

THE PAPPAS-OBOLENSKY AFFAIR

by: HAROLD WILLIS MILNES,
3101 20th Street,
Lubbock, TX 79410.

We have been bombarded for the last several months from all over the world with preprints and reprints of the Pappas-Obolensky paper **Thirty-six Nanoseconds Faster Than Light**. We are grateful to our interested friends who have sent them to us, aware of our pioneering struggles in bringing this easily reproducible superluminary phenomenon to the attention of science. We accept their congratulatory compliments happily that the record has been a success but it comes as no surprise as there have been already, to our awareness, three previous, independent corroborations by others during the more than six years since our original paper appeared in print in **Radio Electronics**. For the record, we also mention that a fourth person whose experimental skills we respect, has also attempted it, but failed, due primarily, we believe, to his employing coaxial cable, a known delay line, as his transmission line in order to control the noise interference which bedevils this type of experiment.

It is certain that Pappas has taken up the axe and dealt a death blow to the relativity baobab tree. The axe has always been there but now it has been wielded. The c-postulate of Einstein-Poincaré has ever been a vulnerable point for relativism and now that even galaxies have been found which exhibit superluminary velocities relative to earthbound observers, one just wonders how the theory of relativity can go on. We must remember, however, that it is all a political matter and that the in-group of science have a considerable investment in publications, in dignities, Einstein chairs and an unwarranted prestige in the academic community, all of which they would have to give up for the cause of truth, which they are unlikely to do. They are not going to lay aside anything for such an ideal, taking the back seat in humiliation, admitting the errors that have been pointed out over and over again to them by the more logically minded and honest. It will be a generation or so yet before the baobab tree finally shrivels up but the tap root is cut, nonetheless. In the meantime it is just being kept alive artificially so that it still looks as if it were green. But it is a cardinal rule of life that time corrects all abuses and the time of the relativistic abuse is come.

We say this, not because of the Pappas publicity campaign but for other reasons we shall discuss a few paragraphs further along. Here, however, we wish to make it clearly understood that we have not been party in any way to what is being put over at present; we do not accord with it in even the slightest degree and are remaining out of communication with Pappas and his cohort of abettors. We do not know Pappas personally, and now do not wish to, despite the support his experiment gives to our own. This is well attested by the fact that the Pappas-Obolensky overt attempt at backdating of their research is an attempt to take from us the credit which is ours. We are the victim of this scam and transparent attempt at piracy. Their claims to priority are unsupported by the factual evidence and that is galling in the extreme to this writer. He is absolutely infuriated on account of it. We have not worked to the limit of our energies so that some Johnny-come-lately may have the credit for it.

In the long run, honesty is the only policy. The outcome of this affair can be nothing but negative, leaving the politicians of the in-group more firmly entrenched than they were before. We could not support what other members of the Dissident group have engineered even if it did not touch us closely. Salesmen are not well known for a devotion to truth. One has stooped to the same methods which the relativists are guilty of: newspaper science, party allegiance, factional adherence to a cause and the exploitation of ignorance. Senior leadership demands impeccable professional integrity and that simply is not the standard indicated here, so there is no real leadership evidenced; and without it what has the Dissident to offer that is better than the status quo? Why be disappointed that the Dissident cannot gain attention and respect for his endeavours or following, or that the senior professionals pay no heed to his efforts? Given the same position of power enjoyed by the CABAL today, that power would be no better used than the CABAL is guilty of; it would be exploited in exactly the same way with no improvement except a change from one bad regime to another like it. This business is chicanery from beginning to end and a taking advantage of ignorance.

This point of ignorance is significant. In this matter of superluminary electromagnetic wave propagation, neither Pappas nor Obolensky or the crew supporting what they are about has any awareness of the early controversy of 1907 involving Sommerfeld, Wien, Voigt, Braun and DesCoudres relating to it. This occurred in the early days of relativism only two years after the 1905 paper of Einstein. The existence of a longitudinal wave moving at infinite velocity had been predicted by Weber already but it was in accordance with his electromagnetic theory. Whether experimental evidence existed then to support this infinite velocity wave is unknown to the writer as the debate seems to have centered around theoretical considerations and much of it to have taken place more behind the scenes than was put into print. It was sparked by W. Wien who pointed out that the so-called anomalous dispersion of light in the spectrum close to an absorption line has a refractive index that is less than unity, implying in turn that the velocity of this light is greater than c . In a paper he presented this fact as an objection to the then novel theory of relativity and as factual counter-evidence to the Einstein-Poincaré hypothesis. We remark here that in 1907, however, instrumentation simply did not exist to make evident the type of superluminary effect in fine wires that is under present discussion. It was probably not until the early 30's that sufficiently fast oscilloscopes were developed to make it apparent, and then only in the better equipped laboratories.

