

**A short version of Santilli's Original appeal
As an introduction to present obscurantism in Science
Edited by the Santilli - Galilei Association.**

**Open appeal
CALL TO CONTAIN ETHICAL DECAY IN PHYSICS**
Posted at <http://home1.gte.net/science2/ir00005.htm>

January 31, 2000

Dear Colleague,
Permit me to express my extreme concern for the current decay of ethics in physics, not only in the so-called "orthodox" physics community, but primarily in the so-called "progressive" physics community, under which conditions there is no window left of a real future for real science. I am here presenting my personal experience, soliciting your view, and suggesting that we unite forces to create at least a core of individual scientists willing to stand for scientific ethics, in which absence any scientific process is merely illusory.

As far as I am concerned, following repetitious denials of corrective actions protracted for years, in a desperate attempt to contain the decay of scientific ethics, I have been forced to file civil legal proceedings, with criminal proceedings under initiations (see <http://home1.gte.net/science2/>). On my part, I admit that such actions can be excessive, perhaps wrong, and ultimately counter-productive. I therefore asks for constructively critical suggestions for alternative ways of containing the decay of scientific ethics, under the clear understanding that such suggestions do not compromise on the central issue, the correction of ethical wrongdoings, because their tolerance would be vulgar complicity.

Let me outline my experience with the use of real names and expressed in my broken, yet plain English. Ethical misconducts in science constitute serious crimes against individuals as well as against society. Therefore, to avoid a vacuous academic talk, ethical misconduct cannot be treated with vague academic parlance.

1. THE ETHICAL DECAY IN THE "PHYSICS ESTABLISHMENT":

I have been prohibited from publishing papers at the APS journals since 1981, despite a documentation of about one hundred submissions, all

rejections made with a reiteration of vacuous sentences, the known technique being that of suppressing unwanted advances by tiring the author.

Similarly, the Italian Physical Society has systematically rejected all my submissions since 1983, all rejections perpetrated with truly incredible "reviews", such as that personally released by Renato Angelo Ricci, President of the SIP, that the "the theories treated are not accepted by Harvard University, your [mine] former affiliation."

The systematic, protracted, all inclusive, and forceful rejections by the British IOP since 1993 have been even more incredible, because perpetrated to such an extreme of offending the memory of distinguished British physicists (such as the rejection of all my papers dedicated to Rutherford's legacy protracted for years).

The rejections of all my submissions by the journals controlled by the Swedish Academy of Sciences are perhaps more unreassuring, because based on excessively transparent manipulations of scientific truths for excessively transparent political gains, as well as denoting the replacement by the Swedish Academy of Sciences of the scientifically oppressive role played by Italy during Galilei's times, a sinister role which delayed the advancement of basic human knowledge for hundred of years. The legitimation of unquestionable scientific corruption by the editors of the above quoted orthodox scientific communities is sealed by the fact that each and every one of over one hundred papers they rejected, was then published, often without any change whatever, by more serious Journals of unimpeachable ethnical standard, such as Foundations of Physics, Foundations of Physics Letters, Mathematical Methods in Applied Sciences, Acta Applicandae Mathematicae, International Journal of Modern Physics, Modern Physics Letters, JINR Rapid Communications, and other distinguished Journals (other than those in which I am an editor).

You should be aware that, by no means, the obstructions I experienced from the organized academic interests were solely restricted to the suppression of publications with vulgarly corrupt "reviews". In fact, the organized scientific crime in orthodox academia has pushed its action to the extreme of suppressing any reference to my publication. The order going on in the corridors of the APS, IOP, SIP and other journals is that any paper merely quoting the name "Santilli" must be rejected.

As one among too many examples, I identified the first known (p, q)-parameter deformations of Lie algebras,

$$(A, B) = pAB - qBA = m(AB - BA) + n(AB + BA),$$

$$A(t) = [\exp(iHqt)]A(0)[\exp(-itpH)],$$

as part of my Ph.D. Thesis, and published it in Nuovo Cimento Vol. 51, page 571, 1967 (which, at that time, was not yet controlled by the scientific

cartel headed by Renato Angelo Ricci). This identification was done some two decades before being "rediscovered" by others, such as by Larry Biedernarn, who was fully aware of my origination (we even applied for a DOE grant together on my deformations!). Yet, Biedernarn elected to suppress the quotation of my prior work in his first paper of 1989 on the particular case of q-deformations because, as he admitted to me under serious duress, of "Cantabridgean pressures."

