

Google groups

« Groups Home

# Oscillator/Substance

## + Theory

Search this group

Search Groups

REPEAT of " INFINITE VARIABLES " Wishing you what you so desperately seek.

Options

2 messages - Collapse all - Report discussion as spam

ka-sala [View profile](#)

[More options](#) Jun 2 2010, 11:11 pm

\*\*\* The reason for this repeat is because this is where we are all standing. On the same pin-point. I said I believe we have the key, and the gravity of this O/S jig-saw. I have not repeated in these simple words for nothing. Best wishes to all. Can anyone see this while we are together ?

In our Oscillation Theory, a lot has been said lately regarding Infinity. Directly or indirectly; we have been oscillating all around the subject of the O/S Theory. To get to where we want to be we must bring it back to the unified weak and electromagnetic interaction between elementary particles, including inta alia, the prediction of weak neutral current.

We have to return to the source of our search; see it for what it is, and go on from there. ie. A look at quantum superposition, atemporality and the direction of entropy in relation to eternity. We can go over and over Planck's Theory, and anyone else's. The difference is we are here... now. Today's Theory.

\*\*\* Please excuse any spelling mistakes. I would be very interested to have feedback on these two posts regarding the O/S Theory which Links all which has been covered to date.

Wishing you what you so desperately seek.  
Ka-sala

\*\*\*\*\*

### INFINITE VARIABLES

This is like asking one such as a human, to stand on the point of a pin; take a step off, and simply hope we won't fall into the abyss of Eternity.

The quantum superposition if being so finite as to suppose we can take a minute step in such a diversity as the Infinite we call Eternity, is neither to know we are retreating or progressing. To literally make such an absolute turn around, with the knowledge that we will step back into chaos; is more than one giant step for man to handle. He has enough already to assemble in his own collective elements.

If this direction of entropy points with a definite sign-post (be it visible in such a universal science as the quantum's allow,) there has to be some-one who has been to Eternity and back to signify any measurement at all its physical science. Even quantum superposition would be that all the pieces of the jig-saw puzzle still missing,

### Home

#### Discussions

[+ new post](#)

#### Members

[About this group](#)

[Edit my membership](#)

[Group settings](#)

[Management tasks](#)

[Invite members](#)



View this group in the [new Google Groups](#)

#### Sponsored links

[What is Quantum Jumping?](#)

Discover Why Thousands of People are "Jumping" to Change Their Life [www.QuantumJumping.com](#)

[Masters in Public Policy](#)

Earn a Master's Degree in Public Policy Online at NEC. Free Brochure [PublicPolicy.NEC.edu](#)

[How to Do Meditation?](#)

Did You Know That Meditating Just 15 Min a Day Could Change Your Life [www.SilvaLifeSystem.com](#)

[See your message here...](#)

will  
automatically just fall into place as the elements should.

Hoping that each like a stepping stone - or giant quantum leap of certainty - our only amoebic particle of theoretical virtue will take our weight. Or carry us as a whips of quantum superposition back into a space time dimension of... are we there yet, or is there more to come? The place called atemporality, or timeless.

Elements of the unknown all lie within the universe of each of us - within our sub atomic thermodynamic elementary and transitional particles - right through to the seeming chaos of decay. We shovel every component required to keep us fueled to create an infinite layer of cells required to hold us in an overlay called skin. As long as the life-span of our own nuclear decay exists while in this superposable state called human, we will continue within our own field force.

So while on the pin-point of quantum superposition, instead of stepping off, we can use our own electromagnetic energy, vacuuming every quantized oscillating molecule around us, to us. By doing so, we draw on all variable changes created via the quantum super positioning; propelling us by repulsion within a non moving vacuum.

Through this, we create from what was a seeming a state of entropy, a transverse tunnel in which we can now safely step off the pin. By turning matter back on itself from what would have been a physical phenomenon of universal conformity, it has been transformed into a usable state.

There is nothing in the universe called oscillating energy, which is not transferable, transitional, reversible, or any other attribute, which cannot be utilized when known how to superimpose. The atemporality is unaffected by the space time dimension of Eternity's Infinite variables.

The only unknown factor is the inconsistent knowledge yet, within our own field. The Cosmos it's Photons, and Electromagnetism is within each and every one of us. Why are we oscillating for so long over so many theories?

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#) [Report spam](#)

[dean sinclair](#) [View profile](#)

[More options](#) Jun 3 2010, 9:45 am

O.K. Ka-Sala,  
You are just much too bright for this old man. Or maybe you just think too much. It seems to me that you are missing a lot of my points, particularly my point about defining what we are talking about.  
Just what do you mean by "unified weak and electromagnetic interaction?"  
By my thinking both the "weak" and "electromagnetic" interactions are terms from conventional physics which are meaningless if we consider the "four forces" as all being observational aspects of one "force--" pressures within a "substance-substrate" having the basic characteristics of a liquid at its triple point.

Could you define "atemporality" for me, hopefully in terms of my postulated "Aether?" Also, can you give me a good definition of "Entropy?" I've never seen a really good one, and I must admit that I'm not sure how to fit the concept in. Does it fit in with the concept of Mass as I define it, with the problems of Kinetic Energy, or is it a measure of some sort of the "degree to which some action-reaction sequence somehow repairs the chaos behind a shock wave in which we exist?"

"Infinity," to me, has a practical definition of "the point, instant, or number just beyond where we stop, quit counting, quit examining, or our means of information gathering or transfer fail...." Eternity would have a similar connotation. An extent just beyond the extent of our "Perceptual Universe."

As long as we've been co-workers in this, I don't think that you have listened closely to old Eski...

It could, of course, be that Old Eski, "the Pretend Genius," a person of admittedly slow and limited intellectual abilities, who can only try to be intelligent by looking for different ways to interpret what others take for granted, is totally lost in comprehending the ideas of those who have true genius level capabilities. I only vaguely discern what either you or O'Sullivan is saying a great deal of the time. .

I do hope that some how, Eski can put together something that is at least rational for a 30 min. presentation at the Vigier Symposium so we don't end up appearing a bunch of "nincompoops."

If you were to suggest one point that you think he should make in that presentation, what would it be?

Allaha asmaladik...DLS

- [Show quoted text](#) -

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#)

End of messages

---

[« Back to Discussions](#)

[« Newer topic](#) [Older topic »](#)

Gmail Calendar Documents Photos Reader Sites Web more

deanlsinclair@gmail.com

Google groups

[« Groups Home](#)

# Oscillator/Substance Theory

Search this group

Search Groups

## MECHANISM

Options

3 messages - [Collapse all](#) - [Report discussion as spam](#)hoek [View profile](#)[More options](#) Jun 4 2010, 6:54 am

We all find ourselves existing in a wondrous realm of three spatial and one forward moving dimension of time. This last dimension allows cause, effect and logic, allows motion within the other three spatial dimensions, which allows MECHANISM! Mechanism allows biological life.

Even, though, it won the Nobel Prize for nuclear physics, back in 1967, I doubt that any of us believe in quark theory or it's spawn, Quantum Chromo-Dynamics as a valid nuclear model. Assuming the positive proton to be +1, the slightly, more massive neutral, neutron to be (0 zero) and the minute, more than 1860 times less massive, negative electron to be -1, some of the best and fastest to publish, of two teams of mathematicians, presented Quark Theory. Simply put,  $(+2/3)+(+2/3)+(-1/3) = +3/3 = +1 = \text{Proton}$ ,  $(+2/3)+(-1/3)+(-1/3) = 0 = \text{Neutron}$ . It is without a doubt, the simplest mathematical solution to the assumed axioms, but, how does it work, what is the mechanism by which these up and down quarks interact and interchange to form protons and neutrons? This brings us to the above mentioned QCD which needs, at least one or possibly up to three more extra complex dimensions, depending upon which quantum particle physicist you ask, an extra fundamental force of nature, (color force) and eight fields of mediating force particles called gluons to explain the mathematics of the "bootstrap" quark hypothesis and nobody knows how it all works, what the mechanism is. As we all know, bootstrap means that the model was created before data was found to substantiate it. Particle physicists have been searching for that data for the last 47 years and still they search on for the elusive quark.

We all believe that the atom or some part of it is a primary oscillator or we wouldn't belong to the Oscillator/Substance (energy-mass) group. Most of us approached this topic from varying directions. I saw an animation in a science film 32 years ago. It nagged at my curiosity. ([http://www.protoncosmology.com/new\\_page\\_1.htm](http://www.protoncosmology.com/new_page_1.htm)) What could be causing these peculiar dynamic charge patterns to appear on the proton, as predicted by computer analysis of scattering data? I eventually figured it out, ([http://www.protoncosmology.com/new\\_page\\_3.htm](http://www.protoncosmology.com/new_page_3.htm)), my training in electricity and electronics helped immensely; this led me on to further questions like, what made it work, why did the particles continue to oscillate, what was the spark plug, the mechanism? I eventually arrived at  $E = MC^2$  and the fact that the velocity of the oscillating particles was always slower (sub-luminary) than the spinning charge fields that they generated while in linear motion. It was an extreme Eureka moment! Placing the four particle oscillating model within the confines of a reflective, semi-permeable, sphere, will result in a perpetual primary oscillator, a Proton. ([http://www.protoncosmology.com/fundamental\\_mechanics1.htm](http://www.protoncosmology.com/fundamental_mechanics1.htm).)

I welcome, in fact, urge any member of our group or anyone else who would be good enough to read about it, to comment on this model. If you find fault in this fundamental mechanics hypothesis, please point it out. If you find something pertinent, that can help, PLEASE, point that out too. The only major assumption that I make in the electromagnetic like dynamics of this model is directionality of charge, as mediated by  $C^2$ , relative to the energy mass spectrum.

Being interested in physics, I'm sure you're all familiar with Occam's razor. "When competing hypotheses are equal in other respects, the principle recommends selection of the hypothesis that introduces the fewest assumptions and postulates the fewest entities while still sufficiently answering the question." – wiki.

## Home

### Discussions

[+ new post](#)

### Members

[About this group](#)[Edit my membership](#)[Group settings](#)[Management tasks](#)[Invite members](#)View this group in the [new Google Groups](#)

### Sponsored links

[Particle Identification](#)Particle size, shape & make-up Using SEM/EDS/AFA Analysis [www.herguth.com](http://www.herguth.com)[Ask a Lawyer: Motion](#)

24 Lawyers Are Online!

Motion Answers Today: 87.

[Legal.JustAnswer.com/Motion](http://Legal.JustAnswer.com/Motion)[See your message here...](#)

Quantum Chromo-Dynamics needs from one up to three extra dimensions, one extra fundamental force of nature, whose force strength works opposite to the four fundamental forces recognized by physics and no valid logical mechanism to describe its workings. The nuclear model, I propose, has a mechanism, operates in just the four perceivable dimensions in which we exist, is in agreement with the accepted Rutherford-Bohr atomic model and can be explained by the mathematics of Classical Hamiltonian Physics. It needs no extra dimensions, or forces. It is a total cosmology, from top to bottom, that can explain what caused the inflationary big bang to occur, what gravity, dark energy and dark flow, quantum foam and the internal mechanics of the atomic nucleus are. For those interested: (<http://www.helium.com/items/1304605-how-the-universe-formed>).

Dr. Sinclair, Eski (the old one) as he likes to be called, is the founder of the group. We met through our writings on helium.com and he was kind enough to invite me to join his group. Thanks Doc.

Doc approaches the oscillator model via various derivations, manipulations and associations of the Planck's constant equation. Max Planck, a pioneering physicist, the first, I know of to propose an oscillating atom. I know you don't like to believe in the neutron, Eski, your cosmological view is, you propose a splitting of energy mass into two separate universes, one matter, and one antimatter. Your nuclear view is a mirror image of that and a neutron, kind of, gets in the way. My model proposes four synchronously oscillating, antimatter universes, whose motions and fields act externally to create our universe and dispense it back to energy. They've been probing the neutron. It's there: ([http://protoncosmology.com/science\\_news1.htm](http://protoncosmology.com/science_news1.htm)). In the model I propose, the charge and anti- or opposite charge both occur transitionally, from positive to negative charge during the densest, most compacted, energy mass phase. Can Planck's constant be transposed to accommodate that supposition, Eski, Hugh, anyone? From energy to positively charged mass, to negatively charged mass, to energy. Will that work out on a graph, Hugh? Charles, in your posting you state, "In fact, all of the Planck constants are reduced values as of the elementary charge,  $2\pi$  or the reciprocal of the speed of light." Is there a correlation with the collapsing of two diametrically opposed conical charges upon a point ( $V = 2(1/3 \pi c^2 h)$ , where  $h$  stands for the cone height, not Planck's constant?

Next month will bring the Vigier VII symposium in London, Eski, at which you will be afforded 15 minutes to talk about our group. Unless you or someone finds a viable mechanism for your model or someone can demonstrate something vitally wrong with the model I propose, I urge you to please give it a noticeable mention. I guarantee you, Eski, if I win anything. We both won't have to depend on Social Security anymore.

Good Luck and best wishes to all,  
hoek

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#) [Report spam](#)

**ESKI** [View profile](#)

[More options](#) Jun 4 2010, 4:27 pm

Don't know what is going wrong, get a little way and lose all I've written, Will take other tack and try to post one version, far from complete, (You are not mentioned, Hoek, and I intend to get you a passing comment, at least, as having a somewhat similar theoretical approach, we have a couple of weeks yet, maybe we can get to common ground....) Anyway, that version might clear up some of your misconceptions as to my stance....

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#)

**dean sinclair** [View profile](#)

[More options](#) Jun 4 2010, 4:40 pm

This is the first part of a tentative draft of a talk for the Vegier Symposium, it may bear little resemblance to a final draft and anyone is certainly welcome to comment within. I'm posting it in the hopes that it will help to clarify my positions with respect to those taken by you (Hoek) .

A Framework for a Fundamental Theory?

Dean L(eRoy) Sinclair

An idea, "Perhaps one could pretend to be a genius by consciously trying to 'see the overlooked obvious'," when applied to physical science data--some

using the centimeter-gram-second system of dimensions, at about  $4.7 \times 10^{-19}$  grams and  $4.7 \times 10^{-19}$  centimeters. This  $4.7 \times 10^{-19}$  g. is some orders of magnitude larger than the rest mass values for the electron and proton. The size value turns out to be very close to the  $10^{-18}$  cm. value where Quantum Mechanics is said to fail and the Strings of String Theory disappear into a 10 dimensional hole.

If the O/S Model be valid, then the Hadron Collider has a very low probability of ever being able to fulfill the aim of colliding streams of protons. The problem of moving vortexes which can coordinate, through a medium containing other oscillators, some of which may well be separable into electrons and anti-electrons and deformable into neutrons, is far different from "pushing a stream of charged particles which will repel each other through a vacuum...."

I have covered most of the ideas that were promised to be mentioned in the "abstract,"

(see "Sinclair's Abstract, " which can be found by Googleing "Vigier VII Symposium and checking on "abstracts submitted," please don't be too angry at the mangled English in the abstract, it wasn't carefully proof read.)

It is probably time to try to explain the logic on which all of this is based. I finally realized, that I might as well go back to an article I wrote, but have never published, called

#### The Model That Grew Itself

I hope this will be a bit more understandable and enjoyable than the previous...

#### MODEL THAT GREW ITSELF

A simple, almost naive, Model of Everything, has seemed to almost grow by itself, logical step by logical step, during the last five years. The simplest statement of the model is that it postulates that all of existence is within a "Substance," tending always toward a triple point of equal distribution of motion, which consists of oscillators or is controlled by oscillators of a "constant torque family" defined by the equation,  $m \times r = h/c$ , that is mass times radius equals Planck's Constant divided by the speed of light.

The above is a simple digest of this entire article; however, one may hope that it is not a total turn-off for readers. Let us back off and start at the beginning.

About January of 2004, a year before the "Year of Einstein," 2005, which was exactly a century after Albert Einstein published his work that later came to be known as "Relativity," an old man working as a part-time janitor and newspaper inserter, was thinking back to his younger days who, despite being somewhat learning disabled and slow-thinking he had, somehow, staggered through college to a rather extensive education in science. HE realized, however, that despite all the "education," he had not understood the "Theory of Relativity." even though the term, "Relativity" seemed to be an obvious concept, the idea that all information is relative to the observer. He had a thought, "Maybe Einstein's Genius was the ability to see things that were so obvious that everyone tended to overlook their significance. If this be true, then possibly, one could pretend to be a genius by deliberately seeking to find hidden significance in overlooked information."

The very first thing that the Oldster thought of looking at was a rather ironic idea, "Maybe there is something in Einstein's Relativity that is commonly overlooked?" That started an internal dialog something like this:

"The most common thing known about Einstein's Relativity is the mathematical equations containing the relationship,  $v^2/c^2$ . Now any mathematical relationship can be generalized, what would the meaning of 'c' as a constant be, if we generalized Einstein's Relativity mathematical equations?"

"'c' would be the maximum speed of information transfer in whatever Universe we are considering whether it be the Universe felt by Whales at

dating back to before 1900--has led to a simple--but inclusive--model which may provide a framework for a comprehensive theory uniting the fields of physical science.

This model--which could possibly be dubbed "The Research Results of the Pretend Genius Approach--" is currently called the "Oscillator/Substance Model." Its basic tenet is "All existence is the result of sequential 'action-reaction-action' interactions within a Substance/Substrate of undefined basic composition and extent." This all-pervasive basic substance/substrate can be considered to have the general characteristics of a liquid substance at its "triple point," where with slight changes it can act as a gas or solid.

Continued "sequential equilibration" within this results in constant motion such that the system is composed of/controlled by oscillators.

Some of these oscillators are vortexes which have long term stability.

Their interactions result in "Matter."

Among the results of this view are an explanation for "charges," which are a result of the orientation, counter-clockwise or clockwise of the rotation-inversion senses of the vortex oscillators and the related definition of the size, shape and form of electrons and protons and the corresponding "anti-units." These appear from a reinterperetation of Planck's Constant and a use of it to define a basic family of oscillators.

A solution to the problem of unifying the "Four Forces of Nature," appears automatically when it is realized that none of the "Four Forces of Nature" meet the criterion of a "Force." and that pressures within a substance does.

Resolving the "Matter of the Missing Anti-matter." becomes a bit more complicated, but essentially add up to the realization that if one half of the oscillation of a given oscillator be defined as a matter unit, the other half would be anti-matter. As the electron and anti-electron can be considered as the split off halves of a parent oscillator, if the electron be called a matter unit, the anti-electron is "anti-matter." There is an extension to this. The electron is a split off "half" of another oscillator, the neutron. If half an oscillator be matter, and the electron be defined as matter, then the proton is "Anti-matter." Since it can be shown that if about 41/42 of the Kinetic Energy of an anti-electron were transformed into Mass, an anti-electron would apparently become a proton. Similar calculations show an electron could, theoretically be transformed into an anti-proton. One may say, therefore, that "There is something the matter with this whole 'matter-anti-matter' idea.

What we call "Matter" is observed in our Universe as a combination of the "matter unit," the electron and the "anti-matter unit," the proton. A thorough examination of the idea of oscillators in a medium shows that this view is probably correct and that the expressiion of the different rotations of smaller oscillators within a half of a larger oscillator, that half being our "Universe" which has a rotation of its own, accounts for this apparent anomaly. In the Anti-verse corresponding to ours, the "electron" and "proton" of that Universe would have the reversed rotation inversion orientation of ours, as the Anti-verse has the reversed rotation-inversion of ours.

Careful examination from nuclear chemistry suggests that the "proton-neutron" atomic nucleus, hides an interesting clue to the "Lost Anti-matter" of our universe. If the electrons and protons be considered "Matter," the "neutron" count may be considered as the instantaneous amount of the "nucleus" which is being expressed as positrons and anti-protons, i.e. the "Anti-matter" content. The missing anti-matter, appears to be, by this model, simply a semantic illusion.

Another situation which may be considered as a semantic illusion is the missing mass of the universe. This probably occurs because "Mass" is used in two different ways, as the name of an entity, and as an attribute of an entity. As an attribute, it is a variable. This variable, we measure, usually, as a "rest mass" which turns out to be a minimal value. An average value for the oscillators of our universe can be estimated, along with an average size of the oscillators of our universe, by noting that if Planck's Constant be divided by the speed of light, the resulting constant has the dimensions of mass and distance (radius). As at some instant, mass and radius would have the same absolute values, each equal to the square root of this new constant, one can say that this "inversion" point would occur,

1000 ft. in the ocean, or Pony Express Riders carrying the mail in the 1880's. We could even define a 'Perceptual Universe' by the speed of information transfer in it. Einstein's equations, then, describe what happens to information as transmitters and receivers move with relation to one another. The work actually would belong in 'Information Theory.' "

"What then actually is 'c?'" " If we consider the Pony Express Analogy, "c" would be the average speed in any direction from a point that can be expected from averaging over some period the motions of the 'Information Packet Carriers.' The Speed of Light is an average, not an absolute limit, An average of the motions of the carriers, whatever they are, which must exist throughout nature, if nature is consistent."

This view of information transfer being consistent and the speed of light being an average rather than a maximum sets up an entirely different possible view of everything from the conventional picture taught in science classes and the logic which arises leads to a different ...

[read more »](#)

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#)

End of messages

[« Back to Discussions](#)

[« Newer topic](#) [Older topic »](#)



This view of information transfer being consistent and the speed of light being an average rather than a maximum sets up an entirely different possible view of everything from the conventional picture taught in science classes and the logic which arises leads to a different mode. of everything.

Additional questions arose. IF there is a medium, an information carrier, what is its nature? How can it be a "solid/" How does light have both "particle" and "wave" properties? Where do "mass" and "energy" fit in? To be a solid, it must somehow act as if it were a matrix. For information to move there must be some movement, some motion. So the first idea was "Motion in a Matrix." Fitting in Mass and Energy as two aspects of motions, energy as motion along a line and Mas as being related to motion about a point fit well into this. Later it was realized that there would be some slight shifts that would bit better to reality. Mass could be considered as being about a point, but contained within a surface centered on a point. Energy could be considered as a more general term for a total "package of motion," but usually meaning Kinetic Energy, motion associated with motion of an entity along a line, perhaps better called "Translatory Energy."

The focus, however, remaining on where, this started, with the consideration of the importance of the speed of light and hence of electromagnetic phenomena, it was natural to consider what could possibly be learned by examining Planck's relationship between frequency of electromagnetic radiation and energy, the equation,  $E=hu$ . Energy equal Planck's Constant,  $h$ , times the frequency, " $u$ ," {Pronounced "Nu," as the Greek letter.} Analysis of the equation shows that Planck's Constant,  $h$ , has the dimensions of Angular Momentum, which is mass times radius (of a spinning body) times velocity. That led to the idea of simply writing,  $h=mvr$  and evaluating this at an average value of velocity as " $c$ ."

Doing the substitution of " $c$ " for " $v$ " and dividing it out to produce  $mr=h/c$ , gave an almost electrifying result when two separate things were realized about this very simple little equation. It was realized, that mass times radius is a "torque." which can be considered as the effect of one spinning body on another. As " $h$ " and " $c$ " are "Constants of Nature,"  $h/c$  would be the "Torque Constant of Nature." It was also realized that " $mr=h/c$  is an equation that could be written in the form of  $xy=K=yx$ . That is if the "Absolute Numerical Values" of Mass and Radius are switched there will be found the other limit of an oscillator, the balancing values to the observed values. The equation,  $xy=K=yx$ , is the form equation for a number of "Balanced Laws of Nature" including the Law of Levers and the Law of Forces. "for each and every force there is an equal and opposite force. " It., also defines limits for a linear oscillator. Although any natural oscillator would be surely multi-dimensional, such an oscillator, having symmetry, can be analyzed as if it were linear... The  $mr=h/c$  equation appears to represent represent such a dimensional analysis applicable to any oscillator of the "family-set" which may represent all of the fundamental oscillators of our natural existence.

