Roland Michel Tremblay

Sci-Fi Helper

Correspondence between Roland Michel Tremblay and

William Taggart

TIME DENSITY AND MASS (TDM)

This correspondence with William Taggart is very important to my ideas. He is the only person who shares my ideas even though he appears to have pushed everything much further than me. He has the physics and maths background to develop applications based on my and his theories.

Sometimes it seems that I copied some parts of our conversation again and again, but this is only to keep the rythm of the conversation. It was made by emails and we keep coming back to certain points.

All of my talkings start with ------, then ======, then ++++++, then ....., then //////, etc.

Roland Michel Tremblay

rm@themarginal.com

Return to my theories: www.themarginal.com/relativity.htm

My novel: www.themarginal.com/universe.htm

-----Original Message-----
From: Thurlby Computers
Sent: 28 March 2002 23:07
To: rm@themarginal.com
Subject: (Speculative) but you may find it interesting (In HTML format)

Thurlby Computers

Hi,

I was busy surfin' around various science sites when I found yours. I have been quite surprised to see just how many publications and websites had been inspired, by my relative scale approach to the universe back in the late 1970's.

After reading some of the contents of the site I thought you may find this little bit of speculative conjecture interesting :)

It allows infinite finite relativity, without altering any of the basic laws of physics.

You may notice that there are some unique mathematical symbols here, I have described them for you.

1. $\Pi_n = \frac{\Lambda}{\Omega}$
2. $\Pi_n = \frac{\Omega}{\Lambda}$
3. $\Pi_n = \frac{\Omega}{M}$
4. $\Pi_n = \frac{M}{\Omega}$

These 4 equations are the variations of the same theme. Basically they represent.

1. The obtained interaction with a given density per volume of space when decompression occurs of the original density per volume of space.

2. As above in reverse. Basically they are exactly the same thing.

3. In this case the given resistance on an object alter its density to that of a new location of interaction

4. The same as equation 3 but in reverse.

As you are fully aware that can be represented in just 2 equations.

Actually there is a deliberate mistake there. As when the given state increases in density you should subtract the value of 1 from the total. This value of 1 represents our current finite universe.

$\sqcap\!\sqcap$ = The obtained TDM (Time density & Mass) state, or scale multiple of our finite universe.

Λ = Lambda or the surrounding relative space.

Ω = The resistance acting upon the given object or volume of space.

M = the Given object.

$\mathfrak{C} = C(\sqcap\!\sqcap_n)$

This is an equation which return the pseudo superluminal velocity compared to your current relative TDM state (Finite universe).

$\mathfrak{C}$ = obtained pseudo superluminal velocity, theoretical multiples of relative light velocity.

$E=M\mathfrak{C}^2$

This is a variation on a well known equation which returns the pseudo energy value in Ergs. Or in classical physics terms when this equations are combine into a process it returns the principle of relative infinite energy.

Relative infinite energy= What appears to be infinite to our finite universe, however as I am sure you are aware this is not true infinity.

These equations allow you do something which physicists like to say is impossible. To plot and co-ordinates and show the given energy level of a an object in relative terms anywhere in an infinite space time continuum.

The odd thing about it is that it fully complies and does not require you to re-write the laws of physics.

Basically It is a measuring process known as TDM (Time density & Mass). A sort of glorified tape measure. That allows you to theoretically plot any location infinity. Although in reality you can't ever complete such task for every possible value as it would take an infinity to do so.

To explain but more simply what TDM does is to theoretically generate infinite parallel finite universes. There is nothing new in that multiverse theories have been around for some time. The difference with TDM is that it applies Density per volume. In other words one universe exists inside the other.

Another description is like a Russian doll, if you open it up you find another which is smaller inside, open that ands you find another yet smaller and so on.

What TDM exploits is a theoretical physical interpretation of one of Zeno's paradox's, Ulysses and the Arrow (Which I am sure you are familiar with)

Basically Zeno said that if Ulysses stood at a given point (Which I will call point (a)) and fired an arrow to a target (Which I will call point (b)). The then the flight of the arrow would be the full distance away from the target (point (a) to point (b).

As the arrow flew through the air it would be 1/2 the distance from point (b) , then 1/4 the distance form point (b) , 1/8, 1/16, 1/32, 1/64 and so on for infinity,

What Zeno said it when does the arrow reach zero and hit the target (Point (b))

If fact it never does!

There has been many attempts to interpret this in physical terms over the many years since he produced it.

However to this date nobody else has been able to represent it in physical form.

As you are aware, The Arrow never actually hits the target. It is only because our finite range of observation cannot see the other instances of space time that we get the illusion that it has. To make it even more awkward to understand the arrow never actually flew in the first place, but that is another level of understanding which can be a very steep learning curve. (I will assume however that you do understand it anyway)

Now if you replaced the ever smaller distances with scale representation of that given point of space time then the points of interaction begin to make sense however on the larger scale. In TDM we use the finite universe as the scale increment of measurement . Although the difference between one point in space time and the next is the equivalent of an entire relative universe.

To describe simply TDM states that our finite universe is TDM state zero or $\sqcap_0$

Higher density or smaller scale finite universes are $\sqcap_1, \sqcap_2, \sqcap_3, \sqcap_4, \sqcap_5, \sqcap_6, \sqcap_7$ and so on infinitely

Lower density or larger scale finite universes are $\sqcap_{-1}, \sqcap_{-2}, \sqcap_{-3}, \sqcap_{-4}, \sqcap_{-5}, \sqcap_{-6}, \sqcap_{-7}$ and so on infinitely.

I originally created TDM when I found that science became so vague when it hit this physical point of Zero or in other terms crosses the event horizon. In other words no way exists to describe such state of matter in relative finite physical terms.

What I wasn't expecting when I created it was to find the way to quantify gravity, explain the principles of space time, to produce situations that should defy causality but they don't , to describe infinity in finite terms etc etc etc, the uses of TDM are as infinite as that which it allows you to describe.

This just skims the surface of what TDM is and what it can do in conjunction with Classical physics.

As an example of an interesting prediction that TDM makes, anti gravity is easier to achieve by increasing the gravity of an object so that it has a greater gravity per volume than that of terrestrial origin.

Anyway I think I have taken up enough of your time.

Now who would really need the ability of infinite finite relativity without re-writing the laws of physics?

It would ruin all the fun in the science community if you could do that! hehe **;)**

Regards William Taggart Adip.Prof.Con.Phys.

-----Original Message-----
From: rm@themarginal.com [mailto:rm@themarginal.com]
Sent: 28 March 2002 23:31
To: 'Thurlby Computers'
Subject: RE: (Speculative) but you may find it interesting (In HTML format)

Dear Mr Taggart,

I had a quick look at what you wrote to me and I think this is highly interesting. Your  might be just what I am looking for when I say in my 8 points that C needs to be readjusted to reflect the fact that C itself is relative to our point of view.

I will read your message and websites more in the next few days in order to understand completely what you are saying and see how I can use this in my ideas. (Of course I would credit you in any of my writings for any inspiration you might provide).

Please tell me, is this present message something you sent to many people or did you write it after reading my ideas and realising that I might have some similar ideas?

I mean, is this a personal message sent only to me? (In which case you are interested in my ideas and I can talk to you further), or has it been sent to many people (in that case you most probably did not read my website and it is just a coincidence if what you are saying is similar to what I say).

I need to know as well if we think alike or if our ideas are totally different. It would be surprising as I never met anyone who agreed with my ideas. I will know more in the next few days after reading you.

Thank you for answering me.

Universal Relativity: www.themarginal.com/relativity.htm

Note: you might want to rethink the way you send your messages, I almost deleted it thinking it was a publicity!

Merci!

Roland Michel Tremblay

-----Original Message-----

From: Thurlby Computers

Sent: 29 March 2002 04:18

To: rm@themarginal.com

Subject: Re: your reply

Message Hi again,

Some of the information I posted is from a standard document I have, however when I read through your site I seen some similarities on what I been working on for quite a few years (Although the amount if time has no bearing on its validity)

>From what I seen on your site, it appears that you have been able to

>grasp

the meaning of a fixed range of observation. Sort of bubble of space time if your prefer that analogy.

Distance and scale:

How can classical physics interpret what we see. Lets say for an example you are standing at given point which we will call (A) and you look tot the horizon point (B).

You can see this scale effect with the naked eye.

Now if you travelled to a place which you could previously seen to be at point (B)

What has occurred?

1. That place appears to have got larger and is the same scale as you.

2. The horizon that was at point (B) has moved away from you proportionately to the distance travelled.

O.K so most people are ware of the conventional interpretation of this.

However lets look at this in TDM terms.

Classical physics states that each action has an equal and opposite reaction, in TDM terms the resistance of matter acting upon you as you move. Compresses your atomic/sub atomic structure. In doing so, instead of things getting larger as you get closer to them in actual fact you are getting smaller.

In other words your range of observation is compressed so that you are physically within the range of interaction of the given place.

This is easier to understand if you think of the universe in a true stable linear form. I.E each bubble of space time lined up end to end spanning from infinitely small to infinitely large. This means that any given point in space time has a TDS (Time density signature).

The TDS of a given object is what you would more commonly call gravity.

Why is TDS important, well basically this means that any given object within an infinite space time continuum has place in which it is totally stable, If everything was in this solid stable state we would have an infinite void.

However what we perceive is the given objects trying to obtain this state. The problem being that they never can. As the very action of trying to obtain that state. In turn has an equal and opposite reaction which increases or decreases there density in doing so there TDS has changed. Thus normal displacement attempts to displace to this new co-ordinate in space time, as you may have guessed this just repeats the process.

Although everything is subject to his the more dramatic example are super heavy gravitational objects such as black holes and white holes. Worm holes etc.

BTW black/whites are transient in space time, as there TDS is constantly changing.

Why are such space time occurrences important, well basically they are part of what we need to avoid a close loop scenario. In a close loop scenario the finite universe would keep gaining energy but there would be no place for it to go.

So the black/white holes act a bit like a Fawcett and drain that are linked together in a perpetual loop. As one part gains the other loses, keeping the balance.

In fact all matter works on this principle.

TDM throws some interesting twists on what Einstein said.

I am sure you are familiar with the question about the train travelling at light velocity and the person walks to the front of train. That Einstein stated that person would not be travelling faster than light.

Well in relative terms to the train. Passenger does not exceed light velocity. Yet he does exceed light velocity in relativity to the velocity of the train when compared to an external point in which the light velocity was measured by.

Basically in this situation the bubble of space time that is the passenger alters its TDS proportionate to its increase in velocity based resistance. To an observer on the train the person is walking at normal speed to an external observer of the train the person disappears for the and reappears at the front of the train.

Why did the person disappear and then re-appear to the external observer.

Well the scale range of observation of the external observer prevented him from seeing beyond his relative light velocity. However the person on the train is already at light velocity so when he moves normally his density range (TDS increases) this means that for the period of time whilst the person is moving. That persons TDS is too small to interact with the TDS of the external observer.

So if it is to small then it cannot be seen or touched. However when that person stops moving they once again return into the range of observation of the external observer.

However the person who was walking along the train just sees, a normal walk along a train. He is unaware that he has just shifted in space time.

It is only when he compares his watch to that of the external observer that he will realise that it has ticked slower proportion to the resistance acting upon him.

The laughable thigh is that we are performing this very task of time travel every single day of our lives and we don't realise it.

I.E how far away is the computer monitor that you are reading this text from?

1/4 of a metre, 1/2 metre. would you believe me if I said that screen could be several million light years away from you?

Do you think I am kidding?

Well I'm not, just think about what is relative.

So our finite universe is TDM state 0 , if the mass of that monitor was

7,500,000(10^53kg) The actual point in time where that monitor exists would be half way along the curvature of space time in TDM state 6. Travelling at a relative velocity O.5C . Or a pseudo superluminal velocity compared to you of 6.5 times greater than your velocity of light.

This comes from those equations that I posted to you.

btw the 10^53Kg is the current estimated mass of the finite universe.

You may notice that I quotes a subluminal (less than light) velocity. Well in the scale range that is TDM state 6. You would just see a normal universe thus in relative terms its mass would be such that its natural velocity would be half of that of the relative scale universe it exists in.

What you then do is to scale this back up. to that of our current finite universe and you would have the point in space time in which it directly interacts with.

So say for an example you were 59,999th of 100,000th the way along the curvature of space time, it exists at 1/2 thus would actually be several million light years away from you.

This would mean that the space time between you and the monitor would dramatically increase in density proportionate spanning the difference between the two locations.

This is the distortion of space time lambda part of the equations. I previously posted. Is also the principles exploited on a larger/smaller scale in wormholes etc.

A really simple way to visualise this displacement is to drop a stone in a bucket of water. The stone sinks to its natural level in doing so it displaces the water.

So basically the high density object tries to get to its natural level of interaction (Stable TDS), in doing so it displaces lower density objects. Thus starting off the TDS cycle I previously explained.

Some how I think that is enough for you to consider for the moment ;)

Please tell me if I am going to fast for you.

;)

Sorry if there are any typo's but it is now 04:16 hrs, and I am feeling a bit tired. (Yawn!)

Regards

William

-----Original Message-----

From: rm@themarginal.com [mailto:rm@themarginal.com]

Sent: 29 March 2002 13:18

To: 'Thurlby Computers'

Subject: RE: your reply

Great,

Let me review your sites and messages and I will get back to you early next week.

I see you are like me, you never go to bed!

www.themarginal.com/relativity.htm

Merci!

Roland Michel Tremblay

-----Original Message-----

From: Thurlby Computers

Sent: 29 March 2002 16:38

To: rm@themarginal.com

Subject: Re: your reply

BTW my site doesn't carry very much information on TDM. I took it down several months ago after the I.S.P complained about the amount of hits it was getting . It was effecting the whole server.

I have been considering placing it elsewhere, but have been to busy to do so.

Bed what's that? : D

Regards

William

-----Original Message-----
From: rm@themarginal.com [mailto:rm@themarginal.com]
Sent: 29 March 2002 17:41
To: 'Thurlby Computers'
Subject: RE: (Speculative) but you may find it interesting (In HTML format)

Dear William,

I did a search on the Internet on your name and saw your problems on some forums. Why do you bother writing in those forums? I never do because it always end up in some nightmares. (I am talking about literature forums, I never posted in scientific forums before). This said, I too will launch my own forum about literature in the next few days :) all on my own server.

I copied here your messages and I am answering between the lines...

RM

www.themarginal.com/relativity.htm

Time Density Mass (T.D.M)

----------I read the first page on your website, there is not much. I can only say that from what I can understand you have a point and that it does sound very interesting.

-----Original Message-----
From: Thurlby Computers
Sent: 28 March 2002 23:07
To: rm@themarginal.com
Subject: (Speculative) but you may find it interesting (In HTML format)

Hi,

I was busy surfin' around various science sites when I found yours. I have been quite surprised to see just how many publications and websites had been inspired, by my relative scale approach to the universe back in the late 1970's.

-------I could have been inspired by someone who was inspired by you, but I never read any websites and the only books I read were Stephen Hawking and Michio Kaku and an old Physics book for students I have around here. Could you have inspired these authors or Super Strings authors? (How successful was your book and/or ideas?)

After reading some of the contents of the site I thought you may find this little bit of speculative conjecture interesting :)

It allows infinite finite relativity, without altering any of the basic laws of physics.

You may notice that there are some unique mathematical symbols here, I have described them for you.

1. $\Pi_n = \frac{\Lambda}{\Omega}$

2. $\Pi_n = \frac{\Omega}{\Lambda}$

3. $\Pi_n = \frac{\Omega}{M}$

4. $\Pi_n = \frac{M}{\Omega}$

These 4 equations are the variations of the same theme. Basically they represent.

1. The obtained interaction with a given density per volume of space when decompression occurs of the original density per volume of space.

2. As above in reverse. Basically they are exactly the same thing.

3. In this case the given resistance on an object alter its density to that of a new location of interaction

4. The same as equation 3 but in reverse.

As you are fully aware that can be represented in just 2 equations.

Actually there is a deliberate mistake there. As when the given state increases in density you should subtract the value of 1 from the total. This value of 1 represents our current finite universe.

Π = The obtained TDM (Time density & Mass) state, or scale multiple of our finite universe.

Λ = Lambda or the surrounding relative space.

Ω = The resistance acting upon the given object or volume of space.

M = the Given object.

$\Sigma = C(\Pi_n)$

This is an equation which return the pseudo superluminal velocity compared to your current relative TDM state (Finite universe).

 = obtained pseudo superluminal velocity, theoretical multiples of relative light velocity.

This is a variation on a well known equation which returns the pseudo energy value in Ergs. Or in classical physics terms when this equations are combine into a process it returns the principle of relative infinite energy.

Relative infinite energy= What appears to be infinite to our finite universe, however as I am sure you are aware this is not true infinity.

These equations allow you do something which physicists like to say is impossible. To plot and co-ordinates and show the given energy level of a an object in relative terms anywhere in an infinite space time continuum.

The odd thing about it is that it fully complies and does not require you to re-write the laws of physics.

Basically It is a measuring process known as TDM (Time density & Mass). A sort of glorified tape measure. That allows you to theoretically plot any location infinity. Although in reality you can't ever complete such task for every possible value as it would take an infinity to do so.

To explain but more simply what TDM does is to theoretically generate infinite parallel finite universes. There is nothing new in that multiverse theories have been around for some time. The difference with TDM is that it applies Density per volume. In other words one universe exists inside the other.

----------Density per volume, in order words, is what defines the degree of relativity around you. Basically it is like my idea that depending on the gravity around you, where you are, (your lambda), and depending on the speed you are going at (your resistance on the object), you can calculate what the real relative C is for any given object. So I believe that we are talking the same language and that you have the background to write equations about it. So do you agree that objects can go faster than the speed of light?

----------Now, what I am interested in is how do you go about calculating your lambda? (I suppose there is a simple already existing equation to calculate the resistance of an object... even though it is not coming to mind right now).

Another description is like a Russian doll, if you open it up you find another which is smaller inside, open that ands you find another yet smaller and so on.

What TDM exploits is a theoretical physical interpretation of one of Zeno's paradox's, Ulysses and the Arrow (Which I am sure you are familiar with)

----------No, I am not familiar with this paradox. This probably proves to you how amateur I am.

Basically Zeno said that if Ulysses stood at a given point (Which I will call point (a)) and fired an arrow to a target (Which I will call point (b)). The then the flight of the arrow would be the full distance away from the target (point (a) to point (b).

As the arrow flew through the air it would be 1/2 the distance from point (b) , then 1/4 the distance form point (b) , 1/8, 1/16, 1/32, 1/64 and so on for infinity,

What Zeno said it when does the arrow reach zero and hit the target (Point (b))

If fact it never does!