Ironically, Biedernarn and a river of followers initiated studies in q-deformations precisely at the time, 1989, when I had abandoned them because of catastrophic physical inconsistencies (lack of invariance, thus total lack of any physical value - see below-) as Biedernarn himself admitted to be at the Third Wigner's Meeting in Oxford, again, under duress.

I have accumulated a rather massive documentation on the systematic refusal to merely add my paper of 1967 among the list of quotation in the current sea of publications on deformations, NONE of which quotes my origination. These systematic refusals were perpetrated for about two decades by now, by Roger Newton and his editorial cartel at the Journal of Mathematical Physics, by the notoriously anonymous cartel controlling the British Journal of Physics and the Proceedings of the Royal Society, by Nuovo Cimento, by Nuclear Physics, etc.

A similar rejection for due quotation of my origination of the deformations of Lie's theory has been perpetrated by Howard Georgi (a co-founder of the Hadronic Journal when I was at Harvard University, I thought he was my friend) in his capacity as editor of Physics Letters, thus establishing a serious violation of the Laws at that particular journal.

Additional repeated rejections of my origination of the isotopies of Lie theory,

$$[A, ^B] = ATB - BTA,$$

$$A(t) = [\exp(iXTt)]A(0)[\exp(-itTX)],$$

(see my Found. of Theor. Mechanics with Springer-Verlag, 1983, and Elements of Hadronic Mechanics, Ukraine Academy of Sciences, 1993, and a subsequent vast literature in the field by others) have been perpetrated by Arthur Jaffe, also of Harvard University, this time in his capacity as President of the AMS, as well as editor of Letters in Mathematical Physics, the latter journal refusing the publication of a paper identifying the proper paternity of the isothory by one of my associates after its admission of being "correct" (see for details Algebras, Groups and geometries Vol. 15, p. 497, 1998).

Vulgar plagiarisms of my broader Lie-admissible theory,

$$(A, B) = ARB - BSA = (AMB - BMA) + (ANB + BNA),$$

$$A(t) = [\exp(iXSt)]A(0)[A(-itRX)],$$

and related formulations (see the latest paper at Found. Phys. Vol. 27, page 1159, 1997) are just too many for comfort, the more organized being those by fellow Italian colleagues, e.g., at the Universities of Turin, Milan and Florence.

At this point what shall I do just to have my prior references merely quoted? Please let me know your suggestions. Over a span now surpassing twenty years of efforts, I have tried everything I could for the implementation of at least minimal conditions of decency, let alone minimal scientific process, and failed without any hope of self-corrections by the organized academic greed. Therefore, my only possibility left is to file lawsuits in civil and criminal courts. After all, my attorneys tell me that "the available documentation [now stored in a safe place in Europe] is worth millions of dollars." Do you have any alternative which does not compromise on the substantive issue: quotation of origination papers in a list with any desired other paper, quotation to be evidently done in chronological order?

I have been the victim of numerous additional incredible violations of the Law, such as blatant discriminations under public financial support. Do you want just one example? Mr. Griffiths, president of the Institute for Advanced Study, refused my delivering an informal seminar (to be done at my own covering of all costs) at his institute of perhaps my most important study, the Iso-Grand-Unification of gravitation and electroweak interactions, despite the fact that it had been accepted for publication in the proceedings of the M. Grossmann's meeting held in Jerusalem in June 1997, and had been published in Found. Phys. Letters Vol. 10, page 307, 1997. The suppression was seemingly motivated by the fact that the unification identifies in all its glory the incompatibility of curvature with electroweak interactions. The legal problem at the IAS emerges also with all its glory from the acceptance of presentations on grand unifications by Witten and others which are known to be catastrophically inconsistent, because they have a noncanonical/nonunitary structure $UU^+ \neq 1$, under which any first year graduate student can prove that all numerical predictions n are noninvariant in time, $n' = UnU^+ = nUU^+ \neq n$, thus having no physical value of any known type (for a technical study of the catastrophic physical and mathematical inconsistencies of theories with a noncanonical-nonunitary structure, one may inspect the memoir at IJMP A Vol. 14, pages 3157-3206, 1999).

