

RON PEARSON CHALLENGED

In FSR 37/2 (Autumn, 1992), with his article *Are UFOs Compatible With "Our" Physics?*, I introduced a new FSR Scientific Consultant, the engineer Ron Pearson.

I now reproduce below the text of a critical letter received from a reader in Canada, together with Mr. Pearson's reply to him. EDITOR.

[A] THE EDITOR, FLYING SAUCER REVIEW.
February 23, 1993.

Dear Editor,— I am writing to you because of an article in Vol. 37 No. 3 by R.D. Pearson entitled *Are UFOs Compatible With "Our" Physics?*. I'm no scientist. So when I read that article, I was glad to see that someone had finally found an answer to the dilemma represented by UFOs.

This happiness didn't last long. I spoke of it with others (some of whom are scientists) and learned some details that were not included in the article.

Here is what I was told about the Champeney and Moon experiment:

"The time dilatation effect described was originally thought to be evident around a structure called a Tipler cylinder. That's a really, really huge structure, extremely dense, perhaps made of neutronium, spinning along its long axis in space, at a speed near the speed of light. Near the spinning surface, it's been shown that some interesting effects based on relativity *may* make themselves evident. The experiment you listed used a cylinder made of lead, spinning far, far below the speed of light. Most responsible researchers dismissed the experiment, due to the fact that the predicted effects were several orders of magnitude below anything our instruments could detect. It's not a practical experiment, as things stand now."

As you see, things are not as simple as they seem. And I think that the author must have known about this. Here I continue with some thoughts about the experiment of Alain Aspect:

"Aspect's work is completely in accord with Quantum Mechanics. In fact it was designed to test a controversial claim of Quantum Mechanics called Bell's Theorem. It would be rejected by relativity, that is what made it controversial.

It isn't known if the effect is purely local within the same frame of reference, or if it truly ignores the space/time continuum, and is instantaneous over any distance."

Again, many details were kept from the readers. Now the last argument presented by the author is the experiment carried out by Silvertooth which showed that the ether exists after all:

"Michelson and Morley's maths was correct, and what Silvertooth proposed is absurd, mathematically. Also, it has been shown that he bases his conclusion on a single run, out of many, which was the flawed one.

And the evidence against an ether comes from more than the Michelson-Morley experiment."

The author could have at least mentioned the fact that these were *not* absolute certainties. He is adding to the confusion in the field by his irresponsible writings. He didn't include references for the readers to verify. How can we, lay-men readers, decipher what's possible and what's not, if we're not given all possible means of verification?

On the overall *Computing Grid* theory, here are

some comments:

"I've heard of a set of algorithms for super-computers described that way; it was originally written to help solve some of the problems involved in the Superstring Theory of the cosmos."

"Certain solutions generated so far seem to indicate that several universe systems can co-exist, overlapping dimensionally, but none of those solutions reflect the laws and structure of the Universe that we can observe. They have been rejected for that reason..."

I hope that you will understand the reasons I'm writing this letter. I greatly appreciate FSR. It is full of information, very well documented (generally), and permits readers to make contact with other UFO researchers (the addresses are almost always included). Frankly, I wouldn't want to see this magazine disappear.

So instead of not renewing my subscription, I decided to write and express my opinions: in hope that it was an isolated incident. Ufology has suffered enough battering from mainstream science. If we want respect, as my father always said, we must act respectfully. If we want the scientific community's support, it's time we start adopting the scientific method, and stick to it.

Finally, I wanted to thank you for the time and effort you put into publishing this magazine. Keep up the good work.

Jacques Poulet
404 9th Avenue
Deux-Montagnes, Quebec,
Canada J7R 3M8.

[B]

April 24, 1993.

Dear Gordon,—Thank you for sending on the criticism from Jacques Poulet.

To me, his reaction seems to be an extraordinary one for a lay reader. He sees your acceptance of my article as merely a one-off aberration, which he hopes will not be repeated. He has clearly taken on board the "rejection attitudes" of his scientific friends, lock-stock-and-barrel, in a quite uncritical way, and he even reveals that he considered not renewing his subscription to FSR as a way of protest!

I think it unlikely that readers will let themselves be "put off" by a controversial article. Indeed, I feel that controversial articles will enhance the FSR readership, seeing that, in the present and prevailing climate, controversy is lacking. In general, people will like to compare opposing theories and then to judge for themselves.

Enclosed please find my reply to Jacques Poulet.
Yours sincerely,
Ronald Pearson,
Curbar Edge,
2 Rowlands Close, Bathford, Bath,
Avon, BA1 7TZ.