In any event, the new and revolutionary theory of relativity which included the c -hypothesis did not agree with either the infinite velocity wave of Weber or with the anomalous dispersion of light which Wien pointed out as a counter-example. Sommerfeld was astute enough to foresee the ultimate threat this was going to be - and has now become some 80 years later - to the cause of which he was a partisan along with Lorentz, Eddington and other now celebrated names, then busily touting the brave new and revolutionary departure from the old, outmoded, classical concepts. He was politician enough to recognize the danger and to see well enough the axe that threatened the root. Along with Brillouin, therefore, he set about dulling the edge of it and in due course, by 1914, there appeared together two papers, one by Sommerfeld and the other by Brillouin, rationalizing superluminary effects according to relativistic electrodynamics, this in despite of the Einstein-Poincaré hypothesis, now declared to be perfectly in accord with them.

Sommerfeld's paper deals with continuously emitted wave trains and is based on the tenuous hypothesis that it is impossible to identify and track any specific wave in an infinite continuum of waves, which is, of course, buncombe on the face of it but it does, like the wolf's excuse to the spring lamb for eating it, to answer any and all objections. Brillouin's paper deals with the leading edge velocity of electric signals, which is supposed to have the approved c -velocity. The Pappas-Obolensky signal is one of such type and thus does not exist. It is an artifact, even if Pappas and

Obolensky say it is not, whatever that term means to begin with. There are supposed to be things called 'precursors' ahead of the main signal which are voltage changes without any accompanying amperage or energy - nice things if one believes them possible - and although they are there and acknowledged by relativism, predicted and accordant in all possible ways with its version of electromagnetism, they really aren't there after all and are artifacts to be explained away on the basis of phase and group velocities. We hope the reader is clearer in regard to such a bunch of jargon than we are. These papers are sophisticated in every sense of that word; they go on and on for pages and pages of Fourier transforms, mappings about poles, accompanied by a sufficient quantity of mathematical runes to confuse Toth himself. Among mathematicians, there is a standing joke that one can prove anything in a hundred pages; these papers are of that class.

We insert here a pertinent anecdote about the great naturalist, Buffo. Based on the Sommerfeld-Brillouin analysis, in a further hundred pages of analysis of the same sort, Buffo proved conclusively that mammals could not lay eggs, and the multitude of other lesser lights in the field of naturalism applauded roundly the work of the great figurehead of his age. Someone, however, presented Buffo with a duck-billed platypus which was unquestionably a mammal that disconcertingly laid eggs. For a long while, from 1907 to 1914 in fact, Buffo refused to acknowledge the presence of the beast which went on laying eggs in its cage in his mammalium reproducing itself repeatedly thereby. At last there were so many of these creatures around, as many as there are now instances of superluminary phenomena, that the state of affairs demanded that Buffo go back to the drawing board and expand his basic theory of mammals. This he did in still another hundred pages of mathematical runes, thereby proving with equal conclusiveness and learning that duck-billed quacks could lay eggs and suckle young, but it remained true that duck-billed platapi could not. The creature in the mammalium was therefore not a platypus but a quack. The multitudes of other lesser naturalists marvelled once again at the great Buffo, who then published his researches in **Wireless World**, we are given to understand.

The moral of this anecdote was not lost on Sommerfeld and Brillouin who renamed superluminary electromagnetic effects: phase velocity, instead of quack. It is under this title that relativism recognizes their existence and then vaunts not only its awareness of them but is proud that it explains them perfectly and that their non-existence is artifactual.