Not yet fully satisfied by such a "beautiful" conduction of the IAS under U. S. public funds, in his capacity as chairman of the talk committee at the 1998 International Congress of Mathematicians in Berlin, Griffiths went into the extreme frenzy of suppressing presentations by senior mathematicians at that meeting, just because the name "Santilli" was in the

title of the talk (the Lie-Santilli isothery), in blatant violation of the tradition of these oceanic meetings of admitting a representation of all branches of mathematics. The problem which disqualifies Griffiths as a member of the real scientific community is that, as it has been the case from Galilei on, academic dirt cannot suppress undesired advances, such as the Lie-Santilli isothery, especially after several monographs and hundred of papers have been written in the field, and the new isothery has even permitted new industrial applications which are simply impossible with the excessively simplistic conventional formulation of Lie's theory (see <http://home1.gte.net/ibr>).

Following these exploits by Griffiths & Co I was urged by various friends to file lawsuits in the U. S. federal Court against the IAS because of well identified violations of the Civil Code (e.g., discriminations) as well as of the Criminal Code (e.g., intentional deceptions in suppressing catastrophic inconsistencies by Witten's and other IAS members of preferred "theories"). What do you thing is the best for Science and for human knowledge? Should I file civil and criminal charges against Griffiths, Witten, and his cartel at the IAS? Or should I silently and vilely accept their feudal scientific corruption? Please let me know your view.

I am sure all of you may well have experienced similar (if not worse) wrongdoings from the so-called "establishment". If we want to really address the issue beyond the level of vacuous academic parlance, we must identify the ethical decay in plain, clear, understandable language: all these actions establish the existence of an organized scientific obscurantism perhaps bigger than that during Galilei's times, because, unlike the latter, ultimately motivated by billions of dollars in research funds. What is your opinion? Should this ethical decay be accepted silently with grace? Or, as a necessary condition for advances, as well as for our own human dignity, we have an ethical obligation to denounce it publicly and attack it in court?

2. THE ETHICAL DECAY IN THE "PROGRESSIVE" PHYSICS COMMUNITY

The reason for my extreme distress is that I believe the collapse of ethics in the so-called "progressive" physics community is worse than that of the physics "establishment", thus leaving no other option than: either supinely accept acts of vulgar scientific corruption, thus becoming accomplices via silence; or we go to civil and criminal courts. If you see any other alternative, please do let me know. You will have my sincere gratitude, provided you do not compromise on scientific ethics. Here are a few representative "pearls".

INFINITE ENERGY. As you may know, Eugene Mallove and Barbara Dello Russo published in the IE 10-th Anniversary Issue # 24, p. 49, 1999 a paper by E. Conte which is a verbatim copy of my first representation of all characteristics of the neutron as a bound state of a proton and an electron (Hadronic Journal Vol. 13, page 513, 1990, JINR Communication E4-93-352, 1993, and other papers), said publication at IE having occurred without any quotation whatever of my indicated prior work directly related to the topic (this is the catch). The case was serious because, according to iron-strong documentation, Conte as well as Mallove and Dello Russo were fully aware of my preceding work in the field, as admitted by Conte himself in a subsequent letter naively published at IE, and as established for Mallove/Dello Russo by the fact that they had my papers sitting in their editorial desk exactly on the same topic. The case was rendered more serious by the fact that the publication of the series of five papers of mine had been financially supported by a US public company with the payment in stock the equivalent to \$ 22,000. Yet, Mallove and Dello Russo intentionally preferred the paper by Conte to mine, and intentionally published it without any references to my prior work in the topic. Immediately after discovering this occurrence, I contacted Mallove and Dello Russo, first in a very respectful way, and then in a progressively hard way, first by kindly requesting, and then insisting that a correction be IMMEDIATELY (this is the catch) published in their magazine at least identifying the existence of my preceding paper of 1990, as well as (and this is another catch) pointing out that the results coincide with those by Conte. Mallove and Dello Russo insistently, perniciously, repeatedly refused to publish such a corrective statement despite the overwhelming evidence against them, despite the intervention of other, and despite all possible attempts, thus leaving no other recourse than the filing of a civil lawsuit at the US federal Court (which you may inspect at <http://home1.gte.net/science2>).