There has been many attempts to interpret this in physical terms over the many years since he produced it.

------I was mentioning something similar on my page (but I got read of it two years ago):

Summation Of An Infinite Series (Calculus)

http://www-groups.dcs.st-and.ac.uk/~history/HistTopics/The_rise_of_calculus.html:

"Archimedes constructed an infinite sequence of triangles starting with one of area A and continually adding further triangles between the existing ones and the parabola to get areas

A, A + A/4, A + A/4 + A/16, A + A/4 + A/16 + A/64, ...

The area of the segment of the parabola is therefore

A(1+1/4 + 1/4 + 1/4 + ...) = (4/3)A.

This is the first known example of the summation of an infinite series."

This was my comment at the time, I was supposed to get back to this to comment further, but I never did: "This principle of summation of an infinite series makes me think about how this could actually not be possible in mathematics, but in the way we picture the universe as well. I just said that there was not really any infinities in the universe, but we always managed to see a very large and a very small. In reality, you could do like Archimedes and end up with these infinities being equals to a finite number. "

However to this date nobody else has been able to represent it in physical form.

As you are aware, The Arrow never actually hits the target. It is only because our finite range of observation cannot see the other instances of space time that we get the illusion that it has. To make it even more awkward to understand the arrow never actually flew in the first place, but that is another level of understanding which can be a very steep learning curve. (I will assume however that you do understand it anyway)

Now if you replaced the ever smaller distances with scale representation of that given point of space time then the points of interaction begin to make sense however on the larger scale. In TDM we use the finite universe as the scale increment of measurement . Although the difference between one point in space time and the next is the equivalent of an entire relative universe.

To describe simply TDM states that our finite universe is TDM state zero or $\sqcap\!\sqcap_0$

Higher density or smaller scale finite universes are $\sqcap\!\sqcap_1$, $\sqcap\!\sqcap_2$, $\sqcap\!\sqcap_3$, $\sqcap\!\sqcap_4$, $\sqcap\!\sqcap_5$, $\sqcap\!\sqcap_6$, $\sqcap\!\sqcap_7$ and so on infinitely

Lower density or larger scale finite universes are $\sqcap\!\sqcap_{-1}$, $\sqcap\!\sqcap_{-2}$, $\sqcap\!\sqcap_{-3}$, $\sqcap\!\sqcap_{-4}$, $\sqcap\!\sqcap_{-5}$, $\sqcap\!\sqcap_{-6}$, $\sqcap\!\sqcap_{-7}$ and so on infinitely.

---------I believe that you are on to something here. I think this is exactly what I am thinking and that you might have provided some sort of way to calculate and even prove my theories. I was not expecting that. Do you have any way of proving your ideas? Is there some sort of experiment you could do to verify this? Any more applications that can be thought of?

I originally created TDM when I found that science became so vague when it hit this physical point of Zero or in other terms crosses the event horizon. In other words no way exists to describe such state of matter in relative finite physical terms.

What I wasn't expecting when I created it was to find the way to quantify gravity, explain the principles of space time, to produce situations that should defy causality but they don't , to describe infinity in finite terms etc etc etc, the uses of TDM are as infinite as that which it allows you to describe.

This just skims the surface of what TDM is and what it can do in conjunction with Classical physics.

As an example of an interesting prediction that TDM makes, anti gravity is easier to achieve by increasing the gravity of an object so that it has a greater gravity per volume than that of terrestrial origin.

Anyway I think I have taken up enough of your time.

Now who would really need the ability of infinite finite relativity without re-writing the laws of physics?

It would ruin all the fun in the science community if you could do that! hehe ;)

-------I was faced with the same dilemma. Can we just readjust the actual equations or do we start from scratch? And I realised that you only need to modify Einstein's equation (the C) and perhaps just use plain old Newton. I spoke about this on my French website. I recently started my page in French and all my last ideas are now in French. But I can translate them here if needed.

Regards

William Taggart Adip.Prof.Con.Phys.

-----Original Message-----

From: Thurlby Computers

Sent: 29 March 2002 04:18

To: rm@themarginal.com

Subject: Re: your reply

Message Hi again,

Some of the information I posted is from a standard document I have, however when I read through your site I seen some similarities on what I been working on for quite a few years (Although the amount if time has no bearing on its validity)

---I understand. I have been working on my theories for about 5-6 years now.

>From what I seen on your site, it appears that you have been able to

>grasp the meaning of a fixed range of observation. Sort of bubble of space time if your prefer that analogy.

Distance and scale:

How can classical physics interpret what we see. Lets say for an example you are standing at given point which we will call (A) and you look tot the horizon point (B).

You can see this scale effect with the naked eye.

Now if you travelled to a place which you could previously seen to be at point (B)

What has occurred?

1. That place appears to have got larger and is the same scale as you.

2. The horizon that was at point (B) has moved away from you proportionately to the distance travelled.

O.K so most people are ware of the conventional interpretation of this.

However lets look at this in TDM terms.

Classical physics states that each action has an equal and opposite reaction, in TDM terms the resistance of matter acting upon you as you move. Compresses your atomic/sub atomic structure. In doing so, instead of things getting larger as you get closer to them in actual fact you are getting smaller.

In other words your range of observation is compressed so that you are physically within the range of interaction of the given place.

----------The word compression et decompression is very nice. I use Shrinking and enlarge, but it is more appropriate to use your words.

This is easier to understand if you think of the universe in a true stable linear form. I.E each bubble of space time lined up end to end spanning from infinitely small to infinitely large. This means that any given point in space time has a TDS (Time density signature).

----------I agree with you. I don't suppose many people agree with this?

The TDS of a given object is what you would more commonly call gravity.

Why is TDS important, well basically this means that any given object within an infinite space time continuum has place in which it is totally stable, If everything was in this solid stable state we would have an infinite void.

However what we perceive is the given objects trying to obtain this state. The problem being that they never can. As the very action of trying to obtain that state. In turn has an equal and opposite reaction which increases or decreases there density in doing so there TDS has changed. Thus normal displacement attempts to displace to this new co-ordinate in space time, as you may have guessed this just repeats the process.

Although everything is subject to his the more dramatic example are super heavy gravitational objects such as black holes and white holes. Worm holes etc.

BTW black/whites are transient in space time, as there TDS is constantly changing.

----------I think I need to read your book. Where can I buy it?

Why are such space time occurrences important, well basically they are part of what we need to avoid a close loop scenario. In a close loop scenario the finite universe would keep gaining energy but there would be no place for it to go.

So the black/white holes act a bit like a Fawcett and drain that are linked together in a perpetual loop. As one part gains the other loses, keeping the balance.

In fact all matter works on this principle.

TDM throws some interesting twists on what Einstein said.

I am sure you are familiar with the question about the train travelling at light velocity and the person walks to the front of train. That Einstein stated that person would not be travelling faster than light.

Well in relative terms to the train. Passenger does not exceed light velocity. Yet he does exceed light velocity in relativity to the velocity of the train when compared to an external point in which the light velocity was measured by.

----------exactly! I talk a lot about this train idea and the platform on my website, later on in the page.

Basically in this situation the bubble of space time that is the passenger alters its TDS proportionate to its increase in velocity based resistance. To an observer on the train the person is walking at normal speed to an external observer of the train the person disappears for the and reappears at the front of the train.

Why did the person disappear and then re-appear to the external observer.

Well the scale range of observation of the external observer prevented him from seeing beyond his relative light velocity. However the person on the train is already at light velocity so when he moves normally his density range (TDS increases) this means that for the period of time whilst the person is moving. That persons TDS is too small to interact with the TDS of the external observer.

----------Yes, this is true.

So if it is to small then it cannot be seen or touched. However when that person stops moving they once again return into the range of observation of the external observer.

However the person who was walking along the train just sees, a normal walk along a train. He is unaware that he has just shifted in space time.

It is only when he compares his watch to that of the external observer that he will realise that it has ticked slower proportion to the resistance acting upon him.

The laughable thigh is that we are performing this very task of time travel every single day of our lives and we don't realise it.

I.E how far away is the computer monitor that you are reading this text from?

1/4 of a metre, 1/2 metre. would you believe me if I said that screen could be several million light years away from you?

Do you think I am kidding?

Well I'm not, just think about what is relative.

----------I certainly don't, I had the same conversation with other people. We are thinking alike, there is no two ways about it.

So our finite universe is TDM state 0 , if the mass of that monitor was

7,500,000(10^53kg) The actual point in time where that monitor exists would be half way along the curvature of space time in TDM state 6. Travelling at a relative velocity O.5C . Or a pseudo superluminal velocity compared to you of 6.5 times greater than your velocity of light.

----------I am beginning to understand your point of view, and it is a bit different from mine. But it still makes sense and might correct some questions I had. I cannot remember now, I will have to get back to it.

This comes from those equations that I posted to you.

btw the 10^53Kg is the current estimated mass of the finite universe.

You may notice that I quotes a subluminal (less than light) velocity. Well in the scale range that is TDM state 6. You would just see a normal universe thus in relative terms its mass would be such that its natural velocity would be half of that of the relative scale universe it exists in.

What you then do is to scale this back up. to that of our current finite universe and you would have the point in space time in which it directly interacts with.

So say for an example you were 59,999th of 100,000th the way along the curvature of space time, it exists at 1/2 thus would actually be several million light years away from you.

This would mean that the space time between you and the monitor would dramatically increase in density proportionate spanning the difference between the two locations.

This is the distortion of space time lambda part of the equations. I previously posted. Is also the principles exploited on a larger/smaller scale in wormholes etc.

A really simple way to visualise this displacement is to drop a stone in a bucket of water. The stone sinks to its natural level in doing so it displaces the water.

So basically the high density object tries to get to its natural level of interaction (Stable TDS), in doing so it displaces lower density objects. Thus starting off the TDS cycle I previously explained.

---------Ok, I see. Fascinating, but hard to understand. I need more.

Some how I think that is enough for you to consider for the moment ;)

Please tell me if I am going to fast for you.

---------If I could read your book or your old website, that would help. If you have a problem finding a host for your pages, I would gladly give you a space on my website. I pay enough money (that I don't have) to make sure that too many visitors will never be a problem. (Of course I will never ask you for money).

;)

Sorry if there are any typo's but it is now 04:16 hrs, and I am feeling a bit tired. (Yawn!)

Regards

William

Merci!

Roland Michel Tremblay

www.themarginal.com/relativity.htm

-----Original Message-----
From: Thurlby Computers
Sent: 29 March 2002 19:23
To: rm@themarginal.com
Subject: Re: (Speculative) but you may find it interesting (In HTML format)

99% of those posts in various forums are completely bogus, a few idiotic persons thought it would be funny to impersonate me. Oh well I guess that's the nature of the NET. You will always get some people with a very weird sense of humour.

Occasionally I do go to those forum's to get the webmasters to clean the crap off there sites. However it got pointless because more was just posted. So I left them to it. They will get bored eventually, when I don't respond to the flame bait.

Your comment about a personal forum reminds me, I must update mine and get it running again.

I will warn you in advance beware of posters that go under the names of, Bruce, Casimir, Simple Mind and Bailey. They can completely destroy science boards with their bogus posts and flame bait.

Regards William

-----Original Message-----
From: rm@themarginal.com [mailto:rm@themarginal.com]
Sent: 29 March 2002 19:30
To: 'Thurlby Computers'
Subject: RE: (Speculative) but you may find it interesting (In HTML format)

I gathered as much from what I read. It convinced me to not go anywhere near these forums...

-----Original Message-----
From: Thurlby Computers
Sent: 29 March 2002 22:48
To: rm@themarginal.com
Subject: Some of the questions I managed to decipher

Blue= your questions

Silver= my original post

Black= my replies to your questions

----------The word compression et decompression is very nice. I use Shrinking and enlarge, but it is more appropriate to use your words.

Compression and decompression just fits better with classical physics terms,

However your term is just as valid.

This is easier to understand if you think of the universe in a true stable linear form. I.E each bubble of space time lined up end to end spanning from infinitely small to infinitely large. This means that any given point in space time has a TDS (Time density signature).

----------I agree with you. I don't suppose many people agree with this?

I am surprised why so many people have problems with this since the likes of Kip Thorne, Stephen Hawking etc have said very similar things in recent years.

Why is TDS important, well basically this means that any given object within an infinite space time continuum has place in which it is totally stable, If everything was in this solid stable state we would have an infinite void.

However what we perceive is the given objects trying to obtain this

state. The problem being that they never can. As the very action of trying to obtain that state. In turn has an equal and opposite reaction which increases or decreases there density in doing so there TDS has changed. Thus normal displacement attempts to displace to this new co-ordinate in space time, as you may have guessed this just repeats the process.

Although everything is subject to his the more dramatic example are super heavy gravitational objects such as black holes and white holes. Worm holes etc.

I think I need to read your book. Where can I buy it?

Sadly it was never an open publication, generally though certain anonymous transcripts of it just sort of turned up in various research labs ;)

TDM throws some interesting twists on what Einstein said.

I am sure you are familiar with the question about the train travelling at light velocity and the person walks to the front of train. That Einstein stated that person would not be travelling faster than light.

Well in relative terms to the train. Passenger does not exceed light velocity. Yet he does exceed light velocity in relativity to the velocity of the train when compared to an external point in which the light velocity was measured by.

----------exactly! I talk a lot about this train idea and the platform on my website, later on in the page.

I will have to go and read your analogy on that.

I.E how far away is the computer monitor that you are reading this text from?

1/4 of a metre, 1/2 metre. would you believe me if I said that screen could be several million light years away from you?

Do you think I am kidding?

----------I certainly don't, I had the same conversation with other people. We are thinking alike, there is no two ways about it.

Its interesting to see just how many people are able to understand this,

although sadly the ability to visualise things in non-local terms is quite

a rare gift. I'm sure you have run into this problem. I.E. Things that you take

for granted others have great difficulty in even grasping the basics of.

So our finite universe is TDM state 0 , if the mass of that monitor was

7,500,000(10^53kg) The actual point in time where that monitor exists would be half way along the curvature of space time in TDM state 6. Travelling at a relative velocity O.5C . Or a pseudo superluminal velocity compared to you of 6.5 times greater than your velocity of light.

----------I am beginning to understand your point of view, and it is a bit different from mine. But it still makes sense and might correct some questions I had. I cannot remember now, I will have to get back to it.

There are surprising similarities in our view points. However when I created TDM

it was working form the premise that there is no need to alter classical physics since

it works so well within the finite universe. In other words if it works don't fix it

By using the finite universe as the basic scale increment of measurement. This means that no matter what relative scale you are in. Then the relative laws of physics apply (With exactly the same action & results).

The benefit of taking this approach is that you are not challenging classical physics. You are just extending its capability. So the relative term of infinity is no longer boundary or a brick wall that classical physics smashes into. The other stuff such as being able to quantify gravity, explain the complexities of space time etc are just welcome side effects of this extension to physics.

The one thing I always liked about TDM is its ability to explain things in simple everyday terms. I.E to understand the principles you don't have to be educated to the level of a Doctor or be a Professor of physics.

One important thing to remember about any theories that address these issues. They must be Covariant. Or in other words the given equations etc must be able to work in any given scale no matter what the values are.

Einstein's GR & SR are good examples of covariant Theories.

TDM proves its covariance. when you consider that the TDM states could be measured in scale Elephants and it will still work ;)

This is the distortion of space time lambda part of the equations. I previously posted. Is also the principles exploited on a larger/smaller scale in wormholes etc.

A really simple way to visualise this displacement is to drop a stone in a bucket of water. The stone sinks to its natural level in doing so it displaces the water.

So basically the high density object tries to get to its natural level of interaction (Stable TDS), in doing so it displaces lower density objects. Thus starting off the TDS cycle I previously explained.

---------Ok, I see. Fascinating, but hard to understand. I need more.

Basically everything in an infinite space time continuum has its set size, set scale, etc which has a defined point that it is always trying to get to. The problem being that in trying to get to that stable point interactions with other objects alters its structure. So with each interaction it has a new point in space time in which it is stable. Thus it can never obtain that stable point.

If all matter was to obtain this stable point then no reactions would occur and you would have an infinite void. In classical physics terms this is the pre-big bang state of the universe

BTW space time is not as linear as we think it is, a reaction that creates an object can occur after the object already exists.

Its a bit like saying that you have just seen your great grand father being born. Logically to our single finite range of observation we would say that this isn't possible.

---------If I could read your book or your old website, that would help. If you have a problem finding a host for your pages, I would gladly give you a space on my website. I pay enough money (that I don't have) to make sure that too many visitors will never be a problem. (Of course I will never ask you for money

Why tank you, but I think I have sorted out the problems with my I.S.P on that server now.

I am currently creating an up to date Plain English version of TDM. (I always hated the way that certain scientific papers exclude 90% of the population just because they don't understand advanced mathematics or scientific terminology) Actually at the moment I am trying to create a Flash based space time distortion simulator. Which will visually show TDM shift in action.

Regards William

-----Original Message-----
From: rm@themarginal.com [mailto:rm@themarginal.com]
Sent: 29 March 2002 23:25
To: 'Thurlby Computers'
Subject: RE: Some of the questions I managed to decipher

Am I allowed to copy all of our conversation on my website, including what you told me about the definition of your theory?

I usually ask this question and I am OK with people who prefer to keep it confidential.

Please read below.

Its interesting to see just how many people are able to understand this,

although sadly the ability to visualise things in non-local terms is quite

a rare gift. I'm sure you have run into this problem. I.E. Things that you take

for granted others have great difficulty in even grasping the basics of.

=====Tell me about it. They are rarely even willing to listen. Some do but still cannot visualise it or perhaps they can but keep coming back to the mainstream way of looking at things. To be honest I don't think anyone can visualise Einstein's way at looking at the universe, they just accept it because it is sort of proven in their eyes.

So our finite universe is TDM state 0 , if the mass of that monitor was

7,500,000(10^53kg) The actual point in time where that monitor exists would be half way along the curvature of space time in TDM state 6. Travelling at a relative velocity O.5C . Or a pseudo superluminal velocity compared to you of 6.5 times greater than your velocity of light.

=======So TDM state 6 means 6 times the speed of light?

There are surprising similarities in our view points. However when I created TDM

it was working form the premise that there is no need to alter classical physics since

it works so well within the finite universe. In other words if it works don't fix it

By using the finite universe as the basic scale increment of measurement. This means that no matter what relative scale you are in. Then the relative laws of physics apply (With exactly the same action & results).

==========So what happens in a Black Hole from your point of view?

---------Ok, I see. Fascinating, but hard to understand. I need more.