The rule of relativism is succinctly put by Sommerfeld in his book **Lectures On Theoretical Physics**, that the c-hypothesis applies only to the velocity of matter, the transmission of energy and the conveying of intelligible signals or information. The ignorance of pseudo-relativists is so great that hardly anyone knows this. He places especial emphasis, repeatedly, on his point that an infinite sinusoidal waveform without beginning or end cannot convey a signal. Such a waveform, therefore, is permitted under relativism to have a velocity greater than c. It may then be mixed with other c-velocity waves to form what is called a group velocity of waves and that group velocity may, or may not, thus turn out to have a resulting velocity that is greater than c. Transparently evident?? It does take care of the 'artifactual' nature of signals encountered by this author and Dr. Pappas - at least on paper, that is. It is just quack but the sophism works with weak intellects to cover for any electromagnetic phenomena that might have been, or ever shall be, discovered seemingly at variance with the predicated c-hypothesis, since obviously that hypothesis does not apply to them but only to the c-moving components which therefore move at velocity c, as supposed. Consequently, the discovery of faster-than-c phenomena in radar waveguides is normal and just an evidence of phase velocity- more cheers for relativity! This superluminary effect in fine wires, then, is merely another evidence of phase velocity. So be it; a duck by any other name would quack just as sweetly. It is all perfectly regular, acknowledged, to be expected, unsurprising and entirely covered by sophisticated quack. Pappas simply has not done his homework not to know all about this, and thus has run off to the London meeting displaying his ignorance in the

belief that he has discovered something new and an evidence counter to relativity. His ignorance comes as no surprise for the self-conceit of the average Dissident is such that he believes that he knows everything without having to study what has gone before him. What is more surprising is the universal ignorance among the rank and file of aetherist attendees of the London conference who could be 'wowed', lacking proper awareness of the limitations of the c-hypothesis of relativity.

Stratton says of the Sommerfeld-Brillouin analysis:

There is no lack of examples to show that u may exceed the velocity c . Since at one time it was generally believed that the group velocity was necessarily equivalent to the velocity of energy propagation, examples of this sort were proposed in the first years following Einstein's publication of the special theory of relativity as definite contradictions to the postulate that a signal can never be transmitted with a velocity greater than c .

He adds:

The objection was answered and the entire problem clarified in 1914 by a beautiful investigation conducted by Sommerfeld and Brillouin, which may still be read with profit. ...

which may explain why Stratton has inverted the terms 'phase velocity' and 'group velocity' throughout his textbook synopsis of the papers mentioned. The papers are really a perfect slough, a veritable pig wallow of turbid and murky in clarity, ill founded to begin with and illogically argued throughout but quite sufficient for sophists to wave hands towards declaring it a beautiful investigation and that all is elucidated. It is only the stupidity of the reader that fails to follow the beauty of the investigation. Nonetheless, despite this, Stratton's discussion remains the best in the area of textbook coverage and it has been reprinted elsewhere in this writer's work already. There is also a brief paragraph or so devoted to the topic in Feynman's introductory classroom textbook on physics.

Ignoring this so-called theoretical justification as so much quack, what we have learned is that phenomena involving velocities of electromagnetic waves are known, so that if Pappas and Obolensky had ever researched their topic adequately they would not have become excited and neither would Aspden have made an ass of himself helping them with newspaper and television publicity, etc., relating to things of which he has evidently no awareness whatever. Had there not been total ignorance among the participants of the London conference, Pappas could not have got away with it and the meeting could not have been 'wowed' and should not have been. We also learn from Sommerfeld that the c-hypothesis definitely does apply to all information carrying signals, such as Morse code telegraph signals:

The Morse signals used in wireless telegraphu are interrupted wave trains. So far, our considerations in no way imply that the front of such a Morse signal propagates with phase velocity u .

* * *

Thus u would be a velocity greater than that of light which cannot exist according to the theory of relativity. [The emphasis is Sommerfeld's].

This author has had no difficulty whatever in transmitting Morse code signals using this superluminary effect, as has been reported elsewhere in this Journal years ago. Anyone can do it who wishes to follow instructions and there is no doubt that the Pappas-Obolensky apparatus can be employed to do the same. In fact, we do not doubt that after reading this remark we shall have another claim to priority in having done so, appropriately backdated. Sommerfeld's analysis is more than tenuous, it is erroneous.