Even after filing the lawsuit, what did Mallove & Co do? While carefully avoiding any quotation of my work, they published additional horrendous plagiarisms of my original paper of 1990! And then, after filing the last motion presenting seven experts reviews all unanimously confirming the verbatim plagiarism by Conte's paper, what Mallove, Dello Russo, and all other editors of IE did? They insisted in their stand, that is, continuing in a stubborn way the suppression in their magazine of the quotation of my prior publications exactly in the field. As of today, January 31, 2000, after all the requests by me and others, after the filing of the lawsuit, after the filing of all the motions, and all this jazz, the mere "quotation" of my papers on the structure of the neutron (as a bound state of a proton and an electron according to hadronic mechanics) is still totally missing, while

numerous other vulgar plagiarisms have been instantly published. That is the documented reality. Other views are vulgar lies for the inept, the uninformed, or the accomplice.

There is little doubt in my mind (as well as that of numerous others) that, under these premises, Eugene Mallove and his group at IE are damaging the search for new energies in a way much bigger than the notorious damage inflicted by Herman Feshbach and his cartel at MIT. This is an unquestionable consequence, not only of such an incredible opposition against a senior member of the progressive community such as myself, but also in view of the publication at IE of genuine scientific trash without any shadow of review. How can our progressive community advance under these premises? In view of all this (and much more), I am left with no other option than a serious escalation of the case, with the initiation of criminal proceedings against all editors of IE.

Please let me know what do you think. Are, in your view, criminal proceedings against the IE guys excessive? But then, in their absence, do you have a serious alternative, that is, one based on the absolutely uncompromisable need that IE publishes a corrective statement identifying my prior work and then pointing out the identity its result with those by Conte?

PHYSICS ESSAYS. This is another truly incredible repetition of exactly what happened at IE, only referred to other papers by Conte. Quaternions are known to provide a trivial reformulation of quantum mechanics without any novelty whatever. Conte has plagiarized Hamilton quaternions, dubbed them with another crazy name (biquaternions, which is a verbatim plagiarism of Hamilton original conception over a complex field), and went into a frenzy of verbatim reformulation of all aspects of hadronic mechanics. The point which condemns Panarella and all editors of Physics Essays is that of accepting this reformulation as "new" (e.g., new Pauli's matrices which are IDENTICAL to the Pauli-Santilli isomatrices published numerous times years ago). Again, the publication at Physics Essays of Conte's plagiarized papers was done in full, documented knowledge by both Conte and Panarella of my prior work. Again, I asked Panarella to publish IMMEDIATELY (this is the catch) corrective statements. Again, Panarella & Co., refused systematically, repeatedly, perniciously any correction. Again, I was left with no other recourse than that of filing a law suit in Federal Court against Physics Essays. Again, Panarella and his editorial accomplices have continued to refuse the publication of a correction statement identifying with clarity my prior papers and the identity of the results with those by Conte (that is the catch). Again, this manifestly immoral stand has continued following seven expert reviewers stating that the papers published at PE by Conte are a verbatim

plagiarism of my papers. Again, under all these premises now protracted for years and years, I am left with no other alternative than that of a serious escalation by filing criminal actions against all editors of Physics Essays and all their administrative conduits. Again, if you have any serious alternative, please, do let me know. I want to do physics and not waste my time in court proceedings. HOWEVER, let me clarify with clarity that I will do anything permitted by law at whatever personal cost to force the publication at Physics Essay of the ethical duty Panarella and his cartel should have done in their original editorial function, and, after notification of wrongdoing, should have immediately implemented as requested by the Law, let alone minimal human and scientific standards.

APEIRON. This is another truly incredible case. I have been told that you know only the river of accusations against my person voiced by Roy Keys. Well, it is time that you also know the documented facts. Years ago Franco Selleri convinced Roy Keys to publish in the Apeiron a comprehensive review on hidden variables & all that. Yet, when the review appeared in print, it missed the only known concrete and invariant realization of hidden variables, that provided by hadronic mechanics and published in prestigious, serious journals, such as Foundations of Physics, Acta Applicandae Mathematica, Intern. J. Modern Phys., and other journals.

