

The Physics Community is Committing Crimes against all of Mankind by Suppressing One Particular Paper on this Web Site

This may seem like a rather bizarre title. However, if the reader is concerned about the future of mankind, what follows will precisely delineate the nature of this title. Furthermore, the Nobel Prize will be won if a small handful of scientists are prepared to be “upstarts” against the rest of the professional scientific community. (Please be forewarned that this is rather lengthy.)

Despite the length of the explanation, the most succinct insight I can provide is via the following two points.

Point number one: There is one paper under physics which, if proven correct, will precipitate the single greatest crisis in the history of physics.

Point number two: Time and time again, science is not about discovering the laws of nature, but about protecting one’s ego/reputation. Because of point number one, the physics community is maintaining a conspiracy against me and working to suppress the dissemination of this paper. In the process, there is the perpetration of crimes against all of mankind.

To begin, point number two will be elucidated upon in greater detail. Why would there possibly be the suppression of a paper? Although the reason has been stated under point one, further clarification may be judicious. Please consider the following question. Is *everybody* truly interested in progress? Envision the following hypothetical scenario.

In feudal times, how would candlestick makers have reacted to the world wide use of electricity? Upon coming to the realization that each and every one of them would have been out of a job, they would have vehemently opposed its development. These candlestick makers would have been completely apathetic about the future of mankind. Their sole singular concern would have been the maintenance of their livelihood. (This precept could be expounded upon to a large extent. However, I am striving not to make this too lengthy.) Hundreds of years later, nothing has changed, even with highly educated professionals. Are they concerned with mankind, or their own “individual situations”? It is the latter, *not* the former which is in effect.

If the reader accepts this, it may beg the question, how does this pertain to physics and/or the material on this site? In order to appreciate the underlying precepts behind this, it’s imperative that the reader recognize the following. There are elements of physics which are *completely* different from other human endeavours. The germane aspect of this is as follows. There is one particular theory which an ***absolutely inordinate*** amount of physics theories *relies* upon. If it were ever disproven, it would precipitate the greatest crisis in the entire history of physics. Many careers would end and thousands (if not tens of thousands) of papers would be overturned. Some physics professors who are familiar

This precept has been conclusively proven when history has recorded workers intentionally destroying equipment which they believed would replace them by putting them out of a job.

with my work have warned me that as a direct result of this, the professional community will never allow this theory to “see the light of day”.

There is a particular problem which nobody has ever been able to solve. I believe that the solution will be found in the first paper under the physics section. However, if my solution is correct, a central theory, the Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle, will be proven wrong. In order to prove to the reader that the physics community *is* maintaining a conspiracy against me for the explicit purpose of preventing the community from learning of this theory, here is a description of what once transpired.

Since 1991, there has been one particular web site which has become *the* source for new papers on physics and astronomy. For their initial several years, they were supposed to have an *iron clad* rule in effect. There was to be absolutely *no refereeing* of the papers. A moderator could not remove a paper merely because he “didn’t like” it. He had to be able to *prove* that the paper was wrong in order to *justify* its removal. When these rules were still in effect (they’ve been changed in the interim), I submitted the previously mentioned paper to the site. The submission adhered to all of their rules. However, the next day it did not appear in the listings. Their excuse was that it was deemed an inappropriate submission for the quantum physics archive. There was no elaboration whatsoever on the meaning of this. I subsequently asked four different physics professors to review the paper in case there was some error which I was oblivious to. None of them found anything wrong with the paper. Therefore, the removal of the paper was an egregious violation of their rules. This begs the question, *why did they break the rules?*

After reading it, a few of the moderators drew the conclusion that there was a distinct possibility that I had successfully solved one particular problem which nobody in this history of physics has ever solved. However, if my solution was correct, there would be hard proof that the Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle was wrong via the experiments that I proposed. Firstly, they wouldn’t allow their own careers to end. Secondly, they would not allow the greatest crisis in the history of physics to be brought about. Therefore, they broke the rules and removed the paper via a nonsensical excuse.

The physics community is maintaining a conspiracy against me by working to suppress the dissemination of this one particular paper.

The casual reader may be wondering the following. Why would this constitute the commission of crimes against all of mankind? The basis of technology is science. Without science there would be no technology. If our science is wrong, mankind will be constrained in our technological development *now and forever more*. Without technology, societal progress will not be possible. Even at a more fundamental level, there are significant repercussions to the suppression of this paper. Many countries in the world spent a total of nine billion dollars for the construction of the Large Hadron Collider in Switzerland. The primary purpose of this is an attempt to verify *existing* quantum theory. Yet this paper shows that all of quantum theory is wrong, thereby rendering this nine billion dollar expenditure a complete and utter waste. Furthermore, future generations of physics students will be forced to “shed blood, sweat, and tears” spending years learning about a quantum framework which is completely wrong. For

those who become professional physicists, they will spend a lifetime in the completely futile pursuit of the Copenhagen interpretation of quantum mechanics.

With this, the lay reader may now have another question in mind. It was previously written that if this paper were verified, the Nobel Prize would be awarded. The reader may be wondering, why?