Basically everything in an infinite space time continuum has its set size, set scale, etc which has a defined point that it is always trying to get to. The problem being that in trying to get to that stable point interactions with other objects alters its structure. So with each interaction it has a new point in space time in which it is stable. Thus it can never obtain that stable point.

If all matter was to obtain this stable point then no reactions would occur and you would have an infinite void. In classical physics terms this is the pre-big bang state of the universe

BTW space time is not as linear as we think it is, a reaction that creates an object can occur after the object already exists.

Its a bit like saying that you have just seen your great grand father being born. Logically to our single finite range of observation we would say that this isn't possible.

==========This sounds very interesting. I have never thought of this and I will think about it further.

I am currently creating an up to date Plain English version of TDM. (I always hated the way that certain scientific papers exclude 90% of the population just because they don't understand advanced mathematics or scientific terminology) Actually at the moment I am trying to create a Flash based space time distortion simulator. Which will visually show TDM shift in action.

==========I look forward looking at all that.

Regards William

Roland www.themarginal.com/relativity.htm

-----Original Message-----
From: TDM [mailto:tdm@thurlbycomputers.co.uk]
Sent: 30 March 2002 06:46
To: rm@themarginal.com
Subject: Re: Some of the questions I managed to decipher

----- Original Message -----

From: rm@themarginal.com

To: 'Thurlby Computers'

Sent: Friday, March 29, 2002 11:25 PM

Subject: RE: Some of the questions I managed to decipher

Am I allowed to copy all of our conversation on my website, including what you told me about the definition of your theory?

You are more than welcome to!

I usually ask this question and I am OK with people who prefer to keep it confidential.

Please read below.

Its interesting to see just how many people are able to understand this,

although sadly the ability to visualise things in non-local terms is quite

a rare gift. I'm sure you have run into this problem. I.E. Things that you take

for granted others have great difficulty in even grasping the basics of.

=====Tell me about it. They are rarely even willing to listen. Some do but still cannot visualise it or perhaps they can but keep coming back to the mainstream way of looking at things. To be honest I don't think anyone can visualise Einstein's way at looking at the universe, they just accept it because it is sort of proven in their eyes.

I think you have hit the nail on the head, most people just blindly accept. An interesting point though. Einstein never was a brilliant mathematician, He was like myself a Conceptual Physicist (An ideas man) but to get his ideas accepted he had to go back and learn almost everything that he was disproving with his publications.

Unlike Einstein I found myself in a unique position with TDM. I did not have to learn everything else unless I really wanted to. Because the very nature of TDM already encompasses all of classical physics. I.E. 1 TDM state is all the science that human kind has ever devised (The finite universe) and according to TDM there are infinite scale versions of them. This unique property also means that to disprove TDM you must disprove every fundamental law of physics.

So what happens if the definition of the finite universe changes as science moves on?

Well again TDM automatically adjusts with it.

Considering its basis is so simple, its turning out to be one of the most robust physics theories ever devised. No matter what you throw at it in physics terms, when combined with classical physics it can produce an answer.

So even question like what is zero point energy becomes almost as easy to answer as primary school maths.

So our finite universe is TDM state 0 , if the mass of that monitor was

7,500,000(10^53kg) The actual point in time where that monitor exists would be half way along the curvature of space time in TDM state 6. Travelling at a relative velocity O.5C . Or a pseudo superluminal velocity compared to you of 6.5 times greater than your velocity of light.

=======So TDM state 6 means 6 times the speed of light?

Essentially each TDM state is a finite scale related universe.

So working from TDM state zero (Our current finite universe).

The TDM scale spans like this

In higher density (smaller scale versions of our finite universe)

TDM states	Pseudo Velocity	Local Relative velocity
TDM state 0	0 to C	0 to C
TDM state 1	1C to 2C	0 to C
TDM state 2	2C to 3C	0 to C
TDM state 3	3C to 4C	0 to C
TDM state 4	4C to 5C	0 to C
TDM state 5	5C to 6C	0 to C
TDM state 6	6C to 7C	0 to C
TDM state 7	7C to 8C	0 to C

and so on into infinite possible TDM states and infinite possible pseudo superluminal velocities.

In lower density (larger scale versions of our finite universe)

TDM states	Pseudo Velocity	Local Relative velocity
TDM state 0	0 to C	0 to C
TDM state -1	-1C to -2C	0 to C
TDM state -2	-2C to -3C	0 to C
TDM state -3	-3C to -4C	0 to C
TDM state -4	-4C to -5C	0 to C
TDM state -5	-5C to -6C	0 to C
TDM state -6	-6C to -7C	0 to C
TDM state -7	-7C to -8C	0 to C

and so on into infinite possible TDM states and infinite possible pseudo superluminal velocities.....

There are surprising similarities in our view points. However when I created TDM

it was working form the premise that there is no need to alter classical physics since

it works so well within the finite universe. In other words if it works don't fix it

By using the finite universe as the basic scale increment of measurement. This means that no matter what relative scale you are in. Then the relative laws of physics apply (With exactly the same action & results).

==========So what happens in a Black Hole from your point of view?

Depends what you want to know, in TDM basically a black hole is like having a physical link between say TDM state 1000 and Our current TDM state 0. In other words it is an ultra high density distortion in space time.

Or in it a point of physical interaction between to non local relative scale universes.

However if you take a stage further and scale that non relative universe back up to our scale, you will find the point in space time in our universe which that black hole links to.

---------Ok, I see. Fascinating, but hard to understand. I need more.

Basically everything in an infinite space time continuum has its set size, set scale, etc which has a defined point that it is always trying to get to. The problem being that in trying to get to that stable point interactions with other objects alters its structure. So with each interaction it has a new point in space time in which it is stable. Thus it can never obtain that stable point.

If all matter was to obtain this stable point then no reactions would occur and you would have an infinite void. In classical physics terms this is the pre-big bang state of the universe

BTW space time is not as linear as we think it is, a reaction that creates an object can occur after the object already exists.

Its a bit like saying that you have just seen your great grand father being born. Logically to our single finite range of observation we would say that this isn't possible.

==========This sounds very interesting. I have never thought of this and I will think about it further.

I am currently creating an up to date Plain English version of TDM. (I always hated the way that certain scientific papers exclude 90% of the population just because they don't understand advanced mathematics or scientific terminology) Actually at the moment I am trying to create a Flash based space time distortion simulator. Which will visually show TDM shift in action.

==========I look forward looking at all that.

Regards William

Roland www.themarginal.com/relativity.htm

-----Original Message-----
From: rm@themarginal.com [mailto:rm@themarginal.com]
Sent: 30 March 2002 10:48
To: 'TDM'
Subject: new questions

Essentially each TDM state is a finite scale related universe.

So working from TDM state zero (Our current finite universe).

The TDM scale spans like this

In higher density (smaller scale versions of our finite universe)

TDM states	Pseudo Velocity	Local Relative velocity
TDM state 0	0 to C	0 to C
TDM state 1	1C to 2C	0 to C
TDM state 2	2C to 3C	0 to C
TDM state 3	3C to 4C	0 to C
TDM state 4	4C to 5C	0 to C
TDM state 5	5C to 6C	0 to C
TDM state 6	6C to 7C	0 to C
TDM state 7	7C to 8C	0 to C

and so on into infinite possible TDM states and infinite possible pseudo superluminal velocities.

In lower density (larger scale versions of our finite universe)

TDM states	Pseudo Velocity	Local Relative velocity
TDM state 0	0 to C	0 to C
TDM state -1	-1C to -2C	0 to C

TDM state -2	-2C to -3C	0 to C
TDM state -3	-3C to -4C	0 to C
TDM state -4	-4C to -5C	0 to C
TDM state -5	-5C to -6C	0 to C
TDM state -6	-6C to -7C	0 to C
TDM state -7	-7C to -8C	0 to C

and so on into infinite possible TDM states and infinite possible pseudo superluminal velocities.....

----------I find that you have solve the problem a bit like Einstein did. And Einstein knew he was wrong because he continued to search all his live to unite both the Relativity and Quantum Physics. You basically adjusted the results of measurements to the scale the measurement was made in. In relativity, it can of adjust itself automatically. The problem with Einstein was that we could not make the distinction about what scale you were at. So your ideas are fine with me, now I can measure at what speed a ship is going at and at what speed a small particle in a particle accelerator is going at, and it ain't 99,9999999% the speed of light, it is much faster than that. I will have to put our conversation on my website because I really think you are right and that makes the second person who thinks like me, so perhaps I was not so crazy after all. I will have to read over and over again our conversations and please keep it coming, any more bits of information will be greatly appreciated.

==========So what happens in a Black Hole from your point of view?

Depends what you want to know, in TDM basically a black hole is like having a physical link between say TDM state 1000 and Our current TDM state 0. In other words it is an ultra high density distortion in space time.

Or in it a point of physical interaction between to non local relative scale universes.

However if you take a stage further and scale that non relative universe back up to our scale, you will find the point in space time in our universe which that black hole links to.

----------So, according to your theory, if you found yourself in a Black Hole, should you not adjust to the degree of compression and find yourself in a normal environment? And then, when you look at the Earth, it would look like if it was in a Black hole because the degree of compression would be reversed and extreme? Or, because of the analogy of the rock and

the bucket filled with water, the black hole is way at the bottom of the bucket and the Earth is, let's say, almost at the surface of the bucket? So when you reach a Black Hole you reach the bottom of the bucket?

-------From your comment, you could reach any point in the universe instantly as it is all around us within reaching distance, no? If you could find the point in space time in our universe which the Black hole links to, you could travel there instantly? What kind of travelling application or at the very least communication device could you use in order to travel or communicate instantly from point a to point b?

Basically everything in an infinite space time continuum has its set size, set scale, etc which has a defined point that it is always trying to get to. The problem being that in trying to get to that stable point interactions with other objects alters its structure. So with each interaction it has a new point in space time in which it is stable. Thus it can never obtain that stable point.

----------In my theory size is relative, an object can be compressed or decompressed, making it a relative value.

----------So if a rocket goes into space at an incredible speed, you would used your adjusted C to calculate its real speed which could be 6 C. Would you say that if you were to use Newton's equations you could reach the exact same result?

BTW space time is not as linear as we think it is, a reaction that creates an object can occur after the object already exists.

----------Explain this. Why can you say this?

Regards William

Roland www.themarginal.com/relativity.htm

-----Original Message-----
From: Thurlby Computers
Sent: 30 March 2002 19:16
To: rm@themarginal.com
Subject: Re: new questions

----- Original Message -----

From: rm@themarginal.com

To: 'TDM'

Sent: Saturday, March 30, 2002 10:47 AM

Subject: new questions

Essentially each TDM state is a finite scale related universe.

So working from TDM state zero (Our current finite universe).

The TDM scale spans like this

In higher density (smaller scale versions of our finite universe)

TDM states	Pseudo Velocity	Local Relative velocity
TDM state 0	0 to C	0 to C
TDM state 1	1C to 2C	0 to C
TDM state 2	2C to 3C	0 to C
TDM state 3	3C to 4C	0 to C
TDM state 4	4C to 5C	0 to C
TDM state 5	5C to 6C	0 to C
TDM state 6	6C to 7C	0 to C
TDM state 7	7C to 8C	0 to C

and so on into infinite possible TDM states and infinite possible pseudo superluminal velocities.

In lower density (larger scale versions of our finite universe)

TDM states	Pseudo Velocity	Local Relative velocity
TDM state 0	0 to C	0 to C
TDM state -1	-1C to -2C	0 to C
TDM state -2	-2C to -3C	0 to C
TDM state -3	-3C to -4C	0 to C
TDM state -4	-4C to -5C	0 to C
TDM state -5	-5C to -6C	0 to C
TDM state -6	-6C to -7C	0 to C
TDM state -7	-7C to -8C	0 to C

and so on into infinite possible TDM states and infinite possible pseudo superluminal velocities.....

----------I find that you have solve the problem a bit like Einstein did. And Einstein knew he was wrong because he continued to search all his live to unite both the Relativity and Quantum Physics. You basically adjusted the results of measurements to the scale the measurement was made in. In relativity, it can of adjust itself automatically. The problem with Einstein was that we could not make the distinction about what scale you were at. So your ideas are fine with me, now I can measure at what speed a ship is going at and at what speed a small particle in a particle accelerator is going at, and it ain't 99,9999999% the speed of light, it is much faster than that. I will have to put our conversation on my website because I really think you are right and that makes the second person who thinks like me, so perhaps I was not so crazy after all. I will have to read over and over again our conversations and please keep it coming, any more bits of information will be greatly appreciated.

As you say the only thing that Einstein was missing was scale. I still can't believe that if somebody who would devise GR or SR could not see the blatantly obvious. There are two possible outcomes of this. 1. Being a confirmed pacifist, Einstein realised just how dangerous this was. 2. That his studies of classical physics (So that he would be taken seriously) blinded him to what was in front of his face.

Concerning velocities, did you know that everything is travelling at its own relative light velocity? Also If you could become unistationary (stationary in the universe) everything would fly past you at C and beyond. So ever higher speeds can be obtained by standing still.

==========So what happens in a Black Hole from your point of view?

Depends what you want to know, in TDM basically a black hole is like having a physical link between say TDM state 1000 and Our current TDM state 0. In other words it is an ultra high density distortion in space time.

Or in it a point of physical interaction between to non local relative scale universes.

However if you take a stage further and scale that non relative universe back up to our scale, you will find the point in space time in our universe which that black hole links to.

----------So, according to your theory, if you found yourself in a Black Hole, should you not adjust to the degree of compression and find yourself in a normal environment? And then, when you look at the Earth, it would look like if it was in a Black hole because the degree of compression would be reversed and extreme? Or, because of the analogy of the rock and the bucket filled with water, the black hole is way at the bottom of the bucket and the Earth is, let's say, almost at the surface of the bucket? So when you reach a Black Hole you reach the bottom of the bucket?

Actually if you adjust to the degree of compression you will find yourself in a normal environment. I.E. you become relative, although as kip thorne suggests the highly unstable and intense gravitational shifts going a black hole, would probably kill you long before you reached this stage.

-------From your comment, you could reach any point in the universe instantly as it is all around us within reaching distance, no? If you could find the point in space time in our universe which the Black hole links to, you could travel there instantly? What kind of travelling application or at the very least communication device could you use in order to travel or communicate instantly from point a to point b?

You have hit the nail on the head this, reaction is instantaneous, even the likes of Ken Olum with Olum's model. (A Simplistic representation of Casimir effect) found that in theory this reaction is instantaneous. Which seems to defy logic. again it all comes down to your to your range of observation being inside or outside of the reaction. However you have understood a this at a remarkable speed, I know of some top physicists who still struggle with what this means.

However you don't need a black hole or a worm hole to do this, our everyday life is composed of these very reactions taking place, but because that is our normal perception of things so we can't separate

ourselves from it. We look at the extremes of our perception to understand this. Which just happens to be super heavy objects such as black holes.

Basically everything in an infinite space time continuum has its set size, set scale, etc which has a defined point that it is always trying to get to. The problem being that in trying to get to that stable point interactions with other objects alters its structure. So with each interaction it has a new point in space time in which it is stable. Thus it can never obtain that stable point.

----------In my theory size is relative, an object can be compressed or decompressed, making it a relative value.

Its very similar in that respect, the compression/decompression does make an object relative. However if the Compression/ Decompression exceeds the boundaries of what can be relative at the given co-ordinates in space time. This will mean that its structure would to to large of to small to interact with the density range. So it is naturally displaced to a density range in which it will interact with.

In our conventional terms of distance, this would mean that because it does not physically interact, it is not subject to resistance. Thus it can travel vast distances at extremely high velocities. Convention Classical physics defines this as infinite velocity. Which as we know with TDM which shows us the larger picture, this velocity is not exactly true, it could be just several times C. Although as you said the reaction is instantaneous. So maybe classical physics is not that wrong ;)

Again it all comes down to your current range of observation.

----------So if a rocket goes into space at an incredible speed, you would used your adjusted C to calculate its real speed which could be 6 C. Would you say that if you were to use Newton's equations you could reach the exact same result?

Basically if a rocket went off into space at a velocity which is theoretically 6.5C (I added used the 0.5 as it makes it easier to describe) What you could say is that the given object is travelling at 0.5C in relativity TDM state 6. Its curvature on space time would be the equivalent to its original plus 1/2 the mass of the finite universe. Also compared to us would be a pseudo superluminal velocity of 6.5C

Were as classical physics on its own would describe the rocket as being destroyed, or travelling at infinite velocity.

Which do you think is the more viable? ;)

However there is another approach to this, if you compressed the atomic/subatomic structure of a rocket that was standing still by 6.5 times the point in which it would cross the relative event horizon or relative zero.

You would now find that the given object is travelling at 0.5C in relativity TDM state 6. Its curvature on space time would be the equivalent to its original plus 1/2 the mass of the finite universe. Also compared to us would be a pseudo superluminal velocity of 6.5C

Which is exactly the same thing, the difference is that physically the rocket didn't move in the first place. Compared to us yet it still achieves the same distortion in space time.

BTW space time is not as linear as we think it is, a reaction that creates an object can occur after the object already exists.

----------Explain this. Why can you say this?

Well as I just described increasing or decreasing the compression acting upon an object can alter its point of interaction in the space time continuum what I previously described as its TDS. Thus if an object existed now and you altered its density so that it was lower in these terms it would interact with a previous point in space time. Thus if for an example that was an atom and you jumped it back to the time of the primordial soup of finite universe (Pre big bang in classical physics terms) the appearance of that atom would trigger the big bang that brings about this finite universe.

Thus a non linear event cause the linear process of time that we understand. So I ask you can honestly say with what you have learned that the screen you are looking at is in the past present of future from your current location on the curvature of space time.

You asked me previously concerning the use of Newton's Theories, Anything that can realistically define that which is finite can be applied using TDM. As an example of this Newton's theories of gravity break down at the atomic level. Basically they say that not enough gravity exists to hold an electron in orbit.

Well TDM gives you two answers here.

1. You can become relative to the atoms scale thus Newton's laws of gravity once again function in the manner which we are more familiar with.

2. The Atom does instantaneously destroy itself, however TDM shows that different perceptions of instantaneous can in reality be very long time in relative terms.

At the end of the Day Einstein did not discredit, Newton and Hawking did not Discredit Einstein. They all just had different perception of the same thing. TDM allows all these perceptions to be true, yet in any singular state they can still contradict each other.

However those contradictions are for the classical physicists to argue about, we as ScR (Scale Relativity) Theorists don't need to bother ourselves with their squabbles. As what we use is multiples of what ever they definei the finite universe to be. This is the benefit of the like of TDM, it not effected by petty scientific bickering.

