ESSAY 34: To B(3) or not to B(3)

The debate over whether B(3) exists or not was an entirely artificial one created by vested interest in the status quo. The B Cyclic Theorem is just the same thing as the frame of reference in three dimensional space. No one would challenge the existence of a frame of reference, or the existence of three unit vectors, i, j, and k. At first the idea of the B(3) field was published in three papers in Physica B from Cornell Theory Center and it was accepted by leading thinkers such as Vigier, Mansel Davies, Kielich and several others. The source documents of the era are on www.aias.us. When I won the open competition for a chair of physics at University of North Carlina, Charlotte, the interview lecture was on the B(3) field, to an audience of staff and others. There was no objection. The Adebate@ over B(3) was caused by the insistence of two chemists on a failed theory of symmetry that no one has taken up in thirty years. A lot of things must have gone on behind the scenes, because a paper on B(3) accepted by the Physical Review E was Aunaccepted@. The announcement of the paper is on the archives of the Physical Review as a Aforthcoming paper@ that never appeared.

A debate on B(3) occurred in Physica B, one in which the purely subjective symmetry argument of Barron was defeated. If this argument were true, there would be no frame of reference. The question that must be asked now, almost twenty years later is why absurd obstacles were put in the way of an idea that has become the basis of a new industrial revolution: Kurata / B(3) technology. The answer must be found in the perennial weaknesses of the university system, notably in the way in which absurd ideas can be forced through into print by influential editors and professors. Nothing is more absurd than string theory, which has been forced on science for half a century and which has produced nothing new. Instead of accepting that the debate had gone against him, Barron tried to reopen it by submitting the same paper to his advisor Buckingham, who ran AChemical Physics Letters@. This procedure is unethical, a paper cannot be submitted twice. I replied to this second paper in the same way as the first paper, but with added comments. Notably, the Barron symmetry arguments conflict with the C, P, T symmetries of physics. The Barron symmetry argument is based on something called Acomplete experiment symmetry@, an idea which has been rejected by the entire physics community.

Buckingham then proceeded to block my reply to AChemical Physics Letters@ maybe forty or fifty times before Mansel Davies finally interceded, asking for openness in science. Instead of allowing my reply Buckingham rejected both papers and proceeded to publish a paper in AScience@, using his influence to make sure I could not reply. I was allowed to reply by van der Merwe in AFoundations of Physics Letters@. There seems to have been behind the scenes coordination between Buckingham and Lakhtakia, an engineer who was later investigated by the police for cybserstalking, and who has been rejected with deeply negative student assessments in the public domain. Lakhtakia became the notorious AScience Guy@ on wikipedia, which started a campaign against B(3) unequalled in malevolance. This catalysed the longest debate in the history of wikipedia before I finally forced wikipedia to remove its defamation. On two occasions Lakhtakia slammed down the receiver when I tried to phone him, and charmingly informed me that I would be buried. He seems to have quietened down now after being warned repeatedly about his conduct, but is still clinging on to his job in the teeth of student rejection.

Meanwhile, on the other side of the world, Taishi Kurata developed B(3) into what is effectively a new industrial revolution. The Kurata technology was taken up by NASA on its space shuttle, and the first full scale plant has just opened in Cordoba in Spain, producing 40,000 metric tons of clean burning diesel a year from waste oil. The Kurata / B(3) technology is described in the public domain on several websites easily found by google.

There cannot possibly be more of a contrast between the sour, absurd attitudes of the bad part of academia and the industrial drive for desperately needed new energy. Not for the first time do we find ourselves asking whether academia is a variation on mediaevalism as mentioned in foregoing essays.

In a democratic society there lives among us a secretive society that is self perpetuating, which as sat there too long for all the good it has done. The biggest question of all is how this society can get away with an injustice so acute that it delayed the development of industry for twenty years. How can UNCC get away with the contrivance of charges without ever replying to the severe international criticism of its conduct? This is what happens when a democracy drifts into totalitariansim. How can it happen here?