Schroedinger equation $Hx|> = H|> = E|>$ has the structure of a right associative module. The hadronic realization of hidden variables is $Hx'|> = HT|> = E'|>$, $E' \neq E$, $T = \lambda = \text{fixed}$, which provides an OPERATOR (let alone parametric) realization of hidden variables, $\lambda = T$. The realization is hidden because the two products x and x' are totally equivalent on axiomatic grounds (both are right modular associative products). As a result, the difference between x and x' disappears at the abstract level, or, equivalently, the hadronic realization of hidden variables verifies identically ALL quantum axioms and laws, thus being hidden in the same (this is technically called an isotopy, see Rendiconti Matematici Palermo, Suppl.. Vol. 42 totally dedicated to the field).

On physical grounds, the hidden operator T represents a new class of interactions and effects whose representation is impossible for quantum mechanics, such as, nonlinear, nonlocal, and nonhamiltonian interactions due to wave-overlappings. These effects have been verified experimentally in particle physics, nuclear physics, chemistry, superconductivity, astrophysics, and cosmology (see the review of experimental evidence in Journal of New Energy, Vol. 4, special issue 1, 1999, 324 pages, entirely dedicated to the subject, which was originally intended for IE). In addition to this vast theoretical literature, and the vast experimental verifications,

ALL applications of hadronic mechanics ARE an application of hidden variables. This is also the case for the so-called "hadronic reactors" and the related over-unity (recently measured up to the value 6) which I constructed at Toups Technology Licensing (see the web sites <http://www.toupstech.com> and <http://home1.gte.net/ibr>).

Good. What happened after the publication by Keys, Selleri, Assis & Co of the "comprehensive" review of hidden variables? I was informed on the complete lack of quotation of papers on the hadronic realization by several of its irate founders. The case was serious because Keys, Selleri, Assis & Co were notoriously aware of the hadronic realization, while they had gone to the extreme of listing all possible papers in the field, even those of extremely vague, indirect, or totally vacuous connection to hidden variables, yet with TOTAL SILENCE on the hadronic realization. As representative of the founders of hadronic mechanics, I therefore contacted Roy keys, first very respectfully and gently as per my style for stage one, requesting the publication of a simple note or letter in a subsequent issue, which at least identified the hadronic realization as a necessary condition for the review to be "comprehensive" as officially claimed. I also contacted Selleri, Assis, and other editors of Apeiron with the same request. What happened after that? Not only nothing of nothing was done by all editors to this day, but they went into the same frenzic rapture enveloping the editors of orthodox journal: suppress systematically ANY paper with ANY reference to "Santilli". In fact, I have documentation of this kind of papers rejected by the Apeiron editorial cartel, even from authors of the "inner circe" (such as a paper by Phipps) just because it merely indicated a connection to hadronic mechanics).

If you care about Science you should know that the case at the Apeiron is much more serious than just suppressing Santilli's references. ALL papers quoted by Keys, Selleri, Assis, & CO are well known to be NONINVARIANT (for any complex realization of the hidden variables, let alone for their operator realization), as a result of which they have no physical value of any type, not even remote. This is due to the fact that the time evolution becomes nonunitary, $UU^+ \neq 1$, under which, if the theory predicts a numerical value, say, 50 cm, at the time $t = 0$, the same theory predicts a different numerical value at different times for the same measurement under the same conditions, since the same value now reads $U50U^+ = 50UU^+ \neq 50$ cm (you may inspect the technical details at Modern Physics Letters A, Vol.13, 327, 1998, and in the memoir at IJMP A Vol. 14, pages 3157-3206, 1999). The suppression of catastrophic inconsistencies in publications sold to the public by editors in their full knowledge of the same, constitutes a violation of the Criminal Code (deception).