BTW you my find this an interesting read

FRACTAL SPACE-TIME AND MICROPHYSICS.

Towards a Theory of Scale Relativity.

Laurent Nottale.

An excerpt of this can be found here

http://www.chez.com/etlefevre/rechell/ukliwo12.htm

If you are not familiar with advanced physics it can be quite heavy going at times.

The full publication can be found at Amazon.com @ this URL

http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/ASIN/9810208782/qid=1017515553/sr=1-1/ref=sr_1_1/103-1489475-9048621

This is remarkably close to what I worked on, however it lacks the ease of use and genuine practicality of TDM

There is also this site. Which is devoted to ScR.

http://www.daec.obspm.fr/users/nottale/ukmenure.htm

Regards William

-----Original Message-----
From: rm@themarginal.com [mailto:rm@themarginal.com]
Sent: 30 March 2002 21:29
To: 'Thurlby Computers'
Subject: RE: new questions 2

----------I find that you have solve the problem a bit like Einstein did. And Einstein knew he was wrong because he continued to search all his live to unite both the Relativity and Quantum Physics. You basically adjusted the results of measurements to the scale the measurement was made in. In relativity, it kind of adjust itself automatically. The problem with Einstein was that we could not make the distinction about what scale you were at. So your ideas are fine with me, now I can measure at what speed a ship is going at and at what speed a small particle in a particle accelerator is going at, and it ain't 99,9999999% the speed of light, it is much faster than that. I will have to put our conversation on my website because I really think you are right and that makes the second person who thinks like me, so perhaps I was not so crazy after all. I will have to read over and over again our conversations and please keep it coming, any more bits of information will be greatly appreciated.

As you say the only thing that Einstein was missing was scale. I still can't believe that if somebody who would devise GR or SR could not see the blatantly obvious.

+++++++GR = gravity? SR = ? (it must be blatantly obvious, but I am blind! Scale Relativity?)

There are two possible outcomes of this. 1. Being a confirmed pacifist, Einstein realised just how dangerous this was.

++++++++Yeah, because E can be much greater than initially thought, and much more within our reach, right? I don't think Einstein would I kept something like that for himself because of war or possible weapons, or else he would have never come up with E = mc(2) in the first place.

2. That his studies of classical physics (So that he would be taken seriously) blinded him to what was in front of his face.

++++++++++According to my sister (who is an mechanical engineer who studied the subject in University and therefore knows more than me) Einstein was aware of my ideas and even talked about it in some of his books. But I could not verify this and I would bet he did not say any such things.)

Concerning velocities, did you know that everything is travelling at its own relative light velocity? Also If you could become unistationary (stationary in the universe) everything would fly past you at C and beyond. So ever higher speeds can be obtained by standing still.

++++++++++++++Mmmh, you will have to prove this to me. Nothing would go slower than C and we would all be going at C? Why?

----------So, according to your theory, if you found yourself in a Black Hole, should you not adjust to the degree of compression and find yourself in a normal environment? And then, when you look at the Earth, it would look like if it was in a Black hole because the degree of compression would be reversed and extreme? Or, because of the analogy of the rock and the bucket filled with water, the black hole is way at the bottom of the bucket and the Earth is, let's say, almost at the surface of the bucket? So when you reach a Black Hole you reach the bottom of the bucket?

Actually if you adjust to the degree of compression you will find yourself in a normal environment. I.E. you become relative, although as kip thorne suggests the highly unstable and intense gravitational shifts going a black hole, would probably kill you long before you reached this stage.

++++++++++Well, you see, perhaps a Black hole only look as such because we see in a relative way. Perhaps that because particles/matter goes so fast, we see everything distorted and even, we don't see anything. But if we were there we would have adjusted and things would be going at normal speed?

-------From your comment, you could reach any point in the universe instantly as it is all around us within reaching distance, no? If you could find the point in space time in our universe which the Black hole links to, you could travel there instantly? What kind of travelling application or at the very least communication device could you use in order to travel or communicate instantly from point a to point b?

You have hit the nail on the head this, reaction is instantaneous, even the likes of Ken Olum with Olum's model. (A Simplistic representation of Casimir effect) found that in theory this reaction is instantaneous. Which seems to defy logic. again it all comes down to your to your range of

observation being inside or outside of the reaction. However you have understood a this at a remarkable speed, I know of some top physicists who still struggle with what this means.

++++++++++ I did not understand that at an incredible speed (light velocity and beyond), and not from what you said. It took me years of thinking and I gathered this information from my own theory similar to yours. I am trying here to find out if you have reached the same conclusions as mine as far as applications and consequences of our theories are concerned. I have mentioned all these possible applications in the novel I have started to write, in the plan at the beginning:

+++++The Relative Universe: www.themarginal.com/universe.htm

However you don't need a black hole or a worm hole to do this, our everyday life is composed of these very reactions taking place, but because that is our normal perception of things so we can't separate ourselves from it. We look at the extremes of our perception to understand this. Which just happens to be super heavy objects such as black holes.

++++++++Yeah, I suppose we are, depending from the frame of reference. And yes, I too noticed that all the effect of my ideas are clear even to our face in the day to day life. A pound coin you would hold in the sky would be bigger than the moon on certain nights, and in fact, from your relative point of view, the moon is definitely smaller than your pound coin. Though from your ideas the moon is much heavier, so gravity and resistance makes it really down the bucket and your pound coin is floating in the stock exchange market (instead of the Euro). Other examples that i love to look at is when you take a plane, and suddenly this is the fastest you and me will ever go. Look at the buildings by your windows, they don't appear to be getting away from you, they appear to be shrinking away, or compressing. It is getting more obvious about how differently we can be looking at the world.

Which as we know with TDM which shows us the larger picture, this velocity is not exactly true, it could be just several times C. Although as you said the reaction is instantaneous. So maybe classical physics is not that wrong ;)

----------So if a rocket goes into space at an incredible speed, you would used your adjusted C to calculate its real speed which could be 6 C. Would you say that if you were to use Newton's equations you could reach the exact same result?

Basically if a rocket went off into space at a velocity which is theoretically 6.5C (I added used the 0.5 as it makes it easier to describe) What you could say is that the given object is travelling at

0.5C in relativity TDM state 6. Its curvature on space time would be the equivalent to its original plus 1/2 the mass of the finite universe. Also compared to us would be a pseudo superluminal velocity of 6.5C

Were as classical physics on its own would describe the rocket as being destroyed, or travelling at infinite velocity.

++++++++++Yeah, but you could still use Newton to calculate the speed of that rocket.

Which do you think is the more viable? ;)

++++++++To be honest I much prefer the idea that an object is going at a speed of 6.5 C than 0.5 C in relativity TDM state 6. And it is also easier for the planet to accept, they appear to see your TDM as a threat as they forget it means something sensible and important: Time Density Mass. But hey, one way or the other, as long as we are talking the same language (same meaning), I am quite please with anything. These days, to even meet someone capable of conceptualising something going faster than the speed of light is a miracle. I think you're the first I ever met. We will have to see the advantages of talking in terms of TDM states, and perhaps it will be very much useful when it comes to talk within specific frame of references at different scales.

However there is another approach to this, if you compressed the atomic/subatomic structure of a rocket that was standing still by 6.5 times the point in which it would cross the relative event horizon or relative zero.

You would now find that the given object is travelling at 0.5C in relativity TDM state 6. Its curvature on space time would be the equivalent to its original plus 1/2 the mass of the finite universe. Also compared to us would be a pseudo superluminal velocity of 6.5C

++++ I will have to listen more to your ideas if you say that it is when the mass of the rocket goes beyond the whole mass of our finite universe that it actually crosses the event horizon or crosses the threshold of the speed of light. (Well, the relative mass of the rocket anyway). I would like to hear more about how you got the mass of the whole universe calculated.

Which is exactly the same thing, the difference is that physically the rocket didn't move in the first place. Compared to us yet it still achieves the same distortion in space time.

+++++++ So, an interesting question here, what do you think of the missing mass or dark matter of the universe, the biggest mystery of contemporary physics? I suppose it is now gone by the window? Problem solved?

BTW space time is not as linear as we think it is, a reaction that creates an object can occur after the object already exists.

----------Explain this. Why can you say this?

Well as I just described increasing or decreasing the compression acting upon an object can alter its point of interaction in the space time continuum what I previously described as its TDS. Thus if an object existed now and you altered its density so that it was lower in these terms it would interact with a previous point in space time. Thus if for an example that was an atom and you jumped it back to the time of the primordial soup of finite universe (Pre big bang in classical physics terms) the appearance of that atom would trigger the big bang that brings about this finite universe.

Thus a non linear event cause the linear process of time that we understand. So I ask you can honestly say with what you have learned that the screen you are looking at is in the past present of future from your current location on the curvature of space time.

You asked me previously concerning the use of Newton's Theories, Anything that can realistically define that which is finite can be applied using TDM. As an example of this Newton's theories of gravity break down at the atomic level. Basically they say that not enough gravity exists to hold an electron in orbit.

Well TDM gives you two answers here.

1. You can become relative to the atoms scale thus Newton's laws of gravity once again function in the manner which we are more familiar with.

2. The Atom does instantaneously destroy itself, however TDM shows that different perceptions of instantaneous can in reality be very long time in relative terms.

+++++++ I see your point.

At the end of the Day Einstein did not discredit, Newton and Hawking did not Discredit Einstein. They all just had different perception of the same thing.

++++++++ Exactly.

TDM allows all these perceptions to be true, yet in any singular state they can still contradict each other.

However those contradictions are for the classical physicists to argue about, we as ScR (Scale Relativity) Theorists don't need to bother ourselves with their squabbles. As what we use is multiples of what ever they define the finite universe to be. This is the benefit of the like of TDM, it not effected by petty scientific bickering.

+++++++++ Or dependent on Super Strings that might be proven wrong. What are your thought about this?

BTW you my find this an interesting read

FRACTAL SPACE-TIME AND MICROPHYSICS.

Towards a Theory of Scale Relativity.

Laurent Nottale.

An excerpt of this can be found here

http://www.chez.com/etlefevre/rechell/ukliwo12.htm

If you are not familiar with advanced physics it can be quite heavy going at times.

The full publication can be found at Amazon.com @ this URL

http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/ASIN/9810208782/qid=1017515553/sr=1-1/ref=sr_1_1/103-1489475-9048621

This is remarkably close to what I worked on, however it lacks the ease of use and genuine practicality of TDM

There is also this site. Which is devoted to ScR.

http://www.daec.obspm.fr/users/nottale/ukmenure.htm

Regards William

+++++++++Thanks, I will have a look at those websites.

++++ I am based close to Heathrow Airport, so basically in London. You are in the UK, right? And you are a professor or something, with a PhD in Physics?

+++++I am not sure if you were able to read about me on my website, but my background in Physics is very limited, I am even surprised that I can comprehend almost everything you are talking about. Sometimes some people comes back to me and they appear to be talking Chinese. I am more a philosopher and I wish I could have a better background in Physics. That is why I am registered to study Theoretical Physics at the University of London for September 2002, but since I have no money and lots of debts, I doubt very much I will be able to start. That was my story.

Merci! Roland Michel Tremblay

-----Original Message-----
From: Thurlby Computers
Sent: 31 March 2002 00:32
To: rm@themarginal.com
Subject: Re: new questions 2

As you say the only thing that Einstein was missing was scale. I still can't believe that if somebody who would devise GR or SR could not see the blatantly obvious.

+++++++GR = gravity? SR = ? (it must be blatantly obvious, but I am blind! Scale Relativity?)

oops force of habit using those abbreviations, GR= General relativity, SR= Special relativity

There are two possible outcomes of this. 1. Being a confirmed pacifist, Einstein realised just how dangerous this was.

++++++++Yeah, because E can be much greater than initially thought, and much more within our reach, right? I don't think Einstein would I kept something like that for himself because of war or possible weapons, or else he would have never come up with E = mc(2) in the first place.

Well there is the situation in which American Government tricked Einstein into supplying the information, which Oppenhiemer needed for the atomic bomb. As a confirmed pacifist Einstein was against any such research.

2. That his studies of classical physics (So that he would be taken seriously) blinded him to what was in front of his face.

++++++++++According to my sister (who is an mechanical engineer who studied the subject in University and therefore knows more than me) Einstein was aware of my ideas and even talked about it in some of his books. But I could not verify this and I would bet he did not say any such things.)

Einstein continually searched for this missing link after he had to reluctantly admit that his theories predicted super heavy bodies such as black holes. Obviously his reluctance to accept such prediction from his theories was because it generated as more questions than his theories actually answered.

It was Einstein that devised the calculation based upon lambda to represent the volume of relative space time. This was so remarkably close to solving the problem. This is why I am reluctant to accept that Einstein did not understand this.

A reason why Einstein may have with held his information on Either.

The House of Cards effect.

Basically if you can manipulate an point in space time, you can set up a space time cascade. As an example, Imagine building a house of cards. Say for an example [le seven levels high, when you knock out a bottom cards the house comes tumbling down.

Now imagine a house of cards that spans several scale universes, what happens when you knock out a bottom card?

Compared to this the atomic bomb is a Childs toy. If you were to translate a single particle forma scale universe of say TDM state 10,000,000 to direct interaction in TDM state 100,000,000 then the cascade effect of the scale universes shifting to fill in the loss of matter would be vast by the time it scaled back up to our TDM state 0.

Thus the danger of the house of cards effect has to be always taken into account when considering publication.

Concerning velocities, did you know that everything is travelling at its own relative light velocity? Also If you could become unistationary (stationary in the universe) everything would fly past you at C and beyond. So ever higher speeds can be obtained by standing still.

++++++++++++Mmmh, you will have to prove this to me. Nothing would go slower than C and we would all be going at C? Why?

Remember what's relative

Lets look at the scales again, the distance between each velocity represents the TDS scale range of matter at a given velocity.

This is just simple representation of a few of the TDM states and is not to scale.

TDM state -4 0----------C

TDM state -3 0----------C

TDM state -2 0----------C

TDM state -1 0----------C

TDM state 0 0--------C

TDM state 1 0----C

TDM state 2 0--C

TDM state 3 0-C

So if you imagine any given bubble of space time has a TDS (Time density signature) and this time density signature is a TDM state in its purest form. This mean that should a given object

speed up or slow down it will alter its TDS. (or absolute velocity) in doing so it becomes another TDS. The relative absolute velocity is that of light, nothing can go faster than it and still react in the same relative range. In the same manner if it slows down it becomes the absolute velocity of another lower density scale or TDS. Thus it is always at relative light velocity

However as you can see from the diagram the relative light velocity may be the same for those who in relative terms to each scale. However the actual velocities to an external observer which is the view shown in the diagram from 0 to C spans different distances and is different velocities.

So this means for an example A hydrogen atom has a different absolute velocity (relative light velocity) than that if Oxygen. If you altered the Hydrogen atoms TDS to that of Oxygen in all sense and purposes it would become Oxygen. So this is not just limited to the extremes of the universe. This occurs all around us.

So by increasing the density (Compression of an object) say our solar system to that of a particle on another inner orbit in the universe. Our solar system would then exist at that point in space time. In normal terms in classical terms its velocity between the two locations would be many times the normal definition of light velocity. As you notice before in these terms the reaction between point (A) it original location and that of point (B) it new location on the curvature of space time is instantaneous.

----------So, according to your theory, if you found yourself in a Black Hole, should you not adjust to the degree of compression and find yourself in a normal environment? And then, when you look at the Earth, it would look like if it was in a Black hole because the degree of compression would be reversed and extreme? Or, because of the analogy of the rock and the bucket filled with water, the black hole is way at the bottom of the bucket and the Earth is, let's say, almost at the surface of the bucket? So when you reach a Black Hole you reach the bottom of the bucket?

Actually if you adjust to the degree of compression you will find yourself in a normal environment. I.E. you become relative, although as kip thorne suggests the highly unstable and intense gravitational shifts going a black hole, would probably kill you long before you reached this stage.

++++++++++Well, you see, perhaps a Black hole only look as such because we see in a relative way. Perhaps that because particles/matter goes so fast, we see everything distorted and even, we don't see anything. But if we were there we would have adjusted and things would be going at normal speed?

Again you have hit the nail on the head. You are spot on with that analogy apart to build upon what you said about particle/matter the distortion is caused because our range of observation cannot see beyond the event horizon, much like we can't see beyond a normal Horizon until we approach it. And there is an equal an opposite reaction which displaces decompressed energy/matter form the other relative scale (TDM state).

-------From your comment, you could reach any point in the universe instantly as it is all around us within reaching distance, no? If you could find the point in space time in our universe which the Black hole links to, you could travel there instantly? What kind of travelling application or at the very least communication device could you use in order to travel or communicate instantly from point a to point b?

You have hit the nail on the head this, reaction is instantaneous, even the likes of Ken Olum with Olum's model. (A Simplistic representation of Casimir effect) found that in theory this reaction is instantaneous. Which seems to defy logic. again it all comes down to your to your range of observation being inside or outside of the reaction. However you have understood a this at a remarkable speed, I know of some top physicists who still struggle with what this means.

++++++++++ I did not understand that at an incredible speed (light velocity and beyond), and not from what you said. It took me years of thinking and I gathered this information from my own theory similar to yours. I am trying here to find out if you have reached the same conclusions as mine as far as applications and consequences of our theories are concerned. I have mentioned all these possible applications in the novel I have started to write, in the plan at the beginning:

Well for an example, This is based upon Quantum tunnelling experiments (Prof Gunter Nimtz) What he basically showed that if you set up two up a microwave emitter so that part of the photons are channelled towards a target and part travel through normal air. At the receiver the photons that pass through the target get there sever time faster than the photons through air.

At first there seems to be nothing odd about this, but when you consider the photons are already travelling at light velocity this means that the photons that travelled through the solid target are travelling several times faster than light. So there is a noticeable time distortion between points (A) and (B). To prove the situation was not random reaction which was the argument set against it. He encoded Mozart 40 into the signal and transmitted this at faster than light velocity. The very first man made intentional sub space transmission.

Many arguments have arisen because this violates causality etc, Causality states that as signal cannot be transmitted at faster than light velocity. Instead of admitting that causality is wrong the physics community just moved the goal posts and redefined what a signal was. Thus the transmissions made in this experiments are now known as wave packets.

Although technically I have to admit the physics community was correct to shift the goal posts, but that does not change the fact that causality is relative description and without a scale range like TDM to explain space time then causality actually has no jurisdiction in this range of physics.

Anyway lets look at this in TDM terms. In TDM the target becomes the resistance which acts as the compression on the photons. In doing so the TDS of the photons is changed so the distance they travel is on a higher density scale. Which as you know is technically faster than our scale. So they get form point (A) to point (B) faster than there counterparts who are not subject to the same resistance or shift in their TDS.