Assuming that the oscillator family set,  $\{mr=h/c=rm\}$ , is a valid description of fundamental units of existence, it was postulated that the average value through which all oscillators will vibrate is the balance value of the above equation where  $m=r=(m/r)^{0.5}$ . That is, the absolute value of mass equals absolute value of radius and each has the absolute value of the square root of the torque.

Checking the above ideas to see whether they would fit with the very important basic units of matter, the electron and the proton, we find that they do indeed fit the set, and in fact, information describing one oscillator limit, the largest radius and the smallest mass set, does occur in the literature. The mass is reported as "rest mass" and the radius is reported as Compton Wavelength. The transposition to determine the other set of limits is not in the literature, nor is there any evidence that the Compton Wavelength is recognized as a radius. A careful examination of the literature definition of the Compton Wavelength showed that it is indeed the same as the "r" defined by our set equation.

Somewhere about this point in the logic that seemed to be leading automatically toward a rather complete "Theory of Everything" starting from very few basic assumptions, there came the realization that what we are looking at as an overall model would fit closely to the idea of a substance which would tend to equalize motion throughout. That is tend to a "triple point," where it could act as any of the three standard states of matter, solid, liquid or gas. This would explain the transverse wave motion of light, the pressure change of the disturbance is enough to cause the medium, "substance," to react as if it were a solid at the instant the disturbance passes through. Electromagnetic radiation would be a transient wave disturbance, "particles" such as the electron would be permanent oscillators/oscillations.

Other ideas began to drop into place. The electron and its reverse, the anti-electron are known to "annihilate" with the release of radiation having a value equal to the "rest the electron" times the square of the speed of light. Conversely, it is known that light at an energy above this value can interact with matter to produce an electron-anti-electron set, "pair Production." It is also known that the electron and anti-electron spend appreciable time in the same vicinity before "annihilation." This implies that annihilation requires a very specific orientation of the two oscillators. As an oscillator spinning counter clockwise and a reversed oscillator spinning clockwise if they became exactly oriented along a common axis could combine to a simple pulsating oscillator with loss of the spinning energy to the milieu, it seems logical to consider that the electron and anti-electron are actually halves of a pulsating parent unit having the same oscillator limits as either of the two. Oscillators in a substance would be expected to fall into three general patterns, full-wave, pulsating spheres, full-wave pseudo-spheres having an axis and an equator with counter-rotating halves, and half-wave vortices which result from the splitting of the second category. The electron, anti-electron and proton would apparently belong to the last category.

Looking at the neutron, it was noted that it does not fit neatly into any of the three above categories as, having a magnetic moment it is not symmetric. A calculation of what it would take to change an anti-electron into a neutron showed that if about  $4\frac{1}{2}$  of the kinetic energy of the anti-electron were changed to mass, it could become a neutron. As a spherical oscillator could presumably be "squashed" such that half of the unit took the "mass" (it's becoming clear that mass must be a measure of the internal motion within a unit) then it makes sense that the "parent unit" of the electron and anti[electron might, under the right circumstances be distorted to a neutron, which could later rearrange into an electron and proton.

A little consideration showed that the inversion/splitting instant of an oscillator of the kind of oscillator which could produce a "Universe " would certainly release a twisting shock wave in opposite directions, this could distort "parent units," on one side of the split or inversion into neutrons, on the other side, anti-neutrons. If our half-wave oscillators have an average rotational velocity and an inversion rate of "c" the speed of light, their minimum speed is zero and their maximum speed at inversion is 2c. A pulse trying to move at "2c" against a medium with an average value of "c," in any given direction, would create a shock wave distorting some of the medium.

This not only gives a rationalization for the existence of neutrons, but also gives a possible description of the "Big Bang" postulated as the start of our Universe. The "Big Bang" would simply be the inversion instant of an ultra-low-frequency oscillator in the "Substance of Existence," --or possibly the instant of split, if our Universe actually be an "Electron Analog.""

The conclusions reached at this point give an outline of a theory of everything being a part of a substance of an undefined size, consisting of oscillators--or organized into oscillators--partially or totally belonging to a "family." defined by the set,  $\{m \times r = h/c\}$ . This substance is in constant flux due to its tendency to equilibrate motion throughout....

The conclusions that can be reached from this model are interesting. Here are some: We can define mass as a measure of the tension/pressure felt at the surface of an entity balancing the motion within the object under consideration and the rest of Existence. Energy is a general term for a "packet of motion." Kinetic Energy is a measure of the motion content of an entity moving within the Substance on a given vector. Light, i.e., electromagnetic radiation, is a vibration disturbance within the substance. A disturbance which will dissipate. Electrons and protons are vibrational disturbances which have indefinite life times.

Considering the electron and proton as inverting oscillators of the set, having an average rotational speed of "c" and an inversion rate of once per rotation allows the calculation of probable comparative "sizes" of the two units, their actual motions and the meaning of "positive and negative charges." A "positive charge would be a characteristic associated with a clock-wise spinning unit, the proton. A "negative charge" defines a "counter-clockwise" spinning unit, the electron. (The electron has been shown in cloud chambers to leave a counter-clockwise spiral path in space.)

Since the two entities rotate in opposite senses, they would tend to cancel each others effects in space and hence be "attracted." However, as they have radically different oscillator limits-- therefore, much different inversions frequencies--they cannot "annihilate." Rather than annihilating, they associate in a multitude of ways, resubsting in all of the entities which we consider matter.

By this model, we exist behind the shock wave of the expansion phase of an

E347 - July 19, 2010

People, here is my current idea for a script for my talk scheduled in July for the Vigier VII Symposium. I am inviting comment, editing, addition or deletion ideas. Send any ideas to me at deanlsinclair@yahoo.com. As close as I can tell, "reading time" for this as an oral presentation is right on 30 min. I do not know yet how much time will be allowed. Will fill you all in with any details as to the Symposium whenever I get any. Thanks.

THIRD TRY FOR A SCRIPT...

It is my pleasure to welcome the Vigier VII Symposium to the Aberdeen American News here in Aberdeen, South Dakota, U.S. of A. and to be able to thank the News and Dr. Amoroso for this opportunity to introduce to the wider scientific community a Framework for a Comprehensive Theory which seems to be applicable at any scale from sub-atomic to cosmic.

I also wish to thank my friends from two Internet Groups who have contributed information and support over the last three years since the first version of this model was published on Helium.com as "Motion in a Matrix..." The current version has a working title of the Oscillator/Substance Model, as it has become clear that the motions that are involved are primarily, if not totally, oscillatory in nature, and a liquid substance at its triple point where it can also act as a solid or a gas makes a much better model than does a rigid matrix.

One of the groups which I need to thank is the Condensed Matter Nuclear Science Group, cmns, which has furnished much information including the fact that this Symposium existed. Thank you, Jean Pierre

The other group is the Oscillator/Substance Theory Group.

One member of that group, Robert vanderHoek, has a somewhat different version which he feels is superior. That version can be found on line as "Proton Cosmology." He says, "...mention me, and if I win a prize, neither one of us will have to depend on Social Security again." Well, Hoek, you got your mention; however, I have news for you, the chances of either of us winning any prizes are about the same as the chance of the Hadron Collider finding the Higgs Boson. That is about the same as a snow flakes chance of survival in a furnace.

Be that as it may, it is best to get on to the project of using my remaining minutes in trying to convince an undoubtedly, and rightfully, skeptical audience that there is a possibility that an elderly day-laborer may have accidentally accomplished what a man recognized widely as one of the greatest geniuses of all time spent years unsuccessfully trying to do. That is come up with a unifying framework for the physical sciences.

Probably the difference is that this speaker is working with no particular set of preconceptions but is simply following a line of logic based on the thought that he can pretend to be a genius

Google groups

[« Groups Home](#)

## Oscillator/Substance Theory

Search this group

Search Groups

### View this page "Possible Script for VigierVIIITalk"

Options

3 messages - [Collapse all](#) - [Report discussion as spam](#)ESKI [View profile](#)[More options](#) Jun 10 2010, 3:15 pm

Am posting a possible script as a "page" on this site. Want to know what the people of this Group think about this version.

I'm finding it more difficult than I thought it would be to condense the last three years of discoveries, even the most basic, into a thirty-minute, oral presentation.

I haven't done an oral presentation to a group in almost 30 years,;and, in those days, I always extemporized.

This is my first try with a reading script and I have never done anything by remote before. I'll need a lot of "fingers crossed." to pull this one off without making a mess of it. ESKI

Click on <http://groups.google.com/group/oscillatorsubstance-theory/web/possibl...> - or copy & paste it into your browser's address bar if that doesn't work.

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#)hoek [View profile](#)[More options](#) Jun 17 2010, 2:42 pm

Hello Dr. Sinclair,

Well, it's the middle of the month of June and so far no one, but, me has responded to your call for assistance in working out a speech for the upcoming Vigier VII Symposium in July. I want to thank you for mentioning me and my website in your upcoming speech, but, mentioning me isn't necessary. My motives are not personal fame or recognition, but, purely and simply to tell the truth about nature, as I perceived it. The objective of Vigier VII Symposium is "The Search For Fundamental Theory". Talking about anything other than a description of that fundamental theory or where one could be located, would be off topic. It's interesting how you described your quest that began in 2004 or 2005, when it seems, you had an epiphany and realized that there were things relative to Planck's formula that had been overlooked. My own quest began in 1978. After viewing a science film, which made me realize that there was valuable data being overlooked, that didn't agree with the prevailing quark theory, but, would describe the inner workings of the proton. These are both interesting stories, but, both are off topic and not what the people at the Vigier VII symposium want to hear. In my point of view. You try to oversimplify the universe. It seems you twist substitute and rearrange Planck's formula trying to get things out of it that just aren't there, most notably, a mechanism. If your model has no viable sustaining mechanism, than it is no better than the Quantum Chromo-Dynamics of "Quark Theory. These people are looking for a FUNDAMENTAL THEORY! Not the story of a self acclaimed "pretend genius" or day worker or janitor or old man, who wants to make his mark in the world before he dies or about the other semi-famous people who are also named Dean Sinclair. Focus on the topic that they've invited you to speak about, a FUNDAMENTAL THEORY.

You've got me by about 14 years Eski. I am the survivor of a liver transplant, back in 2003. I could also die any time, as any of us can. I don't complain about it or look for people's sympathy, but, I

#### Home

#### Discussions

[+ new post](#)

#### Members

[About this group](#)[Edit my membership](#)[Group settings](#)[Management tasks](#)[Invite members](#)View this group in the [new Google Groups](#)

#### Sponsored links

[Linear Motion Solutions](#)Shaft-Rails-Guides-Slides-Actuators  
Proven Linear Bearing Technology  
[www.PBClinear.com](http://www.PBClinear.com)[Powerful Email Marketing](#)Get real email marketing results.  
Improve your business. Sign Up  
Free[www.ActiveCampaign.com](http://www.ActiveCampaign.com)[What is Quantum Jumping?](#)Discover Why Thousands of People  
are "Jumping" to Change Their Life  
[www.QuantumJumping.com](http://www.QuantumJumping.com)[See your message here...](#)

thank God the Creator for every extra day that I am allowed to live in this beautiful realm of existence where everything seems to make sense, at least in nature. This pretend genius you speak of, who wants those at the Vigier Symposium to throw out all that they've learned in science from Rutherford's discovery of the nucleus to our present concept of atomic structure. A century of knowledge discovered, not by pretend geniuses, but many real certifiable ones. You ask a lot!!! In her last posting, our group secretary, ka-sala said, " We can go over and over Planck's Theory, and anyone else's. The difference is we are here... now. Today's Theory." I think she's saying you're beating a dead horse, Eski. I noticed in your speech, you mentioned twice about reality, disappearing down the 10 dimension hole of string theory. WHY? Your own hypothesis has nothing to do with other dimensions. It works quite fine in just the three of space, and one of time that we can naturally perceive, as does my own. QCD needs at least one and possibly three, extra dimensions for their mathematical model to work, depending upon which quantum physicist you ask. I've always thought of assumption of extra dimensions as a "fudge factor". A generous assumption factor, a place to hide the sloppy bits that don't quite fit in. When neutrons undergo beta-decay, by emitting an electron and an anti-neutrino and turn into proton's the mathematics of quark theory fails. It seems there's some missing charge energy and mass that needs to be there and isn't. Well, where is it? Oh, I see, it resides in an alternate dimension and pops over just when it's needed. Who would've thought? More dimensions are just more fudge factors and I recommend to you, not to use or acknowledge their existence, that is, unless they are pertinent to your hypothesis. I tell you all this, Eski, not in a mean-spirited or condescending fashion, but, to try and help you and our group make a good impression. I've edited the beginning of your speech in a way that mentions my website twice. It's more important to me that my hypothesis be analyzed, then my name being mentioned. If you mention my website, as well as that of the O/S group, a third time at the end, it's been proven that more people are likely to remember it. You'll notice they do this in almost every TV commercial. Remember to try and focus on the topic, Eski, a fundamental theory and how it works, in describing reality as we know it, at the nuclear and possibly cosmological level as well. By the way, my full name is Robert Kardien Vanderhoek, that's CAR-DEAN VANDER HOOK. If you do mention it, tell them to google it. It will take them to my Fundamental Mechanics page.

I've taken the liberty to rewrite the intro to your speech. I think it more clearly defines the objectives of all the members of the O/S group. I hope you like it and it helps you, let me know what you think. Thanks again for including me and I wish you and all of us best of luck.  
hoek

It is my pleasure to welcome the Vigier VII Symposium to the Aberdeen American News here in Aberdeen, South Dakota, USA and to be able to thank the News and Dr. Amoroso for this opportunity to introduce to the wider scientific community a framework for a Comprehensive Theory which seems to be applicable at any scale from sub-atomic to cosmic.

I also wish to thank my friends from two Internet Groups who have contributed information and support over the last three years since the first version of this model was published on Helium.com as "Motion in a Matrix..." The current version has a working title of the Oscillator/Substance Model, as it has become clear that the motions that are involved are in part primarily, if not totally, oscillatory in nature, and a liquid substance at its triple point where it can also act as a solid or a gas makes a much better model than does a rigid matrix.

One of the groups which I need to thank is the Condensed Matter Nuclear Science Group, cmns, which has furnished much information including the fact that this Symposium existed. Thank you, Jean Pierre

The other group of which I, Dean LeRoy Sinclair, am founder and director of is the Oscillator/Substance Theory Group. At <http://groups.google.com/group/oscillatorsubstance-theory>

Members, of our group all seek the truth about the nature of the realm in which we find ourselves existing. We all believe that the

basic mechanics that govern the universe and the workings of the sub-atomic, quantum, world are oscillatory in nature and mirror each other at the largest and smallest of scales. We come from different backgrounds, with various approaches and models to try to explain this phenomenon. One member of the group, who has a somewhat different version from my own, of which I'll return to in a moment, is at [protoncosmology.com](http://protoncosmology.com). His model agrees with the current Rutherford-Bohr atomic model, but, not the currently accepted quark nucleon hypothesis. His model takes an electro-magnetic like, field dynamics approach based on neglected and recently verified electron-proton scattering data. The model poses the proton as an internally driven spherical oscillator, an electro-dynamic like perpetual motion machine. It is driven by the conversion of charge energy into mass and back again by the function  $M=E/C^2$ , which is a simple transposition of  $E=MC^2$  and the fact that no particle with mass can attain the velocity of light. The full version, which is too lengthy to describe now, can be found on line at "<http://www.protoncosmology.com>", or on links at: <http://groups.google.com/group/oscillatorsubstance-theory>

I'll now use my remaining minutes in trying to convince an inquiring audience that we have come up with a unifying framework for the physical sciences.

Probably the difference is that this speaker is working on a model with no particular set of preconceptions, but, is simply following a line of logic examining commonly accepted ideas for hidden or overlooked significances. This is a totally different approach from trying to fit together already accepted viewpoints. This is an open ended journey rather than one focused on some desired destination.

You take it from here Doc

On Jun 10, 4:15 pm, ESKI <[deanlsincl...@gmail.com](mailto:deanlsincl...@gmail.com)> wrote:

[- Show quoted text -](#)

[Reply to author](#)   [Forward](#)   [Report spam](#)

**dean sinclair** [View profile](#)

[More options](#) Jun 17 2010, 4:54 pm

[- Show quoted text -](#)

Actually, the biggie, was realizing that there was a tremendous amount to be learned by "Looking for the Overlooked Obvious," The second biggie was that The Speed of Light is an AVERAGE. Planck's Constant got only into the act because of logical follow-up on what needed to be happening in a sensible situation where the Speed of Light was an average motion of some sort of information carrier which had to be ubiquitous, it information transfer followed the same principles no matter when or where.

- > My own quest began in 1978. After viewing a science
- > film, which made me realize that there was valuable data being
- > overlooked, that didn't agree with the prevailing quark theory, but,
- > would describe the inner workings of the proton. These are both
- > interesting stories, but, both are off topic and not what the people
- > at the Vigier VII symposium want to hear. In my point of view. You
- > try to oversimplify the universe. It seems you twist substitute and
- > rearrange Planck's formula trying to get things out of it that just
- > aren't there, most notably, a mechanism.

\  
Nope, the "mechanism" is inherent to the assumption of a basic substrate in which there is motion, The "Mechanism" is the Law of Forces, or Action, "For each and every action there is an equal and opposite reaction."...W hat needs only to be added to this to get "my version of your perpetual motion machine" is to note that since there is always sequence, this reaction is itself an action and the process of generating motion goes on and on....I only use Planck's Constant and the Speed of Light to give us usable basic information about this Reality in which we exist....I'm not extracting a bit more out than do the QM people and others. The difference is actually that I focus on the Torque, rotation aspects, where as they analyze the same equations from the view of "momentum."

If your model has no viable

- > sustaining mechanism, than it is no better than the Quantum Chromo-
- > Dynamics of "Quark Theory. These people are looking for a FUNDAMENTAL
- > THEORY! Not the story of a self acclaimed "pretend genius" or day
- > worker or janitor or old man, who wants to make his mark in the world
- > before he dies or about the other semi-famous people who are also
- > named Dean Sinclair.

These things were inserted because of the felt need to minimize the "Crack Pot Factor." of screaming too loudly, "Gee, look how brilliant I am. For the same reason, I've made no comment about my science background. If the ideas won't stand on their own from a simple old man, detailing that he actually had a first rate science education won't help a bitl.

- > Focus on the topic that they've invited you to
- > speak about, a FUNDAMENTAL THEORY.

Interesting point. The problem, always, in giving a talk is to balance the situation of some degree of "entertainment" with the information. What you say about the Group and your material is very correct. As the write up to be published later can be much "drier" and fact filled, it will be very appropriate there. Will think about using it "here."

You've got me by about 14 years Eski. I am the survivor of a liver

- > transplant, back in 2003. I could also die any time, as any of us
- > can. I don't complain about it or look for people's sympathy, but, I
- > thank God the Creator for every extra day that I am allowed to live in
- > this beautiful realm of existence where everything seems to make
- > sense, at least in nature. This pretend genius you speak of, who
- > wants those at the Vigier Symposium to throw out all that they've
- > learned in science from Rutherford's discovery of the nucleus to our
- > present concept of atomic structure. A century of knowledge
- > discovered, not by pretend geniuses, but many real certifiable ones.
- > You ask a lot!!! In her last posting, our group secretary, ka-sala
- > said, " We can go over and over Planck's Theory, and anyone else's.
- > The difference is we are here... now. Today's Theory."

The point, however, is that our "geniuses," by overlooking what was under their noses, have grossly over complicated scientific theory. The Universe and Fundamental Theory, have to be simple!!!

- > I think she's
- > saying you're beating a dead horse, Eski. I noticed in your speech,
- > you mentioned twice about reality, disappearing down the 10 dimension
- > hole of string theory. WHY?

You've never seen my explanation of the ten dimensions thing. That is a mathematical trick, You can triangulate any point from three others, each of which you assign three arbitrary dimensional axes, hence you end up with nine dimensions to define your locus, then you give the locus a dimension of motion, ergo, ten dimensions. The disappearance into a ten-dimensional hole is simply because at that size, the mathematics, based essentially on the two observations of "constants of nature" which I consider fundamental, i.e.. Speed of Light and Planck's Constant, shows that the mass and radius scales, (or any other two dimensions based on these two "Constants" ) have the same "Absolute Values." We enter into a "reversed" dimension, if you wish, of unimaginable smallness and fantastic mass.....The mathematics used in QM and String Theory, simply fails at this inversion size and mass.

- > Your own hypothesis has nothing to do
- > with other dimensions. It works quite fine in just the three of
- > space, and one of time that we can naturally perceive, as does my
- > own.

Not quite true as to my own hypothesis. It is simply a matter of what one considers a "Dimension," the term actually simply defines the name of a unit that we decide to measure by..... In the cgs system, our three dimensions are centimeters, grams and seconds... The volume below  $4.7 \times 10^{-19}$  cm. in radius, could be considered an "internal dimension" with respect to our "outer dimension" larger than that radius.



QCD needs at least one and possibly three, extra dimensions for

- > their mathematical model to work, depending upon which quantum
- > physicist you ask. I've always thought of assumption of extra
- > dimensions as a "fudge factor".

Of course, it is a fudge factor, one can introduce as many dimensions as one pleases. The Standard Model does this, in a sense, if a Quark doesn't, explain it. add a Graviton, if a Graviton doesn't toggle things up add a Gluon, and so on and on....

A generous assumption factor, a place

- > to hide the sloppy bits that don't quite fit in. When neutrons
- > undergo beta-decay, by emitting an electron and an anti-neutrino and
- > turn into proton's the mathematics of quark theory fails. It seems
- > there's some missing charge energy and mass that needs to be there and
- > isn't. Well, where is it? Oh, I see, it resides in an alternate
- > dimension and pops over just when it's needed. Who would've thought?

This kind of bull is the reason why I try to carefully define "Mass" and "Energy" in most of my work, unfortunately, there really isn't time in a short talk to go into the misconceptions that pervade scientific theory by the loose use of these terms and the fact that scientists seem to go really no farther in defining these terms than the old meaning less and misleading circular definition, "Energy is what moves Mass, and Mass is what is moved by Energy." Lots of hidden mess ups in that bit. Mass as an entity? Or mass as an attribute of an Entity? Mass as a Constant or Mass as a variable? Energy within or outside a surface? Energy as determined by some balancing process? In any case, what do the words REA:LLY mean. (I finally define mass as a measure of the tension/pressure at the surface of an entity which is a measure of the point centered motions within that entity. I consider "Energy" as a general term for a "package of motion." A term which need in every usage to be much more explicitly defined in context. Both terms, as used in physics, describe variable amounts of motion.

- > More dimensions are just more fudge factors and I recommend to you,
- > not to use or acknowledge their existence, that is, unless they are
- > pertinent to your hypothesis.

Actually, I wasn't acknowledging their existence; but, rather, pointing out that the calculations showed a reason for the failure of the older models.

[- Show quoted text -](#)

...

[read more »](#)

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#)

End of messages

[« Back to Discussions](#)

[« Newer topic](#) [Older topic »](#)

Google groups

« Groups Home

Oscillator/Substance Theory

Search this group

Search Groups

REPEAT of INFINITE VARIABLES - Reply to ESKI.

Options

2 messages - Collapse all - Report discussion as spam

ka-sala View profile

More options Jun 19 2010, 1:49 am

>>>O.K. Ka-Sala, >>>You are just much too bright for this old man.

\* Never believe this of yourself Eski... nor of me!

>>>Or maybe you just think too much.

\* It has been no secret between us that I have almost completed a Report/Book. I try to share 'snippets' but cannot give it all away... yet. OK ?

>>>It seems to me that you are missing a lot of my points, particularly my point about defining what we are talking about.

\* If I am, I am sorry. I personally know what I am talking about and the link is to you all and the Oscillation Substance Theory. You know that! But I never claimed to speak your theoretical language, knowing another of my own, and that is hard to translate.

