

## ERRORS BY THE NOBEL COMMITTEE

Ph. M. Kanarev  
[kanphil@mail.ru](mailto:kanphil@mail.ru)

**Announcement:** The errors of the Nobel Committee are a mirror of the “scientific” intelligence of our age.

There has already been created a scientific basis for a detailed description of scientific errors, for which the Nobel Prizes have been awarded; the future generations of scientists will describe the essence of the scientific errors of the laureates of this committee easily. We’ll show only a part of those errors that have been included in textbooks and have formed the erroneous scientific notions of schoolchildren, students and scientists [1], [2], [3], [4], [5].

“November 9, 1922. 1921 Nobel Prize in physics goes to Albert Einstein for his services to Mathematical Physics, and especially for his discovery of the law of the photoelectric effect, and 1922 Nobel Prize goes to Niels Bohr for his services in the investigation of the structure of atoms and of the radiation emanating from them”.

An impropriety of Einstein’s contribution in the field of mathematical physics has already been proved, and the essence of his errors is being widely discussed on the Internet. The impropriety of his law of the photoelectric effect has been proved as well, but it is not known to the scientific community as yet. Its essence is described in detail in our monograph. In brief, it is as follows [3].

The existing notions concerning retarding potential in the photoelectric effect, which are based on Einstein law of the photoelectric effect, are erroneous, because they are at variance with the key diagrams of operation of solar arrays. An essence of the error rests in the incorrect interpretation of retarding potential and its influence on a process of electron liberation from the anode by the photons, which does not exist in reality.

Einstein's mathematical equation, which describes the experimental regularities of the photoelectric effect, has profound physical meaning. If the components of this equation are interpreted correctly, it becomes a mathematical model of the law of the formation of the spectra of the atoms and the ions being discovered by us in the year of 1993 [3].

The essence of Niels Bohr’s error originates from the new law of the formation of the spectra of atoms and the ions discovered by us during the analysis of the regularities of the formation of the experimental spectra of the atoms and the ions. An absence of the orbital motion of the electrons in the atoms originates from this law unambiguously. It is impossible to prove an impropriety of the new law of the formation of the spectra of the atoms and the ions, because it originates from the largest set of the experimental data: from the spectra of the atoms and the ions [3].

“1929 Nobel Prize in physics goes to Louis-Victor de Broglie for his discovery of the wave nature of electrons”. An impropriety of the notions concerning the wave nature of electrons does not require a special comment. The diffraction patterns being formed by electrons are a result of an interaction of their spins after a reflection from the objects, which form these patterns. The

photons diffraction patterns are formed in the same way. A process of their formation is described in detail in our monograph [3].

“1932 Nobel Prize in physics goes to Werner Heisenberg for the creation of quantum mechanics, the application of which has, inter alia, led to the discovery of the allotropic forms of hydrogen”. Heisenberg inequality served as a foundation of quantum mechanics in the period when it was created. And only recently a physical essence of this inequality and a limitation of the field of its application have been found. This inequality operates only within the framework of a specific wavelength, for example, of radiation; it loses its influence completely outside this wavelength. Modern knowledge concerning hydrogen atom and molecules causes bewilderment concerning the introduced notion of “the allotropic forms of hydrogen” [3].

“1933 Nobel Prize in physics was divided equally between Erwin Schrodinger and Paul Adrien Maurice Dirac for the discovery of new productive forms of atomic theory”. The way, in which these Nobel Prizes have closed the prospects of development of atomic theory, has been described in our monograph and in the books devoted to the detailed analysis of the errors of the laureates of the Nobel Prizes [3], [4].

“November 15, 1945. 1945 Nobel Prize in physics goes to Wolfgang Pauli for the discovery of the Exclusion Principle, also called the Pauli Principle”. The Exclusion Principle is a result of Niels Bohr’s error concerning the orbital motion of electrons in the atoms and Schrodinger equation, which has strengthened Bohr’s error [3].

“November 3, 1954. 1954 Nobel Prize in physics goes to Max Born for his fundamental research in quantum mechanics, especially for his statistical interpretation of the wavefunction”. The most successful colligation of these “achievements” belongs to Albert Einstein who said: “God does not play dice” [3].

“November 5, 1963. Half of the Nobel Prize in physics goes to Eugene Wigner for his contributions to the theory of the atomic nucleus and the elementary particles”. Modern knowledge and theories concerning the atomic nucleus and the elementary particles are far from those one, for which these prizes have been awarded, and it is unnecessary to comment their differences [3].

“October 21, 1965. Nobel Prize in physics goes to Sin-Itiro Tomogano, Julian Schwinger and Richard Feynman for their fundamental work in quantum electrodynamics, with deep consequences for the physics of elementary particles”. No consequences happened after the prize was awarded. Quantum electrodynamics proved to be completely erroneous. Only recently we have started a correction of these errors [3].

“October 16, 1975. Nobel Prize in physics goes to Aage Bohr, Ben Mottelson and James Rainwater for the discovery of the connection between collective motion and particle motion in atomic nuclei and the development of the theory of the structure of the atomic nucleus based on this connection”. What theory of the structure of the atomic nucleus can be discussed if the latest achievements of orthodox physics describe the nucleus as a drop similar to a water drop?

“October 18, 1976. Nobel Prize in chemistry goes to William Lipscomb for his studies on the structure of boranes illuminating problems of chemical bonding”. These achievements are far from the modern ones, and a wish of chemists to cover over a complete incomprehension of the essence of nature of chemical bonding by a notion of “congeniality to the electron”, which characterizes a complete incomprehension of the essence of the formation of chemical bonding between the atoms of the molecules, makes one smile [3], [4], [5].