Regardless of whether the professional community wants to acknowledge it or not, the overthrow of science which everybody believes is correct, is of a vital nature. If it were achieved, the Nobel committee would not be able to ignore something of this magnitude. They would have no choice but to award the prize. However, it would not go to me as they have their rules for the awarding of the prize. Since my paper will never be published in an academic journal, that will disqualify me from the prize. However, the previously stated web site will not relinquish their attempt to suppress this paper. Therefore, for the Nobel Prize to be awarded, this is what would have to be done.

Firstly, the experiments would have to be conducted in order to (obviously) verify the theory. If this were achieved, the paper and the experimental results would have to be posted on the university's own web site. At that stage, there would have to be a press conference to announce a monumental scientific discovery. At that point in time, the "genie would be out of the bottle" and the conspiracy could not be maintained. Inevitably some physics journal will publish the paper with the experimental results. As long as there are three scientists (or fewer) who have done the work (no Nobel Prize will be awarded to four or more people) they *will* be awarded the Nobel Prize in physics.

If the reader has reached this far, there is yet another paper on this web site which "certain individuals" are striving to suppress. It pertains to my paper on homosexuality under the psychiatry section. I have developed a theory as to how the Egyptians built the pyramids. There was an initial attempt to disseminate it via Oxford university. Because of what the reader will presently read, I was forced to take my work to Cambridge instead. Students in general should ask themselves if they want to be as bad (in a variety of ways) as the students at Oxford. The explanation/history is as follows.

When I initially made the inquiry of Oxford, it was to place an ad in their student newspaper *exclusively* about my theory of pyramid construction. Initially, everything was proceeding well as the ad was authorized and I sent them the money for the ad. Then, they stopped communicating with me. I then received the following letter via e-mail as an attachment as an explanation of their behaviour. (In the name of certain privacy issues, I have omitted the person's full last name and only included their first initial.)

9th of October 2015

Dear Mr.Miller,

I am writing to you on behalf of Cherwell regarding the payment of £90 in return for an advertisement in one of our publications. I regret to inform you that the advertisement was not published on the 9th of October.

In the correspondence between Cherwell and yourself on September 15th, 2015 you have indicated that you wanted to draw general public's attention to one of your papers. You specified that you haven't modified the article yet and that there was a picture of an Egyptian pyramid and 'that would be about it'. This was not the issue. Our decision not to publish had to do with other content on the website (newtheories.net). The editors determined that we could not advertise a website on which one could find homophobic articles. The advertisement of such material would compromise our reputation and expose us to criminal liability.

We feel that you have deceived us as to the material facts of what the advertisement was promoting. However, we will refund you for the fee you have paid in return for the publication.

If you have any questions as to this decision, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Kind Regards,

Wiktorina S

OSPL para-legal assistant

I absolutely wanted to contact them and had to ask for that person's e-mail. Upon provision of said e-mail, here's what I sent back to them. (Once again, full last names have been omitted.)

Although this e-mail is carbon copied to Emma L, it is meant for Wiktorina S. Perhaps Ms.L would like to question the integrity and value of the people you work for. Firstly, this is not intended to try and change your mind in regards to the running of my ad. Over the years, I've realized there's no point in trying to affect the mindset of irrational and illogical people. However, I will take issue with you via two points. I only expect you to respond to one of them.

The first point

You claim that there is homophobic content on my site. Given this irrational (and clearly wrong) reaction, I can only presume that someone there is openly gay, or, at the least, has someone close to them who is openly gay. I did not preach violence against homosexuals. I did not write that they should be killed or violently attacked. I simply wrote my scientific theory that homosexuality can be cured given my theory that its cause is purely psychological. If I am right, it is up to *society* to decide if this should be implemented. It is *not* up to a group of arrogant individuals at Oxford who (erroneously) think they're smarter than everybody else to make this decision for all of society. Furthermore, society has the right to know whether or not homosexuality is a choice, or if there is the possibility to change it. But arrogant individuals such as yourselves are deciding what is, and is not right, for all of mankind. Contrary to your nonsensical assertion that you will be held criminally liable, you can only be held liable for what you agreed to advertise. I did not ask you to advertise that paper. If you still think that what I wrote was so horrible, keep some of the following in mind.

--- there are individuals who are discontent with their orientation and would like to change (if it were possible). A few examples would be, religious individuals; individuals who are close to their parents and don't want to devastate them with the news that they're gay; a man married to a woman with children who has always experienced homosexual yearnings and has now reached a certain "breaking point". He doesn't want to leave his wife or have his children experience the pain of divorce. Yet his yearnings are starting to become more prominent. What is he to do? Yet your arrogance will never allow these people to know they do have a choice.

--- you have no idea what the *long term* societal ramifications are of accepting homosexuality. Because of my training, I do. But I suppose you people think you know everything about everything and that your "brilliance" trumps my training/theorizing.

--- you think you have the right to stop the spirit of scientific inquiry and the right to scientific freedom. The most cogent way of demonstrating the horrors of this would be as follows. I myself am coloured. However, there is ***no doubt whatsoever*** in my mind about the following. If a discovery were made as to how to transform a coloured person like me, into a white person, that information is to be disseminated. It would be my choice (and the choice of any person of colour) as to whether they wish to make the change or not. But because of your unmitigated arrogance, you would never allow such a thing if a discovery like this were made.