Dear Mr. Creighton,

I take great pleasure in having Jacques Poulet's critique of my article ARE UFOS COMPATIBLE WITH OUR PHYSICS? to counter. I will take his points one by one as listed below:-

1. The Tipler cylinder is merely an untestable prediction of Relativity Theory and need not be considered — because none of Einstein's approach is used in the EXTENDED NEWTONIAN THEORY on which my article depends.

2. The Champeney and Moon experiments used a rotating bar, not a cylinder of lead (although they may have used a lead radiation shield). Iron foil was irradiated to make it emit rays of a precise frequency and these were absorbed by another iron foil placed at a different point on the bar to provide, in effect, an extremely sensitive clock for checking the predictions of relativity. With emitter at the centre and absorber at one end of the arm the effect represented observation of a moving clock and the measured frequency shift came out in close support of Relativity Theory. With both emitter and absorber at opposite ends of the bar, however, the predicted frequency shift was four times as great. No shift at all was observed. Both observations, however, are in accord with predictions of the Extended Newtonian.

3. Jacques Poulet's statement that Relativity Theory is incompatible with Alain Aspect's experiment has my support. (Aspect's experiment showed that photons, arising like identical twins, could thereafter interact instantaneously). The conflict arises because of Einstein's assumption that there is no special frame of reference for any object. Logic then prohibits any message from travelling faster than light. In the new approach there *are* special reference frames and messages could now travel perhaps millions of times as fast as light along ether-grid filaments. I have no quarrel with Quantum Theory since the Extended Newtonian is quantum-based.

4. I did not keep details from readers, I had limited space, and full references can be found in the literature I quoted.

5. The Extended Newtonian theory provides mathematical support for the Silvertooth experiment. He showed that Michelson and Morley only measured frequency shift but they assumed wavelength to remain constant. Silvertooth's experiment measured both effects simultaneously using a very clever interferometer. Now, however, there is more experimental support. Stefan Marinov used a totally different "coupled shutters" method, and obtained a similar result. Furthermore he has carried out experiments over the year and finds the +/- 30 kilometre/sec variation one would expect due to the orbital motion of the Earth about the Sun, with an average of about 350 km/s. (See my *ORIGIN OF MIND* for references.)

6. The computing grid theory has advanced considerably in the two years since my article to FSR was written. Then its existence was only inferred to explain wave-particle duality. Now it comes out as a direct

mathematical prediction from a study of collisions between the particles of opposite energy which the gravitational theory showed had to pre-exist. Some fine detail of the structure now emerges, showing it to be very similar to a neural network — like a brain rather than a computer.

Establishment theories, based on abstract curved higher dimensions, have no power to uncover such detail. Superstring theory, demanding at least 10 higher curved space-time dimensions, is regarded as highly controversial among physicists and they admit it has not yet produced a single checkable prediction. It is unreasonable to assume that a new theory cannot succeed simply because establishment ones have failed.

I take no offence at Jacques Poulet's opinion that my work is "irresponsible" because I can use this as input data. It is clear from this remark that he has been exposed to establishment scientists who regard Einstein's theories as incontestable. But these people have been indoctrinated in early years to *believe* in Einstein, who now seems to be revered like a god. It is a regrettable consequence that in modern science new ideas are being thrown out like babies whilst the bathwater is being retained. When violent emotional responses of rejection, backed only by false logic, appear, the true reason can be pinpointed as the "mind block". It is very difficult for new thinking to break through the barriers such negativeness presents. I will support this by presenting some evidence:-



Ron Pearson

Svetlana Tolchel'nikova was one of the organisers of the "Space and Time" international conference of September 1991 in St. Petersburg which I attended. She is an astronomer at the

Pulkovo Observatory, and showed how bad the situation has become. She analyzed publications showing exact agreement between derivations from Einstein's theories and some radar measurements to the planet Venus. Then she showed that plus and minus signs had been interchanged in some of the equations. Then she corrected these "errors" and the good agreement simply vanished. The implication was that nobody had the slightest hope of being published unless Einstein was given strong support. This had followed some fierce criticism of the referee system which showed nobody could obtain publication of alternatives or criticisms of Einstein's theories.

Science can only thrive in an atmosphere which welcomes new ideas plus critical appraisals of the old as well as the new!

Unfortunately for the West, Russian scientists are much more open-minded. At the end of the latest conference in St. Petersburg, March 1993*, a proposal was debated, "that Einstein's theories of relativity be dropped, to be replaced by advanced Newtonian concepts in future Russian university syllabuses". This received unanimous support.

I will end with a prediction. Western physics will continue locked in its blind alley, rejecting all attempts at new advance. It will be overtaken by Russian academicians who will lead the field within a few decades.

Yours sincerely,

R.D. Pearson

[D] NOTE BY EDITOR, FSR.

