

Dear Professor Engelen,

I can understand that my results on nuclear reactions shake some foundations of your view of science. However, I am very well aware of the results I have reached and their implications and am confident about them. I am an experimentalist who seldom speculates about theory and avoids everything about “new physics” since that seems as a way to avoid the necessary proofs.

So I am working on science in an open-minded way and try to learn what nature is able to tell me. I always avoid being confused by theories even if have worked in theory and computations many times in my life. The results I have reached are reproducible and have been repeated many times in a few laboratories.

The main problem I have met in my work is the “priests of physics” who know what is right and wrong without repeating or even analysing the experiments. It may be interesting for you to know that the main argument which the editors of PLOS One used to retract my first publication on mesons after two years was that they said that the law of baryon conservation did not allow the creation of mesons. You can be lucky that the “specialists” they asked were not on the board of CERN.

Have you really read the paper in IJHE that was so upsetting to you? Have you observed that the life-times of all the mesons involved and of the muons have actually been measured with high precision? Did you observe the exact closing of the energy cycles of annihilation? These results are not mistakes and are not fabricated. They took a long time and hard work to reach. If you follow the development of my research you will observe that I do not know beforehand what the experiments will show and that I have had to change my mind openly several times when I have learned more from the experiments. I do not like many physics experiments which are just “keyhole” experiments where no new information is found but where only a theoretical prediction is to be confirmed. I assume that we differ there.

Finally, I want to stress that I believe strongly in scientific method and especially in experimental science. I have met so many arguments in my life that experimental results were impossible, first in the field of Rydberg species, then in the field of Rydberg Matter, then in the field of ultra-dense hydrogen, and now in the field of nuclear processes. The know-it-alls were usually theoreticians. I have always continued to do better experiments and after around 50 publications, the voices from the “priests of physics” have died down. I believe that this will happen once more.

I want you to publish this answer to your comments on your web-site. I have also prepared an answer to your comments as if you were a specialist reviewer. Thank you for the opportunity to discuss my experimental results. Of course, they are not what you want but they are correct.

Yours sincerely, Leif Holmlid