>>>Just what do you mean by 'unified weak and electromagnetic interaction' ?

\* To save you the confusion of my language, let me just explain it in more depth via Wikipedia. A/ Particle Physics. 1/ Elementary subatomic constituents of matter and radiation, and the interactive relationship between them. Also called high energy physics Read more... Look it up.

B/ The unified description of two of the four fundamental interactions of nature: electromagnetism and the weak interaction. Though these two forces appear very different at everyday low energies, the theory models them as two different aspects of the same force. Above the unification energy on the order of 100GeV, they would merge into a single electroweak force. If the Universe is hot enough (approx. 10 to the power of 15 K, ) a temperature reached after the Big Bang, then the electromagnetic force and weak force will merge into a combined electroweak force.

>>>"By my thinking both the "weak" and "electromagnetic" interactions are terms from >>>conventional physics which are meaningless if we consider the "four forces" as all being >>>observational aspects of one "force--" pressures within a "substance-substrate" having the >>>basic characteristics of a liquid at its triple point. >>>Could you define "atemporality" for me, hopefully in terms of my postulated "Aether?"

\* I cannot see that you have not already formulated the timelessness of this Aether/Ether but if you are moving into the dimensions in which Alchemy operates, then you are looking at Life's Elixir. So naturally your 'substance substrate' is very illuminating. The very catalyst you want.

>>>Also, can you give me a good definition of "Entropy?"

Home

Discussions

+ new post

Members

About this group

Edit my membership

Group settings

Management tasks

Invite members



View this group in the new Google Groups

Sponsored links

Six Sigma Certification Earn Certification, 100% Online. Top Six Sigma Training Program. VillanovaU.com/SixSigma

Is SSNTD A Scam? Read Now Urgent Must Read Report Never Before Seen Information. www.VictoryStocks.com/SSNTD

Learn Spanish in 10 Days World-famous Pimsleur Method. As seen on PBS - \$9.95 w/ Free S&H. PimsleurApproach.com/Learn-Spanish

See your message here...

\* Which one do you want Eski ? For now, just stay with the catalyst but...! Once you have your energy interaction and in balance - therefore equal - what you term 'repair' becomes in quantum thermodynamics a propellant beyond any shock waves, and in absolute silence the interacting forces within your term, 'Aether' wraps itself around the electromagnetic forces of your Oscillation, as if in a safe cocoon. ( Inclusive of paragraph below's answer.)

>>>I've never seen a really good one, and I must admit that I'm not sure how to fit the concept >>>in. Does it fit in with the concept of Mass as I define it, with the problems of Kinetic Energy, >>>or is it a measure of some sort of the "degree to which some action-reaction sequence >>>somehow repairs the chaos behind a shock wave in which we exist? >>>"Infinity," to me, has a practical definition of "the point, instant, or number just beyond where >>>we stop, quit counting, quit examining, or our means of information gathering or transfer >>>fail..." Eternity would have a similar connotation. An extent just beyond the extent of >>>our "Perceptual Universe."

\* Who can measure Infinity Eski. But while you are working on this O/S I believe the 'google' will be big enough to measure what you want.

>>>As long as we've been co-workers in this, I don't think that you have listened closely to old >>>Eski...

\* You wait this long to tell me ??? Then forgive my efforts to contribute.

>>>It could, of course, be that Old Eski, "the Pretend Genius," a person of admittedly slow and >>>limited intellectual abilities, who can only try to be intelligent by looking for different ways to >>>interpret what others take for granted, is totally lost in comprehending the ideas of those who >>>have true genius level capabilities. I only vaguely discern what either you or O'Sullivan is >>>saying a great deal of the time.

\* That was the problem I had when trying to explain the incident of my Profile. No-one seemed to understand, until it was found that I had what was 5 months prior to the announcement of the 1979 Nobel Prize. At least even some-one like me had it! Your earth language is not easy !!! Facts are I cannot 'pretend'... only extend. And to you Eski my friend, it was a helping hand. I proclaim no qualities of a genius. I'm just a bit alien to many thoughts and ideas which have been boxed in by their theoretical masters.

>>>I do hope that some how, Eski can put together something that is at least rational for a 30 >>>min. presentation at the Vigier Symposium so we don't end up appearing a bunch >>>of "nincompoops."

\* I am sure you know what it is you want to say and have to offer. Do it your way as we do offer ours. One cannot be a 'nincompoop' to make such a presentation. Just be sure of what it is you have!

>>>If you were to suggest one point that you think he should make in that presentation, what >>>would it be?

\* Don't ever think it's too late, nor that what you have is not presentable. Anyone with enough insight will see through your efforts, and if I - little me - can come up with Nobel material. Anyone can! One just has to know what it is that you are presenting, and that it is fact..

Would we be behind you if we were not with you ?

>>>Allaha asmaladik...DLS

' Ve size' dear Dr Dean L(eRoy) Sinclair  
Kind regards Eski,  
Ka-sala

PS.. Have just been requested to submit material re. radio-active waste issue to Federal Minister for Environment; Australian Parliament !

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#) [Report spam](#)

ka-sala [View profile](#)

[More options](#) Jun 19 2010, 1:52 am

PS> Correction typo. Radio-active waste

On Jun 19, 4:49 pm, ka-sala <irrir...@gmail.com> wrote:

[- Show quoted text -](#)

[Reply to author](#)   [Forward](#)   [Report spam](#)

End of messages

---

[« Back to Discussions](#)

[« Newer topic](#)   [Older topic »](#)

---

[Create a group](#) - [Google Groups](#) - [Google Home](#) - [Terms of Service](#) - [Privacy Policy](#)

©2011 Google

Gmail Calendar Documents Photos Reader Web more ~

deanlsinclair@gmail.com ▾

Google groups

« Groups Home

## Oscillator/Substance Theory

 Search this group

 Search Groups

### ADDENDUM TO TALK

Options

3 messages - [Collapse all](#) - [Report discussion as spam](#)

ESKI [View profile](#)

[More options](#) Jun 22 2010, 3:56 pm

In thinking about it, particularly realizing that the criticism, "You are asking an awful lot!!!" (In a justifiable criticism of the temerity of an admittedly average person operating rather jokingly as a "pretend genius" daring to say, in effect, "some of the geniuses were possibly wrong, Eski, has decided that he should probably go ahead and point out some of the very definite differences in what he is saying and what the conventional wisdom says.... Get some of it out in the open and "let the brick bats fly."

So here is a possible addendum for near the end of the "London Talk." Criticism and comment are, of course, invited. How about some of you who haven't had much to say chiming in??

Addendum to talk...

This is called a "Framework" as it is a simple start toward new construction. The model, developed essentially independent of consideration of theoretical models from a thought that communication should be consistent whether the information be carried by by Pony Express Riders or Electromagnetic Waves, turns out to be definitely in contrast to most scientific attitudes. In fact, we might say that it is usually anywhere from 90 to 180 degrees out of phase.

Where the standard view seems to be that what is needed is somehow a theory to unify many diverse parts, this model takes the view that there is a "unity," " a Substance/substrate of undefined extent and undefined basic unit." This may be paraphrased, " There is a Fact of Existence which we may never be able to totally understand or define, let us accept that and move on to what we can do."

Where the general consensus is that there is nothing in a "vacuum," this model postulates that there is an all pervasive substance, even in "vacuums" from which the vortex aggregates which we call "matter," have been removed.

Matter and "void" are considered, in this model, as being composed of different "arrangements" within the same basic "substance/substrate."

Where the usual view of electrons is as some sort of probability cloud, this model sees them as rotating, inverting vortex oscillators...similarly, reality of size and shape are given to other subatomic units.

Where the conventional picture is that electrons and positrons combine to annihilate converting totally to "electromagnetic radiation," this model says that they combine to another type of oscillator with dissipation of half of their total motion in the form of "radiation." Whereas, conventionally, "pair-production" is some sort of a mysterious conversion of "Energy" into "particles" in the presence of matter, in this model, pair production is simply the splitting of the "parent oscillator" when supplied with enough excess motion...

Much of conventional physics theory is based on an idea similar to

#### Home

#### Discussions

[+ new post](#)

#### Members

[About this group](#)

[Edit my membership](#)

[Group settings](#)

[Management tasks](#)

[Invite members](#)



View this group in the  
[new Google Groups](#)

Einstein's supposed comment, " Mathematics is the reality." It is even assumed by many that if theoretical ideas are not expressed in differential equations, they have no validity. The view here is that math. is a tool, and that it is probably best to work with the simplest tools possible. Although advanced math. could have been used, this entire presentation has used nothing that was beyond grade school level.

Where Mass and Energy are accepted as being somehow fundamental and inter convertible, without truly defining either; this model defines both with respect to motions relative to a point.

Where the "Unification of the Four Forces of Nature" is considered conventionally as a major theoretical problem, this model almost cavalierly dismisses the situation by pointing out that none of the "Four So-Called Forces" meets the definition of a force, whereas pressure does.

The Matter of the Missing Anti-matter has been discussed earlier. Clearly the view is very different from the conventional.

The problems of the "Missing Mass" of our Universe, Dark Energy, and some of the other related concepts may turn out to be due to several factors, one could be the semantic confusion between the use of the term, "Mass," as describing a "physical body," and "mass" as a scientific term describing an attribute of that body. This differentiation clearly shows in this model.

Where, conventionally, there are many constants of nature, this model implies that there should be few, and those will be not absolute limits of any sort but are more likely to be statistical averages. Furthermore, combinations, multiples, and roots of "constants" are logically also "constants" which may furnish information. For instance, the square root of the speed of light,  $(c)^{0.5}$ , about 173 Kc/sec., might be a very interesting frequency, as it is the value at which frequency and wave length will have the same "Absolute value."

This model does not consider positive and negative charges as mysterious, accepted things of nature, but as manifestations of the rotation, inversion senses of vortex oscillators. As such, they are not constant values...

Where the Standard Model considers the units found as results of atom-smashing experiments as somehow being fundamental particles released by the experiments, this model would imply them to be different, alternative states of matter created in the experiments. That is artifacts, rather than fundamentals.

This is by no means a conclusive listing of the differences in philosophy and attitude of this model from the conventional situations.

In presenting this framework, this person, is not asking that all the ideas and information collected by all the geniuses who have contributed in the past be discarded. He is simply suggesting that this model may be a frame work into which profitable re-examination of data and ideas could be fitted,

Remember the Oscillator/Substance Google Group is an open membership group where you can post "Kudos" or "Boos." I hope that this presentation will receive feed back.

[Reply to author](#)   [Forward](#)

**Hugh V** [View profile](#)

[More options](#) Jun 28 2010, 10:26 am

Yep, Doc,  
You certainly do end up very much out of step with the conventional situation. It's about time someone did. What a confused mess scientific theory is in!

Have you noticed that the two experimental results that you focus in

on, "MM" and Planck are where Einstein's Space Time, Quantum Mechanics, and String Theory all have their start, except that you're interpreting from the opposite side from where they are?

In an old copy of Astronomy Magazine there is a comment about something called the space ship mystery or some such thing. Seems there is some mysterious force that is braking space ships that are going away from Terra in opposite directions by the same amount. Seems this would fit, the ships if they don't get destroyed in the meantime by collision with something else would be eventually turned around and sent back to their origin?? Seems to fit with the idea of a substance which tries to balance. Maybe?  
Good luck with the talk. Who knows, someone might actually listen.  
HAV

On Jun 22, 3:56 pm, ESKI <deanlsincl...@gmail.com> wrote:

[- Show quoted text -](#)

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#) [Report spam](#)

ESKI [View profile](#)

[More options](#) Jun 30 2010, 11:29 am

Hugh,  
You point out an interesting fact that I had sort of overlooked. The currently fashionable, or at least for the last few years, fashionable, theories, all have at their base information from the Michelson-Morely and Planck's work. It would appear that they, and we, are agreed that there are basic answers hidden there. However, the others all interpret the results in one way, we use an almost opposite version. \

They were trying to invent a theory while we were just following up a string of logic to see where it would go.

It could be that there is a definite point in this that needs to be somehow gotten across,,the answers are probably in front of our noses, if we are looking in the right direction, in the right way. Maybe that "Theory of Now" is somewhere around what we are talking. It seems to me that what has developed so far seems to explain more things and make more sense than what the "real geniuses" have come up with in the last 100 years or so.

The idea from Astronomy Mag.is interesting. We could use some good astronomers in this group , or an astrophysicist or two!!

I just sent in for a "Great Courses" copy of "The Joy of Mathematics" which is a popularization of math. which takes one up through Calc. I'm hoping that I can go thru it and get some of my old math. training back in focus. I was quite good with Calculus for about 6-7 years after I took the course, but that course was about 1952-53. I..don't know if any of that will help with fitting the work to the cosmos, but it can't hurt....

On Jun 28, 10:26 am, Hugh V <hughv...@gmail.com> wrote:

[- Show quoted text -](#)

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#)

End of messages

[« Back to Discussions](#)

[« Newer topic](#) [Older topic »](#)

Google groups

[« Groups Home](#)

# Oscillator/Substance Theory




## Vigier VII Symposium

Options

5 messages - [Collapse all](#) - [Report discussion as spam](#)

hoek [View profile](#)

[More options](#) Jul 2 2010, 1:30 pm

Hello again, Dr. Sinclair,

In your prompt, inconsiderate, dismissive and unacceptable response to the below paragraph, which I ask that you read in your upcoming Vigier VII Symposium address. An address that you asked all members to help you with as I did below:

It is my pleasure to welcome the Vigier VII Symposium to the Aberdeen American News here in Aberdeen, South Dakota, USA and to be able to thank the News and Dr. Amoroso for this opportunity to introduce to the wider scientific community a framework for a Comprehensive Theory which seems to be applicable at any scale from sub-atomic to cosmic. I also wish to thank my friends from two Internet Groups who have contributed information and support over the last three years since the first version of this model was published on Helium.com as

"Motion in a Matrix..." The current version has a working title of the Oscillator/Substance Model, as it has become clear that the motions that are involved are in part primarily, if not totally, oscillatory in nature. One of the groups which I need to thank is the Condensed Matter

Nuclear Science Group, cmns, which has furnished much information including the fact that this Symposium existed. Thank you, Jean Pierre

The other group of which I, Dean LeRoy Sinclair, am founder and director of is the Oscillator/Substance Theory Group. At

<http://groups.google.com/group/oscillatorsubstance-theory>  
Members, of our group all seek the truth about the nature of the realm in which we find ourselves existing. We all believe that the basic mechanics that govern the universe and the workings of the sub-atomic, quantum, world are oscillatory in nature and mirror each other

at the largest and smallest of scales. We come from different backgrounds, with various approaches and models to try to explain this

phenomenon. >One member of the group, who has a somewhat different

> version from my own, of which I'll return to in a moment, is at  
> protoncosmology.com. His model agrees with the current Rutherford-  
> Bohr atomic model, but, not the currently accepted quark nucleon  
> hypothesis. His model takes an electro-magnetic like, field dynamics  
> approach based on neglected and recently verified electron-proton  
> scattering data. The model poses the proton as an internally driven  
> spherical oscillator, an electro-dynamic like perpetual motion  
> machine. It is driven by the conversion of charge energy into mass and  
> back again by the function  $M=E/C^2$ , which is a simple transposition of  
>  $E=MC^2$  and the fact that no particle with mass can attain the velocity  
> of light. Thus, the field deflections always precede the oscillating particles. The full  
version, which is too lengthy to describe now, can  
> be found on line at "<http://www.protoncosmology.com>".

You Respond,

"This I will probably find some way to use in the "write up" for publication,

its too technical a coverage for here, I think that it is better to note

that you have a different version which may possibly be preferable,

### Home

#### Discussions

[+ new post](#)

#### Members

[About this group](#)

[Edit my membership](#)

[Group settings](#)

[Management tasks](#)

[Invite members](#)



View this group in the  
[new Google Groups](#)

#### Sponsored links

[FreeConferenceCall.com](#)

24/7 Unlimited Free Conference Calls. Easy Sign Up Online!

[FreeConferenceCall.com](#)

[Looking For a Dakota?](#)

Check Out the Chevy Colorado & Its

Powerful Vortec Engine Choices.  
[www.Chevrolet.com/Colorado](http://www.Chevrolet.com/Colorado)

[1.9¢/min Conference Calls](#)

800# Toll-Free and Toll Access. No Monthly Fees or Minimums.  
[TurboBridge.com](#)

[See your message here...](#)



give

your name and the references."

"Too technical a coverage for here", Sure Eski , much too technical for a group of scientists to understand. Dean, I really think they'll be able to handle it and probably they'll be accompanied by someone who'll explain it to them, if they can't.

Anyway, I realize that it cost you 75 Euros to enter the Vigier VII Symposium and I will contribute (pay to you) 25 Euros if you'll just read the paragraph from, >One member, to "<http://www.protoncosmology.com>". above, the way I've written it. I timed it 5 times. I read it aloud, moderately, concisely, annunciating each word and it took on average, one minute and 16 seconds for all of it, the longest reading being one minute and 22 seconds. Send me your mailing address or paypal or however you would like me to pay you for 1/3 of your submission cost and I'll pay you the day I received it. By the way, I and I'm sure the other members of the O/S group, would like to know the exact time you'll be broadcasting to the scientists attending the symposium? What are the call letters and frequency of the station you'll be broadcasting from? I hope you'll find it in your heart to be a fair, responsible and just group leader. Remember, I'll pay you for a third of your time for just under a minute and a half of it.  
Stay well,  
hoek

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#) [Report spam](#)

hoek [View profile](#)

[More options](#) Jul 9 2010, 4:11 pm

ATTENTION, ATTENTION!!!! Where is Eski????  
It's been a week since my last posting in which I asked our group leader to post the time, date and broadcast frequency of his address to the Vigier VII Symposium. There has been no response and the symposium starts in only three days!!!! Is he alright, does anybody know??? It's not like him to be so long in responding to a post, especially one as important as this. In the past, he's usually responded to my postings within in a few hours. DOES ANYONE KNOW IF HE'S ALRIGHT, HUGH, KA-SALA ????

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#) [Report spam](#)

dean sinclair [View profile](#)

[More options](#) Jul 10 2010, 4:08 pm

Sorry, Hoek. Haven't had a chance to check on things. Was out of town on family business for a week, no computer available... We just, finally got a date and time, 1500 hrs.. London Time. on Wed. the 14th. I think that that is 9 AM. here in SD.

Check the Vigier VII Symposium site, As to "broadcast frequency" and address at/to the Symposium, that probably won't be available until Nonday. Seems that my contact there is doing everything at the last minute, like everyone else.....Will try to keep you people informed. "Eski"

[- Show quoted text -](#)

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#)

ESKI [View profile](#)

[More options](#) Jul 15 2010, 9:05 am

Well, Folks  
,The VigierVII Symposium has come and gone, and, as we might have expected, if anything can go wrong it will.

It did.

I don't know what happened; but, on July 13, I got word :  
"Sorry ...can't get our act together this time (Internal problems),,,,," I wrote back, sending a copy of my final short script, asking if someone else could give the talk for me so that the time slot, 1500 hrs., Wed, July 14, 2010, London time, would not be empty and told my correspondent, in a separate communication, "Como jefe de este symposio tu tienes la responsibilidad ultima por qualquier

'chingandos de patos' que pasan...sea que tu puedes dar la lectura para mi en person?" In blunter English, this adds up to "You were the boss, so you bear the ultimate blame for any foul ups (I used the Spanish translation for an certain English vulgar, slang expression for messing up thoroughly) so how about you giving the talk?"

Answer this morning July 15, was, "Sorry, we couldn't accommodate.... time to concentrate on (the write-up for the 'Proceedings') ....make sure it is well referenced...."

Well, there it is.

We got a little exposure as the "abstract" is still posted on the Vigier VII site, and, possibly in part from there, we seem to be getting consistent hits here on the site of a hit or so an hour. When I signed in it said, "100 web views in the last 4 days." Now I have the problem of getting the final paper done and in by Nov. 1. I am going to try to put a personal deadline of Sept. 1 on it,

Incidentally, have not yet received an address to which to send the final draft. The paper is supposed to be "in Microsoft Word with a pdf file for comparison" what ever that means? Can someone translate?

Socio-economics of science... If there had been any way to have a representative of our group there, we could have probably done a couple of papers.... As a research group, we are definitely underfunded.

Well, " back to the drawing board. "

Of course, if I were being a bit paranoid about it, I'd think that we ran into some scientific politics and got deliberately stalled. There is more and more information that is showing up that says that O/S is probably very close to "right on." Some part of the "Establishment" could possibly have done a sabotage job to stall this set of ideas giving more time for damage control on the "current frameworks." After all, no one wants to have some upstarts point out that a lot of the theory of the last 100 years is "somewhat off base." (A toggle up of Quantum Mechanics to cover what we are saying might well earn someone a Nobel Prize and the ever-lasting gratitude of the "Scientific Establishment." There are rumours of a Russian Group that seems to be on somewhat of this course.)

An instance of more information showing up is the following bit of information: Some work that had a preliminary publishing in May says that certain units, which are shown to oscillate between "Matter and Anti-matter" states, spend less time in the Anti-matter state. We can predict this by saying, "In our Universe the expression of the proton-electron, anti-proton-positron states which we call matter, is read as 'protons and electrons.' The expression of smaller vortex oscillators, in the larger vortex oscillator which we call "the Universe" will be affected by the rotational/inversional sense of that oscillator..."

It is a bit disgusting to have spent so much time in trying to get a short talk done. At least 40 hrs. ;or more of typing and retyping, writing and rewriting. The result probably wasn't that great, but it is frustrating!!! Eski

On Jul 10, 4:08 pm, dean sinclair <deansinclair...@gmail.com> wrote:

[- Show quoted text -](#)

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#)

dean sinclair [View profile](#)

[More options](#) Jul 15 2010, 9:45 am

Nope, Ka-Sala, we beat that deadline. We were supposedly "on" to give the talk up until almost the last moment: I could post the interchanges back and

forth for the several days as we were trying to set up the teleconferencing net, but consider e-mails as semi-confidential.

We were OK from this end; but, apparently, either they couldn't get a link into the Conference room in London or someone said, "We have some inconvenience in setting this up so, why should we waste our time and effort on what clearly is some Crackpot nonsense." I hope that the comment, "internal problems," meant the former. The fact that we did have--as far as I know, still do have--an abstract posted and had a time slot reserved (those can be checked on the VigierVII Symposium site) tends to indicate that we did everything we could from this end, and, at least at some point, we were scheduled in.

. The collapse of the "talk" was some problem at their end, not ours. We honestly tried. DS

- Show quoted text -

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#)

End of messages

---

[« Back to Discussions](#)

[« Newer topic](#) [Older topic »](#)

Google groups

« Groups Home

# Oscillator/Substance

## + Theory

Search this group

Search Groups

**Fwd: Can someone else read a script into the 1500 slot schedule so that there isn't a "blank" space where I'm supposed to be?**

Options

1 message - [Collapse all](#) - [Report discussion as spam](#)

dean sinclair [View profile](#)

[More options](#) Jul 15 2010, 10:01 am

People, here is the e-mail that I sent to the Symposium director when he wrote, "Sorry to disappoint after...." DS

- [Hide quoted text](#) -

----- Forwarded message -----

From: dean sinclair <deansincl...@gmail.com>  
Date: Tue, Jul 13, 2010 at 10:29 AM  
Subject: Can someone else read a script into the 1500 slot schedule so that

there isn't a "blank" space where I'm supposed to be?  
To: noet...@mindspring.com

Dr. Amoroso,: Assuming that the "Internal Problems" of which you speak are technical problems of scheduling and getting a Teleconferencing set up, rather than some sort of Scientific Politics problem, is it possible that some one could read the following into the record at the scheduled time? This would not be considered an endorsement of the ideas but merely an endorsement of the principle that ideas are more important than the speaker.

