

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

Henok Tadesse
Email: entkidmt@yahoo.com

01 July 2026

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 lack these qualities. Journal editors and reviewers need to have good perception of possible new insights in submitted papers. Science needs more Einsteins, not more Einstein followers.

Einstein is rightly regarded as one of the greatest icons in the history of science. His scientific life continues to inspire people around the world. It is difficult to imagine science being as captivating without his extraordinary contributions. He possessed a remarkable ability to discern underlying patterns amid a maze of seemingly confusing facts. His elegant thought experiments have continued to fascinate physicists for more than a century. Throughout much of his scientific career, he remained deeply focused on a single fundamental question: the nature of motion and the nature and speed of light. This lifelong dedication to one profound problem is virtually unparalleled in the history of science.

His “only failure” was that he just did not completely solve the light speed problem. Only his “chasing a beam of light” thought experiment [1] and his light quanta theory 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 achieve. He proposed the unthinkable at his time, something we take for granted today, revealing one of the greatest mysteries of the universe: the constancy of the speed of light relative to all observers, regardless of their velocity. But he stopped short of revealing the mystery behind the constancy of the speed of light itself (that is, the mystery behind the mystery). He wrongly interpreted it as relativity of space and time. To the end of his life, he continued to pursue basically the same line of thinking and ideas he developed during his 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.

But it would be unfair to claim that Einstein's failure diminishes his achievements. Such a view can only arise from a lack of deep appreciation for the revolutionary nature of his insight into the constancy of the speed of light. To propose that the speed of light could remain constant for all observers—regardless of their motion—was an astonishing intellectual leap, almost unthinkable within the scientific mindset of that era.

But 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. Here we claim that 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 [2]. 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 good perception of possible new insights in submitted papers. Einstein had such an acute perception of novel ideas that he would have recognized 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. He also paid great attention to Mach's ideas in an attempt to develop a deeper understanding of the nature of inertia and gravitation. It turns out that Einstein was also right, at least in part, in his dissatisfaction with the probabilistic interpretation of quantum mechanics. In short, Einstein had a remarkable ability to recognize elegant ideas proposed by others and develop them to their fullest potential.

For many years, I have been proposing a new physical theory, yet it has received little serious attention. Editors and reviewers at physics journals—including, in one case, a Nobel Prize winner—have rejected my manuscripts without explaining what they believe is scientifically incorrect about the theory itself. Instead, the feedback has often focused on presentation. In some cases, reviewers have stated that the paper is not "scientific," citing poor organization rather than identifying specific flaws in the theoretical arguments.

Journal editors rejected my papers because they are not “high quality”. I have learned that, practically, “high quality” [5][6] paper means, at least, that the author should be affiliated with a well-known, prestigious institution, 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. Ignorant of the realities of the scientific publishing landscape, I naively assumed that the novelty of an idea was the single most important criterion for publication. I believed that genuinely original ideas would naturally be recognized and welcomed by the scientific community.

On the other hand, this is not surprising. If even experimental findings such as those of Silvertooth and Marinov could not gain acceptance or publication within mainstream journals, it is hardly surprising that my own theoretical papers were rejected. Nevertheless, this is still frustrating, because ideas challenging established theories face extraordinary barriers regardless of whether they are theoretical or experimental.

Thus, none of the journal editors or reviewers appeared to recognize the central novel ideas presented in my papers, even though the essential theory was stated explicitly in just a few lines of the abstracts. Had they recognized even a glimpse of the underlying insight, they might have evaluated the manuscripts primarily on their scientific content rather than dismissing them because of shortcomings in presentation or my lack of institutional 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. *The second postulate has been shown to be wrong as it is usually stated, such as: the speed of light is constant in all reference frames, the speed of light is constant c independent of source velocity. (See Appendix for disproof). Not surprisingly, readers will be confused here because the second postulate and Einstein's "chasing a beam of light" thought experiment have always been seen as one and the same, which they are not.*

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

3. *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

4. *Apparent Constancy of the Speed of Light and Apparent Change of Time of Light Emission Relative to an Inertial Observer in Absolute Motion*, by Henok Tadesse, www.vixra.org

5. 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.

6. 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 in 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 [4] 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 [3].

APPENDIX

The second postulate of the Special Relativity Theory- the velocity of the source relative to what?

Next we uncover a flaw in the second postulate of Special Relativity theory that has been overlooked for more than a century. The second postulate of SRT states that the speed of light is independent of the source velocity. But there is a flaw in the second postulate: the velocity of the source relative to what?