Whence comes so much ignorance and the unawareness of the true basis of relativism? We may blame the CABAL for this and they are about to fall as a result of their own duplicity - which is only just in the long run. Though explained away somehow, it is well understood by the politicians of the relativistic clique that the axe remains close to the root and is still a real danger to it. Superluminary phenomena exist and they cannot be done away with as they are Nature's way. The only thing to be done to save the baobab is to direct attention to other matters. Hopefully, no one will use the axe, then. Consequently, the policy has been to deemphasize their existence, leaving new generations in total ignorance of the facts so recent scientific textbooks and literature do not contain an adequate discussion of these phenomena, as the inparty would be overthrown. It is almost impossible to find so much as a reference to these phenomena today. A paper submitted to a CABAL dominated publication gets the treatment such as every Dissident has had experience with:- the editor immediately drops it into a file along with several inches of other similar papers being currently similarly handled, does not so much as send it on to a referee, waits six months so as to discourage the writer of it, and then returns it to him without a comment. The relativistic editor then asserts that Einstein's doctrine is now so universally accepted that no referee can be found who will even look at the paper. The stories we get here at this press are so uniform in this repetitious complaint of the free thinking Dissident that they are simply monotonous now and have become tedious, so that we can only reply to them any longer with a shrug and the remark: So what's new? In other words, the scientific press is censored by the CABAL completely on this menacing topic and an entire generation has been brainwashed by ignorance. In the meantime, bushels of worthless commentaries on what is and what is not relativistic hogwash come into print every year advertising the c-hypothesis as dogma. Such pot-boilers line the shelves of libraries, ill written, on cheap paper and scientifically humbug even in respect to what relativistic theory is. Then the papers and pulps find they can sell copies with a picture of Einstein standing in front of a blackboard, his hair en aureole, writing $c = \text{Const.}$, or preferably $E = mc^2$. This has nothing to do with scholarly awareness. Now television scenarios are the rage as movie producers and actors wow the public with the Bobbsey twins launched into space at some velocity close to the miraculous speed of light, one returning with a long beard, the very image of the expiring old year; while his brother, launched in the opposite direction, returns in diapers, the very image of the happy new year. All this to the dismay of their stay-at-home girl friends who take bubble baths in one's living room to get over their disappointment at the turn of scientific events. To such has science degenerated; unless there is a sales pitch accompanying a new discovery no one is 'wowed' enough to pay attention to it.

Still following this theme of ignorance, an instance of how great it is may be given. After coming on this superluminary effect many years ago - we reserve the equal right to backdate our unpublished investigations of it even further than Pappas and Obolensky - we discovered about eight different instances of it before being bold enough to circulate a preprint rather widely to about 200 senior individuals worldwide, particularly to many leading persons in the field of electrical engineering. We add here that both Dr. Wesley and Dr. Marinov were included in the number. This is frequently done if something may be open to criticism, as this was. When the private replies come back, one is made aware of shortcomings in what he has done and can correct them or withdraw the paper, forestalling worse, after it would appear in print. Of this original 200, only one man, and he a famous scientist, was aware of what we have been writing in the previous several paragraphs. Many of the original group sent the preprint on to other friends, say another 200 individuals, and secondary comment came in, with two more knowledgeable and informed, top-flight electrical engineers being turned up. In respect to the article which was later published in **Radio Electronics** magazine which circulates to perhaps millions, not a single person has so far communicated with us or the editor of the magazine who knows about the Sommerfeld-Brillouin analysis relating to phase velocities. We remark that the censorship by the CABAL is even more effective than that exercised by the worst of

totalitarian states where the freedom of the press is non-existent. The replies generally ranged from a reasonable skepticism, to eyebrow lifting, up to rude abusiveness. Most amusing of all were the Sir Galahads in shining armour who jumped to Dr. Einstein's defense, armed with sword and spittle; whom the latter really might have done without, seeing that relativism incorporates the business into itself and that their attacks were being made, unknown to themselves, against him.

Especially rude was Wesley; so much so that we found ourselves compelled to pin his ears back for him. He had an all but irrelevant objection that was based on impedance mismatch, which is something one might be expected to have looked into right after checking that there was no shortcircuit in the line. We hope he is now taking the question up with equal impudence with his close friend and associate, Dr. Pappas, as well as Mr. Obolensky, and will continue to irritate them instead of us.