Cheers, Dean Sinclair

This is the final script that was intended to be used for the oral version of the paper that was scheduled for the 1500 slot on Wed. July 14, 2010, by Dean L. Sinclair speaking from the Aberdeen American News in Aberdeen, South Dakota, US of A to the Vigier Symposium in London. Difficulties at the London end prevented Dr. Sinclair from being able to present this material.

It is my honor to present some information about a model called. the Oscillator Substance Model which may provide a framework for a comprehensive theory uniting the fields of physical science.

The basic tenet is, " All existence si the result of sequential action-reaction-action interactions within a Substance/Substrate of undefined extent and undefined basic composition. A Substance/Substrate which may be considered as if it be a liquid at the triple point, able to respond to slight pressure differences as any of the three basic phases of solid, liquid or gas.

The continuous, sequential equilibration within the substance results in constant motion such that the system is composed of/controlled by oscillators.

Some of the oscillators are vortexes having long term stability. these vortexes, the electron and proton and their mirror units, the positron and anti-proton, interact to form what we know as matter.

### Home

### Discussions

[+ new post](#)

### Members

[About this group](#)

[Edit my membership](#)

[Group settings](#)

[Management tasks](#)

[Invite members](#)



View this group in the [new Google Groups](#)

### Sponsored links

#### [Maid Service Software](#)

Easy-to-Use. Web-based. Most Widely Used by Maid Services - Free Trial [ServiceCEO.insightdirect.com/Trial](#)

#### [Collaboration Software](#)

Simple and secure collaboration for leadership teams [www.boardvantage.com](#)

#### [Project Management Tools](#)

Manage Projects from Anywhere. Register Now For a Free Demo! [www.Tenrox.com/ProjectManagement](#)

[See your message here...](#)

This view produces valuable insights that often differ from the conventional viewpoint by 180 degrees.

Positive and negative charges are seen as the result of reverses rotation/inversion senses of vortex oscillators. As these vortex units have mass and radius limits--and, corresponding frequency limits, charges will vary from a maximum value to zero and back, Charges are not fixed values, but have limits and an average.

As the vortexes responsible for charges have determinable limits, their sizes and shapes can be estimated, The results of these determinations have interesting results for the theories of atomic structure.

As the equilibration process in a substance can be considered to result in constant pressure adjustment. Pressure fits the criterion for a true force; therefore, the various Forces of Nature can be seen to be a result of interpretations of pressure adjustments.

The "Missing Anti-matter" Matter has a double explanation. The separation--or inversion instant --of an oscillator, which we know as the "Big Bang" resulted in the definition of two oscillator halves, having reversed rotation/inversion orientations. Smaller oscillators, within these halves will be influenced by the larger oscillator, the orientation of one half will tend to be stretched, the other compressed, so that one rotation/inversion will tend to be expressed differently than the other. In our Universe, it appears that the stretched form which appears most obviously is the electron. Its "almost identical" mirror, the "positron," appears to be somewhat suppressed.

If one half of a separable oscillator be considered "Matter," and the other half be "Anti-matter," then, as the electron is always considered matter, the positron is anti-matter. The two units are logically halves of a separable oscillator, to which they rejoin in the "annihilation" process.

The electron and proton are halves of another separable oscillator, the neutron. The electron is still "Matter," hence the proton, as the other half of a separable oscillator, is ANTI-MATTER.! Since the neutron is "neutral" it may be considered as either Matter or Anti-Matter and, like the B sub s Meson, could probably be shown to invert between the two states.

From the foregoing, we see that what we call "Matter," combinations of electrons and protons, are actually combinations of the "Matter" electrons, and the "Anti-matter" protons.

Logically, there is, somewhere, an "anti-Verse" where the rotation inversion dominant expressions are the opposite of ours, but, also, we have no truly "Missing Anti-Matter," we only have semantic confusion. The "neutron count" of an atom can be considered simply as the number of nucleons that , at any given instant, are in anti-electron, anti-proton states.

Considering the electron and proton as vortex oscillators which can associate gives a clue as to why the Hadron Collider apparently breaks down soon after starting up. Vortex oscillators can not only associate with different vortexes, but also self-associate. Electron-electron association has been long known. However, no one seems to have realized the same to be true for protons. Additionally, conventional science gives no hint of the possible existence in "vacuums" of pulsator-oscillators some of which may be separable into electrons and positrons and deformable into neutrons.

Pushing a stream of mutually repulsive "Charged Particles" through a void, is very different from trying to control vortexes which can self-associate through a possibly-reactive medium.

If the O/S --Oscillator/Substance--view be correct, the Hadron Collider, designed to be a sophisticated particle accelerator, may well be acting for a short time as a rather primitive fusion reactor before feed-back causes a break down.

What the basics of this framework are have been stated, and a few implications covered. A few words about the start of the ideas leading to the O/S Model and the basic reason for its almost reversed view from the

conventional may help.

This model started to develop quite innocently in the Spring of 2004 with the realization that basic ideas of Einstein's Special Relativity fit into communication theory, where they would apply to any Perceptual Universe defined by a maximum, practical velocity of information transfer, whether that velocity be determined by Pony Express Riders or Electromagnetic Waves.

Since, in every case, practical maximum velocity of information transfer is going to be a bit less than the average speed of the packet carriers, the Speed of Light, is logically an average which acts as a practical maximum velocity of information transfer.

By the Summer of 2008, when the Oscillator/Substance Google Group was set up, follow-ups on the initial insight noted above, had led to the realization that there was a "T.O.E." available, as outlined at the start of this talk, which would have been seen a Century ago had the Mickelson-Morley Experiment which determined the Speed of Light been reversed in interpretation from ruling out an "Aether," to partially defining an Aether. If then, a few years later, Planck's Constant had been considered a Constant of Angular Momentum and used to define characteristics, of that Aether, this model could have come into existence 100 years ago.

Equating Planck's Constant, "h," to its definition as an angular momentum and evaluating the resulting equation at the Speed of Light, "c," leads to the equation,  $m \times r = h/c = r \times m$ . This arises from the fact that one definition of angular momentum is the resultant of a mass, m, rotating at a radius, "r," from a point, with a tangential velocity, "v.," As Planck's Constant applies at the Speed of Light, it makes sense to evaluate at the speed of light and to simply by dividing out that speed from the left side of the equation to form a ratio constant, "h/c." The resulting equation,  $m \times r = h/c = r \times m$  is an example of a common, very valuable relationship in physics, the law of levers, the balance law used in weighing, the law of conservation of momentum, the law of conservation of energy. Here it can be used to determine the oscillator limits for a family of constant torque oscillators, defined by the set,  $\{m \times r = h/c = r \times m\}$ , with a torque of h/c and inversion at the state where  $r = m = \text{square root of } h/c$ . In the cgs system, this value is about  $4.7 \times 10^{-19}$  grams at  $4.7 \times 10^{-19}$  cm.

This implies a hidden half of any basic oscillator which is smaller than  $4.7 \times 10^{-19}$  cm.

Coming to these two basic sets of data from the opposite view of the more standard theoretical approaches such as Space-Time, Quantum Mechanics and String Theory, this model has a reversed orientation on many issues. Very heretical, it asks for re-examination of the accepted percepts of modern physical theory.

It may, however, turn out that this model will be complementary to much theory rather than contradictory. In its definition of Mass as a measure of the tension-pressure at a surface of the point-centered motions within that surface, a characteristic of entities that is measured by comparison, and suggesting that the term, "Energy," usually means a measurement of a package of motion which includes a point and its associated motions along a line, a unit whose effects are usually observed as the results of collisions, that is, "Kinetic Energy," it appears that this model tends to focus on the "Mass" aspect, whereas most theoretical approaches focus on "Energy" for the most part, and considering "Mass" as generally a constant value of some sort.

There is far too much too much information developed from this model and closely associated ideas which cling easily to it as a "Framework." to even begin to cover in this short presentation.

I refer you to the web site of the group previously mentioned, [Groups.Google.com/Oscillatorsubstance](http://Groups.Google.com/Oscillatorsubstance) (written as one word) hyphen theory.

Where most of the extant material has been collected as "pages" which vary in size from a half-page to 23 pages and counting.

There, also, you can meet some interesting people including the Canadian, Al Zeeper, who has an analysis of of the various mathematical energy expressions. There are the two ladies of the group, "Nish Laverz," a young writer from the North of England, and "Ka-Sala," the most philosophical of the group, and Group Manager, who is from the South of Australia. There is also, Robert Kardien Vanderhoek, "Hoek," who has another version of an

Oscillator theory which he considers superior to the version presented here, it can be examined on the Internet as "Proton Cosmology. "

I hope that the rest of the crew do not take offence that they are not mentioned here. They, each and every one, are separate and interesting personalities. !

The site is open membership, anyone can join-- any of you who'd like to pat me on the back or kick some other part of my anatomy is welcome to do so there. I hope to get some feedback, and "see" some of you there.

I'd be remiss, also, if I did not thank Jean-Paul from the cmns, Condensed Matter Nuclear Science Group, for the "heads up" about this Symposium which led to this paper. The cmns group, of which I have the honor of being a member, is a widely diverse, international group of experimentalists, theoreticians and others who are interested in the area which I personally think of as "sub-atomic chemistry." I expect that, in the not too distant future, out of that group and its associates will come some of the most valuable scientific information of our time.

Although, in a sense, I am a representative of the two groups mentioned above, I need to emphasize that the ideas and opinions expressed are my own and any errors and misinterpretations are strictly my own responsibility.

Thank you, Dr.Amoroso, for all your help and for inviting me to participate in this Symposium. I regret that I could not attend in person.

Thanks, everyone for taking the time to stay with me in this brief examination of the Oscillator/Substance Model as a possible Framework on which to Build a Fundamental Theory.

"

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#)

End of messages

[« Back to Discussions](#)

[« Newer topic](#) [Older topic »](#)

Well, there it is.

We got a little exposure as the "abstract" is still posted on the Vigier VII site, and, possibly in part from there, we seem to be getting consistent hits here on the site of a hit or so an hour. When I signed in it said, "100 web views in the last 4 days." Now I have the problem of getting the final paper done and in by Nov. 1. I am going to try to put a personal deadline of Sept. 1 on it,

Incidentally, have not yet received an address to which to send the final draft. The paper is supposed to be "in Microsoft Word with a pdf file for comparison" what ever that means? Can someone translate?

Socio-economics of science... If there had been any way to have a representative of our group there, we could have probably done a couple of papers.... As a research group, we are definitely underfunded.

Well, " back to the drawing board. "

Of course, if I were being a bit paranoid about it, I'd think that we ran into some scientific politics and got deliberately stalled. There is more and more information that is showing up that says that O/S is probably very close to "right on." Some part of the "Establishment" could possibly have done a sabotage job to stall this set of ideas giving more time for damage control on the "current frameworks." After all, no one wants to have some upstarts point out that a lot of the theory of the last 100 years is "somewhat off base." (A toggle up of Quantum Mechanics to cover what we are saying might well earn someone a Nobel Prize and the ever-lasting gratitude of the "Scientific Establishment." There are rumours of a Russian Group that seems to be on somewhat of this course.)

An instance of more information showing up is the following bit of information: Some work that had a preliminary publishing in May says that certain units, which are shown to oscillate between "Matter and Anti-matter" states, spend less time in the Anti-matter state. We can predict this by saying, "In our Universe the expression of the proton-electron, anti-proton-positron states which we call matter, is read as 'protons and electrons.' The expression of smaller vortex oscillators, in the larger vortex oscillator which we call "the Universe" will be affected by the rotational/inversional sense of that oscillator..."

It is a bit disgusting to have spent so much time in trying to get a short talk done. At least 40 hrs. or more of typing and retyping, writing and rewriting. The result probably wasn't that great, but it is frustrating!!! Eski

On Jul 10, 4:08 pm, dean sinclair <deansincl...@gmail.com> wrote:

[- Show quoted text -](#)

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#)

dean sinclair [View profile](#)

[More options](#) Jul 15 2010, 9:45 am

Nope, Ka-Sala, we beat that deadline. We were supposedly "on" to give the talk up until almost the last moment: I could post the interchanges back and forth for the several days as we were trying to set up the teleconferencing net, but consider e-mails as semi-confidential.

We were OK from this end; but, apparently, either they couldn't get a link into the Conference room in London or someone said, "We have some inconvenience in setting this up so, why should we waste our time and effort on what clearly is some Crackpot nonsense." I hope that the comment, "internal problems," meant the former. The fact that we did have--as far as I know, still do have--an abstract posted and had a time slot reserved (those can be checked on the VigierVII Symposium site) tends to indicate that we did everything we could from this end, and, at least at



some point, we were scheduled in.

. The collapse of the "talk" was some problem at their end, not ours. We honestly tried. DS

[- Show quoted text -](#)

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#)

End of messages

[« Back to Discussions](#)

[« Newer topic](#) [Older topic »](#)

[Create a group](#) - [Google Groups](#) - [Google Home](#) - [Terms of Service](#) - [Privacy Policy](#)

©2011 Google

[Gmail](#) [Calendar](#) [Documents](#) [Photos](#) [Reader](#) [Sites](#) [Web](#) [more](#)

[deanlsinclair@gmail.com](mailto:deanlsinclair@gmail.com)

Google groups

[« Groups Home](#)

## Oscillator/Substance Theory

### Matter-Anti-matter Annihilation

[Options](#)

7 messages - [Collapse all](#) - [Report discussion as spam](#)

**ESKI** [View profile](#)

[More options](#) Jul 27 2010, 3:32 pm

Hi, everybody,  
I have a question that I need an answer for, It is: IS THERE ACTUALLY, ANYWHERE, A VERIFIABLE CASE OF MATTER-ANTI-MATTER ANNIHILATION AT THE LEVEL OF THE HYDROGEN ATOM OR ABOVE?

It seems to be dogma that "Matter" and "Anti-matter" annihilate on contact to revert to pure "Energy."

Our work suggests that this is nonsense, and in fact, "Matter", as we know it, is made up to a great extent of a unit, the electron, and another unit, the proton, which could be considered as, respectively, "matter" and "anti-matter" units by a logic which I have outlined elsewhere. In fact, there seems to be evidence developing that the "neutron count" of an atom is actually a count of the number of nucleons which are at any given instant in a state of "anti-electron, anti-proton" i.e. an "Anti-matter state." By this view, everything is made up of a balance of what we consider as "Matter," (electrons and protons) and Anti-matter (anti-electrons and anti-protons.)

The point is that I can't find a thing in the literature of a true case of matter-anti-matter annihilation other than the known electron-anti-electron situation which, at least by my reasoning, is a combination "reaction" to form another oscillator rather than a destruction to wave motion (electromagnetic radiation.)

IF SOME ONE HAS THE TIME, COULD THEY DO A LITERATURE SEARCH ON ANTI-MATTER AND SEE IF, ANYWHERE, THERE IS A VERIFIABLE CASE OF ACTUAL "MATTER-ANTI-MATTER ANNIHILATION" FOR ANYTHING OTHER THAN THE ELECTRON-ANTI-ELECTRON CASE? On a quick scan, I could find nothing....

seems to me this might make a basis for a good science article for some aspiring writer, with a title something like "Anti-Matter Myths..."

Thanks, Dean (Eski)

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#)

**ESKI** [View profile](#)

[More options](#) Jul 27 2010, 3:33 pm

#### Home

#### Discussions

[+ new post](#)

#### Members

[About this group](#)

[Edit my membership](#)

[Group settings](#)

[Management tasks](#)

[Invite members](#)



[View this group in the new Google Groups](#)

Hi, everybody,  
 I have a question that I need an answer for, it is: IS THERE ACTUALLY, ANYWHERE, A VERIFIABLE CASE OF MATTER-ANTI-MATTER ANNIHILATION AT THE LEVEL OF THE HYDROGEN ATOM OR ABOVE?

It seems to be dogma that "Matter" and "Anti-matter" annihilate on contact to revert to pure "Energy."

Our work suggests that this is nonsense, and in fact, "Matter", as we know it, is made up to a great extent of a unit, the electron, and another unit, the proton, which could be considered as, respectively, "matter" and "anti-matter" units by a logic which I have outlined elsewhere. In fact, there seems to be evidence developing that the "neutron count" of an atom is actually a count of the number of nucleons which are at any given instant in a state of "anti-electron, anti-proton" i.e. an "Anti-matter state." By this view, everything is made up of a balance of what we consider as "Matter," (electrons and protons) and Anti-matter (anti-electrons and anti-protons.)

The point is that I can't find a thing in the literature of a true case of matter-anti-matter annihilation other than the known electron-anti-electron situation which, at least by my reasoning, is a combination "reaction" to form another oscillator rather than a destruction to wave motion (electromagnetic radiation.)

IF SOME ONE HAS THE TIME, COULD THEY DO A LITERATURE SEARCH ON ANTI-MATTER AND SEE IF, ANYWHERE, THERE IS A VERIFIABLE CASE OF ACTUAL 'MATTER-ANTI-MATTER ANNIHILATION' FOR ANYTHING OTHER THAN THE ELECTRON-ANTI-ELECTRON CASE? On a quick scan, I could find nothing....

seems to me this might make a basis for a good science article for some aspiring writer, with a title something like "Anti-Matter Myths..."

Thanks, Dean (Eski)

[Reply to author](#)   [Forward](#)

Discussion subject changed to "Micro-Black-Holes & Matter-Anti-matter A

**Jack O Suileabhain** [View profile](#)   [More options](#) Jul 28 2010, 6:23 pm

DEAN you KILLJOY(not)~;-) Hey; If we blow the 'anti-matter' cover then Star-Trek get's CANCELED. . .

AND: Aren't the super-colliders racing a micro-thimble's worth of Anti-Matter around the track so that a virtual ARMY of ping-pong playing & tenured physicists can maintain their credentials and PAYCHECKS? Mostly this is an elaborate & intentional 'campaign of disinformation; methinks.'

HEISENBERG'S 'Uncertainty' is having big-play in this global CHARADE; now you see the wee lil' Anti-Matter(s) & Now you DON'T.

MOSTLY-----> It's never been anything but DON'T.

When Galaxies (Gyro-Toroidal energy-mass bodies with Singularity Centres-balanced 'grey-holes') reach light-speed at the Universe-bubble border their respective hub-grey-hole singularity centres dialate to BLACK-HOLE status at the AexoDarkEnergy-Hyperspace frontier and to the fanfare of MEGA-GAMMA-RAY-BURSTERS are 'eaten' back into parallel-adjacent AexoDE-Hyperspace.

Hadron-Cern copies the above process using super-energized-accelerated Protons aka (MICRO Gyro-Toroidal energy-mass with Singularity Centres-balanced (micro-grey-holes').

At the appropriate quasi-light-speed acceleration point the Proton-grey-hole-Centre dialates to MICRO-Black-Hole Status and SUCKS itself-shut to the fanfare of a MICRO-GAMMA-RAY-BURSTER(notable) energy release. . . . and this process is that which was touted as the FICTIONAL 'anti-matter-annihilation energy-release' phenomenon. But MUCH energy IS being released but NOT from fictional anti-matter-annihilation.

?Why does not said Micro-Black-Hole-Singularity EXPAND dangerously. EASY. The hugely-overwhelming proximal PLANETARY MASS-PROTON dynamic equilibrium simply SQUASHES-SHUT the Einstein-Rosen Micro-Black-Hole access to parallel-adjacent AexoDE-Hyperspace. This could be the LAW of AETHYR-M-BRANE PROXIMAL ELECTRO-GRAVIONIC FIELD HYPER-TENSOR EQUILIBRIUM(especially near High-mass Bodies; like planets AND even being near a 'free-black-hole' the PROXIMAL M-BRANE TENSOR FIELD would 'preclude' any 'other' relatively 'near-by' singularity formation.)

EVEN the same parallel macro-phenomenon of a Fission-Bomb's Plasma-Gyro-Toroidal creates the 'micro-singularity-centre' which ingresses the classic INGRESS MUSHROOM PILLAR, which initiates a FUSION PILLAR within the FISSION RELEASE GYRO-TOROIDAL MAELSTROM. And even this notable (miniscule but relatively large/to-us) ingress of parallel-AexoDE-Hyperspace plasma is QUICKLY SQUASHED-SHUT by the Solar-System/Planetary Electro-Gravionic Field tension upon our immediately surround 'space-M-brane.'

LOS ALAMOS: Manhattan's 'Teller etc.' thought that the 'bomb's' reaction would 'cascade-open-exponentially' and consume the ENTIRE MASS OF THE EARTH and maybe the solar system.

But 'Singularity' is the MODEL & RULE of all 'Mass-Matter-Gyro-Toroidal' constructs in the Bubble-Universe which accounts for pretty-much EVERYTHING. And the natural M-Brane/Aether Electro-Gravionic super-tensor field-state STABILIZES this COSMIC/AEXOCOSMIC fluid-dynamic energy circulation SYSTEM.

So obviously the above HIGHLY FUNCTIONAL MODEL pretty much excludes the so-called anti-matter & thusly anti-matter annihilation-model.

And because of the above stated LAW of M-Brane FIELD-TENSOR Equilibrium the notion of MORONS that Cern-Hadron is 'creating' so-called DEADLY BLACK-HOLE is mostly BS.

HOWEVER: Being able to FIRE-DIRECT a stream of BLACK-HOLE STATE ACCELERATED PROTONS aka 'Micro-Black-Holes' is probably DOABLE & would make ONE HECK OF A POTENT WEAPON>(maybe already in existence)< Cheers Jack Harbach O'Sullivan~:-)

- [Show quoted text](#) -

[Reply to author](#)   [Forward](#)   [Report spam](#)

dean sinclair [View profile](#)

[More options](#) Jul 28 2010, 7:43 pm

Hi Jack,

As usual, we seem pretty much in agreement, although, again, as usual, I don't quite understand your ~~DeutscherTypeWordSprache~~ <sup>Deutscher</sup>.

The problem with the Hadron super-collider racing a pico-thimble full of anti-matter around is that the darn thing just can't "get off the ground." Odds are that it is broke down again, right now.

The idea that protons can be accelerated in the same way as the more massive units can is an error. Protons can, and do, associate with one another; and, to make it worse, the proton is an inverting oscillator which probably, under the right circumstances, can convert to an Anti-proton--think conversion of the Hydrogen Molecular Cation to the Deuteron--there are lots of things that can happen that the designers had no idea of..

.In the talk that I didn't get to give, i was going to note that there is a possibility that the Hadron Collider, while designed as a sophisticated particle accelerator may well be acting as a crude fusion reactor before feed-back causes it to break down....

The tenured professors may end up sweating a bit, if their jobs depend on the Hadron Collider finding the Higgs Boson....'Tain't gonna happen....

Apparently, you have no better luck finding any authentic Matter-Anti-matter Annihilation material than I did. Cheers, Dean

On Wed, Jul 28, 2010 at 6:23 PM, Jack O Suileabhain <

braghgoerin...@hotmail.com> wrote:

> DEAN you KILLJOY(not~;-) Hey; If we blow the 'anti-matter' cover then  
> Star-Trek get's CANCELED. . .

Horrors. But didn't Star Trek us DiLithium.....???

- [Show quoted text](#) -

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#)

Discussion subject changed to "Matter-Anti-matter Annihilation" by ka-sala

ka-sala [View profile](#)

[More options](#) Aug 1 2010, 1:26 am

QUOTE

> seems to me this might make a basis for a good science article for  
> some aspiring writer, with a title something like "Anti-Matter  
> Myths..."

> Thanks, Dean (Eski)

Hello Eski,

I know of one writer who wrote about all of this; and I have to agree with Jacko here, despite you say you find some of his language 'DeutscherTypeWordSprache'. a bit hard to understand. Yet he is right when he says...

QUOTE

>probably DOABLE & would make ONE HECK OF A POTENT WEAPON  
(maybe already in existence)<

Plus as you have said, some of mine is #@!!\*\*\*( ....) which maybe of interest to you that in the beginning, '70's, was done in a form of hieroglyphics for protection. So breaking this down into English, I am the first to admit much of what I say goes over the heads, due to reading it according to what only the theorists claim. When in fact, it is given with a wisp of insight into whatever subject matter is being discussed. Perhaps it is this 'wisps' you need?