As far as I know (if in error, PLEASE let me know), hadronic mechanics is the ONLY theory achieving invariance under a nonunitary time evolution, thanks to the use of isomath. The "iron strong" axiomatic consistency of this result is illustrated by the fact that all hadronic formulations can be constructed via simple positive-definite nonunitary transforms of quantum formulations (see the above quoted literature)

$$UU^+ = I^* = 1/T > 0, \quad UH|> = (UH^+)(UU^+)^{-1}(U|>) = H^+ T |>' = UE|> = EU|> = E|>'$$

Invariance is then achieved by assuming I^* as the new unit, and by reconstructing the entire formalism in such a way that I^* is indeed the (left and right) unit of the new theory. In fact, the unit is the basic invariant of any theory.

To be really honest with yourself and with others, you should ask the question: what is wrong with the publication of these ideas at the Apeiron, of course, among all others? After all, the scientific level there is known to be rather limited. Of course, nothing is wrong with such a routine publication. But then, WHY Franco Selleri (the known expert of the cartel, since Keys is not a scientist) opposed a mere quotation to such unethical extent? I will tell you why. Under a nonunitary lifting of Pauli's matrices and related context, the corresponding Bell's inequalities do admit a classical counterpart. But then, all the river of ink written on local realism & all that, goes down the drain (see *Acta Applicandae Mathematicae* Vol. 50, p. 177, 1998). THAT is the reason why Franco Selleri obstructed to such an incredible extent the mere listing of the hadronic realization of hidden variables. Other interpretations are just lies.

The documentation, therefore, establishes that the wrongdoing entirely rests with Keys, Selleri, Attis & Co. What really hurts is that I have suffered this wrongdoing from people such as: Roy Keys, with whom I have always been very respectful (evidently prior to the case), to the point of inviting him with financial support to our last meetings at the Castle Prince Pignatelli in Italy; Franco Selleri, who I invited to be an editor of our journals to later truncate his editorship because I discovered that what he had done with me at the Apeiron he was doing routinely in other papers against other authors; or Assis, a colleague I had always respected sincerely, invited to be a honorary member of our Institute, invited with financial support to our meeting, etc. When you treat colleague to your sincere best, and are treated with senseless deception, fraud and conspiracy in return, that really hurts, and, of course, DEMANDS appropriate response.

Now, please tell me what should I do with Roy Keys and the other editors of Apeiron. As it was easy to predict, the editorial frenzy of suppressing anything bearing the name "Santilli" has degenerated in plain, vulgar scientific plagiarism, fraud, and deception at that journal (under the

available documentation, weaker names here would imply complicity). Since, after so many years of trying and failing to implement at that journal an orderly scientific conduct, we must assume that the pernicious, insistent, repeated, protracted, frenziness of suppressing my name and that of other founders of hadronic mechanics will continued in a totally unperturbed way. But then, the ONLY alternative (other than vile acceptance of vulgar corruption), is that of initiating civil and criminal lawsuits.

Do you have any other alternative which does not compromise on "the meat": the need for minimal ethical standards in editorship of at least quoting prior literature directly relevant to the topic, particularly when brought to the attention of the editors?. If you do, you will have my unbounded appreciation because I do not want to spend the last years of my life suing countless editors all over the world. However, if your stand is in support of immorality in science (as Phipps did, by unconditionally supporting deception and all other immortal behavior at IE), I suggest you keep a distance of me, because, then, I will not rest until I hurt you. I am serious on Science. Do not expect me to compromise on dirt.

THE CASE OF HALTON ARP.

This is another case that escapes completely my understanding. You have perhaps heard the litany of criticisms on my person by Halton Arp. Therefore, I feel a moral obligation to report here my views. My own academic life had several similarities with that by Halton Arp. He was terminated at Harvard University by the organized scientific fanaticism there on Einsteinian doctrines for reason you know. I was also terminated at Harvard University by the same organized scientific crime and for essentially the same reasons, despite the availability of large DOE funds (which initiated hadronic mechanics). Under these similarities, I thought that Arp was a friend, or at least could understand my condition. On the contrary, Arp turned out to be one of my worse enemy, thus being one of the worse obstacles toward really basic advances. What really hurts is that he has done that despite my treating him in the most respectful fashion (of course, until I discovered his true nature, after which anybody who expects nice treatment from me should rush for medical examination).

