1937, states that with Einstein's consent, these are only *apparent* effects between moving systems, which by the way explains the presence of the transverse and longitudinal masses?

How is it that nevertheless, Planck's equation, which contain an alleged increase of inertial mass due to velocity, without the least of a proof, was pushed to "explain" the effects of linear accelerators, and Kaufmann's experience?

Why is it that the general theory of relativity has multiple contradictory metrics that have yet to accept presumed dark matter in order to "explain" stable disc galaxies?

How is it that Maxwell, Liénard and Wiechert's theories have been modified into Lorentz-invariable versions, and that (as a result) the theory of retardation of the propagation of Liénard and Wiechert

fields is rejected on the basis of a so-called failure to respect the principle of energy conservation?

How is it that CERN engineers complain that nothing in the theory is in line with what they discover?

On what basis can we say that LIGO detected gravitational waves, when it could be an earth tremor, linked ad hoc to a flash in the right direction in the universe, (a universe with a visibility depth of 13.5 billion light years), and whose distance is not known, nor verifiable, and the flash content is not known?

How is it that one claims that the universe is expanding, started from a big bang only 13,8 billion years ago, while nevertheless the alleged "dark energy" is needed and the alleged "expanding of space itself" in order to maintain that theory alive?

How is it that the Gravity Probe B experiment, which clearly defeats General Relativity for linearly moving masses, and imposes the existence of a gravitational induction, is widely disregarded?

How come we only invest in big and expensive experiments that allegedly prove "*Einstein was right*", and which drains the whole budget of much more interesting experiments, all with taxpayers' money?

Why is every well-meaning dissident gagged by all the renowned Journals?

Is there a way of knowing what theory is true and what is false, except through a deep and more general analysis, leaving many reasonable options open, and by exploring multiple tracks at once?

Dear fellow scientists, don't let you overwhelm by these impostors who will ask you how you could possibly disagree with thousands of -even renowned- scientists, who agree with the mainstream science. They were brainwashed and are controlled, mentally and by the money!

That is why this journal emerged, but why also many other newspapers are emerging, and why they must be protected from the destructive grip of mainstream science in some of its important areas.

But we should also we must bombard the mainstream and say that enough is enough. We must unmask the impostors and claim the right to get progress in science instead of stagnation. We must read again the works of Tesla, Heaviside, the great pre-1905 scientists, and start making our own experiments.

We must try to get grouped in our thoughts, and be guided by experiment.

25 Dec 2018