This is one reason why this section of the already written book, is written in such a way, that hopefully, the energy within this potential you seek, will only be used for peaceful purposes. It seems to be the disregard of a lot in science, to keep things that way, once anything seen can be used otherwise.

There is no intention of mine in wanting anything out of this - except an intelligent mind to understand - and to put it into practice. It is simply being held back due to the unstable factor of greed, intentions of self worth, and warfare. It is no myth Eski, far from it! It would be an absolute waste of time spending a life-time of blood, sweat and tears on a myth; only to find the warring nature of many turn it back on their fellow man.

So it remains... always oscillating, until the receiver is worthy of this knowledge. Being a receiver itself, it naturally transmits this energy, and the whole intention is for the benefit of mankind to utilize and not annihilate one another in their race to the top without full knowledge of how.

It would be like letting loose the knowledge of what created the known atomic bomb - despite all the good which has come out of nuclear medicine - the facts remain they did not first know the potential energy of what they still so ignorantly call 'waste'. Instead now the damage done is too late in understanding, what could have been... in place of it's radio-active harm. One should not open the doors to some energies, without first understanding it is all worth-while when used correctly. And when no harm can come upon the heads of any human being.

NASA seeks to make their Lightships - prototypes - but they have a way to go before understanding enough in the direction in which we speak.

Getting back to where we were at the time of the ' VigierVIIITalk' - and what didn't happen - what are you wanting further to bring this together the way you wanted it to be? It appears you are still searching for more ? Have you personally had any outside feedback re as far as you got prepared for this? Is this the reason you now need more, and why you need an answer by further searching...  
>A VERIFIABLE CASE OF MATTER-ANTI-MATTER

ANNIHILATION AT THE LEVEL OF THE HYDROGEN ATOM OR ABOVE? <

Where are your intentions of this O/S leading to? I guess I am asking, since you had it all ready to put forward?  
Regards always,  
ka-sala

PS. Don't overlook the WISP in Science Eski... I don't have the Pleiades avatar for nothing. But NASA won't let me in! As they read my report in the 80's... wouldn't it be an irony ? I have no proof they copied nothing... when they had the lot!

On Jul 28, 6:32 am, ESKI <deanlsincl...@gmail.com> wrote:

[- Show quoted text -](#)

[Reply to author](#)   [Forward](#)   [Report spam](#)

ESKI [View profile](#) [More options](#) Aug 3 2010, 12:13 pm

Ka-sala,  
As always, you are apparently several steps--or is it light years?--ahead of this slow old man. Have to admit to being lost--again. Don't recognize the acronym, WISP, and do not know about your Pleiades Avatar and, somehow, what was your 80's report slips my mind. Would like to see what has been written about the myth of Anti-matter other than my own little short article on Helium. I should check there for the other articles on the same subject. Regards, "Eski"

On Aug 1, 1:26 am, ka-sala <irrir...@gmail.com> wrote:

[- Show quoted text -](#)

[Reply to author](#)   [Forward](#)

ka-sala [View profile](#) [More options](#) Aug 4 2010, 7:22 am

<http://www.sal.wisc.edu/WISP/>

You might get through NASA's Link here...

<https://dns.l4x.org/cddis.gsfc.nasa.gov>

[http://www.kevin.harkess.btinternet.co.uk/wisp\\_ch\\_7/wisp\\_ch\\_7.html](http://www.kevin.harkess.btinternet.co.uk/wisp_ch_7/wisp_ch_7.html)

[http://www.kevin.harkess.btinternet.co.uk/wisp\\_ch\\_5/wisp\\_ch\\_5.html](http://www.kevin.harkess.btinternet.co.uk/wisp_ch_5/wisp_ch_5.html)

[http://ffden-2.phys.uaf.edu/212\\_fall2003.web.dir/tyler\\_freeman/modern...](http://ffden-2.phys.uaf.edu/212_fall2003.web.dir/tyler_freeman/modern...)

<http://www.hypergeometricaluniverse.com/?p=2893>

Don't know if you can bring up this next one!  
Wisp Unification Theory - almost the theory of everything

[http://www-public.icu.edu.au/news/JCUPRD1\\_060264](http://www-public.icu.edu.au/news/JCUPRD1_060264)

Not intending to lose you Eski... Just a little food for thought to add to the subjects within the Light which you seek. Or should I say energy?

Don't worry 'bout Pleiades... Just a starry Cosmological Link.

But I am serious...

Many have gone down in history as having 'lost it'... but there is anti matter as equally as there is matter. It is no Myth! Just as everything has an opposite. In O/S you are looking for this force. Right from the start, I brought this in. Nothing can change this, but minds can confuse it.

It's like there is Light and dark/black Light energies. Just because it reaches into nanos and quantum's it's still there, as even

annihilation leaves something in it's wake... This is why I mentioned the WISP (wisp) so lightly.

This link ties in with just the title alone.

'Antimatter Atoms could shed light on the universe.'

[http://www.usatoday.com/news/science/2002-10-30-antimatter\\_x.htm](http://www.usatoday.com/news/science/2002-10-30-antimatter_x.htm)

Draw from anything what you will Eski. I have never been one to believe all theorists – just because it is written – or claimed (until proven wrong.) I guess I have enough understanding to simply hold to that... as I have all my life. And the same here is just as applicable... Until proven wrong, I will just carry on.

It's very probable you have seen these sites, but then again, there maybe just one small word which triggers your own search here. Anything I say would not change where you are heading. I have been there – in my way – and believe I have given it all in a nut shell, and cannot take you further than you are, if you are not open to new avenues.

I hope somewhere you can find more peace of mind within your understanding. Not feel nor see yourself as some 'old man'... and most of all, even think that some-one who may simply understand things in a different yet realistic light, as not being light years ahead of you, or any others. I just haven't waited this long for an intelligent enough mind to grasp what I'm saying....

Quote. 'Truth is ever to be found in the simplicity, and not in the multiplicity and confusion of things.'

\*Izaak Newton

Regards until next time,

ka-sala

On Aug 4, 3:13 am, ESKI <deanlsincl...@gmail.com> wrote:

[- Show quoted text -](#)

[Reply to author](#)

[Forward](#)

[Report spam](#)

End of messages

[« Back to Discussions](#)

[» Newer topic](#) [Older topic »](#)

[Create a group](#) - [Google Groups](#) - [Google Home](#) - [Terms of Service](#) - [Privacy Policy](#)

©2011 Google



Google groups

[« Groups Home](#)

## Oscillator/Substance Theory

Search this group

Search Groups

### Matter-Anti-matter and the possible HH+ --> D+ transform.Options

4 messages - [Collapse all](#) - [Report discussion as spam](#)ESKI [View profile](#)[More options](#) Sep 23 2010, 1:41 pm

Fairly recently it has been shown that certain entities known as Beta sub s in Standard Model Parlance undergo Matter-to-Anti-matter oscillation....

It is not inconceivable that this type of oscillation is general rather than confined to this type of special case.!

The consequences of such a supposition are interesting. Let us look at one of the possible "beginning reactions" of the build up of the atomic nuclides . This is the possible transformation of the Molecular Hydrogen Cation to the Deuterium Cation. That is HH+ (p+, e-, p+) ---

>D+.

HH+, in our Universe would be expected to be a clockwise rotor with a wobble.... If, in addition to the inversion-rotations of the two protons in this dual centered unit there were also the matter/anti-matter complication so that at any instant there might be the situation not only , p+,e-, p+, but also, p-, e+, p- . and the other possible combinations....

With continuing rotation and loss of vibrational and translational motion to the milieu, it is conceivable that at some point the three units eventually drop into a complete coordination of all the modes, inversion, rotation and "rotation/inversion" ( i.e. matter-anti-matter "switch") so as to become one coordinated entity , the Deuterium Nucleus, a basic unit of many other nuclides..

Is this Science Fiction Fantasy or Legitimate Scientific Speculation?  
Who knows at this point. Dean (Eski)

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#)

ka-sala [View profile](#)[More options](#) Sep 27 2010, 7:24 am

Hello Eski,

In attempting to bring the stellar energy to earth, and in dealing with matter or antimatter, the fact of fusion lies yet in the inability to master it. With fragments of theory - instead of dealing with the cold fusion facts - the obvious eludes due to the simplicity of what really is.

QUOTE

< in addition to the inversion-rotations of the two protons in this dual centered unit... >

Remember Hoek, and the Proton ?

QUOTE

< "(The point our Universe is at, given that size and time are infinitely relative). The U particle has already been confirmed by particle physicist, only they call it the "strange quark".>

#### Home

#### Discussions

[+ new post](#)

#### Members

[About this group](#)

[Edit my membership](#)

[Group settings](#)

[Management tasks](#)

[Invite members](#)



View this group in the  
[new Google Groups](#)

#### Sponsored links

[Alternative Energy - BP](#)

See how BP's advanced technologies are expanding energy production.  
[www.bp.com/energymix](http://www.bp.com/energymix)

[Bloomberg Government](#)

Exclusive Insight and Analysis of Recent Government Actions.  
[www.bgov.com](http://www.bgov.com)

[TED The Energy Detective](#)

Monitor electricity usage of entire home in real-time. Accurate.Simple.  
[www.theenergydetective.com](http://www.theenergydetective.com)

[See your message here...](#)

Whatever the Elements name, Deuterium or anti-deuterium, Hydrogen or anti-hydrogen, any matter or antimatter automatically meets in the middle, creating a 3rd. Call it the Third Law, or even a Muon Catalyst of the 3rd.degree. One could even say a 3 in 1.

When performed correctly, it is not Science Fiction Fantasy but Legitimate Scientific Speculation. I repeat your term of speculation, as you have, until it is mastered here. In all, there are 7 Principles which rule these Laws - and like the harmony of a scale - one could liken them to the Octave. The 1st. is the completion of all, when the 8th - the bridge - is the frequency of all combined. [ As in the Octave.]

As you say...  
QUOTE.

< With continuing rotation and loss of vibrational and translational motion to the milieu, it is conceivable that at some point the three units eventually drop into a complete coordination of all the modes, inversion, rotation and "rotation/inversion" ( i.e. matter-anti-matter "switch") so as to become one coordinated entity... >

Oscillation will always be, whether Matter or Anti-matter, or we would have nothing.  
It is...

QUOTE  
< one of the possible "beginning reactions" of the build up of the atomic nuclides...>

No-one need a big bang to safely work with cold fire. We only need a Light Ship to get back there! Nor do we have to blow ourselves up in the effort. And though I maybe the most philosophical of you all, which came first. Philosophy or Science ? In truth they are linked just as we are to the Cosmos.

In closing... did you check the 'WISP'?

Best regards,  
Ka-sala

On Sep 24, 4:41 am, ESKI <deanlsincl...@gmail.com> wrote:

- Show quoted text -

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#) [Report spam](#)

dean sinclair [View profile](#)

[More options](#) Sep 28 2010, 2:10 pm

KaSala,  
Yes, a lot of what Hoek says makes sense... Nope, i didn't check the WISP?  
i do not know the WISP....D

- Show quoted text -

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#)

ka-sala [View profile](#)

[More options](#) Sep 30 2010, 8:01 pm

It is all linked Eski... WISP and all!  
I gave you some links earlier to see... In the Matter-Antimatter Annihilation if you want to know more to bring you up to date?

Your QUOTE  
< Is this Science Fiction Fantasy or Legitimate Scientific Speculation?  
Who knows at this point. Dean (Eski) >

Remember... what was once Science Fiction are now facts in many fields.  
Regards,  
Ka-sala

On Sep 29, 5:10 am, dean sinclair <deansincl...@gmail.com> wrote:

[- Show quoted text -](#)

[Reply to author](#)   [Forward](#)   [Report spam](#)

End of messages

---

[« Back to Discussions](#)

[« Newer topic](#)   [Older topic »](#)

---

[Create a group](#) - [Google Groups](#) - [Google Home](#) - [Terms of Service](#) - [Privacy Policy](#)

©2011 Google

Google groups

[« Groups Home](#)

# Oscillator/Substance

## + Theory

Search this group

Search Groups

### FW: [Vo]:FZ-Quantum Transistion-LENR-Podkletnov-Casimir

Options

2 messages - [Collapse all](#) - [Report discussion as spam](#)

Jack O Suileabhain [View profile](#)

[More options](#) Oct 6 2010, 1:16 pm

Dean: The following is another 'short' that I 'woke-up' with this morning. . . Cheers; have a good Autumn!~Jack~ aka Jack Harbach O'Sullivan/O'Suileabhain

**\*\*FRANK ZNIDARSIC & QUANTUM TRANSITION re: LENR/Podkletnov corollary\*\***

**\*Quantum Transition root-ingress-Plasma as original pre-atomic energy state a la Frank Znidarsic\***

I've said this all before, but the data is beginning to agree with the posit of Protons' within Electro-Valent Capacitance shells as micro-Singularity systems. This is an extension of Einstein's Solar Voltaic electron-field as 'Capacitors'-model and the Casimir atomic postulates dove-tailing with the original posit.

The corollary of "One Million Meters per second"/Quantum-Transition re. LENR results and also Frank Znidarsic's finding the same within the extended Super-Fluid-Toroid Podkletnov model->re. the Quantum-Transition Velocity is 'huge.'

POSIT: Turn this around 'not' as back-tracking the phenomenon but rather as positing Quantum-Transition speed-density(velocity) as a new insight rather as QUANTUM-TRANSITION-ROOT-PLASMA that is formative energy state of 'ingress-plasma' into the 'eye' of the Proton(all protons) as balanced-worm-hole connected to said proton-eye as a 'each atom is a balanced singularity system.'

Corollary: The Einstein Solar Voltaic modeling of the Electron-shell(s) as an energy quantum-whole-field CAPACITOR state of graduated familiar electro-valent energy multiple levels in onion-layer-like configuration etc.

Case in Point: This Einstein Solar Voltaic Electron shell(s)as Capacitor-Field(s) WORKS. And the Solar Votaic effect is proof of the pudding of this model by producing effective technologies. And in the negative; the 'old model' of the electron-as-particle orbiting a fixed proton making the atom mostly relatively 'empty-space' is a non starter. The whole-atom is a circulating whole-energy 'field-system.'

A co-posit is that 'electron-flow' aka 'electrical current' is exactly like 'light-Photonic 'current' & is a 'wave-form' that I have referred to as 'helicoid-wave-string' of Quantum-Electron current via 'Quantum-Electron' Velocity-Density Momentum. Much is semantic, an admittably Frank Znidarsic tends to state the matter more succinctly. Hydrogens Electro-Valent Capacitance 'shell' equals 'One Quantum Electron' and work up from there. And Quantum-Electron wave-current helicoid-string flow would quantify as One Quantum Electron would equal=> one Q-Elec. Helicoid-spiral-Wave from wave-crest-to-wave-crest; ad Planck-Dirac angular momentum calculations etc.

But specifically I posit that the Frank Znidarsic observation of the 'unity' of the various gradient(spectrum) offshoots of 'forces'(EM-Nuclear-Photonic etc) from the convergent 'One Million Meters per Second,' indeed indicates here in is a Unified Source Quantum-energy state of INGRESS-PLASMA from adjacent Dark-Energy HyperSpace. This Source-Parent-Hyperspace is posited as a hyper-velocity/hyper-fluidic while hyper-dense quasi-infinite Super-M-Brane state. And this is what we have been poking toward under the names of Zero-Point-Energy &/or Quantum Vacuum which tend somewhat to misnomer because Hyperspace is hardly a 'vacuum.'

#### Home

#### Discussions

[+ new post](#)

#### Members

[About this group](#)

[Edit my membership](#)

[Group settings](#)

[Management tasks](#)

[Invite members](#)



View this group in the [new Google Groups](#)

#### Sponsored links

[Alternative Energy](#)

BP is investing in business and technology to deliver clean energy. [www.bp.com/energymix](http://www.bp.com/energymix)

[Amwand Zero Point Energy](#)

In Stock Original AmWand Free Shipping. Low Price Guarantee! [AmwandZeroPointEnergy.com/](http://AmwandZeroPointEnergy.com/)

[Reliant - Official Site](#)

Reliant's Weekly Email Helps Manage Energy Use & Spend. Sign Up Now! [www.reliant.com/energywise](http://www.reliant.com/energywise)

[See your message here...](#)

'Singularity' is the model for all interflow fluid dynamic balance from the atomic micro-singularity level to the macro-cosmological level. This is including the original Hyperdimensional singularity that 'big-banged' our Bubble-Universe into inflation as well as a virtual-infinite-myriad of other universii-sister-bubblels more or less similar to our own. These sister-universii-bubbles are inflated via routine Hyperspace current dynamics that form hypervelocity-hyperdense-hyperfluidic swirling current super-eddies which are the birth torus's of bubble-universes like bubbles within a virtually infinie Hyperspace Champagne.

AND SO: When Jeremy posits the confinguration of Super-Fluid 'bagel/torus' reactors to achieve the Podkletnov-effect, he is definitely on the right track. And if the above model is correct this Hi-Density-EM generated Bagel/Torus/Toroid Reactor which is functioning like a 'SUPER ATOM' according to Znidarsic-&-Jeremy should get much-more than they are looking for.

The Pot-o-Gold of this model; should be that cross-spectrum/transdimensional field viscosity should also intitiate a parallel-hyperspace adjacent torus-field which should act like a virtual cross-dimensional clutch & pressure plate. This should tend to create a common-Einstein-Rosen incipient-worm-hole quasi-singularity connecting the Reactor Torus Eye with the kick-started parallel Hyperspace Torus. And this should elicit a super-Podkletnov effect as the 'bleed-through' Hyperspace super-velocity-density field while also producing hyper-gravity effects. At this point the bleed-through effect will reverse the bagel-EM-input into the 'reciever-inductee' reactor phase and becoming virtually a perpetually inducted EM-energy-field reciever from Hyperspace ingressed-QUANTUM-TRANSITION-ROOT-PLASMA. \* \* \* And this is the 'point.' \* \* \*

CASIMIR: Casimir indicates that the Proton-eye-singularity ingressed Quantum-Trans-Root-Plasma creates a Torus within a specific gyro-gravionic-centrific hypercompressed energy-shell-wall. The Proton's 'eye' as a balance-singularity connecting to adjacent Hyperspace would thusly create a micro-Dyson-Sphere-live gyro-centric-hi-gravionc 'shell' & likewise would be illiciting the Casimir-cavitation effects that housing a transdimensional-micro-singularity would indicate.

The axial-flow of this micro-energy-gyrotorus is indeed the flow-feed of the circulating-electro-valent shell(s)f outer Capacitor-acting-like onion-layered field. Within the Proton-gyro-torus-wall are correctly posited Casimir trans-temporal geometric effects considering that Hyperspace is a Virtual-No-Time/Virtual-No-Distance hypervelocity medium. Also this indicates that the quasi-Hyperspace-ingress of Quantum-Trans-Root-Plasma creates a High-Gravitic-axial-lobe-effect mirrors in parallel both the atomic-level as well as with our macro-level Super-Fluid Bagel/Torus Reactor.

A short jump should lead us to surmise that the hyper-gravitic Quantum-Trans-Root-Plasma around our Bagel-Reactor would tend toward trans-temporal manipulation a la 'Casimir-Effect'. And if this Super-Fluid Bagel Reactor were within a 'craft,' then we might expect it's flight characteristics to elicit quasi-Casimir-transtemporal distortion effects that would exactly mirror likewise posited Casimir effects at the atomic-proton level in parallel with the Bagel-Field's(quasi-macro-electron) shell-field-bubble of a Quantum-Transition-Root-Plasma 'gate' Reactor.

I'm thinking that this above outlines the ultimate destination-conclusions and R&D futures of what Frank Znidarsic has labeled the Quantum Transition Effect. And I'm calling it the Quantum-Transition-Root-Plasma Effect.

The Znidarsic LENR cross-corollary of 'One Million Meters per Second' Quantum-Transition velocity is indicating really cool possibilities for the further developement of inter related Cold-Fusion future strides.

Case in Point: The Super-Fluid-Bagel/Torus Reactors promise virtually-infinite access to cross-dimensional inducted power for global & regional powergrids. And for mass-global-transit such will also welcomely obviate high Carbon/CO<sup>2</sup> generating, JP-4/Jet Fuel guzzling Airline-traffic etc. Thus simply 'not-fouling' our precious atmosphere is worth the price of admission exponentially.

However: Practically for day-to-day, up-close-&-personal uses Cold-Fusion is the related technology of choice. We don't need 'large-transtemporal-effects' occurring under the bonnets of our personal vehicles for instance. . . . Super-Fluid Reactors &/or Cryo-Super-Conductor forms of same do not lend themselves to Personal Vehicle &/or home-dwelling functions etc. & compact-sophisticated functions. But Cold Fusion most certainly is the most promising avenue of application of these extended Quantum-Transition-root-Plasma principals for practical energy system(s) that are vital to our overall global energy uses for these types of applications relative to humanities' day to day needs & crucial compact-energy quasi-overunity technologies. In short; batteries will 'not' cut it for the future.

Methinks that this future is already happening and not 'Blarney.'~:-)-Cheers; Jack Harbach O'Sullivan

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#) [Report spam](#)

dean sinclair [View profile](#)

[More options](#) Oct 6 2010, 3:32 pm

On Wed, Oct 6, 2010 at 1:16 PM, Jack O Suileabhain <

braghgoerin...@hotmail.com> wrote:

> Dean: The following is another 'short' that I 'woke-up' with this morning.  
> . . Cheers; have a good Autumn!~Jack~ aka Jack Harbach  
> O'Sullivan/O'Suileabhain

> \* \* \*FRANK ZNIDARSIC & QUANTUM TRANSITION re: LENR/Podkletnov corollary\* \*  
> \*

> \*Quantum Transition root-ingress-Plasma as original pre-atomic energy  
> state a la Frank Znidarsic\*

I'm going to have to try to make some translations into my vocabulary.  
"pre atomic energy state swounds like my subsance/substrate.

> I've said this all before, but the data is beginning to agree with the  
> posit of Protons' within Electro-Valient Capacitance shells as  
> micro-Singularity systems. This is an extension of Einstein's Solar Voltaic  
> electron-field as 'Capacitors'-model and the Casimir atomic postulates  
> dove-tailing with the original posit

Yeah, so the " little proton" moving back and forth only a bit from the  $4.7 \times 10^{-19}$  cm. radius is easily buried in the ce3nter of the much greater volume electron. Is that what all this verbiage says?

> The corollary of "One Million Meters per second'/Quantum-Transition re.  
> LENR results and also Frank Znidarsic's finding the  
> same within the extended Super-Fluid-Toroid Podkletnov model->re. the  
> Quantum-Transition Velocity is 'huge.'

Are you talking here about th same thing as my " matter-anti-matter "  
transition frequency,?

Turn this around 'not' as back-tracking the phenomenon but rather as  
positing Quantum-Transition speed-density(velocity) as a new insight rather  
as QUANTUM-TRANSITION-ROOT-PLASMA that is formative energy state of  
'ingress-plasma' into the 'eye' of the Proton(all protons) as  
balanced-worm-hole connected to said proton-eye as a 'each atom is a  
balanced singularity system.'

Would agree that each atom is a balanced system which has a , mensurable  
lifetime.

Seems like about three years ago, "Hugh" came up with a suggestion that  
every thing cduld be considered a composed of black holes...(That'd be  
something that had an event-horizon (read inversion sphere or circle) and  
singularity, (read inner limit)

> Corollary: The Einstein Solar Voltaic modeling of the  
> Electron-shell(s) as an energy quantum-whole-field CAPACITOR state of  
> graduated familiar electro-valent energy multiple levels in onion-layer-like  
> configuration etc.

This view sounds simplistic, although useful, it is also very reminiscent  
of Mills' neutrino shell modelling of the Hydrogen atom.