Consider two cases of a terrestrial light experiment involving a light source and an observer/detector. In the first experiment, the observer is at rest and the source is moving with velocity v away from the source, in the earth's frame. In the second experiment, the source is at rest and the observer is moving with velocity v away from the observer, in the earth's frame. Next we analyze the predicted experimental outcomes based on the second postulate for each case, both in the reference frame of the source (Fig 1a) and in the reference frame of the observer (Fig 1b) and compare the results with experimental facts, as shown in the table below.



Fig 1a



Fig 1b

Assume that the distance between the source and the observer is D at the instant of light emission ($t = 0$). We ignore the velocity of the earth relative to the sun and relative to the ECI frame to avoid complications.

	Time of light detection τ (assume light is emitted at $t = 0$) (based on the on the second postulate)		Experimental fact (τ)
	In the reference frame of the observer	In the reference frame of the light source	
Observer at rest and light source moving with velocity v directly away from the observer, in the earth's frame	$\tau = \frac{D}{c}$	$\tau = \frac{D}{c - v}$	$\tau = \frac{D}{c}$
Light source at rest and observer moving with velocity v directly away from the source, in the earth's frame	$\tau = \frac{D}{c}$	$\tau = \frac{D}{c - v}$	$\tau = \frac{D}{c - v}$

If the second postulate was correct and compatible with the principle of relativity, there would be agreement in the predicted times (τ) of detection in the two experiments, there would be agreement between the predictions in the observer's and source's reference frames, and agreement with the actual experimental results.

From the above table, we can see that the second postulate is disproved in both experiments. (amber shaded cells).

1. In the first experiment, that is the case of the observer at rest and the light source in motion relative to the earth, the second postulate makes correct prediction that agrees experiments in the reference frame of the observer. However, the second postulate makes wrong prediction in the reference frame of the source. In this case, the light postulate predicts that the speed of light is constant c . However, as can be seen from the table, this leads to a wrong prediction of τ . The correct value of τ can be obtained only by assuming $c+v$ for the speed of light in this frame.

2. In the second experiment, that is the case of the light source at rest and observer in motion relative to the earth, the second postulate makes correct prediction that agrees with experiments in the reference frame of the source. However, it makes wrong prediction in the reference frame of the observer. In this case the second postulate predicts that (in the reference frame of the observer) the speed of light is constant c independent of the velocity of the source in this frame. But we can see that the speed of light depends on the source velocity in the observers frame! The correct value of τ can be obtained only by assuming $c-v$ for the speed of light in this frame.

The only way out is to accept the existence of absolute motion and restate the second postulate as: the speed of light in vacuum is constant c independent of the source *absolute* velocity. But then this disproves the principle and theory of relativity.

Einstein's second postulate is incorrect, whereas his "chasing a beam of light" thought experiment is correct. Not surprisingly, readers will be confused here because the two have always been seen as one and the same. That is, relative to an observer moving away from the light source at the speed of light, the light waves always travel at the same constant speed of light c . However, the second postulate: the speed of light is constant independent of source velocity, is flawed and this has been hidden for more than a century.

Constancy of the speed of light relative to all observers – Scientific evidence of God

The question arises: Then what is the mystery behind the constancy of the speed of light relative to all observers? Consider an observer moving with a velocity of the speed of light away from a light source. How could light still approach such an observer at the constant speed c ? !

The mystery is that the light photons are emitted from the source with velocity $c + V$, where V is the velocity of the observer, so that the speed of light relative to the observer will be $(c + V) - V = c$. The question that follows: how does the source 'know' the velocity of the observer so as to 'adjust' the speed of the emitted photons accordingly? .

For many years, I have focused my research on the problem of absolute motion and the nature and speed of light. Although I believed I had gained the crucial insight needed to resolve this century-old problem, the theoretical model I developed still contained unresolved difficulties and apparent contradictions. The missing link emerged while I was investigating a seemingly unrelated area of physics: quantum phenomena, wave-function collapse, and, in particular, the puzzle of the quantum which-way experiment. This proved to be the single most important discovery I made during more than a decade of theoretical research.

Based on this work, I arrived at the conclusion that the same underlying principle is responsible for both quantum phenomena and the constancy of the speed of light. I identify this underlying principle with God. Consequently, I argue that quantum phenomena and the constancy of the speed of light constitute scientific evidence for the existence of God.