We stop tiring the readers by a citation of the fundamental errors of the experts of the Nobel Committee. We let alone all laureates in astrophysics and their errors. But we should note that the damage caused by the Nobel Committee to mankind needs studying. A solution of this task becomes easier now. Certainly, future generations will have to discuss a problem of the negative influence of the Nobel prizes on mankind development and will think how to eliminate this influence. We set aside this problem, but we are sure that the future generations will not let it alone. The changes in this direction have already started. Yesterday (on October 5, 2009), the Russian TV reporters cited a cut and dried information having announced that the Nobel Committee refrained from awarding A. Einstein for his relativity theory, the prize was awarded for the photoelectric effect. We have already shown an impropriety of this decision as well.

All the best.

Professor Kanarev

October 7, 2009

#### REFERENCES

1. P. Sulman. Alfred Nobel's will. M. "Mir" 1993.
2. V. Cholakov. Scientists and discoveries. M. "Mir" 1987.
3. Ph.M. Kanarev. The Foundations of Physchemistry of Microworld. Monograph. 12 edition. Krasnodar 2009. 686 pages. In Russian. <http://kubsau.ru/science/prof.php?kanarev>
4. Ph.M. Kanarev. The Theoretic Foundations of Physchemistry of Microworld. Textbook. 3 edition. Krasnodar 2009. 825 pages. In Russian. <http://kubsau.ru/science/prof.php?kanarev>
5. Ph.M. Kanarev. The Foundations of Physchemistry of Microworld. Monograph. 14 edition. 1025 pages. It is prepared for the edition. In Russian

#### SCIENTIFIC AUTHENTICITY CRITERIA

**Ph.M. Kanarev**

**E-mail: [kanphil@mail.ru](mailto:kanphil@mail.ru)**

**<http://kubsau.ru/science/prof.php?kanarev> In English**

**Announcement.** This article has aroused great interest among the specialists concerning this issue who have almost all authentic information on the state of natural sciences. I'd like to supply a comment of one of the scientists to this article. It originates from the comment that it is necessary to unite those people who correct the former errors and develop more realistic direction of cognition of the physical world, in which we live.

#### ON STATE OF NATURAL SCIENCES

**The first comment: <http://www.inauka.ru/blogs/article94559.html/forum/>**

**Author: Michael Gontsa.**

I accept the scientific opinions of Professor Kanarev, and I think that he has managed to find an amazingly simple criterion of a check of the scientific authenticity of the physical theories. A philosophic essence of the Unity axiom is clear to everybody, but we all paid no attention to it and failed to notice how important it is for scientific analysis. It is Professor Kanarev who has noticed it. The Unity axiom has demonstrated plainly one of the fundamental errors of modern physicists concerning a multipotent role of mathematics in the study of physical processes and phenomena.

Professor Kanarev has shown convincingly that if the dimensional coordinates and time are included into the mathematical models as the INDEPENDENT parameters, such models cannot reflect reality adequately, because these parameters are connected in reality. There are no motions with a change of the coordinates without an associated change of time in the universe. This is another and, one can say, the most convincing argument against a thoughtless confidence in mathematization of physics and other sciences. Mathematic is only a FORMAL apparatus (certainly, rather powerful one), a powerful means of scientific cognition. But mathematics is good and applicable only in the cases when it ADEQUATELY describes and models the corresponding processes. One should understand that mathematics cannot discover a new physical phenomenon, for example, radioactivity or uranium nucleus division, etc. That's why it is necessary to take into account what is PRIMARY and what is SECONDARY. Certainly, physics should be in the first place and mathematics should be on the second place.

Our generation is short of luck: we have got into a dreggy swamp of relativism that has deteriorated physical sciences infinitely, has introduced many absurd ideas, postulates, hypotheses, empty "theories", etc. Please, just think: constancy of velocity of light relatively to everything, deformation of empty space, time slow down, body length reduction, particle mass increase, matching of gravity to lift acceleration, introduction of multidimensional spaces up to 26-dimensional ones and greater, string "theories", pressure of empty space, Big bang, black holes, dark matter and dark energy, universe expansion with unthinkable velocity, increasing velocity of universe expansion at its "periphery", impossibility to overcome velocity of light, travel in time, unthinkable tunnels in space, parallel worlds and a possibility of a travel from one world to another and many other things. NONE of these "discoveries" and "inventions" of the relativists has proved out though they keep promulgating with persistence and great range of distribution. Heaps of "scientific" trash concerning relativity theories have been published. The foundations of these theories have even been included into school programs forcedly, but none of teachers of physics understands them. School and universities cripple the young generation putting it off physics. A reduction of those young people who are willing to enter the departments of physics proves it. The leaders of Politphysics have managed to reach the highest levels of the academic and university structures; they have been awarded the highest scientific ranks and positions; they deceive the Nobel committee annually, which grants them Nobel prizes for the erroneous scientific results. Such state of things damages objective development of Physics, Astronomy, Astrophysics, etc., and becomes unbearable.

The representatives of our generation can be proud of many things. We have dealt a blow to all scientific excogitations having proved their complete inability. A discovery made by Professor Kanarev demands complete revision and rethought of physical and chemical science. This process has already started. It is useless to stand against it. Only bullet-headed dogmatists or buzzards can do it. The faster becomes the process, the better and simpler activities connected with education and upbringing of the modern generation and the future ones will be. But one fails to understand incomprehension, silence and inactivity of the authorities of the leading states, including Russia, despite of the multiple joint appeals of thousands of scientists with open letters and calls, for example [www.cosmologystatement.org](http://www.cosmologystatement.org)

**Michael Gontsa**

**July 16, 2009**