> Case in Point: This Einstein Solar Voltaic Electron shell(s)as  
> Capacitor-Field(s) WORKS. And the Solar Votaic effect is proof of the  
> pudding of this model by producing effective technologies. And in the  
> negative; the 'old model' of the electron-as-particle orbiting a fixed  
> proton making the atom mostly relatively 'empty-space' is a non starter.

> The whole-atom is a circulating whole-energy 'field-system.'

I'd sort of go along with that. However, I am not comfortable with the terms, "Energy" and "Energy Field s" I would prefer motion volume systems. This is in part because I feel the term, "Energy" is too loosely defined and I can , starting with the fact that momentum is the instantaneous change of "Energy" with respect to time, derive three different equations which would represent "Energy. [ $mv^2/2$ ,  $m^2v/2$ , and  $m^2v^2/2$ , }

> A co-posit is that 'electron-flow' aka 'electrical current' is exactly like  
> 'light-Photonic 'current' & is a 'wave-form' that I have referred to as  
> 'helicoid-wave-string' of Quantum-Electron current via 'Quantum-Electron'  
> Velocity-Density Momentum. Much is semantic, an admittedly Frank Znidarsic  
> tends to state the matter more succinctly. Hydrogens Electro-Valent  
> Capacitance 'shell' equals 'One Quantum Electron' and work up from there.  
> And Quantum-Electron wave-current helicoid-string flow would quantify as One  
> Quantum Electron would equal=> one Q-Elec. Helicoid-spiral-Wave from  
> wave-crest-to-wave-crest; ad Planck-Dirac angular momentum calculations  
> etc.

My theorizing would suggest that the above would need a lot of

> dissection, Sounds like several concepts are running into each other. also  
> you and I are not yet using the same concepts of the electron and proton....

> But specifically I posit that the Frank Znidarsic observation of the  
> 'unity' of the various gradient(spectrum) offshoots of  
> 'forces'(EM-Nuclear-Photonic etc) from the convergent 'One Million Meters  
> per Second,' indeed indicates here in is a Unified Source Quantum-energy  
> state of INGRESS-PLASMA from adjacent Dark-Energy HyperSpace. This  
> Source-Parent-Hyperspace is posited as a hyper-velocity/hyper-fluidic while  
> hyper-dense quasi-infinite Super-M-Brane state. And this is what we have  
> been poking toward under the names of Zero-Point-Energy &/or Quantum  
> Vacuum which tend somewhat to misnomer because Hyperspace is hardly a  
> 'vacuum.'

Again, by my thinking, these Zero-Point Energy Quantum Vacuum Ideas are a mishmash of confused theory which mixes point-centric motion (essentially what is known as "Mass") and the relative motions measured along collision vectors which result in what is usually called "Energy."

> 'Singularity' is the model for all interflow fluid dynamic balance from the  
> atomic micro-singularity level to the macro-cosmological level. This is  
> including the original Hyperdimensional singularity that 'big-banged' our  
> Bubble-Universe into inflation as well as a virtual-infinite-myrriad of other  
> universii-sister-bubbles more or less similar to our own. These  
> sister-universii-bubbles are inflated via routine Hyperspace current  
> dynamics that form hypervelocity-hyperdense-hyperfluidic swirling current  
> super-eddies which are the birth torus's of bubble-universes like bubbles  
> within a virtually infinie Hyperspace Champagne.

Yes, I'd say we are part of one half of an oscillator which could be called a "bubble Universe," there would be an unknown number of such and they may well overlap and intertwine. Bubbles in Hyperspace Champagne? Lot more romantic than my prosaic half oscillatorsw is a Subsance-Substrate.

> AND SO: When Jeremy posits the configuration of Super-Fluid 'bagel/torus'  
> reactors to achieve the Podkletnov-effect, he is definitely on the right  
> track. And if the above model is correct this Hi-Density-EM generated  
> Bagel/Torus/Toroid Reactor which is functioning like a 'SUPER ATOM'  
> according to Znidarsic-&-Jeremy should get much-more than they are looking  
> for.

\  
I don't know what the Podkletnov effect is. unless it is possibly something like the motion of a Bagel winding in space for "no apparent reason."  
Incidentally, I'm not acquainted, at this point with Z----- and Jeremy or their "Super atom Toroid" .....

- Show quoted text -

Google groups

« Groups Home

# Oscillator/Substance

## + Theory

Search this group

Search Groups

Fwd: Vigier AIP Paper Submission. Correspondence, I give up on this one. I blew it...

Options

2 messages - [Collapse all](#) - [Report discussion as spam](#)

dean sinclair [View profile](#)

[More options](#) Oct 12 2010, 3:42 pm

Geez, people, I hate to admit being a "Quitter" but this one I give up on .

Will post my current version of the paper that I'm giving up on because of publication technicalities and time constraints. It's been an expensive learning experience for an old man.ESKi

Here is my latest correspondence re the paper with the Symposium coordinator.

- Hide quoted text -

----- Forwarded message -----  
From: dean sinclair <deanlsincl...@gmail.com>  
Date: Tue, Oct 12, 2010 at 3:26 PM  
Subject: Re: Vigier AIP Paper Submission.  
To: noet...@mindspring.com

Richard,  
Going through the guidelines and instructions, I see that I am deep in over my head, I'd have to have had this information months ago, and probably then have to have gone to some of my friends at the newspaper to sort it out for me. I don't understand any of the technical jargon of publication and don't know how to do a pdf file....

I'll never be able to beat the paper into shape in three days with all the other things that are going on.;.In any case, if I could beat it into "publishable technical format," AIP would be unhappy with the lack of an institutional address, to say nothing of the fact that the paper has at least thirty points of disagreement with orthodox dogma... To make it worse, it is written in straight American English rather than Physics Jargonese, so--Heaven Forbid--any reasonably literate person could probably understand it! Seems as if that would be about the last thing that AIP would want for a paper they published.....

In a sense, the paper is getting lost in the same way the talk did. At the last minute, it is becoming clear that the technical details are just too complicated to overcome. Sorry to have wasted so much of your time. DS  
On Wed, Sep 29, 2010 at 8:07 PM, <noet...@mindspring.com> wrote:

> Hi Dean

> Attached are the guidelines for the submission  
> Please follow precisely

> Need a copy in MS Word and Pdf

> Papers are due by 15 October

Home

Discussions

+ new post

Members

[About this group](#)

[Edit my membership](#)

[Group settings](#)

[Management tasks](#)

[Invite members](#)



View this group in the new Google Groups

Sponsored links

[Get \\$75 Free Advertising](#)  
Grow Your Business With Google.  
Claim Your \$75 Coupon Now!  
www.Google.com/AdWords

[Advertise Your Website](#)  
News Releases - Cost-Effective Way  
to Market Your Website Online!  
prweb.com

[Download Audio Books](#)  
Listen On Your iPod or MP3 Player.  
No Shipping, No Waiting. Try Now!  
Audible.com

[See your message here...](#)



> if trouble with this email also send to

> amor...@noeticadvancedstudies.us

> This email you sent got through so send a similar without attachment to  
> notify it, then if I see it I will know paper didnt follow

> rla

> >Need specific details whom to submit paper to for the API publication of  
> >the  
> >Vigier VII Symposium. E-mail submission or Hard Copy? Address for  
> >submission. E-mails don't seem to be making it to this address. Thanks,  
> >Dean L. Sinclair

> Richard L. Amoroso -Director  
> Noetic Advanced Studies Institute  
> [www.mindspring.com/~noetic.advanced.studies](http://www.mindspring.com/~noetic.advanced.studies)  
> noet...@mindspring.com  
> (+) 510 435 1013

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#)

ka-sala [View profile](#)

[More options](#) Oct 26 2010, 8:08 pm

Hello Eski,  
I cannot blame you for how you feel here.  
I went over everything you've said, and even trid this  
[www.mindspring.com/~noetic.advanced.studies](http://www.mindspring.com/~noetic.advanced.studies) myself, but only to have  
mail returned.

I'm sure I have seen this Richard L. Amoroso -Director, Noetic  
Advanced Studies Institute on some TV Programs??? I also feel his  
approach is more from the metaphysics point of view and may answer for  
my own approach to things? Just guessing, but he does not appear  
'approachable' without 'joining' his site?

There must be a way round or another address??? Yet you got through  
this one time?  
Sorry all this ended like this, for now anyway. Just don't give up on  
your group who are with you, despite our different approaches.

Till again, take care,  
Ka-sala

On Oct 13, 7:42 am, dean sinclair <[deanlsincl...@gmail.com](mailto:deanlsincl...@gmail.com)> wrote:

[- Show quoted text -](#)

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#) [Report spam](#)

End of messages

[« Back to Discussions](#)

[» Newer topic](#) [Older topic »](#)

# Google groups

« Groups Home

## Oscillator/Substance

### + Theory

Search this group

Search Groups

#### Google is closing our "Pages" section. SjAVE the "Pages Library?!"

4 messages - [Collapse all](#) - [Report discussion as spam](#)

**ESKI** [View profile](#)

[More options](#) Oct 26 2010, 4:56 pm

Google is going to close down access to "Pages" as of Feb. 1 That will destroy our "Library." I suggest that you-all might want to transfer the "Pages" from this site, en masse, to a file on your home computers.

I'm going to try to move the material to a companion OscillatorSubstance Site, but am not sure how to do it. Anyone want to volunteer to take care of this for me?

Way things are going here, I'm only finding about 6 hrs. a week to do any computer work and I don't get any where near what all needs to be done... DLS

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#)

**ka-sala** [View profile](#)

[More options](#) Oct 26 2010, 7:53 pm

Wish I knew this one Eski, but I don't now how to. I wasn't sure after your last post if we were even continuing with this work ? I'm sure there is someone amonst us who can help here.

Take care, and what is meant to be, will be.  
Look after yourself also!  
Ka-sala

On Oct 27, 8:56 am, ESKI <deanlsincl...@gmail.com> wrote:

- [Show quoted text](#) -

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#) [Report spam](#)

**dean sinclair** [View profile](#)

[More options](#) Oct 27 2010, 3:26 pm

In the information that Google posted about closing the Pages, they also said something about a Zip drive and apparently gave a way to move the whole file to a "Zip drive," I tried moving the material to this public computer, apparently successfully, but couldn't get it back off here over to the new site. Cheers, Dean

- [Show quoted text](#) -

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#)

**ka-sala** [View profile](#)

[More options](#) Oct 27 2010, 3:54 pm

I will be grateful if anyone can save this site to ZIP to forward a copy to those unable to, as myself.  
Thank you,  
Ka-sala

#### Home

#### Discussions

[+ new post](#)

#### Members

[About this group](#)

[Edit my membership](#)

[Group settings](#)

[Management tasks](#)

[Invite members](#)



View this group in the new [Google Groups](#)

Gmail Calendar Documents Photos Reader Sites Web more ▾

deansinclair@gmail.com ▾

Google groups

[« Groups Home](#)

## Oscillator/Substance Theory

 Search this group

 Search Groups

Message from discussion [Fwd: Copy of Framework II](#)

ESKI [View profile](#)

[More options](#) Nov 17 2010, 4:51 pm

This is the paper that I didn't get correctly formatted to send in for publication in the AIP Publication of the Proceedings of the Vigier VII Symposium.... It is not in their format. The format used here is more like that used in papers on Helium.com.

For some unknown reason, a couple of other attempts to post this have failed, as I promised to post this about a month ago. DS

On Nov 17, 3:43 pm, dean sinclair <deansincl...@gmail.com> wrote:

> ----- Forwarded message -----

> From: <deansincl...@gmail.com>

> Date: Wed, Oct 6, 2010 at 3:45 PM

> Subject: Copy of Framework II

> To: deansincl...@gmail.com

> I've shared Copy of Framework

> II<[https://docs.google.com/document/edit?id=1Razysz5QR2j5zJ6k1\\_JX2CKE6Tg...](https://docs.google.com/document/edit?id=1Razysz5QR2j5zJ6k1_JX2CKE6Tg...)>

> Message from deansincl...@gmail.com:Click to open:

> - Copy of Framework

> II<[https://docs.google.com/document/edit?id=1Razysz5QR2j5zJ6k1\\_JX2CKE6Tg...](https://docs.google.com/document/edit?id=1Razysz5QR2j5zJ6k1_JX2CKE6Tg...)>

> A Framework for a Fundamental Theory?

> Dean L. Sinclair

> Email: deansincl...@gmail.com

> Abstract. A model called the "Oscillator/Substance Model" may provide a framework for a comprehensive theory uniting the fields of physical science.

> Its basic tenet is "All existence is the result of sequential

> 'action-reaction-action' interactions within a Substance/Substrate of

> undefined basic composition and extent." This continued "sequential

> equilibration" results in constant motion such that the system is composed

> of/controlled by oscillators. Some of these oscillators are vortexes which

> have long term stability. Their interactions result in "Matter." Among the

> results of this view are an explanation for "charges," and the related

> definition of the size, shape and form of electrons and protons; a solution

> to the problem of the "Four Forces of Nature," and an explanation of the

> "Matter of the Missing Anti-matter." More details of the developmental

> process which led to this model, some definitions which arise from it and

> the relationship to some of the other theoretical approaches is also

> covered, as well as implications of the model in various areas. For one

> example: What may be a very basic reason the Hadron Colider has a rather low

> probability of ever being able to fulfill its original mission is mentioned.

> Much of the information covered in the paper is available in a number of

> short "pages" at[http://www.Groups.Google.com/group/oscillatorsubstance-](http://www.Groups.Google.com/group/oscillatorsubstance-theory)

> theory<<http://www.groups.google.com/group/oscillatorsubstance-theory>>

> This is an edited and annotated expansion of a talk prepared for the

> VigierVII Symposium. London, England, July 12-14, 2010, which, because of

> certain systemic failures, was not presented.

> It is my honor to present some information about a model called. the

> Oscillator Substance Model which may provide a framework for a comprehensive

> theory uniting the fields of physical science.

> The basic tenet is, " All existence is the result of sequential

Home

Discussions

+ new post

Members

[About this group](#)

[Edit my membership](#)

[Group settings](#)

[Management tasks](#)

[Invite members](#)



View this group in the  
new Google Groups

Sponsored links

[Submit Articles](#)

Write About What You Are Best at  
And Attract Customers to Your Site.  
[www.Fylko.com](http://www.Fylko.com)

[Translucent Envelopes Now](#)

Manufacturer Direct Transluents  
Clear & Colors Compare \$ Save!  
[www.envelopemail.com](http://www.envelopemail.com)

[eJournalPress](#)

Web based manuscript submission,  
peer review, and tracking software.  
[www.ejournalpress.com](http://www.ejournalpress.com)

[See your message here...](#)

- > action-reaction-action interactions within a Substance/Substrate of
- > undefined extent and undefined basic composition. A Substance/Substrate
- > which may be considered as if it be a liquid at the triple point, able to
- > respond to slight pressure differences as any of the three basic phases of
- > solid, liquid or gas.
  
- > The continuous, sequential equilibration within the substance results in
- > constant motion such that the system is composed of/controlled by
- > oscillators.
  
- > Some of the oscillators are vortexes having long term stability. these
- > vortexes, the electron and proton and their mirror units, the positron and
- > anti-proton, interact to form what we know as matter.
  
- > This view produces valuable insights that often differ from the conventional
- > viewpoint by 180 degrees. One reason being that the model, by shifting the
- > generally accepted interpretation of the Michelson-Morley Experiment from
- > proving the non-existence of an "Aether," to showing some characteristics
- > necessary to an all-pervasive Aether, and thence changing the idea of the
- > Speed of Light from an absolute maximum velocity of anything, to an average
- > velocity which is a limit of information transfer, changes the viewpoint
- > considerably. When, in addition, Planck's Constant be reinterpreted from a
- > Constant of Action (Energy times Time) to a more prosaic, Constant of
- > Angular Momentum, there arises a form which can be combined with the Speed
- > of Light as an average tangential velocity to produce an equation, mass
- > times radius equals Planck's Constant divided by the Speed of Light. This
- > is an equation which can be used to define a family of oscillators. This
- > series of shifts produces a totally different view of reality from the same
- > basic, century-old data which underlies Space-Time and Quantum Mechanics.
  
- > [A good coverage of the Michelson Morley Experiment with annotation is given
- > in the
  
- > Wikipedia Article, "Michelson Morley Experiment "
  
- > Discussion of the development and usual interpretations of Planck's
- > Constant, is given in the Wikipedia Article, "Planck's Constant." ]
  
- > In the model which arises positive and negative charges are seen as the
- > result of reversed rotation/inversion senses of vortex oscillators. As these
- > vortex units have mass and radius limits--and, corresponding frequency
- > limits, charges will vary from a maximum value to zero and back, Charges
- > are not fixed values, but have limits and an average.
  
- > As the vortexes responsible for charges have determinable limits, their
- > sizes and shapes can be estimated. The results of these determinations have
- > interesting results for the theories of atomic structure.
  
- > The liberty is taken to insert, here, most of the contents of a "page"
- > previously published on the Internet Oscillator/Substance Google Site under
- > the title, "The Electron and Proton as Oscillators."
  
- > <http://www.groups.google.com/group/oscillatorsubstance-theory/web/the...>
  
- > If it be taken that the relationship between energy and electromagnetic
- > radiation be a fundamental relationship of our universe, then examination of
- > that relationship should furnish clues as to the nature of our universe.
  
- > If Planck's Constant--the constant which relates energy to electromagnetic
- > radiation--be equated to its definition as an angular momentum, one obtains
- > the equation,  $m \times r \times v = h$ . Evaluating this at "c," the speed of light,
- > we obtain,  $mr=h$  which can be rearranged to  $mr=h/c$ .
  
- > As any equation of the form  $xy=K$  can be taken to describe an oscillator, by
- > writing it in the form,  $xy=K=yx$ , to emphasize the interchangeability of the
- > values of the two variables, we can see that the equation,  $mr=h/c$ , can be
- > taken to define a family of oscillators of constant torque,  $h/c$ . With an
- > "average" value of mass and radius where  $m = r = (h/c)^{0.5}$ .
  
- > When the electron is checked to see if it fits into this family, it is found
- > to fit with one limit set with the "rest mass" as the mass, "m", and the

> "Compton Wavelength" as the radius, "r." For an oscillator the absolute  
 > values can be switched to determine a "reciprocal limit." For this  
 > particular oscillator, the other oscillatory limit would be absolute value  
 > of Compton Wavelength as mass and the absolute value of the "rest mass" as  
 > the value of the radius, "r."

> The set of values best known to this writer is the centimeter-grams-second,  
 > "cgs," system, which will be used throughout this discussion in analysis of  
 > oscillatory motion.

> Noted in our Universe as "Rest Mass" and "Compton Wave Length" for the  
 > electron are  $9.10953 \times 10^{-28}$  g. for the mass, correlated to  $2.42631 \times$   
 >  $10^{-10}$  cm. for the Compton Wavelength which corresponds to the radius.  
 > Switching the absolute values of the units, the other oscillatory limit  
 > would be  $2.43631 \times 10^{-10}$  g. correlated to  $9.10953 \times 10^{-28}$  cm. (The rest  
 > mass and Compton Wavelength values are taken from the Chemical Rubber  
 > Company, Handbook of Chemistry and Physics, 78th Edition.)

> We can analyze the proton in the same way to obtain the values:

> Minimal mass, maximal radius:  $1.67264 \times 10^{-24}$  g. and  $1.321401 \times 10^{-13}$  cm. ;  
 > balanced by the other limit of maximal mass, minimal radius--  $1.321401 \times$   
 >  $10^{-13}$  g. and  $1.67264 \times 10^{-24}$  cm.

> It is to be noted that the electron is both heavier and lighter than the  
 > proton and larger and smaller, depending upon where the observation be  
 > taken. At the average values they are the same, as would be expected of all  
 > oscillators of this family.

> Often oscillators are defined by the frequency limits within which they  
 > operate. If we do this for the electron, using the above radius figures as  
 > expected wavelengths, we find the maximum frequency limit to be about  $3.3 \times$   
 >  $10^{39}$  cycles per second and the minimal frequency to be about  $1.25 \times 10^{20}$   
 > cps. The inversion frequency would be about  $6.4 \times 10^{30}$  cps. For the  
 > proton the corresponding frequencies would be about  $1.8 \times 10^{34}$  cps. and  $2.3$   
 >  $\times 10^{23}$  cps. The inversion frequency--which corresponds to the average or  
 > inversion situation, where  $m = r = (h/c)^{0.5}$ , which is about  $4.7 \times 10^{-19}$   
 > grams at  $4.7 \times 10^{-19}$  cm., would be the same as for the electron, about  $6.4$   
 >  $\times 10^{30}$  cps. These figures would indicate the electron would be operating  
 > over a band width some eight orders of magnitude greater than that of the  
 > proton.

> If the mathematics above accurately reflect the "real world," observations  
 > are of limit situations of minimal masses and maximal sizes of the electron  
 > and proton when measured in "Our Reality," which is "balanced" in an  
 > alternative, and equally valid, alternate reality by a maximal mass and  
 > minimal size limit.

> It is possible that both electrons and protons may be considered as  
 > combination oscillators with one oscillator operating between minimal size  
 > at maximal mass and the  $4.7 \times 10^{-19}$  limits and the other operating between  
 > the maximal size at minimal mass limits and the "4.7 inversion situation."

> Both the electron and proton would show "nodes" at the oscillation limits  
 > and at the central inversion "equator." This 2/1 ratio of limit to  
 > inversion point has an interesting coincidence to the idea that "Quarks"  
 > occur in pairs, one with "2/3 of a charge" the other with "1/3 of a  
 > charge." Possibly the Quarks, considered fundamental particles in the  
 > Standard Model of Particle Physics are observational phenomena due to this  
 > nodal characteristic of oscillators. The interaction of this "internal  
 > structure" of electrons with that of the proton and other "particles." may  
 > be the reason that Quarks are supposedly confirmed by scattering data.

> [The Internet Wikipedia Article, "Quark  
 Model," [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Quark\\_model](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Quark_model) gives an idea of the stunning  
 > complexity of the Quark approach to atomic theory.. It would seem that  
 > there should be a much simpler set of explanations for the "alternate states  
 > of matter" which arise from "atom-smashing."]

> The equilibration process in a substance can be considered to result in  
 > constant pressure adjustment. Pressure fits the criterion for a true Force;  
 > therefore, the various Forces of Nature can be seen to be a result of

> interpretations of pressure adjustments. The "Four Forces of Nature" are  
 > usually said to be Gravity, Electromagnetism and the Strong and Weak Nuclear  
 > Forces. Gravity can be explained as differential pressure between vortexes  
 > and/or vortex aggregates. It is a set observational phenomenon which has  
 > been explained as an "Attractive Force." Electromagnetism is another set of  
 > observational phenomena due to interactions of vortexes in the medium.  
 > Again, these interactions are describable mathematically but do not fit the  
 > criterion for a Force, "For every Force there is an equal and opposite, for  
 > every action a reaction." (1)

> The "Strong and Weak Nuclear Forces" may be considered to arise from the  
 > idea of there being neutrons, as such in nuclei. The proton-neutron nucleus  
 > model, used since the 1930's, is good for "book-keeping" purposes; but, it  
 > requires a good deal of mental agility to try to justify it logically.  
 > Particularly when--on occasion--it requires transformation of an electron  
 > and proton into a neutron, a reaction which is the reverse of the known  
 > "spontaneous," exo-energetic transformation of the neutron into an electron  
 > and a proton.

> .

> The "Missing Anti-matter" Matter can be given a double explanation. The  
 > first part of an explanation is that the separation (or inversion) instant  
 > of an oscillator--an event which we know as the "Big Bang--" resulted in the  
 > definition of two oscillator halves, having reversed rotation/inversion  
 > orientations. Smaller oscillators, within these halves, will be influenced  
 > by the larger oscillator. The orientation of one half of these smaller  
 > oscillators will tend to be stretched, the other compressed, so that one  
 > rotation/inversion will tend to be expressed differently than the other. In  
 > our Universe, it appears that the stretched form which appears most  
 > obviously is the electron. Its "almost identical" mirror, the "positron,"  
 > appears to be somewhat suppressed.