Actually the reaction is a bit more complex than that but at this stage of the explanation , it is not required to know that level of detail.

So from this we get to understand that the amplitude of the photons and the density of the target will increase this distortion in space time.

Now remembering that Gunter Nimtz has already sent an encoded version of Mozart 40 via this process, because TDM shows us know how to increase the efficiency of the reaction. We can increase the distortion in space time, So if this signal was for an example this encoded material was the binary output of a computer processor, it would be possible to transmit digital information over vast distances instantaneously. Which allowing for time related perception would actually be many times the velocity of light.

Alternatively (This is highly dangerous) you could set up the process so that an atomic reaction causes rapid decompression of the photons. Although at first it will appear that the signal is going slower as you increase the decompression beyond the relative zero of this TDM state you will now be causing a reverse distortion in space time. Thus eventually the digital information will reach the receiver at an earlier point in time. This means that you would be receiving the output from the computer processor before it has even calculated it.

Again this at first glance appears to violate causality, but with TDM because we can step back and see the whole picture, we see that its just a simple reaction to physical interaction of objects.

The danger is that this computer could theoretically achieve absolute knowledge in less than one Planck length (largest and smallest divisible unit of measurement in the finite universe) as the computer has the whole of space time to work with. In a sense you have just created god.

+++++The Relative Universe: www.themarginal.com/universe.htm

However you don't need a black hole or a worm hole to do this, our everyday life is composed of these very reactions taking place, but because that is our normal perception of things so we can't separate ourselves from it. We look at the extremes of our perception to understand this. Which just happens to be super heavy objects such as black holes.

++++++++Yeah, I suppose we are, depending from the frame of reference. And yes, I too noticed that all the effect of my ideas are clear even to our face in the day to day life. A pound coin you would hold in the sky would be bigger than the moon on certain nights, and in fact, from your relative point of view, the moon is definitely smaller than your pound coin. Though from your ideas the moon is much heavier, so gravity and resistance makes it really down the bucket and your pound coin is floating in the stock exchange market (instead of the Euro). Other examples that i love to look at is when you take a plane, and suddenly this is the fastest you and me will ever go. Look at the buildings by your windows, they don't appear to be getting away from you, they appear to be shrinking away, or compressing. It is getting more obvious about how differently we can be looking at the world.

It is weird when you start looking at things in this manner, yet it all just seems to fall into place. Actually it scare the shit out of me the first time I realised just what this really meant and just how far ahead of the rest of the physics community it was. I.E. when I created TDM I didn't totally understand that you are not supposed to be able to do this ;)

Btw Einstein explains a process very similar to TDM its called frame dragging. Again I can't understand why he didn't devise a way of interpreting scale interaction between frames.

Which as we know with TDM which shows us the larger picture, this velocity is not exactly true, it could be just several times C. Although as you said the reaction is instantaneous. So maybe classical physics is not that wrong ;)

----------So if a rocket goes into space at an incredible speed, you would used your adjusted C to calculate its real speed which could be 6 C. Would you say that if you were to use Newton's equations you could reach the exact same result?

Basically if a rocket went off into space at a velocity which is theoretically 6.5C (I added used the 0.5 as it makes it easier to describe) What you could say is that the given object is travelling at 0.5C in relativity TDM state 6. Its curvature on space time would be the equivalent to its original plus 1/2 the mass of the finite universe. Also compared to us would be a pseudo superluminal velocity of 6.5C

Were as classical physics on its own would describe the rocket as being destroyed, or travelling at infinite velocity.

++++++++++Yeah, but you could still use Newton to calculate the speed of that rocket.

As I said in each scale range (TDM state) all of the laws of physics apply. So you can use multiples of Newton's laws, in this case 6 times. Plus the normal calculations you would do for an object which is travelling at 0.5C. in a finite universe. It doesn't really mater to physics that this 0.5C is actually 6.5C compared to us.

Do you see the benefit of this scale range approach?

You could work with an object travelling at 100 mph in TDM state 100,000,000,000,000 ^99999999999999999 as if it is travelling at 100 mph in our current TDM state 0. The only difference being that the given object is really travelling at just over 100,000,000,000,000 ^99999999999999999 times the velocity of light compared to us. All of this without re-writing a single part of classical finite physics.

TDM opens up infinity to the scientist. and returns real mathematical values which make sense to us in physical terms.

++++++++To be honest I much prefer the idea that an object is going at a speed of 6.5 C than 0.5 C in relativity TDM state 6. And it is also easier for the planet to accept, they appear to see your TDM as a threat as they forget it means something sensible and important: Time Density Mass. But hey, one way or the other, as long as we are talking the same language (same meaning), I am quite please with anything. These days, to even meet someone capable of conceptualising something going faster than the speed of light is a miracle. I think you're the first I ever met. We will have to see the advantages of talking in terms of TDM states, and perhaps it will be very much useful when it comes to talk within specific frame of references at different scales.

The benefit of TDM is that it shows you the results in both formats. However the 0.5C in given scale range is that which science requires. As classical physics can only deal with objects at less than light velocity. btw there are many experiments taking place all around the world concerning faster than light reactions. Ranging form photon entanglement experiments to quantum tunnelling.

Einstein's SR (Special relativity) does allow a non physical object such as the wave packet to exceed light velocity. The point being that technically the difference between one TDM state and another in this representation is the difference between being physical and non physical.

However there is another approach to this, if you compressed the atomic/subatomic structure of a rocket that was standing still by 6.5 times the point in which it would cross the relative event horizon or relative zero.

You would now find that the given object is travelling at 0.5C in relativity TDM state 6. Its curvature on space time would be the equivalent to its original plus 1/2 the mass of the finite universe. Also compared to us would be a pseudo superluminal velocity of 6.5C

++++ I will have to listen more to your ideas if you say that it is when the mass of the rocket goes beyond the whole mass of our finite universe that it actually crosses the

event horizon or crosses the threshold of the speed of light. (Well, the relative mass of the rocket anyway). I would like to hear more about how you got the mass of the whole universe calculated.

This term is based upon Einstein's relativistic mass, in which a photon at light velocity has the same mass as the universe. However classical finite physics tends to use the invariant mass term. (Quantum mechanics) in which a photon has no physical mass at light velocity. The QM term works very well in a finite universe but it returns some ridiculous meaningless gibberish in ScR terms. Then again Quantum Mechanics was never suppose to work outside of a finite range. TDM cures this as it gives it a finite range to work with anywhere throughout infinite space time.

Which is exactly the same thing, the difference is that physically the rocket didn't move in the first place. Compared to us yet it still achieves the same distortion in space time.

+++++++ So, an interesting question here, what do you think of the missing mass or dark matter of the universe, the biggest mystery of contemporary physics? I suppose it is now gone by the window? Problem solved?

You got it! actually the arguments about dark matter have always caused me to smile. When you know that dark matter is nothing more than matter which is on the borderline of another TDM state. The conversations do sound very comical. Its bit like watching a cave man trying to create fire. Fascinating in a sort of primordial way.

BTW space time is not as linear as we think it is, a reaction that creates an object can occur after the object already exists.

----------Explain this. Why can you say this?

Well as I just described increasing or decreasing the compression acting upon an object can alter its point of interaction in the space time continuum what I previously described as its TDS. Thus if an object existed now and you altered its density so that it was lower in these terms it would interact with a previous point in space time. Thus if for an example that was an atom and you jumped it back to the time of the primordial soup of finite universe (Pre big bang in classical physics terms) the appearance of that atom would trigger the big bang that brings about this finite universe.

Thus a non linear event cause the linear process of time that we understand. So I ask you can honestly say with what you have learned that the screen you are looking at is in the past present of future from your current location on the curvature of space time.

You asked me previously concerning the use of Newton's Theories, Anything that can realistically define that which is finite can be applied using TDM. As an example of this Newton's theories of gravity break down at the atomic level. Basically they say that not enough gravity exists to hold an electron in orbit.

Well TDM gives you two answers here.

1. You can become relative to the atoms scale thus Newton's laws of gravity once again function in the manner which we are more familiar with.

2. The Atom does instantaneously destroy itself, however TDM shows that different perceptions of instantaneous can in reality be very long time in relative terms.

+++++++ I see your point.

I thought you would.

At the end of the Day Einstein did not discredit, Newton and Hawking did not Discredit Einstein. They all just had different perception of the same thing.

++++++++ Exactly.

I'm glad we agree on that. Actually I have known people to almost resort to violence just because I said that. It was like I was talking heresy.

TDM allows all these perceptions to be true, yet in any singular state they can still contradict each other.

However those contradictions are for the classical physicists to argue about, we as ScR (Scale Relativity) Theorists don't need to bother ourselves with their squabbles. As what we use is multiples of what ever they define the finite universe to be. This is the benefit of the like of TDM, it not effected by petty scientific bickering.

+++++++++ Or dependent on Super Strings that might be proven wrong. What are your thought about this?

The point about String theory is that it is a great mathematical concept, To use Feynman's words "Am exercise in alternative thinking". However when it comes down to real finite physical properties it is absolutely useless. However if your thing is Super String theory, TDM can easily accommodate infinite scale versions of it ;)

Actually TDM's Spherical String Shells is a compromise, actually this compromise turned out to be easier to understand than Superstring theory, but its actual interactions are considerably more complex.

BTW you my find this an interesting read

FRACTAL SPACE-TIME AND MICROPHYSICS.

Towards a Theory of Scale Relativity.

Laurent Nottale.

An excerpt of this can be found here

http://www.chez.com/etlefevre/rechell/ukliwo12.htm

If you are not familiar with advanced physics it can be quite heavy going at times.

The full publication can be found at Amazon.com @ this URL

http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/ASIN/9810208782/qid=1017515553/sr=1-1/ref=sr_1_1/103-1489475-9048621

This is remarkably close to what I worked on, however it lacks the ease of use and genuine practicality of TDM

There is also this site. Which is devoted to ScR.

http://www.daec.obspm.fr/users/nottale/ukmenure.htm

Regards William

+++++++++Thanks, I will have a look at those websites.

++++ I am based close to Heathrow Airport, so basically in London. You are in the UK, right? And you are a professor or something, with a PhD in Physics?

Btw use to live near Reading (not that many miles from you). However I now live in Londonderry In Northern Ireland.

Professor? well that's debatable, Professor of Conceptual Physics. Means in plain English I am an Inventor or an ideas man.

+++++I am not sure if you were able to read about me on my website, but my background in Physics is very limited, I am even surprised that I can comprehend almost everything you are talking about. Sometimes some people comes back to me and they appear to be talking Chinese. I am more a philosopher and I wish I could have a better background in Physics. That is why I am registered to study Theoretical Physics at the University of London for September 2002, but since I have no money and lots of debts, I doubt very much I will be able to start. That was my story.

The point is that I have always detested the elitist approach of the physics community thus I have distanced myself as much as possible from that side of things. That is why I never bothered to take the formal qualifications to get that bit of paper which says that I can think like everybody before me. O.K obviously I have had to study and in many cases has surpassed my counterparts, but if having the full title of Professor before my name means that I must act like a puppet for the physics community. Then all I can say is that I rather be plain Mr Taggart. O.K so I don't always get recognition for my work, but if somebody actually uses it then I have done my job correctly

Regards William

-----Original Message-----
From: rm@themarginal.com [mailto:rm@themarginal.com]
Sent: 31 March 2002 03:45
To: 'Thurlby Computers'
Subject: RE: new questions 3

+++++++GR = gravity? SR = ? (it must be blatantly obvious, but I am blind! Scale Relativity?)

oops force of habit using those abbreviations, GR= General relativity, SR= Special relativity

.....God! I am so ashamed! Yes, it is blatantly obvious! And now it makes sense. Yeah, you are right. I cannot believe he would have missed what we have thought of. And, most puzzling, how can the rest of the scientific community can still be missing it? Thank god there is a bunch of weirdos on the

net that at least realise that there is something wrong with Einstein. And I have to say that Super String theory gets closer to the truth.

Einstein continually searched for this missing link after he had to reluctantly admit that his theories predicted super heavy bodies such as black holes. Obviously his reluctance to accept such prediction from his theories was because it generated as more questions than his theories actually answered.

It was Einstein that devised the calculation based upon lambda to represent the volume of relative space time. This was so remarkably close to solving the problem. This is why I am reluctant to accept that Einstein did not understand this.

A reason why Einstein may have with held his information on Either.

The House of Cards effect.

Basically if you can manipulate an point in space time, you can set up a space time cascade. As an example, Imagine building a house of cards. Say for an example [le seven levels high, when you knock out a bottom cards the house comes tumbling down.

Now imagine a house of cards that spans several scale universes, what happens when you knock out a bottom card?

Compared to this the atomic bomb is a Childs toy. If you were to translate a single particle forma scale universe of say TDM state 10,000,000 to direct interaction in TDM state 100,000,000 then the cascade effect of the scale universes shifting to fill in the loss of matter would be vast by the time it scaled back up to our TDM state 0.

Thus the danger of the house of cards effect has to be always taken into account when considering publication.

.....Very interesting stuff. You are right, if he had understood that, he might have wanted to keep it secret. But then he would have told some people and maybe the US government knows about it and it became an X-File. Care to chase that case Mulder?

.....I have to say that I am still not familiar with the way you are seeing the universe. You will really have to give me something more than just bits and bobs. So far it is impossible for me to gather where you are coming from and the whole picture. I hope you will put your website online soon or else we will run out of things to say.

Concerning velocities, did you know that everything is travelling at its own relative light velocity? Also If you could become unistationary (stationary in the universe) everything would fly past you at C and beyond. So ever higher speeds can be obtained by standing still.

++++++++++++Mmmh, you will have to prove this to me. Nothing would go slower than C and we would all be going at C? Why?

Remember what's relative

Lets look at the scales again, the distance between each velocity represents the TDS scale range of matter at a given velocity.

This is just simple representation of a few of the TDM states and is not to scale.

TDM state -4 0----------C

TDM state -3 0----------C

TDM state -2 0----------C

TDM state -1 0----------C

TDM state 0 0--------C

TDM state 1 0----C

TDM state 2 0--C

TDM state 3 0-C

So if you imagine any given bubble of space time has a TDS (Time density signature) and this time density signature is a TDM state in its purest form. This mean that should a given object

speed up or slow down it will alter its TDS. (or absolute velocity) in doing so it becomes another TDS. The relative absolute velocity is that of light, nothing can go faster than it and still react in the same relative range. In the same manner if it slows down it becomes the absolute velocity of another lower density scale or TDS. Thus it is always at relative light velocity

However as you can see from the diagram the relative light velocity may be the same for those who in relative terms to each scale. However the actual velocities to an external observer which is the view shown in the diagram from 0 to C spans different distances and is different velocities.

So this means for an example A hydrogen atom has a different absolute velocity (relative light velocity) than that if Oxygen. If you altered the Hydrogen atoms TDS to that of Oxygen in all sense and purposes it would become Oxygen. So this is not just limited to the extremes of the universe. This occurs all around us.

.....pretty interesting, I will need to read this again though, but it is worth understanding.

So by increasing the density (Compression of an object) say our solar system to that of a particle on another inner orbit in the universe. Our solar system would then exist at that point in space time. In normal terms in classical terms its velocity between the two locations would be many times the normal definition of light velocity. As you notice before in these terms the reaction between point (A) it original location and that of point (B) it new location on the curvature of space time is instantaneous.

-------From your comment, you could reach any point in the universe instantly as it is all around us within reaching distance, no? If you could find the point in space time in our universe which the Black hole links to, you could travel there instantly? What kind of travelling application or at the very least communication device could you use in order to travel or communicate instantly from point a to point b?

You have hit the nail on the head this, reaction is instantaneous, even the likes of Ken Olum with Olum's model. (A Simplistic representation of Casimir effect) found that in theory this reaction is instantaneous. Which seems to defy logic. again it all comes down to your to your range of observation being inside or outside of the reaction. However you have understood a this at a remarkable speed, I know of some top physicists who still struggle with what this means.

++++++++++ I did not understand that at an incredible speed (light velocity and beyond), and not from what you said. It took me years of thinking and I gathered this information from my own theory similar to yours. I am trying here to find out if you have reached the same conclusions as mine as far as applications and consequences of our theories are concerned. I have mentioned all these possible applications in the novel I have started to write, in the plan at the beginning:

Well for an example, This is based upon Quantum tunnelling experiments (Prof Gunter Nimtz)

.....You certainly did read a lot. I am ashamed to say that I never read anything. At the very least I can say that I have not been contaminated by the mainstream way of looking at the universe. I bought the Elegant Universe and the new Hawking book last year, I still did not get around to read them.

What he basically showed that if you set up two up a microwave emitter so that part of the photons are channelled towards a target and part travel through normal air. At the receiver the photons that pass through the target get there sever time faster than the photons through air.

At first there seems to be nothing odd about this, but when you consider the photons are already travelling at light velocity this means that the photons that travelled through the solid target are travelling several times faster than light. So there is a noticeable time distortion between points (A) and (B). To prove the situation was not random reaction which was the argument set against it. He encoded Mozart 40 into the signal and transmitted this at faster than light velocity. The very first man made intentional sub space transmission.

Many arguments have arisen because this violates causality etc, Causality states that as signal cannot be transmitted at faster than light velocity. Instead of admitting that causality is wrong the physics community just moved the goal posts and redefined what a signal was. Thus the transmissions made in this experiments are now known as wave packets.

Although technically I have to admit the physics community was correct to shift the goal posts, but that does not change the fact that causality is relative description and without a scale range like TDM to explain space time then causality actually has no jurisdiction in this range of physics.

Anyway lets look at this in TDM terms. In TDM the target becomes the resistance which acts as the compression on the photons. In doing so the TDS of the photons is changed so the distance they travel is on a higher density scale. Which as you know is technically faster than our scale. So they get form point (A) to point (B) faster than there counterparts who are not subject to the same resistance or shift in their TDS.

.....So it would be much easier to get the Enterprise on the other side of the galaxy than using a matter/anti-matter engine!!!

Actually the reaction is a bit more complex than that but at this stage of the explanation , it is not required to know that level of detail.

So from this we get to understand that the amplitude of the photons and the density of the target will increase this distortion in space time.

.....Which brings us to Quantum Communications and Quantum Computers. I have to say, everything I read about it was really vague. Like if the scientists working on such devices knew some weird results without being able to explain them, and eventually came up with this extraordinary and impossible story to explain the way it works.