The friendship and alliance between Wesley, Marinov and Pappas is well known, so that it is hard to believe that our work was not discussed between them and came to Dr. Pappas' ... *attention after writing this report.* Were the last really the case, an ethical scholar simply rewrites his first paragraph, anyway, acknowledging all prior endeavour and giving an historical purview of the area of research he is engaged in, and then points out what is new of his own and whether it agrees or disagrees with what has already been done in the field. It is even more difficult not to believe Pappas a liar, as he wrote to us in the early winter of 1987 asking for reprints of our publications on this subject, four of which we sent to him, holding a fifth in reserve. There are no traces of that fifth paper in the Pappas-Obolensky report.

In the matter of the ... *Obolensky electrical circuit arrangement which, in its various versions, has been around since 1977,* it is identical in principle with a circuit developed by us in 1984 and published in January 1985, the report of which was included in the group of papers sent to Pappas. It is unknown to him and to Obolensky that the Association for Pushing Gravitational Research offered that paper its yearly prize, an honor we respectfully declined as one does not accept an honor for something equivalent to a door bell circuit. The analysis accompanying it does have some merit but is a nothing for a mathematician. What is significant and realized by the A.P.G.R. is that the circuit establishes simultaneity at two different places up to three significant digits electronically and that with proof and also within the domain of what relativism otherwise accepts. It thereby obviates the relativity of simultaneity and presents a self-contradictory condition in the latter theory.

In a letter to Mr. Obolensky, we have challenged the existence of any confirming evidence for the backdated claims. This has elicited a verbal response by telephone from New York by someone purporting to be Mr. Obolensky's attorney. We were assured by that individual that a corroboration would be sent immediately. That is now a month ago; none has been forthcoming and we are not holding our breath for any. On close examination of the reference:

These experiments have been conducted since 1977. Similar observations and reports have been made on several occasions by Obolensky¹⁾.

we observe that the reference ¹⁾ is to untitled talks or papers presented no earlier than 1986 and 1988. It would be very interesting to know to what subject they relate and whether they are but verbal communications. But even these reports are not forthcoming. In other words, the vaunted claims are unsubstantiated by anything of archival record, which Mr. Obolensky's friend or attorney admitted to be the case.

We have in this affair the most overt and despicable case of outright plagiarism attempted in the last 300 years. It is a shameful departure from standards of both personal and professional ethics. What is worst about it is that it has been wrought internally to the Dissident group and the Establishment will have a field day out of it, neglecting entirely any impact which the scientific corroboration might have had on the falsehoods of relativistic theories. Dr. Einstein must be rolling in laughter

in his grave and the Establishment amused with these antics, funnier than those of a chimpanzee soused in molasses. It has only to continue to ignore the existence of the Dissident endeavour and it will fall apart by itself due to the perfidy of its own members. This affair has wrought a havoc that is possibly irremediable.

Other members of the Dissident group, supporters of this publication, have repeatedly advised us to refuse the contributions to it from the crew of swabs who are involved in this affair. We have been reluctant to do so in the past, as this publication is dedicated to freedom of the scientific press that is so tightly under the present control of the CABAL anywhere else. Perhaps we should listen, but principle must come before personal interest.