> If one half of a separable oscillator be considered "Matter," and the other  
 > half be "Anti-matter," then--as the electron is always considered matter--  
 > the positron is anti-matter. The two units are logically halves of a  
 > separable oscillator, to which they rejoin in the "annihilation" process. (3,  
 > 4)

> The electron and proton are halves of another separable oscillator, the  
 > neutron. The electron is still "Matter," hence the proton, as the other  
 > half of a separable oscillator, is "Anti-matter!"

> Since the neutron is-- like the B sub s Meson which has been shown to  
 > oscillate between matter and anti-matter states--"neutral," it may be  
 > considered as either Matter or Anti-Matter. It may also be possible that all  
 > basic units, including the electron and proton, invert between "matter" and  
 > "anti-matter" states as does the B-sub-s Meson. (5, 6, 7)

> From the foregoing, we see that what we call "Matter," thought of as  
 > combinations of electrons and protons, might be more accurately considered  
 > as combinations of the "Matter" electrons, and the "Anti-matter" protons.

> Logically, there is, somewhere, an "anti-Verse" where the rotation inversion  
 > dominant expressions are the opposite of ours; but, also, we apparently have  
 > no truly "Missing Anti-Matter." We only have semantic confusion. (8) The  
 > "neutron count" of an atom can be considered simply as the number of  
 > nucleons that, at any given instant, are in anti-electron, anti-proton  
 > states. It is possible to do an accounting process as follows: Assume that  
 > the "atomic weight" to the nearest whole number, represents a sum of the  
 > total "heavy nucleons," considered as protons and anti-protons. Assume  
 > also that the atomic number represents the number of electrons and the  
 > number of protons. Now, we assume that there is an exact balance of matter  
 > and anti-matter units. According to the discussion above that would mean  
 > there would be the same total number of protons and anti-electrons as there  
 > are electrons and anti-protons. ((If instead of neutrons in the nucleus, we  
 > guess there to be an anti-proton-anti-electron association where we have  
 > always said, "Neutron.") Both of these summations add up to the atomic  
 > weight. We could also look at this as an electrical neutralization  
 > balance, as the number of electrons plus the number of anti-protons  
 > balances the number of protons and positrons.

> It, also, may be noted that the postulated proton-anti-electron pairs may be

> considered as having energy levels parallel to those that are written for  
 > the "outer electrons," that is. the proton-electron pairs, and correlations  
 > may be made to a set of energy levels including both sets. Taking a simple  
 > example: Li7, atomic number 3, atomic weight 7, would have the standard  
 > "outer electron distribution" of "1s2, 2p1," which we can say would cover  
 > the energy levels for electrons and protons, the distribution for the  
 > anti-electrons and anti-protons would be "1s2, 2s2;" while a combination  
 > distribution would have the structure "1s2, 2s2, 2p3." The  
 > electron-anti-proton energy level postulate represents what has long been  
 > known as a stable set, and the combination number represents a stable set  
 > plus a "half-filled, sub-shell" which is known also to be a situation of  
 > some stability. Considerations of this type lead to interesting  
 > correlations within the "Periodic Chart..(9)

> In addition to the "halves of oscillators" argument above, there is a  
 > mathematical argument that, given that both are "positively charged units,"  
 > the positron and the proton belong to the same category. If a positron of a  
 > certain kinetic energy were slowed down enough, with the "lost" Kinetic  
 > Energy all being converted to Mass, the Positron would be convertible to a  
 > Proton.

> If we let "m" and "v" be the masses of a Positron and "M" and "V" be the  
 > masses of the Proton, equate the Kinetic Energy expressions for the two  
 > units, and forget about the meaningless--for our purposes--one-half value  
 > which is in both, we can write  $mv^2 = MV^2$  and rearrange this to

>  $m/M = V^2/v^2$ . Inserting the "rest masses" for the Positron and the Proton  
 > in this equation, we see that were a Positron slowed to about 1/42 of some  
 > initial velocity, it could be converted--at least theoretically--to a  
 > Proton. (10)

> The logical combination of the electron and positron to form a combination  
 > oscillator with release of "Energy" as "Annular Radiation" does not seem  
 > to have been published anywhere prior to the Sci-Scoop article, "Negatron  
 > plus Positron Equals Zerotron?" (3) There are several logical arguments  
 > for this model for "annihilation" and "pair-production" being reciprocal  
 > processes involving a previously unsuspected combination oscillator.

> One of these arguments involves another often neglected aspect of science  
 > theory. This is the fact that both mass and velocity are variables. When  
 > the momentum expression, "mv," is integrated to form an "Energy"  
 > expression, mass is usually considered to be constant and only velocity to  
 > vary, producing the well known "Energy" expression,  $E = (mv^2)/2$ . This  
 > expression possibly should be said to apply only to "Kinetic Energy," the  
 > "motion package" associated with moving a point and its associated,  
 > "point-centric" motions along a vector.

> If it be considered there could be a situation wherein the velocity cannot  
 > change, then mass would be the variable. Doing the integration under these  
 > circumstances, produces another equation,  $E = (vm^2)/2$ . (11)  
 > Considering that, in reality, both mass and velocity will vary, it might  
 > be better to simply integrate, "p", momentum, itself, as a variable, to  
 > obtain the expression,  $(p^2)/2$  as a more accurate picture of the "total  
 > Energy" that is, of a "total motion-package." This leads to  $(m^2v^2)/2$ , the  
 > expression obtained by reinserting "mv" for "p."(12)

> In the "annihilation," it is noted that the Energy release is " $mc^2$ ,"  
 > where "m" is the "rest mass" of each particle and "c" is the speed of  
 > light. This is the "Energy" release expected from the dissipation of the  
 > Kinetic Energy of two units meeting "head-on" on the same vector at  
 > velocity,

> "c." It is usually considered that the electron and positron are  
 > "destroyed" rather than combining.

> It doesn't seem to be generally realized that when objects meet "head on,"  
 > the Kinetic Energy is dissipated, the objects may be changed, but they are  
 > not converted totally to "Energy." In the usual handling of the case of the  
 > Electron and Positron, the "Second Energy Expression,"  $(vm^2)/2$ , is not  
 > considered, and all of the "Motion" which would be described by  $(m^2v^2)$  is  
 > also not considered.

- > . As it may be argued that the "Collision Energy" would more properly be
- > represented by  $m^2c^2$ , than  $mc^2$ , it can be seen that there is definitely
- > an "m" value which is not accounted for.... It makes sense that the two
- > units, when they finally become oriented on the same vector, after some
- > time existing as one or another of the forms of "Positronium," the
- > short-lived (in our time scale) "near-zero-mass" analog of Hydrogen. [This
- > is a unit having some characteristics of both atomic and molecular Hydrogen.
- > ( 13) ] When the two "halves" reach the proper orientation, Kinetic
- > Energy--possibly actually vibrational Energy--is lost as a wave
- > disturbance, "Annular Electromagnetic Radiation," and the two vortexes
- > coalesce into a pulsator.
  
- > [This would be somewhat analogous to a molecule collapsing to an atom, or a
- > molecular cation collapsing to an atomic cation. These may be the processes
- > whereby Deuterium may arise from the Hydrogen Molecular Cation and Helium 4
- > from the Deuterium Molecular Cation. The latter may be an explanation for
- > the observation of the formation of "Helium 4," along with "excess heat" in
- > certain electrolysis experiments with Palladium electrodes. This is the most
- > studied type of reaction in the ongoing research in the field once called
- > "Cold Fusion," and now known as "Condensed Matter Nuclear Science," or
- > "cmns" for short.
  
- > The definitive history of this field, as of about 2006, can be found in the
- > book, "The Secrets of Low Energy Nuclear Reactions " by Dr. Edmund Storms.
- > A web site maintained by Dr. Ludvik Kowalski contains information which
- > has developed since Storms' book was written. (14) ]
  
- > Considering the electron and proton as vortex oscillators which can
- > associate may give a clue as to why the Hadron Collider apparently has had
- > difficulties. Vortex oscillators can not only associate with different
- > vortexes, but also self-associate. Electron-electron association has been
- > long known. However, no one seems to have realized the same to be true for
- > protons. Additionally, conventional science gives no hint of the possible
- > existence in "vacuums" of pulsator-oscillators, e.g., the "Zerotron"
- > mentioned previously, some of which may be separable into electrons and
- > positrons and deformable into neutrons or even other neutron-like entities.
  
- > Pushing a stream of mutually repulsive "Charged Particles" through a void,
- > would be very different from trying to control vortexes, which can
- > self-associate, through a possibly-reactive medium. If the O/S
- > --Oscillator/Substance--view be correct, the Hadron Collider, when trying
- > to accelerate protons might have been acting for a short time as a fusion
- > reactor before feed-back caused breakdowns.
  
- > [If the "Zerotron" unit idea be valid, and, also, the idea that the neutron
- > may result from shock-wave distortion of this entity, then there is a
- > possibility that the attempts to accelerate protons can cause shock wave
- > effects in the Substance-Substrate, creating neutrons, this soon would be a
- > source of electrons and additional protons. It is not too much of a
- > stretch to see this situation resulting in the  $HH^+$  --Hydrogen molecular
- > cation--which, very possibly can convert to the " $He4^+$ " unit, the Helium 4
- > Cation.... The overall effect would be a release of "Energy" into the
- > system, from a very unexpected source. A system that was supposed to be
- > absorbing "Energy" would instead be emitting it...]
  
- > The basics of this "Framework" have been stated, and some implications have
- > been covered. However, a few words about the start of the ideas leading to
- > the O/S Model and the reasons for its quite different view from the
- > conventional may be in order.
  
- > This model started to develop quite innocently in the Spring of 2004 with
- > the realization that basic ideas of Einstein's Special Relativity fit into
- > communication theory, where they would apply to any Perceptual Universe
- > defined by a maximum, practical velocity of information transfer, whether
- > that velocity be determined by Pony Express Riders or Electromagnetic Waves.
- > (15)
  
- > Since, in every case, practical maximum velocity of information transfer is
- > going to be a bit less than the average speed of the packet carriers, the
- > Speed of Light, is logically an average which acts as a practical maximum
- > velocity of information transfer. This idea, also, would rise quite
- > naturally from the use of the term, "Speed," in the name, "Speed of Light,"
- > as a "Speed" may be considered either as an average over time in a given



- > direction of an number of velocity vectors, or an instantaneous "velocity" of undefined direction.
- > A line of logic stemming from the above consideration. led to two 2007 papers published on Helium com under the title, "Motion in a matrix as a new model of the physical universe." ( 16, 17) These papers outlined the reasoning involved up to that time. These papers were the progenitors of the present theoretical form. It was later realized that the idea of a "Matrix." as a true solid, would be an error. and the model of the "Matrix" was modified to "A medium having the general characteristics of a substance at its triple point."
- > By the Summer of 2008, when the Oscillator/Substance Google Group was set up, follow-ups on the initial insights noted above, had led to the realization that there was a "T.O.E." available, as outlined at the start of this talk, which could have been seen a Century ago. Had the Michelson-Morley Experiment been reversed in interpretation from ruling out an "Aether," to partially defining an Aether; and then, a few years later, Planck's Constant had been considered a Constant of Angular Momentum and used to define characteristics , of that Aether, this model might well have come into existence 100 years ago.
- > Equating Planck's Constant, "h," to its definition as an angular momentum and evaluating the resulting equation at the Speed of Light, "c." leads to the equation,  $m \times r = h/c = r \times m$ . This arises from the fact that one definition of angular momentum states that angular momentum is the resultant of a mass , "m," rotating at a radius, "r," from a point, with a tangential velocity, "v."
- > As Planck's Constant applies at the Speed of Light, it makes sense to evaluate at the speed of light and to simply by dividing out that speed from the left side of the equation to form a ratio constant, "h/c." The resulting equation,  $m \times r = h/c = r \times m$  is an example of a common, very valuable relationship in physics, which occurs in the law of levers, the balance law used in weighing, the law of conservation of momentum, the law of conservation of energy....
- > Here, this relationship can be used to determine the oscillator limits for a family of constant torque oscillators , defined by the set,  $\{m \times r = h/c = r \times m\}$  , with a torque of h/c and inversion at the state where  $r = m = \text{square root of } h/c$ . In the cgs system, this value is about  $4.7 \times 10^{-19}$  grams at  $4.7 \times 10^{-19}$  cm. This implies a hidden half of any basic oscillator which is smaller than  $4.7 \times 10^{-19}$  cm.
- > Coming to the work of Michelson, Morley and Planck from a somewhat opposite view of the more standard theoretical approaches such as Space-Time, Quantum Mechanics and String Theory, this model has a quite reversed orientation. As such, it asks for re-examination of many of the accepted percepts of modern physical theory.
- > It may, however, turn out that this model will be complementary to much theory rather than contradictory. In its definition of Mass as a measure of the tension-pressure at a surface of the point-centered motions within that surface, a characteristic of entities that is measured by comparison; and , in suggesting that the term, "Energy," usually means a measurement of a package of motion which includes a point and its associated motions along a line--a unit whose effects are usually observed as the results of collisions--that is. "Kinetic Energy," it appears that this model tends to focus on the "Mass" aspect , whereas most theoretical approaches focus on "Energy," for the most part, and consider "Mass" as generally a constant value of some sort.
- > There is far too much information developed from this model--and closely associated ideas --which cling easily to it as a "Framework," to cover in this short presentation. Therefore, I refer you to the web site of the group previously mentioned, <http://groups.google.com/group/oscillatorsubstance-theory>. In this site
  - > most of the extant material has been collected as "pages," which vary in size from a half-page to 23 pages and counting..
- > This model is called a "Framework," by this writer who considers it as a simple start toward new construction. The model developed from a thought that communication should be consistent whether the information be carried

- > by Pony Express Riders or Electromagnetic Waves. Since it almost "grew
- > itself--" essentially independent of consideration of other theoretical
- > models--it turns out to be definitely in contrast to many attitudes current
- > in the scientific community. In fact, we might say that it is "usually
- > anywhere from 90 to 180 degrees out of phase." Here are some examples, some
- > of which may not have been explicitly mentioned before.

- > Where the standard view seems to be that what is needed is a theory to unify
- > many diverse parts, this model takes the view that there is a "unity, a
- > Substance/substrate of undefined extent and undefined basic unit." This
- > idea might possibly be interpreted to mean, "There is a Fact of Existence
- > which we may never be able to totally understand or define. Let us accept
- > that and move on to what we can do."

- > Where the general consensus is that there is nothing in a "vacuum," this
- > model postulates that there is an all-pervasive substance, even in "vacuums"
- > from which the vortex aggregates which we call "matter," have been removed.

- > Where the usual view of electrons is as some sort of probability cloud, this
- > model sees them as rotating, inverting, vortex oscillators.... Similarly,
- > reality of size and shape are given to other subatomic units. (The
- > probability cloud idea arises from an average positioning of the electron as
- > an entity in space, but is generally taken as a representation of the
- > structure of the electron.)

- > The conventional picture is that electrons and positrons combine to
- > "annihilate," converting totally to "electromagnetic radiation." This model
- > says that they combine to another type of oscillator with dissipation of
- > half of their total motion in the form of "radiation." Whereas,
- > conventionally, "pair-production" is some sort of a mysterious conversion of
- > "Energy" into "particles" in the presence of matter-- in this model, pair
- > production is simply the splitting of the "parent oscillator," when supplied
- > with enough excess motion That is, pair-production is considered the
- > reverse process of "annihilation."

- > Much of conventional physics theory is based on an idea similar to
- > Einstein's supposed comment, " Mathematics is the reality." It is even
- > assumed by many that if theoretical ideas are not expressed in differential
- > equations, they have no validity. The view here is that mathematics is a
- > tool, and that it is probably best to work with the simplest tools possible.
- > This entire presentation has used nothing beyond grade school level, except
- > for reference to Integration of the Momentum equation to form Energy
- > equations.

- > Where Mass and Energy seem generally accepted as being fundamental and

- > inter-convertible--without truly defining either--this model defines both
- > with respect to motions relative to points. (Mass is considered a measure
- > of the tension/pressure at a surface, a measure of the motions concentrated
- > about points within that surface. Energy specifically refers to Kinetic
- > Energy, A measure of motion of an entity--a surface having a center of
- > mass--along a vector. This is a value which is determined by velocity with
- > respect to a point on that vector...)

- > Where the "Unification of the Four Forces of Nature" is considered
- > conventionally as a major theoretical problem, this model dismisses the
- > situation by pointing out that none of the "Four Forces" meets the
- > definition of a Force, whereas Pressure does.

- > The problems of the "Missing Mass" of our Universe, Dark Energy, and some of
- > the other related concepts may turn out to be due to several factors. One
- > could be the semantic confusion between the use of the term, "Mass," as
- > describing a "physical body," and "mass" as a scientific term describing an
- > attribute of that body. This differentiation clearly shows in this model.

- > Where, conventionally, there are many constants of nature, this model
- > implies that there should be few, and those will be not absolute limits of
- > any sort but are more likely to be statistical averages. Furthermore,
- > combinations, multiples, and roots of "constants" are logically also
- > "constants" which may furnish information. For instance, the square root of
- > the speed of light,  $(c)^{0.5}$ , which is about 173 Kc/sec. (and  $1.73 \times 10^8$
- > cm) may be a very interesting frequency as it is the value at which

> frequency and wave length will have the same "Absolute value." The use of  
 > the square root as two separate units which may have different titles but  
 > have the same "absolute values" is related to two short papers published on  
 > SciScoop. (18, 19)

> This model does not consider positive and negative charges as mysterious,  
 > accepted things of nature, but as manifestations of the rotation, inversion  
 > senses of vortex oscillators. As such, they are not constant values....

> Where the Standard Model of Particle Physics originally considered the units  
 > found as results of atom-smashing experiments as being fundamental particles  
 > released by the experiments, this model would imply them to be different,  
 > alternative states of matter created in the experiments. That is, artifacts  
 > rather than fundamentals.

> This is by no means a conclusive listing of the differences in philosophy  
 > and attitude of this model from the more conventional situations. It is  
 > simply a listing of some of the differences that come immediately to this  
 > writer's mind.

> In presenting this "Framework," this person is most certainly not asking  
 > that the ideas and information collected by all the workers who have  
 > contributed in the past be discarded, he is simply suggesting that this  
 > model may be a framework into which profitable re-examination of data and  
 > ideas may be fitted. This is a framework which appears, at least to this  
 > writer, to furnish a simpler, more easily understandable view of Existence  
 > than is currently available elsewhere.

> \_\_\_\_\_

> References:

- > 1. deanlsinclair, "Four Forces or One Substance?," SciScoop.com
- > 2. ibid.
- > 3.deanlsinclair, Positron plus Negatron equals Zerotron?.SciScoop.com
- > 4.Sinclair, Dean L., ON THE MATTER OF ANTI-MATTER, What is hidden where?  
 > deanlsinclair.blogspot.com
- > 5.Perricone, Mike, It might be...it could be...it is!!! Fermilab Press  
 > Release, Sept 25, 2006
- > 6.Jamieson, Valerie, Flipping particle could explain missing anti-matter,  
 > New Scientist, 18 March 2008
- > 7.Overbye, Dennis, A New Clue to Explain Existence, The New York Times,  
 > May 17, 2010
- > 8. Sinclair, Dean L., Anti-matter, the basics. Helium.com
- > 9. William Harrington, Charles William Johnson. and Dean L. Sinclair,  
 > private correspondence dealing with continuing work.
- > 10, Sinclair, Dean L., Could protons be "reformed" anti-electrons?  
 > Helium.com
- > 11.deanlsinclair, Two Energy Expressions Interact? SciScoop.com
- > 12.ibid
- > 13.\_\_\_\_\_, Positronium, Wikipedia.org
- > 14. Kowalski, Ludvik, Index to Cold Fusion Items, montclair.edu
- > 15,Sinclair, Dean L.,Emulating Einstein in 2004, a privately circulated, 7

- > pg. report.
- > 16.Sinclair, Dean L., Motion in a matrix as a new model of the physical  
> universe. Helium.com
- > .17. Vreeland, Hugh, Motion in a matrix as a new model of the physical  
> universe.Helium.com
- > 18.deanlsinclair, Roots and Directed Numbers, SciScoop.com.,
- > 19. deanlsinclair, Problems in Mathematics-Signs and Signed Numbers,  
> SciScoop.com , \_\_\_\_\_
- > Dean L. Sinclair, B.A., M.S., Ph.D.
- > Aberdeen, SD, USofA
- > Oct. 8, 2010
- > Google Docs makes it easy to create, store and share online documents,  
> spreadsheets and presentations.
- > [image: Logo for Google Docs] <<http://docs.google.com/>>- Hide quoted text -
- > - Show quoted text -

[Reply to author](#)   [Forward](#)

Google groups

« Groups Home

# Oscillator/Substance

## + Theory

Search this group

Search Groups

Elements from "Empty Space," yep, looks like it's accidentally been done; and they darn near killed themselves doing it. ....

Options

1 message - [Collapse all](#) - [Report discussion as spam](#)

dean sinclair [View profile](#)

[More options](#) Dec 1 2010, 4:35 pm

Researchers,posting on a closed Internet site have reported that, in a Cavitation Collapse experiment, they produced--among other things--a melange of elements, consistent with what they called a "Nova Event." They also report that they became very ill. The symptoms are of radiation poisoning. They also note that later checking showed a "neutron burst."

O/S work indicates that there may be as many as  $10^{54}$  --plus or minus a few million orders of magnitude--of neutral oscillators in any centimeter of any space. It also indicates that some--possibly even most--of these are possibly "Shock Wave Convertible" to neutrons or "neutron-like" units.

In consideration of the above, the results reported seem creditable, and raise a red flag for anyone working with experiments which could create an intense shock wave.

Dean Sinclair (Eski)

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#)

End of messages

« [Back to Discussions](#)

[« Newer topic](#) [Older topic »](#)

### Home

#### Discussions

[+ new post](#)

#### Members

[About this group](#)

[Edit my membership](#)

[Group settings](#)

[Management tasks](#)

[Invite members](#)



View this group in the [new Google Groups](#)

Gmail Calendar Documents Photos Reader Web more ▾

deanlsinclair@gmail.com ▾

Google groups

« [Groups Home](#)

## Oscillator/Substance Theory

Search this group

Search Groups

### A bit of update from Eski.

Options

1 message - [Collapse all](#) - [Report discussion as spam](#)

**ESKI** [View profile](#)

[More options](#) Dec 10 2010, 5:39 pm

Apparently Google has backed off from blocking access to current content on our "pages," that is good news.

There is one bit of personal news. Although i do not yet have Internet access except through public computers, at least not useable access, i do now have ove of those little toys that Americans seem to now feel indispensable. a "Cell" phone, thanks to a daughter and step-son who got together and got me one.

The phone no., of the "Net 10 Phone" is a United States of America number, 1-605-290-2154 , in case anyone gets a wonderful idea that they can't wait to give me a "heads up" on... International calls only cost me 15cents a minute which isn't bad consiering the usual rates! Cheers, Eski

P.S. Merry Christmas, Happy Hannukah, Joyeux Noel, Feliz Navidad, Froeliges Weinachtszeit, and Welcome Back to the Sun for all of you who remember the original reason for celebrating a few days after the Winter Solstice!