Now remembering that Gunter Nimtz has already sent an encoded version of Mozart 40 via this process, because TDM shows us know how to increase the efficiency of the reaction. We can increase the distortion in space time, So if this signal was for an example this encoded material was the binary output of a computer processor, it would be possible to transmit digital information over vast distances instantaneously. Which allowing for time related perception would actually be many times the velocity of light.

Alternatively (This is highly dangerous) you could set up the process so that an atomic reaction causes rapid decompression of the photons. Although at first it will appear that the signal is going slower as you increase the decompression beyond the relative zero of this TDM state you will now be causing a reverse distortion in space time. Thus eventually the digital information will reach the receiver at an earlier point in time. This means that you would be receiving the output from the computer processor before it has even calculated it.

.....Sounds like anti-time...

Again this at first glance appears to violate causality, but with TDM because we can step back and see the whole picture, we see that its just a simple reaction to physical interaction of objects.

The danger is that this computer could theoretically achieve absolute knowledge in less than one Planck length (largest and smallest divisible unit of measurement in the finite universe) as the computer has the whole of space time to work with. In a sense you have just created god.

.....Very interesting. You certainly gave this a lot more thought than I did and you know much more as well. What do you think of Schrödinger uncertainty principle now?

However you don't need a black hole or a worm hole to do this, our everyday life is composed of these very reactions taking place, but because that is our normal perception of things so we can't separate ourselves from it. We look at the extremes of our perception to understand this. Which just happens to be super heavy objects such as black holes.

Btw Einstein explains a process very similar to TDM its called frame dragging. Again I can't understand why he didn't devise a way of interpreting scale interaction between frames.

.....As I was saying, I don't think that the scale idea was that far away from Einstein's mind. Like this sort of sentence: "at its scale..."

The benefit of TDM is that it shows you the results in both formats. However the 0.5C in given scale range is that which science requires. As classical physics can only deal with objects at less than light velocity. btw there are many experiments taking place all around the world concerning faster than light reactions. Ranging form photon entanglement experiments to quantum tunnelling.

.....I heard of this. And every time it appears that there is a bunch of scientists finding bugs in the way it was calculated.

+++++++ So, an interesting question here, what do you think of the missing mass or dark matter of the universe, the biggest mystery of contemporary physics? I suppose it is now gone by the window? Problem solved?

You got it! actually the arguments about dark matter have always caused me to smile. When you know that dark matter is nothing more than matter which is on the borderline of another TDM state. The conversations do sound very comical. Its bit like watching a cave man trying to create fire. Fascinating in a sort of primordial way.

..... I have to admit that it gives me pleasure to know that I have perhaps the best answer to their problem. And I admit that I did smile too, though in the back of my head, with the limited knowledge I have, I had to think that I could be wrong, especially that I was the only one who thought this way until you contacted me. I feel much better now and I will get some more confidence in my ideas. Though I do not share all of your ideas and that it would take me some time to understand everything, I am ready to bet that we are saying

the same thing but we use different ways to explain it and different words. Ultimately I think we might be picturing the universe the same way. At least I hope this is the case.

..... I suppose that what you just said about the missing mass of the universe is compatible with what I am saying: my idea was that there was no missing mass because mass is relative to our point of view or frame of reference. When you calculate the mass of an object, in reality you calculate its relative mass from your point of view, and our view of the universe is far from being the real thing. Well, I explain it better in French on my French page, but I think you understand what I mean.

The point about String theory is that it is a great mathematical concept, To use Feynman's words "Am exercise in alternative thinking". However when it comes down to real finite physical properties it is absolutely useless. However if your thing is Super String theory, TDM can easily accommodate infinite scale versions of it ;)

..... My ideas have nothing to do with superstrings. But I have to admit that the catalyst of all my ideas came after I read the book Hyper Space of Michio Kaku. I will not say that it is because of Super String, but certainly what Kaku said opened my eyes to a lot of things. I am not certain about what he said opened my eyes. Since he is doing a review oh the history of Physics, it could be anything. But I think that the idea of a different perception of space might have opened my eyes, even though I do not talk about many different dimensions. The idea of string certainly sounds great, and vibration, sound, organising matter, perfect. It even agree with the Bible and Jesus-Christ being the Verb and blowing the universe to the right diapason. But ultimately, what you see in the very large, planets, stars, must be what is at the smaller scale. It could not be strings. I remember when I went to my first day in Physics two years ago (this is when I registered to study Physics but I had to report it twice because of money). A teacher told us that there was two ways of picturing the very small. Point particle or strings, and that there was nothing beyond Planck length. I fell down my chair. I guess this shows you how far removed I am from what theoretical physicists are working on at the moment. I am quite certain there is something beyond the Planck Length, smaller particles, relatively speaking...

Actually TDM's Spherical String Shells is a compromise, actually this compromise turned out to be easier to understand than Superstring theory, but its actual interactions are considerably more complex.

++++ I am based close to Heathrow Airport, so basically in London. You are in the UK, right? And you are a professor or something, with a PhD in Physics?

Btw use to live near Reading (not that many miles from you). However I now live in Londonderry In Northern Ireland.

Professor? well that's debatable, Professor of Conceptual Physics. Means in plain English I am an Inventor or an ideas man.

+++++I am not sure if you were able to read about me on my website, but my background in Physics is very limited, I am even surprised that I can comprehend almost everything you are talking about. Sometimes some people comes back to me and they appear to be talking Chinese. I am more a philosopher and I wish I could have a better background in Physics. That is why I am registered to study Theoretical Physics at the University of London for September 2002, but since I have no money and lots of debts, I doubt very much I will be able to start. That was my story.

The point is that I have always detested the elitist approach of the physics community thus I have distanced myself as much as possible from that side of things. That is why I never bothered to take the formal qualifications to get that bit of paper which says that I can think like everybody before me. O.K obviously I have had to study and in many cases has surpassed my counterparts, but if having the full title of Professor before my name means that I must act like a puppet for the physics community. Then all I can say is that I rather be plain Mr Taggart. O.K so I don't always get recognition for my work, but if somebody actually uses it then I have done my job correctly

Regards William

Merci! Roland Michel Tremblay

-----Original Message-----
From: Thurlby Computers
Sent: 31 March 2002 07:59
To: rm@themarginal.com
Subject: Re: new questions 3

----- Original Message -----

From: rm@themarginal.com

To: 'Thurlby Computers'

Sent: Sunday, March 31, 2002 3:44 AM

Subject: RE: new questions 3

+++++++GR = gravity? SR = ? (it must be blatantly obvious, but I am blind! Scale Relativity?)

oops force of habit using those abbreviations, GR= General relativity, SR= Special relativity

.....God! I am so ashamed! Yes, it is blatantly obvious! And now it makes sense. Yeah, you are right. I cannot believe he would have missed what we have thought of. And, most puzzling, how can the rest of the scientific community can still be missing it? Thank god there is a bunch of weirdos on the net that at least realise that there is something wrong with Einstein. And I have to say that Super String theory gets closer to the truth.

Don't worry about it. It is easy to misinterpret abbreviations.

Well the only part of superstring that gets close to the truth is M-Theory and the microverses that it creates. This whole thing about 11 dimensions is absolutely pointless in other respects

Einstein continually searched for this missing link after he had to reluctantly admit that his theories predicted super heavy bodies such as black holes. Obviously his reluctance to accept such prediction from his theories was because it generated as more questions than his theories actually answered.

It was Einstein that devised the calculation based upon lambda to represent the volume of relative space time. This was so remarkably close to solving the problem. This is why I am reluctant to accept that Einstein did not understand this.

A reason why Einstein may have with held his information on Either.

The House of Cards effect.

Basically if you can manipulate an point in space time, you can set up a space time cascade. As an example, Imagine building a house of cards. Say for an example [le seven levels high, when you knock out a bottom cards the house comes tumbling down.

Now imagine a house of cards that spans several scale universes, what happens when you knock out a bottom card?

Compared to this the atomic bomb is a Childs toy. If you were to translate a single particle forma scale universe of say TDM state 10,000,000 to direct interaction in TDM state 100,000,000 then the cascade effect of the scale universes shifting to fill in the loss of matter would be vast by the time it scaled back up to our TDM state 0.

Thus the danger of the house of cards effect has to be always taken into account when considering publication.

.....Very interesting stuff. You are right, if he had understood that, he might have wanted to keep it secret. But then he would have told some people and maybe the US government knows about it and it became an X-File. Care to chase that case Mulder?

:)

.....I have to say that I am still not familiar with the way you are seeing the universe. You will really have to give me something more than just bits and bobs. So far it is impossible for me to gather where you are coming from and the whole picture. I hope you will put your website online soon or else we will run out of things to say.

Ok I will get it sorted soon. It is quite simple when you can grasp what TDM is, although its not actually that easy to grasp on the first place.

Concerning velocities, did you know that everything is travelling at its own relative light velocity? Also If you could become unistationary (stationary in the universe) everything would fly past you at C and beyond. So ever higher speeds can be obtained by standing still.

++++++++++++Mmmh, you will have to prove this to me. Nothing would go slower than C and we would all be going at C? Why?

Remember what's relative

Lets look at the scales again, the distance between each velocity represents the TDS scale range of matter at a given velocity.

This is just simple representation of a few of the TDM states and is not to scale.

TDM state -4 0----------C

TDM state -3 0----------C

TDM state -2 0----------C

TDM state -1 0----------C

TDM state 0 0--------C

TDM state 1 0----C

TDM state 2 0--C

TDM state 3 0-C

So if you imagine any given bubble of space time has a TDS (Time density signature) and this time density signature is a TDM state in its purest form. This mean that should a given object

speed up or slow down it will alter its TDS. (or absolute velocity) in doing so it becomes another TDS. The relative absolute velocity is that of light, nothing can go faster than it and still react in the same relative range. In the same manner if it slows down it becomes the absolute velocity of another lower density scale or TDS. Thus it is always at relative light velocity

However as you can see from the diagram the relative light velocity may be the same for those who in relative terms to each scale. However the actual velocities to an external observer which is the view shown in the diagram from 0 to C spans different distances and is different velocities.

So this means for an example A hydrogen atom has a different absolute velocity (relative light velocity) than that if Oxygen. If you altered the Hydrogen atoms TDS to that of Oxygen in all sense and purposes it would become Oxygen. So this is not just limited to the extremes of the universe. This occurs all around us.

.....pretty interesting, I will need to read this again though, but it is worth understanding.

So by increasing the density (Compression of an object) say our solar system to that of a particle on another inner orbit in the universe. Our solar system would then exist at that point in space time. In normal terms in classical terms its velocity between the two locations would be many times the normal definition of light velocity. As you notice before in these terms the reaction between point (A) it original location and that of point (B) it new location on the curvature of space time is instantaneous.

-------From your comment, you could reach any point in the universe instantly as it is all around us within reaching distance, no? If you could find the point in space time in our universe which the Black hole links to, you could travel there instantly? What kind of

travelling application or at the very least communication device could you use in order to travel or communicate instantly from point a to point b?

You have hit the nail on the head this, reaction is instantaneous, even the likes of Ken Olum with Olum's model. (A Simplistic representation of Casimir effect) found that in theory this reaction is instantaneous. Which seems to defy logic. again it all comes down to your to your range of observation being inside or outside of the reaction. However you have understood a this at a remarkable speed, I know of some top physicists who still struggle with what this means.

++++++++++ I did not understand that at an incredible speed (light velocity and beyond), and not from what you said. It took me years of thinking and I gathered this information from my own theory similar to yours. I am trying here to find out if you have reached the same conclusions as mine as far as applications and consequences of our theories are concerned. I have mentioned all these possible applications in the novel I have started to write, in the plan at the beginning:

Well for an example, This is based upon Quantum tunnelling experiments (Prof Gunter Nimtz)

.....You certainly did read a lot. I am ashamed to say that I never read anything. At the very least I can say that I have not been contaminated by the mainstream way of looking at the universe. I bought the Elegant Universe and the new Hawking book last year, I still did not get around to read them.

I have a copy of that, and guess what I have never read it either, was tempted to burn it after Hawking stole er I mean created the instanton. Oh well I made fool of him during his lecture at the white house. Most of the scientific community now refer to the instanton as clever sound bite. Not a real theory after I pointed out infinite versions of it could exist, and only the person who created would know that :)

What he basically showed that if you set up two up a microwave emitter so that part of the photons are channelled towards a target and part travel through normal air. At the receiver the photons that pass through the target get there sever time faster than the photons through air.

At first there seems to be nothing odd about this, but when you consider the photons are already travelling at light velocity this means that the photons that travelled through the solid target are travelling several times faster than light. So there is a noticeable time

distortion between points (A) and (B). To prove the situation was not random reaction which was the argument set against it. He encoded Mozart 40 into the signal and transmitted this at faster than light velocity. The very first man made intentional sub space transmission.

Many arguments have arisen because this violates causality etc, Causality states that as signal cannot be transmitted at faster than light velocity. Instead of admitting that causality is wrong the physics community just moved the goal posts and redefined what a signal was. Thus the transmissions made in this experiments are now known as wave packets.

Although technically I have to admit the physics community was correct to shift the goal posts, but that does not change the fact that causality is relative description and without a scale range like TDM to explain space time then causality actually has no jurisdiction in this range of physics.

Anyway lets look at this in TDM terms. In TDM the target becomes the resistance which acts as the compression on the photons. In doing so the TDS of the photons is changed so the distance they travel is on a higher density scale. Which as you know is technically faster than our scale. So they get form point (A) to point (B) faster than there counterparts who are not subject to the same resistance or shift in their TDS.

.....So it would be much easier to get the Enterprise on the other side of the galaxy than using a matter/anti-matter engine!!!

Yep the Original Star trek is loosely based upon the science of time. Star Trek TNG etc are a bit more cutting edge but they still hold onto some of the hold stuff from the old series.

Actually the reaction is a bit more complex than that but at this stage of the explanation , it is not required to know that level of detail.

So from this we get to understand that the amplitude of the photons and the density of the target will increase this distortion in space time.

.....Which brings us to Quantum Communications and Quantum Computers. I have to say, everything I read about it was really vague. Like if the scientists working on such devices knew some weird results without being able to explain them, and eventually came up with this extraordinary and impossible story to explain the way it works.

Again you have hit the nail on the head, Quantum mechanics was never designed to work outside the finite universe. Thus when you try to work on a physical property which technically is smaller than zero on your scale. The Physical properties go haywire. Everything becomes infinite, an object is suddenly all places at once. This is known as Heisenberg's Uncertainty Principle. I.E. you can never know precisely where anything is. TDM Cures this as less than zero is the same as coming back into the universe from the outside. Less than zero is almost maximum. More than Maximum is more than zero. It the old loop property but when scale is applied the loop travels in a straight line. thus it resembles normal physical properties.

Now remembering that Gunter Nimtz has already sent an encoded version of Mozart 40 via this process, because TDM shows us know how to increase the efficiency of the reaction. We can increase the distortion in space time, So if this signal was for an example this encoded material was the binary output of a computer processor, it would be possible to transmit digital information over vast distances instantaneously. Which allowing for time related perception would actually be many times the velocity of light.

Alternatively (This is highly dangerous) you could set up the process so that an atomic reaction causes rapid decompression of the photons. Although at first it will appear that the signal is going slower as you increase the decompression beyond the relative zero of this TDM state you will now be causing a reverse distortion in space time. Thus eventually the digital information will reach the receiver at an earlier point in time. This means that you would be receiving the output from the computer processor before it has even calculated it.

.....Sounds like anti-time...

As Hawking called it "times arrow", although he wasn't the person who created it he was just the first to mention it in a scientific publication. Times arrow can run in both directions,

Again this at first glance appears to violate causality, but with TDM because we can step back and see the whole picture, we see that its just a simple reaction to physical interaction of objects.

The danger is that this computer could theoretically achieve absolute knowledge in less than one Planck length (largest and smallest divisible unit of measurement in the finite universe) as the computer has the whole of space time to work with. In a sense you have just created god.

.....Very interesting. You certainly gave this a lot more thought than I did and you know much more as well. What do you think of Schrödinger uncertainty principle now?

Well in a finite universe it still works as Schrödinger intended, but in TDM enhanced universe it no longer causes contradictions as you can see the whole picture. Causality is a bit like walking around with blinkers on, you can only see what is i front of you.

However you don't need a black hole or a worm hole to do this, our everyday life is composed of these very reactions taking place, but because that is our normal perception of things so we can't separate ourselves from it. We look at the extremes of our perception to understand this. Which just happens to be super heavy objects such as black holes.

Btw Einstein explains a process very similar to TDM its called frame dragging. Again I can't understand why he didn't devise a way of interpreting scale interaction between frames.

.....As I was saying, I don't think that the scale idea was that far away from Einstein's mind. Like this sort of sentence: "at its scale..."

Maybe it wasn't Einstein in the end, is it really possible that his work has been misinterpreted since it was published? Then again we have the benefit of a completely different social background to that of people in Einstein's time so what we easily understand now would have been nigh on impossible even as little as 40 years ago.

The benefit of TDM is that it shows you the results in both formats. However the 0.5C in given scale range is that which science requires. As classical physics can only deal with objects at less than light velocity. btw there are many experiments taking place all around the world concerning faster than light reactions. Ranging form photon entanglement experiments to quantum tunnelling.

.....I heard of this. And every time it appears that there is a bunch of scientists finding bugs in the way it was calculated.

I think you are referring to the so called high velocity transmissions. I remember point out the boards at superstringtheory.com that there calculations were wrong. it was very embarrassing for the webmaster considering her husband is one of the top researchers in superstring theory. I.E. she went along with the consensus of opinion and banned me. I still can't believe that experiment got published in nature. The photon entanglement experiments however have resulted in a charge being transmitted by non subluminal means over a distance of 75 meters. Actually the guy at Swansea University are some of the pioneers in that experiment. The experiment was also verified at the Bell Laboratories in the states.

+++++++ So, an interesting question here, what do you think of the missing mass or dark matter of the universe, the biggest mystery of contemporary physics? I suppose it is now gone by the window? Problem solved?

You got it! actually the arguments about dark matter have always caused me to smile. When you know that dark matter is nothing more than matter which is on the borderline of another TDM state. The conversations do sound very comical. Its bit like watching a cave man trying to create fire. Fascinating in a sort of primordial way.

..... I have to admit that it gives me pleasure to know that I have perhaps the best answer to their problem. And I admit that I did smile too, though in the back of my head, with the limited knowledge I have, I had to think that I could be wrong, especially that I was the only one who thought this way until you contacted me. I feel much better now and I will get some more confidence in my ideas. Though I do not share all of your ideas and that it would take me some time to understand everything, I am ready to bet that we are saying the same thing but we use different ways to explain it and different words. Ultimately I think we might be picturing the universe the same way. At least I hope this is the case.