The attempt at plagiarism has been set aside and passed over with little or no heed paid to it, as if it were to be expected, normal, par for the course and as usual as the daily rising of the Sun. This is even more amazing. If that be the opinion, then standards of ethics among the Dissidents generally, need a tightening up. A man tolerates in another what is concordant and acceptable to himself. Little wonder is it that the senior professional class wants nothing to do with us, if this is the case. There are thousands of ambitious and unscrupulous third-rate mentalities among the rank and file of the Establishment whose manners and ethics are not to be emulated. They seek unearned reputations and glory in the eyes of their contemporaries. They count for nothing, and while they spend time engaging in political manoeuvring rather than developing real ability, there is no time left to them for the mental development that, in the long run, is what earns general respect. When it is all done, where are they? These men strut for a bit as chairpersons before large groups at meetings, try to look important on the podium before an even lower level of common hoipolloi intellects. There were as many such in the last generation in any discipline one wishes to name, and there will be as many such in the next. When dead for a week, who can remember who they were? Is this the level to which the Dissident contributors to this publication wish to achieve, in emulation of a class of non-descriptors? Better to do one thing of lasting merit than a pile of trash hidden under a covering of cheap tinsel. Theories of gravitation, of electricity, of atomic structure and the cosmos, etc., are being advanced here one after another, displaying not only imagination but even genius in many instances. To these one would wish attention to be given, but not enough attention is paid by the creators of them to what has gone before, in researching the real facts that are involved, as well as to get those theories into a reasonable and properly developed state based on sound premise. Fast answers are taking the place of correction and amendment to meet serious objections. This is sophistry and even chicanery. We are just wasting our time providing a medium for publication and we might better not continue to do the colossal amount of work involved in it, if this sort of thing continues and the level of scientific endeavour as well as ethical standards is not brought up to snuff.

There is a saying that one can put his hands right up to the wrists in a pail of water and make as much commotion as one will and two minutes afterwards there is no trace left of it all. At the expense of bombing an ally, the loss of personal integrity, creating a deep schism in the meagre ranks of the Dissident free thinkers, the loss of all friends in that group, the winning of none with the Establishment, a lifetime of stigma as pirates, and the mistrust by anyone acquainted with this affair, what has been gained? Merely some playing before a brief audience of the ignorant while decked out like a crow in another bird's feathers. It is but a short two months after it and the effect on the political scene of science is not only contained but already forgotten. It has made about as much dent as beating on a rubber anvil with a wet noodle. The waters are closed up, despite all the splash and the status quo is as placid as if nothing had ever occurred.

Yet it was said at the outset that the time of relativity is come. There is today a need for ever faster means of communication. Such a need did not exist in 1914 and therefore Sommerfeld could get away with a pulling of the wool over the eyes of the scientific sheep. Relativity could survive relying on the propagation of ignorance to keep the axe from the root. However, the situation has now

changed. Computers are at about the limit of their speed within the range of present technology. Only a new breakthrough will permit a significant further new development. The possibility of such a breakthrough has presented itself, although it still needs much basic researching. This Pappas and Obolensky might provide now that they are thoroughly assured that this effect is actual. It can be harnessed - regardless of Einstein's and Poincaré's prohibitions of it. Silvertooth has now evidenced some interest that did not exist before. The moment he, too, has become convinced of the potential in this electrical property he will join the excited few, in at the ground level. There is much to be done at that level: for instance, the phenomenon has only been tested so far in transmission lines of at most 600 m length. Does it exist in long lines that might extend across a continent? If so, the instantaneous communication of information is possible, which will undoubtedly have some commercial application of need. For the moment, there is a reason for research grants and funding. In the other direction, some manner of means has to be found to shorten the wire length, eliminating the c-effect and making the p-effect entirely dominant. Pappas has suggested that this phenomenon is associated with surface charges and that was our own conclusion after not-inconsiderable experience with it, but it remains an unproven conjecture. This needs investigating. Then there are legions of applications, all of them money earners. What is needed is a Thomas A. Edison with the inventive genius he applied to develop patentable electric devices. We shall stand by and see what real talents these men actually have; so far all they have done is nothing more than an imitative redo. If they are any good, by now they ought to have at least 300 contract proposals in the mill, if not 3000, all the way from the Athens dogcatchers to the atomic energy commission of Iraq. Some of these they will get and then all that is required of them is to perform. There are ultra-billions in funding to be gained out of this, enough to support not only an institute at the University of Athens, but the school itself, if not a major contribution to the Greek economy. It was all deliberately put into the public domain by myself many years ago and anyone else with enough initiative can go in too and cut himself a share of the pie.

We hope someone will and will make a billion out of it for himself. When he has, one can believe the rush of the standbacks who presently smirk in their confidence in Einstein, Poincaré and Sommerfeld and their own ignorance, will occur, leaving the baobab tree to wither as it ought to have long since. Then, and not until then, when the overpowering force of human greed takes over, will the relativistic CABAL lose control and that regime be recorded in the history of science as the worst nightmare that has ever been experienced since the Middle Ages.