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#)

End of messages

« [Back to Discussions](#)

« [Newer topic](#) [Older topic](#) »

#### Home

#### Discussions

[+ new post](#)

#### Members

[About this group](#)

[Edit my membership](#)

[Group settings](#)

[Management tasks](#)

[Invite members](#)



View this group in the  
[new Google Groups](#)

#### Sponsored links

[Video Chat on Facebook](#)

Video Chat & Connect With Friends  
On Facebook. Sign Up Today!  
[www.Facebook.com](http://www.Facebook.com)

[Small is the New Big](#)

HP@Veer: Intuitive Software &  
Apps

in a Powerfully Small Design. Shop!  
[www.hp.com/veer](http://www.hp.com/veer)

[Download Google Chrome](#)

A free browser that lets you  
do more of what you like on the web  
[www.google.com/chrome](http://www.google.com/chrome)

[See your message here...](#)

[Create a group](#) - [Google Groups](#) - [Google Home](#) - [Terms of Service](#) - [Privacy Policy](#)

©2011 Google

Google groups

« Groups Home

# Oscillator/Substance Theory

Search this group

## Comment on Schroedinger Equation, Also. Happy New Year

Options

1 message - [Collapse all](#) - [Report discussion as spam](#)

dean sinclair [View profile](#)

[More options](#) Dec 30 2010, 3:21 pm

Here is my "take" on the Schroedinger Equation, the basis of Quantum Mechanics.

The first element of the Equation notes a wave function involving the second derivative with respect to time, apparently of Kinetic Energy. The first derivative of Kinetic Energy is Momentum, and the second derivative, the differential of momentum, would be either velocity or mass, whichever one wished to consider as being a constant. The integrations which would result from working with the second derivatives along the x, y, z coordinates of the basic "Energy Wave" considered in the mathematical conventions of positive numbers with Cartesian Coordinates, when followed logically, describe only one type of unit, albeit in ten dimensions; Each double integration adds three dimensions, doing this three times gives nine dimensions, and the combination of the right, up, forward, "positive numbers" conventions adds a counter clockwise twist to the whole thing which adds a tenth dimension of counter clockwise spin. This could be the general basis for the String theorists idea that the strings disappear into a ten d-dimensional hole at  $10^{18}$  cm. which would be about the  $4.7 \times 10^{-19}$  radius which our speculations suggests is the average diameter of the oscillators of our universe..}

This creates a "picture of a model" which is rotating counter clockwise into the octant to the right, up and forward from the chosen origin, So, right at the start, The Wave Function, in this view, is covering only 10/80 of the dimensions of reality, we can go on doubling up, clockwise instead of counter-clockwise, in rather than out, integrating with velocity constant rather than mass, I think I'm up to ten out of 640 at this point, and, I think that I could double up a couple of more times, .In other words, If Schroedinger's Equation be valid as a descriptor, it is of a very limited view of the possibilities.

Anybody out there who is a QM expert, I'd like to hear your comments.

Some ideas for projects, resolutions for this group for 2011....

1. Get this thing some publicity so it will get checked out more widely... Write a short book?

### Home

### Discussions

[+ new post](#)

### Members

[About this group](#)

[Edit my membership](#)

[Group settings](#)

[Management tasks](#)

[Invite members](#)



View this group in the [new Google Groups](#)

### Sponsored links

[Alternative Energy - BP](#)

See how BP's advanced technologies are expanding energy production. [www.bp.com/energymix](http://www.bp.com/energymix)

[Structured Illumination](#)

Starting a New Lab or Research Project? Save on Microscopes Now.

Leica- [Microsystems.com/Life\\_Science](http://Microsystems.com/Life_Science)

[Full Color TI-Nspire CX](#)

TI's New Calculator Offers a More Engaging Study of Math & Science. [education.ti.com](http://education.ti.com)

[See your message here...](#)

2. Fit the "baryons" etc. for the "Standard Model, Atom Smashing work in ...
3. Extend model beyond Chem. and Physics into Cosmology....
- 4..Accomplish what we can ala the Serenity Prayer. as applied to this stuff!

Happy New Year, Prospero Ano Novo, etc. Eski

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#)

End of messages

---

[« Back to Discussions](#)

[« Newer topic](#) [Older topic »](#)

---

[Create a group](#) - [Google Groups](#) - [Google Home](#) - [Terms of Service](#) - [Privacy Policy](#)

©2011 Google



Google groups

« Groups Home

# Oscillator/Substance Theory

Search this group

Search Groups

## Rumoured Soviet Weapons, Death Ray and Hammer

Options

1 message - [Collapse all](#) - [Report discussion as spam](#)

**ESKI** [View profile](#)

[More options](#) Mar 1, 5:28 pm

If as I suspect, the matter-anti-matter duality noted in the Bsubs units is actually common throughout existence even in electrons and protons, then it may well be that the rumoured weapons could have been developed by technologists who, unhampered by theoretical considerations, simply applied greater and greater accelerative forces to electron streams, alternately accelerating and compressing the units toward the "Sin-Vree" unit ( $4.7 \times 10^{-19}$  g. at  $4.7 \times 10^{-19}$  cm.) with a relative velocity of "c."

This resulted product, as a continuous emission stream would be expected to be a very effective "death ray" and, as a pulsed emission, would appear to be some thing which would indeed have a hammer effect...

.I'm simply speculating, noting that there is no reason that, since proton streams can be created and accelerated, ala the Hadron Collider, there really is no reason that the much easier to control and create electron streams could not also have been accelerated to form beam "tools," i.e. weapons.... DS

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#)

End of messages

« [Back to Discussions](#)

« [Newer topic](#) [Older topic](#) »

### Home

#### Discussions

[+ new post](#)

#### Members

[About this group](#)

[Edit my membership](#)

[Group settings](#)

[Management tasks](#)

[Invite members](#)



View this group in the [new Google Groups](#)

Gmail Calendar Documents Photos Reader Sites Web more ▾

deanlsinclair@gmail.com

Google groups

[« Groups Home](#)

## Oscillator/Substance Theory

Search this group

Search Groups

### Reality and math. short comment

Options

1 message - [Collapse all](#) - [Report discussion as spam](#)dean sinclair [View profile](#)[More options](#) Mar 14, 5:00 pm

Reality and Mathematical Definitions

We consider mathematics as a model for reality. Perhaps it would be worth while to consiee4 how certain mathematical definitions fit as we look at the physical world.

First, let us look at the concept of Zero, usually considered as the symbol of nothingness. However, is this true? Zero is the starting point for counting, the starting point for any journey, the crossing for the Cartesian axes of most conventional graphs. It might be better to say that the symbol, "Zero," is actually the symbol for the fact of existence. In the real world, the starting "point" may be of any size, any shape. Zero, then, is not without existence, without dimension, rather it is the symbol of the very first dimension, the Dimension of Existence.

What then of the number, "One?" That's simple, its the 'counting number.' However, isn't it a lot more than that? It is the symbol of wholeness. it represents a whole starting point, a whole line, which actually has to be made up of two starting points, a whole surtace, made up of at least three starting points, etc. Hence the number one may represent many things. If we atttach a sign to the number, implying a motion, then +1, represents the motion of a whole starting unit one unit to the right, or possibly up, or forward. We say that one times one times one equals one, but we always assume that there is a positive value attached to the one, so if the first one represents a motion of one space to the right, the next one represents the motion of the first "one" upward, and the third one represents the motion of the second generated one a unit forward. Therefore, if we attach the positive notation to "one" which, by convention we do, one times one times one actually means one cube generated to the right, above and forward from the origin of a set of axes by a set of motions which are actualy counter clockwise,

Looking at "One" as the symbol of wholeness has many uses. One interesting one arises is one looks, for instance, at figuring a maximum frequency for our particular Universe. The equation for the movement of Energy by electromagnet radiation is  $E=hu$ , where "h" is Planck's constant and "u" is cycles per some unit of time. If we place E equal to one Energy unit in any set of units, the maximum frequency, expressed in that set of units, will be seen to be "1/h". This presumably would be the "high frequency cut off" for communication."

At the other end of the scale is the symbol of "Infinity. the Number Beyond All Numbers." For mathematicians this is a perfectly good definiion; but in the real world we have to use more rational definitions. Does it really make sense to say that we can measure mass of something moving with relation to us up to a velocity as near the speed of light as we care to but say that the mass will become "Infinte, meaning "without limit" at the speed of light? Is the darkness just beyond the flashlight beam a void? Couldn't that darkness be considered an Infinity? We can't see into it. In the practical world we probably should consider the concept of "Infinity" as representing simply the point just beyond the last point that we

#### Home

#### Discussions

[+ new post](#)

#### Members

[About this group](#)[Edit my membership](#)[Group settings](#)[Management tasks](#)[Invite members](#)View this group in the [new Google Groups](#)

Sponsored links

[Online Math Classes](#)Give Your Kids An Academic Edge. K12 Online Curriculum. Learn More! [www.K12.com](#)[Math Teacher Degrees](#)Accredited Math Education Degrees Online. Flexible & Affordable! [www.WGU.edu](#)[See your message here...](#)

can measure with the instruments at hand, the number beyond where we stopped counting, for whatever reason.

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#)

End of messages

---

[« Back to Discussions](#)

[« Newer topic](#) [Older topic »](#)

---

[Create a group](#) - [Google Groups](#) - [Google Home](#) - [Terms of Service](#) - [Privacy Policy](#)

©2011 Google

# Google groups

[« Groups Home](#)

## Oscillator/Substance Theory

Search this group

Search Groups

### VALUE OF INFORMATION ON THIS SITE

Options

2 messages - [Collapse all](#) - [Report discussion as spam](#)

ESKI (deansinclair@gmail.com) [View profile](#)

[More options](#) May 10, 2:10 pm

Dear Reader.:  
Google has removed the welcome message and the pages fro this group, inadvertently destroying its usefulness to most readers.

To get maximum value, rather quickly, firnd the paper, "Essentials of O/S" lsted in the discussions, I t is on about the second page of "Discussions.

Another site at deansinclair.blogspot.com has most of the very essential papers.

SORRY! Eski

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#)

ESKI (deansinclair@gmail.com) [View profile](#)

[More options](#) May 25, 11:49 am

Note the comment in red on the top of the page, I'd recommend any visitor who is working off their own computer to down load the "zipped" pages to be perused at leasure, They are the "historical library of the site," and loaded with information including some information about other theories

,On May 10, 2:10 pm, "ESKI (deansincl...@gmail.com)"

- [Show quoted text](#) -

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#)

End of messages

[« Back to Discussions](#)

[« Newer topic](#) [Older topic »](#)

### Home

#### Discussions

[+ new post](#)

#### Members

[About this group](#)

[Edit my membership](#)

[Group settings](#)

[Management tasks](#)

[Invite members](#)



View this group in the [new Google Groups](#)

#### Sponsored links

[Download Google Chrome](#)  
Searching is fast and easy with Google's web browser. [www.google.com/chrome](http://www.google.com/chrome)

#### Tired of eBay?

Millions have already switched. Try Yardsellr, the free way to list [yardsellr.com](http://yardsellr.com)

[See your message here...](#)

# Google groups

[« Groups Home](#)

## Oscillator/Substance

### + Theory

Search this group

Search Groups

A "Rant " I posted to another site that someone may find Options indesting.

1 message - [Collapse all](#) - [Report discussion as spam](#)

dean sinclair [View profile](#)

[More options](#) May 25, 12:25 pm

GmailCalendarDocumentsPhotosReaderWebmoreSitesOn a Coherent Theory, a "Rant."

Let me introduce myself, for those who do not personally know me, my name is Dean LeRoy Sinclair. I am a 79 year old, former science teacher whose background includes a Ph.D. in Organic Chemistry, Mathematics through Differential Equations and Non-Euclidian Geometry and Electronics Background which includes Radar Repair Training at Ft. Monmouth, a Radio Telephone General Class License and an Amateur Radio Technician's Class License.

In the last few years. it has become clear, not only to me but to many others, that the current theories and beliefs in the physical sciences can not account for the phenomena which are being discovered every day.

This is quite understandable, considering that perhaps the latest of the commonly accepted ideas is the "Standard Model of Particle Physics" which received a Nobel Prize in the 1970's. . and, in my opinion, bears about as much relationship to "reality" as the Geocentric Model did to the Solar System.

The sad state of modern physics theorizing is evident in the fact that the 2010 Nobel Prize in Physics can be said to have been won by a chemical structure, graphene, which is an extended mono-layer of graphite.

It has been proposed on one Internet site, of which I am honored to be allowed to be a posting member, that a new basic theoretical approach is needed. I am totally in agreement with this, However, some have said that this must be, "...in the common language of science and considering the tried and true principles that have served us so well." This last I totally disagree with. To make progress. I feel that we must start over carefully reexamining what we have so long accepted as truths.

The "tried and true principles" have to have errors and misconceptions or there would not be so many conflicting concepts which simply do not fit together, such that people seem to say with straight faces things like, "The electrons in a deflated state of a naught orbital are so highly relativistic that they will cause the quark flavour to penetrate the Coulomb Barrier such as to allow fusion by means of the Strong Force." The above statement, is, of course, pure nonsense, but theoreticians seem to string together pieces of different approaches which have no connection to one another into pronouncements which actually have no more meaning than the above string or fragments.

I propose that we start over.examining ideas from "Point Zero."

Zero, the first number, which in mathematics is considered as representing "Nothing," or more usefully, the starting point from which to travel, or measure. In mathematical conventions it can be the center of a circle or the "origin point of a set of Cartesian Coordinates." In reality, then, as compared to mathematical abstraction, Zero, the starting point

#### Home

#### Discussions

[+ new post](#)

#### Members

[About this group](#)

[Edit my membership](#)

[Group settings](#)

[Management tasks](#)

[Invite members](#)



[View this group in the new Google Groups](#)

#### Sponsored links

#### [Online Math Classes](#)

Give Your Kids An Academic Edge. K12 Online Curriculum. Learn More! [www.K12.com](#)

#### [Download Audiobooks](#)

14-Day Free Trial. No Obligation. Listen on your iPod or Mp3 Player! [Audible.com](#)

[See your message here...](#)

will have a size and shape, and may be called the "First Dimension," the Dimension of Existence. The number, One, has, in reality, a number of meanings, it may represent an entire object, or it may represent a line, which has to be made up of two points, hence, a line can be considered as The Second Dimension ' Line. If we say "one times one equals one," we are saying that we have done a second mathematical operation, so our new "one" represents one surface, a third dimension. One times one times one adds another dimension, one volume. Since we cannot easily visualize the next form we may consider that we start over with a "Zero Dot" which is now a Volume and go on defining a line of volumes,, a surface of volumes, and a volume of volumes. Etc...

Let us note here that. if we use the convention that any "one" with out a sign attached is the signed number, +1, "Positive One," use Cartesian Coordinates , and the conventional "positive directions" of right, up and forward, on the "x, y and z axes.," we might consider that we are describing a potential model which expands counter-clockwise right, up, and forward into the "Totally Positive Number Octant" of the "Cartesian Field."

Having noted that an automatically accepted mathematical convention may well be excluding at least  $\frac{1}{4}$  of "Reality" from a model, let us look at another mathematical number, "Infinity," defined as the number beyond all numbers.... Infinity can be consider in a practical sense as the point, position, number, or whatever, which is just beyond where we stopped measuring or counting, either by choice or because our "tool," is no longer usable. This should be kept in mind wen we look at things such as the statement, "At the speed of light, mass goes to infinity...."

Having mentioned the Speed of Light, brings us to the idea of "Constants of Nature." Since most of our information about nature seems to have been transmitted by means of "Electromagnetic Waves. " two constants of nature which deal with Electromagnetic Waves may possibly be considered as fundamentals for any theory. These are The Speed of Light in a "Vacuum" and Planck's Constant. Let us realize that a constant is not a limit, it is more likely to be a statistical average. In fact, the term, "Speed" implies an averaged velocity between two points. We may take a logical view that the "Speed of Light" is an averaged velocity of some sort. Likewise, Planck's Constant has a possible interpretation as an angular momentum. probably, also, an average value.

If we go one step further and guess that these velocity and angular momentum constants are somehow related and related to something about whatever the "Substance of Existence" might be, we may set Planck's Constant. "h," equal to a definition of angular momentum and get the equation, "h=mr $\cdot$ v. " Assuming that the average "v" involved is "c," the speed of light, we can write "h=mc $\cdot$ r," and rearrange this to "mr=h/c." Since mass times radius is called "torque" the push or pull on a spinning body, we have combined these two constants into another constant, a "torque constant of nature." We can even go a step further and say that at some point there would be a situation where the value of m equals the value of r equals the square root of "h/c."

We have come to an expression which can be evaluated to have possible physical reality, in cgs units this "square root set" is about  $4.7 \times 10^{-19}$  grams at  $4.7 \times 10^{-19}$ cm. (In terms of certain "accepted theories" this is interesting, Quantum Mechanics is said to fail at below  $10^{-18}$  cm. and String Theory Strings vanish into a 10 dimensional hole at the same value..)

There is another interesting factor, the equation,  $mr=h/c$  is an example of an equation which seems to be the very commonest mathematical relationship in nature, the "balancing equation,"  $xy=K=yx$  , which shows up in many guises, and in this case could be taken to possibly define the limits of an oscillator. That is is there has been determined a limiting mass, the corresponding radius could be found from tis equation, and by reversing the coefficients, the corresponding, "balancing" other limit be determined. As "rest masses" may well be limiting values and are known for such things as electrons and protons, this little equation could lead to many insights.

Planck and others have noted that harmonic oscillators make excellent models for natural phenomena. These gentlemen do not seem to have taken the next step to the possibility that may natural phenomena are harmonic oscillators.

Another speculative leap may be taken about the ubiquity of the balance equation in nature and ask the question, "Since this balancing seems to be everywhere, yet the only thing that seems constant is change, couldn't a rational theory be developed on the basis of a "Substance of Existence" which was constantly in flux because of its tendency to "regress toward the mean," to balance all motions throughout. with, however, each action creating a reaction which was in turn is another action--this "Basic Substance" acting something like a physical substance at its Triple Point?

If anyone reading this far sees a theory developing above, which is totally independent of Relativity, Quantum Mechanics, and the Standard Model of Particle Physics, yet one which might at some point give insights into all of these, that person is absolutely correct, over the past few years, starting in 2004, the writer followed a similar line of reasoning and developed what was first called, "Motion in a Matrix," and later, the "Oscillator/Substance Model" A Little scouting around on the Internet, will find information on these if anyone is interested, However, I'd like to issue a challenge to intelligent, creative people who have read this far, "Try to ditch your preconceptions as much as possible about what is 'True' in physical science, reduce to as few simple basics as you can, and try to put together for yourself a coherent model, one where you will be satisfied that you have an understanding of all those things we've taken for granted and never really questioned, mass, energy, charge, gravitation, the proton-neutron nuclear atom, Relativity, Quantum Mechanics, ever, perhaps, Elements. See what you can come up with for a model." Most, if not all, of you are far more intelligent than I, it should take you far less than seven years to put something together. Of course, I expect you to come out about the same place I have, but, also, hope there will be some pleasant surprises....

It is intended to post this several places on the Internet, as a result there is a potential audience of several hundred people. It is hoped that a few will take seriously what I have said and take up the challenge.

Dean L. Sinclair [deansincl...@gmail.com](mailto:deansincl...@gmail.com)

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#)

End of messages

[« Back to Discussions](#)

[Older topic »](#)

[Create a group](#) - [Google Groups](#) - [Google Home](#) - [Terms of Service](#) - [Privacy Policy](#)

©2011 Google

Gmail Calendar Documents Photos Reader Web more ▾

deanlsinclair@gmail.com ▾

Google groups

[« Groups Home](#)

# Oscillator/Substance Theory

Search this group

Search Groups

## Members

Search members

Sort: [nickname](#) ▾ [membership type](#) [join date](#) 15 members [« Previous](#) | [Next »](#)

[eskia...@mail.com](#)  
**Member** - joined Jun 1 2010



Brad Guth  
**Member** - joined Aug 30 2010

**Name:** Brad Guth**Location:** Olalla Washington

**Bio:** 1-253-8576061 or 459-9790  
email: [bradguth@gmail.com](mailto:bradguth@gmail.com)  
Blog and Google document pages:  
<http://groups.google.com/group/guth-usenet?hl=en>  
<http://bradguth.blogspot.com/>  
[http://docs.google.com/View?id=ddsdxhv\\_0hrm5bdfj](http://docs.google.com/View?id=ddsdxhv_0hrm5bdfj)  
[https://docs.google.com/File?id=ddsdxhv\\_4fdgd46df\\_b](https://docs.google.com/File?id=ddsdxhv_4fdgd46df_b)



ESKI ([deanlsinclair@gmail.com](mailto:deanlsinclair@gmail.com)) (you)  
**Group owner** - joined Jul 26 2008

**Name:** Dean L. Sinclair**Location:** Aberdeen, SD, USA

**Bio:** Born Jan.3, 1932, Midland, SD Lived on hard scrabble ranch/farm West River South Dakota to 1944, when the grasshoppers finally ate us out.... Graduated ;Murdo SD HS, class of '49. , valedictorian ;Yankton College, BA, cum laude, Chem., Math. 1953 ; Army, Pfc., Radar Repairman, '54-56, M.S. Chem., Okla. State, 1959, PhD, Organic Chem., Kansas State, 1967. Some 375 SH of total credit.with major hours in Math., Science, Languages, Psychology , Education, Counseling

Interests: Science theory. Languages, Reading, Sketching....  
My current major project is "Oscillator/Substance Theory." which I hope is logic based and not just my "Cracked Pottery."



heycollin  
**Member** - joined May 7 2010



hoek  
**Member** - joined Oct 13 2008

**Name:** Bob Vanderhoek**Location:** Northeast US

## Home

### Discussions

### Members

+ [invite new members](#)

### About this group

[Edit my membership](#)[Group settings](#)[Management tasks](#)[Invite members](#)View this group in the [new Google Groups](#)

### Group info

**Members:** 15**Language:** English**Group categories:**[Science and Technology](#)[> Physics](#)[Science and Technology](#)[> Chemistry](#)[Science and Technology](#)[change categories](#)[More group info »](#)



**Hugh V****Member** - joined Aug 7 2008**JackOS****Member** - joined Oct 25 2009**ka-sala****Manager** - joined Oct 16 2008**Name:** ka-sala**Location:** Cosmos**Bio:**

The load of all my concerns was of the nuclear waste issue, which grew into a new Energy Source.

By 1979, needing confirmation of a small scientific subject I was working on, it took me to a Professor Cunningham, at the Tech. for Higher Education in the Department of Physics. Cape Town SA.

Five months later... he phoned.

"Three scientists, have just won the Nobel Prize for what you were explaining to me. It's all connected to the Cosmic Rays!" (The previous year had been the discovery of the Cosmic Microwave Background Radiation.)

"Oh..." was my only answer. Truth was, I knew it within me, and this was my confirmation. I certainly wasn't looking for a Nobel Prize... but I could at least thank him. \*

\*\*\* These 3 Scientists can be found on Nobelprize.Org.

The year =1979

'for their contribution to the unified weak and electromagnetic interaction between elementary particles, including in particular, the prediction of weak neutral current.'

\*\*\* No... there is no mention of me. All I was doing was making report of 'My Reason'.

I will be happy to share some, as it was recognized... This may not be in exact English Science Jargon.

**magickid****Member** - joined Oct 5 2008**Major Ray****Member** - joined Jan 12 2009**Name:** Major Ray**Location:** Dedham, Massachusetts

**Bio:** I may have several degrees in chemistry, including a Ph.D with honors, but I have no respect for the bias prevalent throughout organized science. Racism and religious bias are the reasons I created BIAS, Inc. (Boston Institute for the Advancement of Science, Inc. ) On my site I address a number of issues related to the MATRIX. I believe in the theory of everything.

**NewYearGreetings****Member** - joined Jan 1 2010



**nishlaverz**  
**Member** - joined Apr 1 2010



**olin**  
**Member** - joined Jan 18 2010

**Name:** Jorge Luna  
**Location:** New Orleans, USA



**Ronald Jennings**  
**Member** - joined Nov 4 2010



**SamisadMark**  
**Member** - joined Nov 2 2010

[+ Invite new members](#)

15 members [« Previous](#) | [Next »](#)

[Edit member list and member permissions >](#)