The language used doesn't really matter, fair enough I may know a bit more about the mainstream physics side, but there are plenty who are better than me, the point is that you reached similar conclusions by yourself. Just because I may have done it first doesn't change the fact that you have been able to visualise something which is a couple of millennia ahead of the competition. I warn you though, its easy us to get labelled as a cranks. Although everything we say does not meet the criteria of a crank. I.E. we are not trying to re-write the laws of physics as cranks tend to do. We are trying to address a major problem in physics in a manner which complies with the laws of physics.

..... I suppose that what you just said about the missing mass of the universe is compatible with what I am saying: my idea was that there was no missing mass because mass is relative to our point of view or frame of reference. When you calculate the mass of an object, in reality you calculate its relative mass from your point of view, and our view of the universe is far from being the real thing. Well, I explain it better in French on my French page, but I think you understand what I mean.

You are saying very similar thing, however the missing mass is matter that is needed to balance out various reactions that have occured in the finite universe, but when you realise that the gravity from another scale range supplies the pulling/pushing forces that are apparently missing, then there is no missing mass!

its bit easier to understand that way.

The point about String theory is that it is a great mathematical concept, To use Feynman's words "Am exercise in alternative thinking". However when it comes down to real finite physical properties it is absolutely useless. However if your thing is Super String theory, TDM can easily accommodate infinite scale versions of it ;)

..... My ideas have nothing to do with superstrings. But I have to admit that the catalyst of all my ideas came after I read the book Hyper Space of Michio Kaku. I will not say that it is because of Super String, but certainly what Kaku said opened my eyes to a lot of things. I am not certain about what he said opened my eyes. Since he is doing a review oh the history of Physics, it could be anything. But I think that the idea of a different perception of space might have opened my eyes, even though I do not talk about many different dimensions. The idea of string certainly sounds great, and vibration, sound, organising matter, perfect. It even agree with the Bible and Jesus-Christ being the Verb and blowing the universe to the right diapason. But ultimately, what you see in the very large, planets, stars, must be what is at the smaller scale. It could not be strings. I remember when I went to my first day in Physics two years ago (this is when I registered to study Physics but I had to report it twice because of money). A teacher told us that there was two ways of picturing the very small. Point particle or strings, and that there was nothing beyond Planck length. I fell down my chair. I guess this shows you how far removed I am from what theoretical physicists are working on at the moment. I am quite certain there is something beyond the Planck Length, smaller particles, relatively speaking...

M-Theory which is part of Superstrings attempts to address this with microverses. Currently there is an experiment being carried out in France at CERN large Hadron Accelerator. it is an attempt to detect the interference caused by micro universes, in our finite universe. It a very hit or miss thing. However if they do manage to do this, then this will be a major step forward for TDM.

But don't get me wrong strings are viable and they do reflect a realistic viewpoint of universe structure, the only problem being that we do not see the strings so it is always an abstract concept. TDM addresses this abstract view point by giving such states of matter a physical form that we understand.

Actually TDM's Spherical String Shells is a compromise, actually this compromise turned out to be easier to understand than Superstring theory, but its actual interactions are considerably more complex.

++++ I am based close to Heathrow Airport, so basically in London. You are in the UK, right? And you are a professor or something, with a PhD in Physics?

Btw use to live near Reading (not that many miles from you). However I now live in Londonderry In Northern Ireland.

Professor? well that's debatable, Professor of Conceptual Physics. Means in plain English I am an Inventor or an ideas man.

+++++I am not sure if you were able to read about me on my website, but my background in Physics is very limited, I am even surprised that I can comprehend almost everything you are talking about. Sometimes some people comes back to me and they appear to be talking Chinese. I am more a philosopher and I wish I could have a better background in Physics. That is why I am registered to study Theoretical Physics at the University of London for September 2002, but since I have no money and lots of debts, I doubt very much I will be able to start. That was my story.

The point is that I have always detested the elitist approach of the physics community thus I have distanced myself as much as possible from that side of things. That is why I never bothered to take the formal qualifications to get that bit of paper which says that I can think like everybody before me. O.K obviously I have had to study and in many cases has surpassed my counterparts, but if having the full title of Professor before my name means that I must act like a puppet for the physics community. Then all I can say is that I rather be plain Mr Taggart. O.K so I don't always get recognition for my work, but if somebody actually uses it then I have done my job correctly

Regards William

-----Original Message-----
From: rm@themarginal.com [mailto:rm@themarginal.com]
Sent: 01 April 2002 03:05
To: 'Thurlby Computers'
Subject: RE: new questions 5

Well the only part of superstring that gets close to the truth is M-Theory and the microverses that it creates. This whole thing about 11 dimensions is absolutely pointless in other respects

<<<<<< I would agree, but I have not read enough about the subject. I have a bunch of books that I need to go through and see what it could inspire me.

Ok I will get it sorted soon. It is quite simple when you can grasp what TDM is, although its not actually that easy to grasp on the first place.

<<<<<< Perhaps, but you appear to have a deal more to say about the rest of the universe than the TDM itself.

I have a copy of that, and guess what I have never read it either, was tempted to burn it after Hawking stole er I mean created the instanton. Oh well I made fool of him during his lecture at the white house. Most of the scientific community now refer to the instanton as clever sound bite. Not a real theory after I pointed out infinite versions of it could exist, and only the person who created would know that :)

<<<< You certainly have been around for quite a while and appear to be known in the scientific circles.

.....Which brings us to Quantum Communications and Quantum Computers. I have to say, everything I read about it was really vague. Like if the scientists working on such devices knew some weird results without being able to explain them, and eventually came up with this extraordinary and impossible story to explain the way it works.

Again you have hit the nail on the head, Quantum mechanics was never designed to work outside the finite universe. Thus when you try to work on a physical property which technically is smaller than zero on your scale. The Physical properties go haywire. Everything becomes infinite, an object is suddenly all places at once. This is known as Heisenberg's Uncertainty Principle. I.E you can never know precisely where anything is. TDM Cures this as less than zero is the same as coming back into the universe from the outside. Less than zero is almost maximum. More than Maximum is more than zero. It the old loop property but when scale is applied the loop travels in a straight line. thus it resembles normal physical properties.

.....Very interesting. You certainly gave this a lot more thought than I did and you know much more as well. What do you think of Schrödinger uncertainty principle now?

Well in a finite universe it still works as Schrödinger intended, but in TDM enhanced universe it no longer causes contradictions as you can see the whole picture. Causality is a bit like walking around with blinkers on, you can only see what is i front of you.

<<<<<<<<< So when this particle is suddenly at all places at once, could it be that you would see the particle as many times as it crosses the speed of light? Like 6.5C will show you 6.5 particles? Or is it really like, at all places at once. How would you explain that even with TDM?

I think you are referring to the so called high velocity transmissions. I remember point out the boards at superstringtheory.com that there calculations were wrong. it was very embarrassing for the webmaster considering her husband is one of the top researchers in superstring theory. I.E. she went along with the consensus of opinion and banned me. I still can't believe that experiment got published in nature. The photon entanglement experiments however have resulted in a charge being transmitted by non subluminal means over a distance of 75 meters. Actually the guy at Swansea University are some of the pioneers in that experiment. The experiment was also verified at the Bell Laboratories in the states.

<<<< So you sort of prove to them they miscalculated and they banned you, knowing their mistake? Or they just did not believe you.

The language used doesn't really matter, fair enough I may know a bit more about the mainstream physics side, but there are plenty who are better than me, the point is that you reached similar conclusions by yourself. Just because I may have done it first doesn't change the fact that you have been able to visualise something which is a couple of millennia ahead of the competition. I warn you though, its easy us to get labelled as a cranks. Although everything we say does not meet the criteria of a crank. I.E. we are not trying to re-write the laws of physics as cranks tend to do. We are trying to address a major problem in physics in a manner which complies with the laws of physics.

<<<<< Well, I have not confronted anyone with my ideas, and the scientists and authors I contacted at the very beginning of my ideas development tended to read it and dismissed it. I have not bothered contacting anyone after I develop my ideas much further, I let people come to me. Once in a while I receive emails and start communicating for a while, but none of these messages reached my website in a long time. So I should get rid of the whole messages already on my website, readers will think that this is what those correspondents thought of my ideas when in fact they only had a limited amount of information from before I got a bunch of great ideas. I have not been called a crank and many students in the UK have contacted me and even talked about me in some of their papers. I still don't know to this day the reaction of their teachers. So slowly my ideas are getting in the minds of certain people and they might keep an open mind and be prepared when some new breakthrough happens in science. For example, I think it is just a question of time before they have to admit that going faster than the speed of light is possible. And then, what are the equations and theories on the market today that could be used to justify this extraordinary event?

..... I suppose that what you just said about the missing mass of the universe is compatible with what I am saying: my idea was that there was no missing mass because mass is relative to our point of view or frame of reference. When you calculate the mass of an object, in reality you calculate its relative mass from your point of view, and our view of the universe is far from being the real thing. Well, I explain it better in French on my French page, but I think you understand what I mean.

You are saying very similar thing, however the missing mass is matter that is needed to balance out various reactions that have occurred in the finite universe, but when you realise that the gravity from another scale range supplies the pulling/pushing forces that are apparently missing, then there is no missing mass!

its bit easier to understand that way.

<<<<< Yes, you are right. I accounted for this as well in my theory anyway, as anything going faster than the speed of light would be impossible for us to see, therefore this is where the missing mass is.

Regards William

Merci! Roland Michel Tremblay

www.themarginal.com/relativity.htm

-----Original Message-----
From: rm@themarginal.com [mailto:rm@themarginal.com]
Sent: 01 April 2002 03:35
To: 'Thurlby Computers'
Subject: questions 6

The laughable thing is that in all these years of those persons posting insults etc. Nobody has actually come forward with a single bit of scientific evidence which disproves what TDM predicts. (Actually as I have found out over the years this task is an impossible one, as to disprove TDM would also be to Disprove the scientific predictions of General Relativity, Special Relativity, Quantum Mechanics and even Superstring Theory etc)

<<<<<<< The only thing that kept me going on my lonely path, was because not only I was convinced I was right, but nobody was able to contradict me or prove to me right there that I was wrong. And I had pretty knowledgeable people looking at my ideas. They all kind of told me that certain things I did not understand, but that ultimately it could be true like it could be false. And this is also annoying, because it does not prove I am right or wrong, just that perhaps nobody can tell. So I need to find a way to prove it, not an easy task. My problem is that I never had the time in the first place. I always worked full time with plenty of extra hours, and studying literature in parallel for most of that time, and on top of this my main priority was to work on these websites and write novel, poetry, well, that crap that is not really philosophical or about Physics. I wish I could just abandon all this and concentrate 100% of my time to pursuing my theories. And as you say, I realised that if I were to go back to university, I might waste many years learning the wrong thing. I almost have to plan myself what I want to learn by myself in order to get where I need to go.

I firmly believe TDM is not the only way to do this, it just happens to be the most viable at the moment.

On another note The Popular Publications like that of Laurent Nottale's FRACTAL SPACE-TIME AND MICROPHYSICS. Towards a Theory of Scale Relativity. Is showing that both the general public and the science community are taking the ScR approach to the universe very seriously.

<<<<< Yeah, I did not have the time yet to go and look at it. The name is telling me something though.

Then again the science community don't really have much choice as the usual rules of disproving a theory just don't seem to apply to TDM. Even Occum's razor, cuts in favour of it.

Regards

William

RM

www.themarginal.com/relativity.htm

-----Original Message-----
From: Thurlby Computers
Sent: 01 April 2002 08:18
To: rm@themarginal.com
Subject: Re: new questions 5

----- Original Message -----

From: rm@themarginal.com

To: 'Thurlby Computers'

Sent: Monday, April 01, 2002 3:05 AM

Subject: RE: new questions 5

Well the only part of superstring that gets close to the truth is M-Theory and the microverses that it creates. This whole thing about 11 dimensions is absolutely pointless in other respects

<<<<<< I would agree, but I have not read enough about the subject. I have a bunch of books that I need to go through and see what it could inspire me.

** M theory can be fascinating, it a a good testing ground for learning more advanced mathematics.

Ok I will get it sorted soon. It is quite simple when you can grasp what TDM is, although its not actually that easy to grasp on the first place.

<<<<<< Perhaps, but you appear to have a deal more to say about the rest of the universe than the TDM itself.

*** I guess I but I try not to influence other peoples opinions before they fully understand the ScR approach the universe, however in your

case you are approaching this from knowing the majority of this already (Although you may use different words to describe the same thing).

However it is important to be sure that you understand that the universe is infinite. I.E there is no real boundaries. However for us to understand we need boundaries, thus the need for the likes of TDM. Let me explain, if our senses could detect superluminal sources, the boundaries of what we define as the finite universe would be much larger. However our technology and science is based upon the limitation of light and light happens to that of the maximum velocity in our range of observation. Its only a theoretical boundary, but to us it seems like a physical brick wall because the very matter we composed of is also seemingly limited in this range of perception.

Do you get what I mean?

Physical boundaries are only creations of our perception!

In a sense TDM is a sculptor. The sculptor does not see a block of stone. He can see a work of art, but for others to see that work of art. The sculptor must carve away the stone that is obstructing their view.

I have a copy of that, and guess what I have never read it either, was tempted to burn it after Hawking stole er I mean created the instanton. Oh well I made fool of him during his lecture at the white house. Most of the scientific community now refer to the instanton as clever sound bite. Not a real theory after I pointed out infinite versions of it could exist, and only the person who created would know that :)

<<<< You certainly have been around for quite a while and appear to be known in the scientific circles.

*** Known! Infamous would probably be a better word ;)

.....Which brings us to Quantum Communications and Quantum Computers. I have to say, everything I read about it was really vague. Like if the scientists working on such devices knew some weird results without being

able to explain them, and eventually came up with this extraordinary and impossible story to explain the way it works.

Again you have hit the nail on the head, Quantum mechanics was never designed to work outside the finite universe. Thus when you try to work on a physical property which technically is smaller than zero on your scale. The Physical properties go haywire. Everything becomes infinite, an object is suddenly all places at once. This is known as Heisenberg's Uncertainty Principle. I.E you can never know precisely where anything is. TDM Cures this as less than zero is the same as coming back into the universe from the outside. Less than zero is almost maximum. More than Maximum is more than zero. It the old loop property but when scale is applied the loop travels in a straight line. thus it resembles normal physical properties.

.....Very interesting. You certainly gave this a lot more thought than I did and you know much more as well. What do you think of Schrödinger uncertainty principle now?

Well in a finite universe it still works as Schrödinger intended, but in TDM enhanced universe it no longer causes contradictions as you can see the whole picture. Causality is a bit like walking around with blinkers on, you can only see what is in front of you.

<<<<<<<<< So when this particle is suddenly at all places at once, could it be that you would see the particle as many times as it crosses the speed of light? Like 6.5C will show you 6.5 particles? Or is it really like, at all places at once. How would you explain that even with TDM?

***Well basically there is only one particle. In fact there was only ever one particle (the explanation of that comment becomes obvious as you fully understand TDM) However in TDM you can either look as any given scale as being a finite universe, which in that respect Heisenberg's uncertainty Principle comes into play in the same manner when you break the boundaries of as an example TDM state 777 in exactly the same way as it does in our current TDM state 0.

TDM however makes this approach obsolete, as TDM shows us that when you exceed the boundaries of one finite universe you will find yourself interacting in another scale version of that finite universe.

This unique property of TDM being retro-science aware in any given finite TDM state. Is the main strength of TDM, as you don't have to re-write current the laws of physics. Plus Scientist can continue to use which ever term they are most comfortable with.

Generally as a rule of thumb, if it works our finite universe, it will work in all of the infinite possible TDM states.

So if what you are working on in our current TDM state) becomes compressed so that it exceeds the smallest definable object in TDM state 0, It will become one of the largest possible objects in TDM state 1. The same applies if it is decompressed beyond that of the largest size of the finite universe it will be the smallest object in TDM state -1

I think you are referring to the so called high velocity transmissions. I remember point out the boards at superstringtheory.com that there calculations were wrong. it was very embarrassing for the webmaster considering her husband is one of the top researchers in superstring theory. I.E. she went along with the consensus of opinion and banned me. I still can't believe that experiment got published in nature. The photon entanglement experiments however have resulted in a charge being transmitted by non subluminal means over a distance of 75 meters. Actually the guy at Swansea University are some of the pioneers in that experiment. The experiment was also verified at the Bell Laboratories in the states.

<<<< So you sort of prove to them they miscalculated and they banned you, knowing their mistake? Or they just did not believe you.

*** Bit of both, most people prejudged what I was saying. I.E. that I was just another crank trying to re-write the laws of physics. Form that point on it would have mattered what I said because they were no longer listening. Those that did listen and give genuine comments were hounded out of the forums.

The laughable thing is that I am not trying to re-write the laws of physics. The likes of TDM make classical physics stronger and able to address more than could ever be imagined.

This is this scientific elitism that I spoke about before, for some reason even the amateurs in those forums try to emulate what there scientific heroes do. I think it really takes something like this to give the scientific community a good kick up the back side. 99% of discoveries catalogued in scientific history have been made by complete unknowns.

Even Einstein was just a patent clerk When he created Relativity and until he learned to speak in the same scientific language of his peers he was classed as crank.

I often wonder what would happen if he was only trying to publish now as an unknown patent clerk?

The language used doesn't really matter, fair enough I may know a bit more about the mainstream physics side, but there are plenty who are better than me, the point is that you reached similar conclusions by yourself. Just because I may have done it first doesn't change the fact that you have been able to visualise something which is a couple of millennia ahead of the competition. I warn you though, its easy us to get labelled as a cranks. Although everything we say does not meet the criteria of a crank. I.E. we are not trying to re-write the laws of physics as cranks tend to do. We are trying to address a major problem in physics in a manner which complies with the laws of physics.

<<<<< Well, I have not confronted anyone with my ideas, and the scientists and authors I contacted at the very beginning of my ideas development tended to read it and dismissed it. I have not bothered contacting anyone after I develop my ideas much further, I let people come to me. Once in a while I receive emails and start communicating for a while, but none of these messages reached my website in a long time. So I should get rid of the whole messages already on my website, readers will think that this is what those correspondents thought of my ideas when in fact they only had a limited amount of information from before I got a bunch of great ideas. I have not been called a crank and many students in the UK have contacted me and even talked about me in some of their papers. I still don't know to this day the reaction of their teachers. So slowly my ideas are getting in the minds of certain people and they might keep an open mind and be prepared when some new breakthrough happens in science. For example, I think it is just a question of time before they have to admit that going faster than the speed of light is possible. And then, what are the equations and theories on the market today that could be used to justify this extraordinary event?