* This second important international scientific gathering took place in St. Petersburg in March 1993, the purpose being to mark and honour the 350th anniversary of the birth of a very great British scientist, Sir Isaac Newton. Once again Ron Pearson was present. (And indeed the Russians were astonished to find that, apart from Ron, not a single British scientist had troubled to attend! This is probably only to be expected, since the British people, for years past, have had it dinned into them by their real rulers, the Political Left and Gentry of the Media, that everything British is shameful and third-rate).

At the previous gathering in St. Petersburg, for the discussion of *Problems of Space and Time in Contemporary Science* (September 1991), there had been just two people from Britain — Ron Pearson and one other.

After his return to England after the 1991 Conference, Ron Pearson tried to interest the British public in these matters, and he wrote to all the leading British newspapers about the new trends, and particularly to alert them to the new findings that the Relativity Theories of Einstein contain some serious flaws. But we learn that not a single newspaper printed a word about it, and in fact only one newspaper (the *Independent*) was courteous enough to reply to his letter. And what the *Independent* had to say was astounding, for they told Ron that his communication had caused a considerable stir in their Editorial Office, but that they regretted being unable to print it!

In a conversation which I had recently (about the UFO Problem) with a famous member of the House of Lords, this member spoke vehemently of the "Mafia" which keeps the British people gagged in relation to a whole range of matters. And the member of the House of Lords was right. The Controllers have as great a strangle-hold over us as the evil power of the Communists ever had over the peoples of Russia. This strangle-hold is plainly visible in British science in general, and also in Religion, Medicine, Law, Education, Government, The Media,, and indeed everything else too.

In the near future we hope to say more about this state of affairs and about Ron Pearson and, in particular, about his paper, *An Alternative To Relativity, Including Quantum Gravitation*, which Ron delivered at the Conference in Russia in September 1991 and which was received by the Russian scientists with considerable enthusiasm.

We also have articles by Ron Pearson on the subject of UFOs and of their possible methods of propulsion. In addition, Ron has been developing a number of other explosive ideas that are bound to give great offence to the Marxist-Materialist-Atheist gang who control the minds of most humans or alleged humans. One of these ideas links up with fundamental concepts found in the origins of all the Great Religions and also voiced again half a century ago by an Astronomer Royal, Sir James Jeans. The core of these concepts is that, as Sir James Jeans used to say, "it looks more and more as though the Universe is Mind Stuff or Thought."

In line with this, what Ron Pearson is saying is that *Mind (i.e. Spirit) existed before what we know as physical matter came into existence.*

Ron Pearson also argues — as another highly important British physicist, Dirac, recently claimed —

that we absolutely must return to acceptance of the view that THE ETHER EXISTS.

No wonder that they won't let him be heard.

However, let us bear in mind Ron's prediction:-

"Western physics will continue locked in its blind alley, rejecting all attempts at new advance. It will be overtaken by Russian academicians who will be leading the field within a few decades."

[E] RON PEARSON'S LETTER TO THE BRITISH NEWSPAPERS

The Letters Editor, The Guardian, 164 Deansgate, Manchester M60 2RR. (Sent also to all the British national newspapers).

2ND INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE CONCERNING PROBLEMS IN TIME AND SPACE. ST. PETERSBURG 16-21ST SEPTEMBER 1991

EINSTEIN REJECTED!

3rd October 1991

Dear Sir —It is most important for the progress of physics that the main conclusions of the above conference be reported in both the non-technical as well as the scientific press. A total of 120 scientists and professional engineers met as equals. And they raised a major issue over and over again. It concerned Einstein's theories of relativity including gravitation. Paper after paper highlighted internal contradictions to an extent representing complete overkill! Only one delegate supported Einstein.

New theories of gravitation which reverted to the old ideas of Galileo and Newton but with minor modifications were presented. At least one of these fitted the same experimental checks just as well as Einstein's whilst being free from all its difficulties of incompatibility with "quantum theory". The latter is the science of the atom. The problem of matching this with relativity has not been resolved after more than sixty years.

A major problem discussed was that of communication of new ideas including criticisms of Einstein's theories. For example:- An astronomer of Pulkovo Observatory, Svetlana Tolchel'nikova, spoke about reported observations of the planet Venus. She analysed two publications which appeared superficially to support Einstein's relativity by showing good agreement with observation. On closer look, however, several + signs had been substituted for - signs in the equations and vice-versa. When these errors were corrected the good agreement vanished! The implication was that the authors, knowing that lack of support for Einstein would result in rejection of their papers, had felt forced to deliberately "doctor" the equations.

The peer review system was blamed for this sad state of affairs. Students of physics had been taught to accept Einstein's relativity even though its internal contradictions made this difficult. Pro-Einstein assessors multiplied and subsequently rejected all alternatives with religious fervour.

I was one of only two British participants and am indebted to Dr Louis Essen OBE FRS, famous for his invention of the atomic clock, for my invitation. As he could not attend he suggested that I be a delegate so that I could present my own theory.