Here are a few "pearls" perpetrated by Halton Arp against me: in the mid 1980's friends in Germany had organized a seminar to be delivered by me at the Max Planck Institute where Arp is, seminar during which I hoped to present in a moderate way the need for basic advances, but the seminar was cancelled AFTER its formal schedule because of pressure by Arp (as

well as others); in a 1997 meeting on generalized time in Texas, Arp went to the extreme of demanding the denial of my participation at that meeting (while several other members of our Institute were accepted), as well as the prohibition of distributing there papers written by my associates on the isotime; do you want more? I feel shame in even telling these things, for they make me feel dirty in just outlining them.

WHY Halton Arp perpetrated such a manifestly unethical acts? Apparently, for a number of converging reasons. First, I denounced in writing the scientific corruption at Harvard University with real names in the nontechnical book "Ethical Probe of Einstein's Followers in the USA: An Insider's view", Alpha Publishing, 1984, and its three volumes of "Documentations", 1995. By comparison, Arp has been very tolerant of the scientific corruption at Harvard, in a feverish dream that in this way he could contain the action by corrupt academicians there. By attacking me, he was dreaming of returning into the grace of Harvard's greed, a dream which I never had and never will, in order not to be dubbed a visionary.

Moreover, I have spent several years of my research life to prove that Arp's astrophysical observations are correct (physical contact of certain quasars and their associated galaxies despite dramatically different cosmological redshifts). My solution is just elementary: light necessarily slows down in the extremely huge quasars chromospheres. Inspection of the Doppler's law then establishes that light merely exits the quasars chromospheres already redshifted, thus explaining the difference in redshift with the associated galaxy, where chromosphere-type effects are much much smaller. That is all (see the Proceedings of the Olympia Conference for a detailed presentation). THAT is the real reason why Arp CANNOT even tolerate my studies, short of suffering imaginary personal damages. In fact, the slow-down solution implies an irreconcilable departure from the beloved Einsteinian doctrines, since the speed of light is no longer that in vacuum, thus causing a host of catastrophic inconsistencies for the special and general relativities). Moreover, my very elementary explanation evidently casts shadows to Arp's rather complicated interpretation, demanding "niente-po-po-di-meno-che", as we say in Italian, the "act of creation" inside quasars. How can Arp solution survive the exact-numerical representation via the slow-down of the speed of light within physical media?

No matter how you put it, Halton Arp is the very essence of my extreme distress: he is supposed to be, or at least he is perceived as one of the promoters of the "new scientific wind", while in reality he is one of its worse enemies. How can real Science survive under these deceptive premises?

In closing I would like to convey a sad personal view. As a U. S. Citizen of

Italian birth and education, I am sincerely sorry to recall that Italy was the place of birth and persistence of the obscurantism during Galilei's times. I am even more sorry to note that Italy is again today the place of biggest origination and conduction of the the contemporary scientific obscurantism. The Cantabridgean-Yale-Princeton-&-Co organized scientific crime did indeed succeed in cutting me out of the establishment. However, America did allow me to publish my ideas. That is all I wanted, and for which America will have my sincere and perennial gratitude. By comparison, Italy opposed horrendously my finding a job there, and discredited me in incredible ways (up to my dubbing by the organized scientific crime in Rome that I "stole money from the US Government" !!! How could I possible do that and stay free???). Moreover, under the control of the SIP by Renato Angelo Ricci and his scientific mafia, I have been prohibited the publication of my technical papers in my country of birth; references to my work has been suppressed; and institutions such as the ICTP in Trieste has reached the extreme of refusing a FREE subscription to our Journals !!! That is something I will condemn until I have one drop of blood in my vein. How can you possible go deeper in human, let alone scientific decay? In the final analysis, if you look at the lawsuits I have been forced to file or which are under preparation at this writing (see <http://home1.gte.net/science2>), by far, their largest number is against excessive corrupt Italian scientists. That is the documented reality.

MY PLEDGE:

I have spent my research life in avoiding the horror stories reviewed above. Before publishing my paper of 1967 on the (p, q) -deformations I spent one entire year in mathematics libraries in Europe in trying to identify prior literature, which I finally did by identifying a paper by Albert of 1943. Before releasing my Vol. I of "Foundations of Theoretical Mechanics" for publication by Springer-Verlag, I spent about two years of research in all Cantabridgean libraries tp identify ALL possible references on the integrability conditions for the existence of a Lagrangian or a Hamiltonian, as you can verify in the first volume. I have done the same for all other writings of mine. If I failed in quoting prior references, please DO let me know. I am not Mallove-Panarella-Keys-Arp-Selleri & Co. I pledge that WILL indeed publish IMMEDIATE corrections.