..... I suppose that what you just said about the missing mass of the universe is compatible with what I am saying: my idea was that there was no missing mass because mass is relative to our point of view or frame of reference. When you calculate the mass of an object, in reality you calculate its relative mass from your point of view, and our view of the universe is far from being the real thing. Well, I explain it better in French on my French page, but I think you understand what I mean.

You are saying very similar thing, however the missing mass is matter that is needed to balance out various reactions that have occured in the finite universe, but when you realise that the gravity from another scale range supplies the pulling/pushing forces that are apparently missing, then there is no missing mass!

its bit easier to understand that way.

<<<<< Yes, you are right. I accounted for this as well in my theory anyway, as anything going faster than the speed of light would be impossible for us to see, therefore this is where the missing mass is.

***As I said we are saying the same things, but in different words.

Regards William

-----Original Message-----
From: Thurlby Computers
Sent: 01 April 2002 09:23
To: rm@themarginal.com
Subject: Re: questions 6

----- Original Message -----

From: rm@themarginal.com

To: 'Thurlby Computers'

Sent: Monday, April 01, 2002 3:35 AM

Subject: questions 6

I firmly believe TDM is not the only way to do this, it just happens to be the most viable at the moment.

On another note The Popular Publications like that of Laurent Nottale's FRACTAL SPACE-TIME AND MICROPHYSICS. Towards a Theory of Scale Relativity. Is showing that both the general public and the science community are taking the ScR approach to the universe very seriously.

<<<<< Yeah, I did not have the time yet to go and look at it. The name is telling me something though.

That book is a multi million seller, it just goes to show that you are part of something very big with what you are doing.

btw I am not saying to accept TDM just because I say so. I just thought you could benefit from having a frame work to place your ideas in to. As sort of leg up that tree of knowledge. You will find that with the right tools to work with that there are infinite discoveries to make. TDM is just one tiny step.

Its like a teardrop in an ocean of infinity.

Regards

William

-----Original Message-----
From: rm@themarginal.com [mailto:rm@themarginal.com]
Sent: 01 April 2002 16:28
To: 'Thurlby Computers'
Subject: RE: new questions 7

<<<<<< Perhaps, but you appear to have a deal more to say about the rest of the universe than the TDM itself.

*** I guess I but I try not to influence other peoples opinions before they fully understand the ScR approach the universe, however in your

case you are approaching this from knowing the majority of this already (Although you may use different words to describe the same thing).

However it is important to be sure that you understand that the universe is infinite. I.E there is no real boundaries.

!!!!!! Infinite in the sense that there is no speed limit even if we would not see the object anymore, and no infinite the other way, the infinitely small. A particle will always be divisible by something smaller. Right? And that something smaller could be larger depending on the point of view, it is only that small in a relative way, from our point of view. Right?

However for us to understand we need boundaries, thus the need for the likes of TDM. Let me explain, if our senses could detect superluminal sources, the boundaries of what we define as the finite universe would be much larger. However our technology and science is based upon the limitation of light and light happens to that of the maximum velocity in our range of observation. Its only a theoretical boundary, but to us it seems like a physical brick wall because the very matter we composed of is also seemingly limited in this range of perception.

Do you get what I mean?

Physical boundaries are only creations of our perception!

!!!!! Of course I get what you mean. I told that same thing in just about 10 different ways on my website. What I cannot understand is why is nobody else seeing it this way? Have you met anyone yet of thought that your TDM idea was right and that he or she had the same sort of ideas?

.....What do you think of Schrödinger uncertainty principle now?

Well in a finite universe it still works as Schrödinger intended, but in TDM enhanced universe it no longer causes contradictions as you can see the whole picture. Causality is a bit like walking around with blinkers on, you can only see what is in front of you.

<<<<<<<<< So when this particle is suddenly at all places at once, could it be that you would see the particle as many times as it crosses the speed of light? Like 6.5C will show you 6.5 particles? Or is it really like, at all places at once. How would you explain that even with TDM?

***Well basically there is only one particle. In fact there was only ever one particle (the explanation of that comment becomes obvious as you fully understand TDM) However in TDM you can either look as any given scale as being a finite universe, which in that respect Heisenberg's uncertainty Principle comes into play in the same manner when you break the boundaries of as an example TDM state 777 in exactly the same way as it does in our current TDM state 0.

TDM however makes this approach obsolete, as TDM shows us that when you exceed the boundaries of one finite universe you will find yourself interacting in another scale version of that finite universe.

!!!!!! Yeah.

This unique property of TDM being retro-science aware in any given finite TDM state. Is the main strength of TDM, as you dont have to re-write current the laws of physics. Plus Scientist can continue to use which ever term they are most comfortable with.

Generally as a rule of thumb, if it works our finite universe, it will work in all of the infinite possible TDM states.

So if what you are working on in our current TDM state) becomes compressed so that it exceeds the smallest definable object in TDM state 0, It will become one of the largest possible objects in TDM state 1. THe same applies if it is decompressed beyond that of the largest size of the finite universe it will be the smallest object in TDM state -1

!!!!!!!!!! Ok, but how are we going to go about distinguishing in which TDM state that particle is in? And basically, you are telling me that I am right. That the same particle, if it was going at a speed to 777 times the speed of light, would give you a result of 777 particles that are all in different TDM states.

!!!!!!!!!! Now how would you explain that a particle in a box would go through door A and B before reaching the exit? (You know that experience they do to explain Eisenberg's Incertainty principle?)

Regards William

!!!! Do you know how to prove your theories. Have you proved them already?

Well I far from being a Genius, but I do find it alarming

!!!!!!!! Alarming?

just how fast you come back with some very deep searching questions. I have known top physicists who have taken many months to get to the level of questions that you returned in your first emails. Don't sell yourself short, you do have a level of perception that is quite rare at this point in time.

!!!!!!! Thank you very much, this is very encouraging for me and I certainly need the motivation. I will have plenty more questions in the near future, when we sort of runs out of things to say in this current batch of emails. Because I will get back to my theories and try to find some other info about TDM in the forums you answered.

That book is a multi million seller, it just goes to show that you are part of something very big with what you are doing.

!!!! Really?

btw I am not saying to accept TDM just because I say so. I just thought you could benefit from having a frame work to place your ideas in to. As sort of leg up that tree of knowledge. You will find that with the right tools to work with that there are infinite discoveries to make. TDM is just one tiny step.

!!!!!! TDM sounds just perfect for my ideas. I have already caught myself using it to explain something in this email and it came naturally. I am not saying that I will keep everything you say and agree with everything you say, but I will certainly take what I agree with, like this new modified C that replaces the C in Einstein's equations. I knew this C needed to reflect its relative value, but I could not find a way to rewrite that equation. You gave me this and I need to see if it is exactly what I was looking for to readjust that C. But I think it is. I will need to go back to my ideas and add some stuff. (In the next few months!!!) And probably ask you more question to find out if you think like me on some other points.

Its like a teardrop in an ocean of infinity.

Regards

William

Regards,

Roland Michel Tremblay

www.themarginal.com/relativity.htm

-----Original Message-----
From: Thurlby Computers
Sent: 01 April 2002 20:07
To: rm@themarginal.com
Subject: Re: new questions 7

----- Original Message -----

From: rm@themarginal.com

To: 'Thurlby Computers'

Sent: Monday, April 01, 2002 4:28 PM

Subject: RE: new questions 7

<<<<<< Perhaps, but you appear to have a deal more to say about the rest of the universe than the TDM itself.

*** I guess I but I try not to influence other peoples opinions before they fully understand the ScR approach the universe, however in your

case you are approaching this from knowing the majority of this already (Although you may use different words to describe the same thing).

However it is important to be sure that you understand that the universe is infinite. I.E. there is no real boundaries.

!!!!!! Infinite in the sense that there is no speed limit even if we would not see the object anymore, and no infinite the other way, the infinitely small. A particle will always be divisible by something smaller. Right? And that something smaller could be larger depending on the point of view, it is only that small in a relative way, from our point of view. Right?

"""" To be totally honest there is no speed limits because there is no speed in the first place. Speed is the time it takes to get between two points. In a true infinity there are no two points, but as you have described it, is the manner we have to use because we need something that we are familiar with to fix our perception on.

THis is the major problem in this field of study, you always need way of tying the infinite with our finite perception. Thus as you have found out yourself it is easier to use a scale version of that finite range as an increment of measurement. SO it expand or contracts to represent infinity.

However for us to understand we need boundaries, thus the need for the likes of TDM. Let me explain, if our senses could detect superluminal sources, the boundaries of what we define as the finite universe would be much larger. However our technology and science is based upon the limitation of light and light happens to that of the maximum velocity in our range of observation. Its only a theoretical boundary, but to us it seems like a physical brick wall because the very matter we composed of is also seemingly limited in this range of perception.

Do you get what I mean?

Physical boundaries are only creations of our perception!

!!!!! Of course I get what you mean. I told that same thing in just about 10 different ways on my website. What I cannot understand is why is nobody else seeing it this way? Have you met anyone yet of thought that your TDM idea was right and that he or she had the same sort of ideas?

"""" I know you did say somewhat the same things but I had to be sure that you could fully grasp the concept of such abstract thinking. Without the likes of TDM. Such thinking can be very hard for the majority of people.

*** Known! Infamous would probably be a better word ;)

!!!! Why? Why was it necessary for you to get to that point?

"""" I guess my humour is as abstract as as my ideas! :D

.....What do you think of Schrödinger uncertainty principle now?

Well in a finite universe it still works as Schrödinger intended, but in TDM enhanced universe it no longer causes contradictions as you can see the whole picture. Causality is a bit like walking around with blinkers on, you can only see what is in front of you.

<<<<<<<<< So when this particle is suddenly at all places at once, could it be that you would see the particle as many times as it crosses the speed of light? Like 6.5C will show you 6.5 particles? Or is it really like, at all places at once. How would you explain that even with TDM?

***Well basically there is only one particle. In fact there was only ever one particle (the explanation of that comment becomes obvious as you fully understand TDM) However in TDM you can either look as any given scale as being a finite universe, which in that respect Heisenberg's uncertainty Principle comes into play in the same manner when you break the boundaries of as an example TDM state 777 in exactly the same way as it does in our current TDM state 0.

TDM however makes this approach obsolete, as TDM shows us that when you exceed the boundaries of one finite universe you will find yourself interacting in another scale version of that finite universe.

!!!!!! Yeah.

This unique property of TDM being retro-science aware in any given finite TDM state. Is the main strength of TDM, as you don't have to re-write current the laws of physics. Plus Scientist can continue to use which ever term they are most comfortable with.

Generally as a rule of thumb, if it works our finite universe, it will work in all of the infinite possible TDM states.

So if what you are working on in our current TDM state) becomes compressed so that it exceeds the smallest definable object in TDM state 0, It will become one of the largest possible objects in TDM state 1. The same applies if it is decompressed beyond that of the largest size of the finite universe it will be the smallest object in TDM state -1

!!!!!!!!!! Ok, but how are we going to go about distinguishing in which TDM state that particle is in? And basically, you are telling me that I am right. That the same particle, if it was going at a speed to 777 times the speed of light, would give you a result of 777 particles that are all in different TDM states.

Nope it would give you one object in 1 state in this case the object would interact with the scale range that is TDM state 777. or from another view point 1 object in infinite finite states. We only concern ourselves with the first result as latter is a philosophical rather than a physical one.

!!!!!!!!!! Now how would you explain that a particle in a box would go through door A and B before reaching the exit? (You know that experience they do to explain Eisenberg's Uncertainty principle?)

""""""Again this comes down to if you are looking at it with blinkers on, classical physics on it own is finite, thus it can only return finite values. Which means that (A) connects to (B) and so onto the exit. However when you have infinite finite scales to work with the particle could go through door (A) exit at a door (Z) enter a door (H) exit a door (D) before entering door (B) then exiting door (C) before exiting the box.

Do you see that what is normally describe is only a small part of what is occurring.

---

btw I am not saying to accept TDM just because I say so or because I have invented a few rather odd things. I just thought you could benefit from having a frame work to place your ideas in to. As sort of leg up that tree of knowledge. You will find that with the right tools to work with that there are infinite discoveries to make. TDM is just one tiny step.

!!!!!! TDM sounds just perfect for my ideas. I have already caught myself using it to explain something in this email and it came naturally. I am not saying that I will keep everything you say and agree with everything you say, but I will certainly take what I agree with, like this new modified C that replaces the C in Einstein's equations. I knew this C needed to reflect its relative value, but I could not find a way to rewrite that equation. You gave me this and I need to see if it is exactly what I was looking for to readjust that C. But I think it is. I will need to go back to my ideas and add some stuff. (In the next few months!!!) And probably ask you more question to find out if you think like me on some other points.

""" In a sense if you use the modified C or the pseudo superluminal velocity representation, then you are using the rest, because the rest shows you how to get that value in the first place, but as I said before this is just a tool. The real discoveries are out there and as it shows us there are infinite discoveries to be made.

Regards

William

-----Original Message-----
From: rm@themarginal.com [mailto:rm@themarginal.com]
Sent: 01 April 2002 22:06
To: 'Thurlby Computers'
Subject: RE: new questions 8

"""" To be totally honest there is no speed limits because there is no speed in the first place. Speed is the time it takes to get between two points. In a true infinity there are no two points, but as you have described it, is the manner we have to use because we need something that we are familiar with to fix our perception on.

«««« This was one of my first finding when I started to think about all this, there is no speed and no distance. Everybody freaked out! I was wasting more time trying to explain those statements than trying to explain my main ideas. So you can read at the beginning of my description of my ideas that I decided to keep using these terms but I defined them better and talk about new definitions of those terms.

This is the major problem in this field of study, you always need way of tying the infinite with our finite perception. Thus as you have found out yourself it is easier to use a scale version of that finite range as an increment of measurement. So it expands or contracts to represent infinity.

I know you did say somewhat the same things but I had to be sure that you could fully grasp the concept of such abstract thinking. Without the likes of TDM. Such thinking can be very hard for the majority of people.

**Well basically there is only one particle. In fact there was only ever one particle (the explanation of that comment becomes obvious as you fully understand TDM) However in TDM you can either look as any given scale as being a finite universe, which in that respect Heisenberg's uncertainty Principle comes into play in the same manner when you break the boundaries of as an example TDM state 777 in exactly the same way as it does in our current TDM state 0.

!!!!!!!!!! Ok, but how are we going to go about distinguishing in which TDM state that particle is in? And basically, you are telling me that I am right. That the same particle, if it was going at a speed to 777 times the speed of light, would give you a result of 777 particles that are all in different TDM states.

Nope it would give you one object in 1 state in this case the object would interact with the scale range that is TDM state 777. or from another view point 1 object in infinite finite states. We only concern ourselves with the first result as latter is a philosophical rather than a physical one.

«««««« Yeah, I understand that, but it would explain why at the moment we appear to see the particle 777 times when there is only one...

!!!!!!!!!! Now how would you explain that a particle in a box would go through door A and B before reaching the exit? (You know that experience they do to explain Eisenberg's Uncertainty principle?)

""""Again this comes down to if you are looking at it with blinkers on, classical physics on it own is finite, thus it can only return finite values. Which means that (A) connects to (B) and so onto the exit. However when you have infinite finite scales to work with the particle could go through door (A) exit at a door (Z) enter a door (H) exit a door (D) before entering door (B) then exiting door (C) before exiting the box.

«««««« Of course. Nothing is really linear.

> """" Yes really! Amazon.com even promotes One of Hawking's books "The Universe in a nutshell" as a good companion to Laurent Nottale's **Fractal Space-Time and Microphysics : Towards a Theory of Scale Relativity**
>
> ««««« The Universe in a Nutshell is the book I bought before Christmas. I even bought a copy to my sister. (Sorry, I know how much you like Hawking!!!)
>
> """" In a sense if you use the modified C or the pseudo superluminal velocity representation, then you are using the rest, because the rest shows you how to get that value in the first place, but as I said before this is just a tool. The real discoveries are out there and as it shows us there are infinite discoveries to be made.
>
> «««««««««« Yeah, I am aware of that, this is why I am writing a Sci-Fi novel, it is to find out all the possible applications and push this further on a theoretical level.
>
> Regards

William

Roland Michel Tremblay

www.themarginal.com/relativity.htm

-----Original Message-----
From: Thurlby Computers
Sent: 01 April 2002 23:14
To: rm@themarginal.com
Subject: Re: new questions 8

----- Original Message -----

From: rm@themarginal.com

To: 'Thurlby Computers'

Sent: Monday, April 01, 2002 10:06 PM

Subject: RE: new questions 8

"""" To be totally honest there is no speed limits because there is no speed in the first place. Speed is the time it takes to get between two points. In a true infinity there are no two points, but as you have described it, is the manner we have to use because we need something that we are familiar with to fix our perception on.

«««« This was one of my first finding when I started to think about all this, there is no speed and no distance. Everybody freaked out! I was wasting more time trying to explain those statements than trying to explain my main ideas. So you can read at the beginning of my description of my ideas that I decided to keep using these terms but I defined them better and talk about new definitions of those terms.

$$$$$ It is seriously difficult to describe something when you don't have something to base it upon. Thus I came to the same conclusion and I guess that was how TDM was born.

***Well basically there is only one particle. In fact there was only ever one particle (the explanation of that comment becomes obvious as you fully understand TDM) However in TDM you can either look as any given scale as being a finite universe, which in that respect Heisenberg's uncertainty Principle comes into play in the same manner when you break the boundaries of as an example TDM state 777 in exactly the same way as it does in our current TDM state 0.

!!!!!!!!!! Ok, but how are we going to go about distinguishing in which TDM state that particle is in? And basically, you are telling me that I am right. That the same particle, if it was going at a speed to 777 times the speed of light, would give you a result of 777 particles that are all in different TDM states.

Nope it would give you one object in 1 state in this case the object would interact with the scale range that is TDM state 777. or from another view point 1 object in infinite finite states. We only concern ourselves with the first result as latter is a philosophical rather than a physical one.

«««««« Yeah, I understand that, but it would explain why at the moment we appear to see the particle 777 times when there is only one...

We don't see it at all unless we are relative to it. (A distortion in space time can also make us relative. it just acts like a physical telescope) however as I said there is only 1 particle in a scale range numbered as TDM 777. Not 777 particles in one range.

!!!!!!!!!! Now how would you explain that a particle in a box would go through door A and B before reaching the exit? (You know that experience they do to explain Eisenberg's Uncertainty principle?)

Return to my theories: www.themarginal.com/relativity.htm

My novel: www.themarginal.com/universe.htm