Yours faithfully. R.D. Pearson, B.Sc.(Eng) ■

THE "TIBETAN CONNECTION" AND HOW TO WRITE A BEST-SELLER

Gordon Creighton

One of the more agreeable "spin-offs" of being the Editor of FSR is that, in addition to all the fine articles sent in, it provides such a steady flow of letters from both lunatics and hoaxers.

One of the more remarkable and most successful of the latter category was the Devonshire-born Cyril Hoskins, the "plumber from Plympton", who, partly through a chance remark from a person well known to many of us at FSR, was enabled to "take off" as a writer and make a fortune by posing as a "Tibetan Lama".

The story is too lengthy to be given here now, so it must go on the back-burner for another occasion. But it is a curious fact that every year we are still receiving letters from readers who are devoted followers of the "Lama" and who want to know why we never mention him and his works, so I am prompted to reply now and give a few further details amplifying what I said in my original article about Cyril Hoskins twenty years ago (FSR 19/6), based upon our own knowledge of the "Lama" then and on a confidential report on him compiled by a Liverpool detective, Clifford Burgess.

The son of a Devonshire plumber, Cyril Hoskins was born in rural Plympton in 1911, and for the first few decades of his uneventful life he bore the somewhat un-Tibetan name of Cyril Henry Hoskins. By 1984, when working as a clerk with a time-and-motion-study firm in Weybridge, Surrey, Mr. Hoskins had decided to become a Chinese, and gave himself the name of "Carl Kuon Suo", allegedly born in Tibet. This surprised his neighbours greatly, for his outward appearance seemed so completely European, apart from his weird "Chinese" clothes and his habit of walking around Weybridge with his cat on a lead.

Meanwhile, he had embarked on a course of reading books about the fascinating and mysterious land of Tibet. In these books he found transcriptions of common Tibetan words such as "Rampa", and "Lobsang", and he decided that a Tibetan name like "LOBSANG RAMPA" sounded very nice. "Lobsang", in Tibetan written as BLO-BZANG (ལྷོ་བཟང་) meaning "GOOD MIND" is one of the commonest Tibetan personal names — about equal, I suppose, to our "JOHN". He had evidently also spotted the word "RAMPA" at the end of the name of some lama in one of his books, and thought he rather liked the sound of that too for his new *surname*.

Sadly he came unstuck over this. For how indeed was a good Lama from Plympton and

Weybridge to know that "Rampa" in Tibetan is not a name, but a monastic degree of learning conferred by the great Buddhist Lamaseries, written RAMSPA (རམ་སྤ་པ་) roughly equal, I suppose, to our degree of "B.D." — *Bachelor of Divinity*. This was to prove a particularly unfortunate choice of "name" because, spurred on by the steamroller successes of his string of best-selling "books about Tibet", Mr. Hoskins was later tempted to reminisce in one of them about his dear old grandmother in Tibet, calling her "Grandma Rampa" — i.e. "Grandma B.D.", or "Grandma M.A."!

At the time when, against the advice of the three leading British experts on Tibet, a London firm of publishers launched his first hoax, "THE THIRD EYE", the Lama of Plympton and Weybridge had never been beyond the shores of this, his native island. Later, to escape publicity when his hoaxing activities were receiving considerable attention in both the *Daily Mail* and the *Daily Express*, Mr. Hoskins withdrew — not, as one might pardonably have surmised — to the fastnesses of Hlasa, the Place of the Gods (ལྷ་ས་), but to Dublin and then, later, when Dublin proved no refuge, to Canada. These were his first journeys abroad.

Mr. Hoskins had, however, already been on cosmic trips in flying saucers ("My Visit To Venus"), and an early Editor of FSR had displayed an incredible degree of gullibility by accepting, from the Hand of the Master, a couple of fascinating articles about such trips and publishing them in our Journal!

Years later I heard one of the senior partners of the publishing firm talking on the BBC radio service about the book "The Third Eye". He said the "Lama" had looked slightly nonplussed when they asked him "to write a few words in Tibetan" for them to use on the title-page. Some days later he turned up again with something that even they recognized as *Chinese*. (Twenty years ago, you see, there were probably not even a dozen Tibetans in the whole of Britain, and most of us had never seen one, and still haven't. But there have always been plenty of Chinese waiters ready to oblige).

When the plumber had eventually sloughed off his earthly body in Canada and soared up into the Buddhist Paradise of DEWATSAN (དཤཱ་ཅན་) a Canadian reader of FSR sent me a photostat of the death certificate. It showed that Canadian officialdom was no more knowledgeable than us Brits where "Things Tibetan" were concerned, for it gave the plumber's place of birth as *Tibet*. (I suppose we can say that "Devon's loss was Heaven's gain.")