At this stage you may be perturbed as to how rude my e-mail is. There's a reason for this. You have been exceedingly rude to me for one particular reason. You've made a false and ungrounded allegation against me. Therefore, I would expect a response to point number two.

The second point

The following has been cut and paste from your letter onto here.

We feel that you have deceived us as to the material facts of what the advertisement was promoting.

I deceived you? Really? Let's scrutinize.

I wished to advertise one ad and one ad alone. My theory of pyramid construction. ***Nothing else!*** I am under zero obligation to expound upon the other material on my site. What further convinces me that someone there is gay is that you focused on that one paper alone. What about the multitude of other papers which would enrage *certain* segments of the population? What about my papers about the origins of religion and the psychological basis of a belief in the afterlife? Both papers would anger religious individuals. Did I deceive you by not telling you about those as well? On that point, what about my theory of the origins of the universe. Another source of anger for religious individuals who believe in the Book of Genesis. Did I once again deceive you? Furthermore, there are scientists who would not like that theory as it overturns their "pet theories" about cosmology (the scientific study of the origins of the universe). Was I once again deceiving you? To further this, my first paper under physics would precipitate the greatest crisis in the history of physics as a central theory of physics is overturned, thereby overturning an inordinate amount of established physics theories. *Many* physicists would vehemently oppose this. Did I deceive you by not informing you of the details of that theory as well?

Did you expect me to send you a 10,000 word e-mail detailing *every single* paper on my web site and a list of whom it may offend? This is nonsensical, idiotic, and wrong. No business entity can expect something like this from a potential advertiser.

I was forthright with you and not even remotely duplicitous. It is you people who have been arrogant, unprofessional, and wrong.

You have no right to single handedly decide what is right for everybody. Society makes those decisions as a whole, not a small group of arrogant individuals. (The exception being those who are *mandated by law* to do so. Namely, the Supreme Court of a nation.)

There are homosexuals who wish to change. But your arrogance will never allow them to know they have this option.

You have stopped the spirit of scientific inquiry and the right to the freedom of scientific expression. Again, if the scientific knowledge were developed to change a coloured man like me to a caucasian, I *know* it must be disseminated.

You've made false claims in your letter (subject to criminal liability) and false claims

against me.

Do you care to "ameliorate" anything that you wrote in your letter to me?

They never did respond to that. I will now repeat a former written question. Do students wish to be as bad as those at Oxford? Do you wish to hold back the spirit of scientific inquiry? Do you want to single handedly decide what is right and wrong for society as a whole? Do you wish to completely distort and misconstrue the nature of my paper on homosexuality? Or will you be radically different from Oxford students and recognize the right to scientific freedom/inquiry *regardless* of how disturbing it may be for *some* individuals?

There is one further point which I must address. Namely, Oxford's allegation that I deceived them. As a direct result of my abhorrent treatment at the hands of Oxford, when I made these same inquiries of the Cambridge university student newspaper, I had no choice but to proceed in the following manner. Prior to making the inquiry, I removed my paper on homosexuality (and the foreign translations) from my site. I have been striving for many years to disseminate the work on this site. I simply could not risk a repeat of my experience with Oxford at Cambridge. The night before the ad was scheduled to appear in the paper, I put those papers back on my site. Therefore, if there are those who wish to blame Varsity Publications for my paper on homosexuality, I will state this.

Varsity Publications were oblivious to my paper on homosexuality. They had no role in assessing that theory as they were oblivious to its existence.

Therefore, if there are those who wish to "yell and scream" because of that paper, yell and scream at me. Don't yell and scream at *Varsity*.

The final thing for me to write is as follows. Although I am hoping that there will be a dichotomy between Oxford students and other students, there is one consistency. The arrogance of ivy league students. In this day and age, there seems to be an obsession for (allegedly) "enlightened" individuals to be pro-gay. For those who may *still* be opposed to my paper on homosexuality (despite everything I've written) then I ask you to consider the following.

As I briefly stated in my response to Oxford, I have a new theory of the origins of the universe. This theory is far more complete than the existing Big Bang model. *All* questions that can possibly be posed by a creationist are answered. There is simply no room for the existence of a supreme deity in the birth of the universe. Now, orthodox Jews/fundamentalist Christians would be vehemently opposed to this as it would oppose the Book of Genesis. If you're opposed to my paper on homosexuality because of political correctness, then I ask you to consider the following. *How appropriate would it be if a religious individual was to stop my ad on the pyramids so that people remain*

oblivious to my web site and ignorant of my theory of the universe? The progress of science should never be stopped merely because a handful of individuals “don’t like” the notion of a theory opposing their own individualistic beliefs. That is why the epochal theory of evolution was held back for decades. Darwin was petrified of the backlash against him for opposing the Bible. It was only the realization that another scientist had made similar discoveries which forced him to publish *The Origin of Species* and risk society’s wrath. If you recognize that it was wrong to hold back evolution, what makes it even remotely appropriate to hold back my theory of homosexuality because of political correctness?