

The Publication Challenge – Journal Editors and Reviewers Need to be as Perceptive as Einstein

HenokTadesse, Electrical Engineer, BSc
Ethiopia, Debrezeit, POBox 412, Mobile: +251 910 751339 / +251 912 228639
email: *entkidmt@yahoo.com* or *wchmar@gmail.com*

16 July 2020

Abstract

Scientific genius is not only about creating original ideas. It is equally about the ability to instantly recognize novel ideas proposed by others, from a maze of wrong ideas. These qualities are intimately related and, in fact, may be two sides of the same coin. Einstein had both these qualities. The process of scientific publication is crucial for the advancement of science and should be effective in its goal of communicating new ideas to the scientific community. The great majority of today's mainstream physicists controlling journal publications have neither of these qualities. Journal editors and reviewers need to have a good perception of possible new insights in submitted papers. Science needs more Einsteins, not more Einstein followers.

Einstein is rightly considered as a scientific icon. His scientific life is so inspiring almost universally. Perhaps science would not have been as interesting if Einstein had never existed. He had an unusually keen mind in discerning patterns in mazes of confusing facts. His beautiful thought experiments keep captivating physicists even after many decades. He spent his whole life working on a single problem: the problem of motion and the nature and speed of light, which is unprecedented.

His 'only failure' was that he just did not completely solve the light speed problem. Only his light postulate and his light quanta are correct. I say this because facts must be told and there is no way around this. Einstein cleared the ether cloud from physics, something his contemporaries and others before him failed to do. However, to the end of his life he continued to pursue basically the same line of thinking and ideas he built during his childhood and youth : the light postulate, relativity of space and time, and the equivalence principle. He was so captivated by his own theory that he could not consider alternative ideas. In a way it was a wasted genius.

Scientific genius is not only about creating original ideas. It is equally about the ability to instantly recognize novel ideas proposed by others, from a maze of wrong ideas. These qualities are intimately related and, in fact, may be two sides of the same coin. Einstein had both these qualities. The process of scientific publication is crucial for the advancement of science and should be effective in its goal of communicating new ideas to the scientific community[1]. The great majority of today's mainstream physicists controlling journal publications have neither of these qualities, and these aspects of their incompetence are not unrelated. Journal editors and reviewers should have a good perception of possible new insights in submitted papers. Einstein had such an acute perception of novel ideas that he would recognize them at the slightest hint.

The situation in physics today is that journal publications are controlled by highly trained professionals who lack the passion and perception.

Einstein displayed both qualities. He displayed exceptional original thinking with his ‘chasing a beam of light’ thought experiment and with his equivalence principle. Einstein also took up Max Planck’s quanta, and showed its full significance. Einstein did the same with the ideas developed before him regarding the problem of motion and the speed of light. Although other scientists such as Lorentz and Poincare had done the hard work before him, he took up those works and recreated them in a much more elegant form.

I have been proposing a new theory called Apparent Source Theory [2][3] to the scientific community for more than six years, but no one understands it or tries to understand it. Editors and reviewers of physics journals, including a Nobelist, have ignored it. They kept rejecting my papers without commenting on what is wrong with the theory. Sometimes they comment that my paper is not ‘scientific’ because, they say, it is not well organized.

Journal editors rejected my papers because they are not ‘high quality’. I have learned that, practically, ‘high quality’ [4][5] paper means that the author is affiliated with a well-known, prestigious institution, it is written according to good scientific writing guidelines, builds on accepted theories and paradigms, is well organized, uses accepted terminology, accepted formats (e.g. Latex), language, word usage etc.

After all, even Silvertooth and Marinov were denied publication of their *experimental* papers in mainstream journals just because they reported on detection of absolute motion. It is almost impossible to publish a *theoretical* paper that claims to disprove relativity.

Thus none of the journal editors and reviewers got the slightest hint of the novel ideas in my papers, despite the fact that I have clearly formulated the theory in a few lines in the abstract. If they had got even a glimpse of the new insight, they would not have rejected my papers just because they are not well written or because of my affiliation. Their lack of perceptiveness to proposed new ideas also reflects on their lack of creativity. Today science needs more Einsteins, not more Einstein followers.

Glory be to Almighty God Jesus Christ and His Mother Our Lady Saint Virgin Mary

Notes and References

1. *Open Peer Review to Save the World*, by Philip Gibbs

2. *Light Speed, Absolute Motion and Quantum Phenomena – Does Nature Have a Foreknowledge of Observer's Motions and Actions? Scientific Proof of God*, by Henok Tadesse, www.vixra.org

3. *A New Theoretical Framework of Absolute and Relative Motion, the Speed of Light, Electromagnetism and Gravity*, by Henok Tadesse, www.vixra.org

4. I started wondering what 'high quality' paper meant when I first learned people talking about it. As an outsider, I always thought about novelty of scientific ideas, not about 'quality' of papers. Over time, I learned that this view of 'quality' of a paper may have developed with the current 'publish or perish' culture. Wikipedia article 'Publish or Perish' says,

“ . . . The pressure to publish has been cited as a cause of poor work being submitted to academic journals. . . ”

, hence people start talking about 'high quality' papers. Writing a paper has already become an end in itself.

5. In general, by definition, high quality / standard/ incremental work will be published in mainstream journals and archives, particularly in physics. Novel, revolutionary papers will be published on viXra. This may explain all the fierce objection to viXra that we have seen. If you write a high quality paper, naturally you would like to publish it on mainstream journals to get credibility, to boost your CV. If your idea is so novel that it can be tempting for anyone (including journal editors and reviewers) to plagiarize it, all your concern is to establish priority, not credibility, and viXra is perhaps the best at this. However, it is to be expected that viXra will host all kinds of papers: high quality, novel and revolutionary, 'cranky', . . .

Note The analyses of all experiments and observations in [3] are correct except that I did not yet arrive at the new interpretation, that is the mystery of nature's foreknowledge of observer's motions, which I have proposed in [2].