I have filed criminal actions against one of my former best friends and a founder of hadronic mechanics, Roberto Mignani, for excessively vulgar suppression of basic references to serve immoral interests in the Italian physics. I also terminated in the mid 1990's H. C. Myung as editor in chief of Algebras, Groups and Geometries, for another excessively vulgar

scientific corruption (the prohibition that I should attend a meeting he organized on a theory, hadronic mechanics, which I founded). Despite all that, as I urge you to verify, I always quote the iso-Schroedinger's equation as the "Mignani-Myung-Santilli isoequation". I do this because scientific priorities always surface, to the evident damage of their suppressors.

I have terminated Franco Selleri as editor of our journals for irreconcilable incompatibilities on issues pertaining to ethics in science. Yet, I took the initiative of writing to the organizers of the PIRT meeting at the Imperial College, or the editor of other publications that may originated under our Institute (such as one attempted by Umberto Bartocci) that Selleri's papers should be treated by the editors like all the others (although I alerted the editors to verify carefully Selleri's references to avoid lawsuits against our Institute by irate authors). One thing I can assure you: I am NOT Selleri, or Arp, or Keys, and the like. I only care about Science.

Is there any other thing I should do in this delicate moment of delicate decisions? Please let me know.

YOUR PLEDGE:

Let us form a core base of physicists really committed to ethical standards. This merely requires the pledge:

- 1) to quote directly relevant prior literature and review it before any allegation of novelty;
- 2) in the event of missing important references, let us publish immediate corrective statements to the satisfaction of the injured author under due documentation, of course; and 3) let us have an oceanic separation between personal hatred and science. I never heard Jewish scientists dismiss Heisenberg's equation because he was suspected to be a Nazi. Let us do the same, for physical laws cannot be influenced by personalities, and realities in science always emerge to the detriment of their suppressors.

SCIENTIFIC OBSCURANTISM AT THE BEGINNING OF THE THIRD MILLENNIUM

Hoping for leniency from the audience, I present the view that, at the beginning of the third millennium, we are experiencing a scientific obscurantism not only comparable to that during Galilei's times, but perhaps deeper, and more diversified. I define "science" as mathematical representations, producing invariant numerical predictions, which can be subjected to experimental verifications via available technology. The first obscurantism I can, therefore, point out is that in pure mathematics,

because of the lack of admission and scholar treatments of basic mathematical insufficiencies, e.g., for a classical representation of antimatter; an invariant, classical and operator representation of nonlinear, nonlocal, and nonhamiltonian interactions; an axiomatically consistent representation of irreversibility in chemical reactions and biological systems, and other fields. I then pass to the outline of the contemporary obscurantism in classical physics, particle physics, nuclear physics, quantum chemistry, superconductivity, biology, astrophysics, and cosmologies, with particular reference to the obscurantisms caused by the limitations of Einsteinian doctrines and quantum mechanics in face of an ever growing knowledge. To provide a tentative historical perspective, I make a parallelism of the current scientific obscurantism with that during Galilei's times. In particular, I show that the techniques employed by the Jesuits in attempting to suppress Galilei's novel ideas, not only are fully in force today, but have been refined into a rather sophisticated art. I then draw a number of parallelisms between specific technical obscurantisms in full dominance of the scientific scene today with corresponding specific scientific manipulations perpetrated against Galilei's work. I finally conclude by recalling that the scientific obscurantism initiated in Italy with Galileo Galilei delayed the acquisition of basic scientific knowledge for centuries. A similar unreassuring perspective appears to emerge in the contemporary scientific obscurantism, however with implications nowadays much more serious than those occurred in the Middle Age, such as the inability to resolve truly basic needs for our societies, such as new clean energies and fuels, as well as the recycling of radioactive and other wastes created by our generation, all advances which necessarily call for halting the contemporary phantasms on the universal validity of Einsteinian doctrines for the totality of all possible conditions existing in the universe.

Edited by Carlo Marafioti
President