

Verifying Evidence for the Predictions of The Special Theory of Reality

Robert F. Beck (in absentia)

Einstein's Revolution, 17 Larchwood Road, Woking, UK, GU21 8XB

e-mail: robert.beck@ntlworld.com

The Special Theory of Reality was formulated from October 2003 on and first published in e-book (2004) and paperback (2005) form towards the end of 2004 and early 2005. In shortened form it was submitted to and considered by the NPA in 2006, with mass, general relativity, gravity and anti-gravity explored further in an NPA paper of 2007. The 2006 paper was very long because it covered a very wide range of phenomena (too long for inclusion in paper form in the proceedings) and contained a long and diverse list of predictions, some supported by experimental, observational and other evidence. This paper summarizes all such evidence gathered to date, firstly as set out in the 2007 paper, with clarifications. The work of over 40 others is now cited.

1. Introduction

The Special Theory of Reality stems from thought experiments that logically demonstrate that the most fundamental component of mass in the tiniest possible of elementary particles is dependent on their spin. Assuming then that a more logical interpretation of general relativity may be that mass (spin) results in curvature of motion rather than curvature of space, a theory of larger particle structure was developed on the implication that mass generated by spin results in curvature of motion in the plane of spin, whereas motion along the axis of spin is facilitated by a corresponding reduction of mass in that direction, with the tendency then towards Newton's straight line motion. Almost immediately, many answers seemed to be offered by this approach, which grew as I delved into the 20th century development of physics, particularly de Broglie's contribution. Most significantly, answers became apparent for the very nature of both quantum mechanics and string theory. Also, curvature of motion of the tiniest particle dependent on total energy present (spin and translation) is quantum general relativity. Thus this simple idea appears to have the potential to unify the three most prominent ideas of 20th century physics.

Relevant Information about the Author

Having no formal training or academic position other than two years of an engineering degree course up to 1965, with only private study of relativity up to that date, the author's position in physics is highly unusual. Only after 'revelations' starting on October 3rd 2003 did the new interpretation of relativity come. An ancillary question raised (and possibly answered) by this paper is whether information can be received by the mind other than via the normal processes of study, which the reader is asked to consider by objectively considering all the evidence here presented without preconception about higher than human intelligence. Apart from the implication of the volume and diversity of verifying evidence, the reader is asked to consider questions such as how I was able to predict straight away on reading of the apparent ability of blobs of plasma gas to 'communicate, replicate and

grow' (Xmas 2003 New Scientist [2]), that this would be via the exchange of encoded helices, whereas as noted below, others did not come to exactly the same conclusion (even verifying my explanation of helical interaction to explain forces) until 2007.

The reader is also requested to bear in mind that the author's access to papers and journals is limited, and that my work covers areas, the history of which is littered by attempts to stop the spread of knowledge. For instance the late Dr. Bruce E. DePalma wrote an open letter [1] saying that his life had been threatened and that he would be kidnapped if he tried to leave the US, and that some of his work had been confiscated. Despite these difficulties, the open minded observer should find the volume of verifying evidence I provide below, covering many areas of physics, impressive.

Predictions of the Special Theory of Reality for which verifying evidence is presented

1. The de Broglie component of light is a helical spiral of spinning and orbiting particles.
2. Gravity is a real force that can be disrupted.
3. Mass derives from spin; mass thus increases in the plane of spin and decreases in the axis of spin.
4. Angular and linear or orbital momentum are interchangeable.
5. Planets spiral out from the sun, decreasing their rate of spin, and expand.
6. There is an anti-gravity frequency that can be passed on by the human nervous system.
7. Rotation can produce anti-gravity effects in respect of non-local gravitational fields.
8. Neutrinos have helicity, and mass dependent upon spin.
9. Stars form from material ejected by black holes.
10. Planets form from material ejected by stars and slowly spiral out.
11. As a general rule, moons form from material ejected from planets and spiral out.
12. The Universe is rotating.
13. Background radiation emanates from black holes.

14. Galaxies follow a curved path in their plane of spin as an explanation for the rotating universe.
15. Photons can split and recombine as an explanation for double slit experiments because they are comprised of large numbers of very tiny particles which orbit as they spin.
16. Light travelling only at constant speed relative to all observers is an illusion resulting from frequency changing with relative velocity. Individual photons will be found to travel at speeds faster or slower than c .
17. The observed ability of blobs of plasma gas to apparently "communicate, replicate and grow" [2], will be shown to be via the exchange of encoded helices.
18. Electro-magnetic forces operate via the interaction of helices of tiny solid particles.
19. Light and other radiations can encode massive amounts of information.
20. Spirals of tiny particles could explain telepathy and other effects usually referred to as 'paranormal'.

Predictions 1 & 2 (Light & Gravity)

Extracts below are from my 2007 paper [3], except where noted. Section 3.1 of that paper provided experimental confirmations of my interpretation of light and gravity as follows:

"In **The Special Theory of Reality** [4], I referred to experiments by Alois Mair in 2001 [5], confirming that the orbital angular momentum shown by Les Allen in 1992 [6] to apply to twisted light, resided in individual photons [7], verifying my interpretation of the de Broglie component as orbiting particles moving at right angles to the plane of spin and orbit. I also referred to the experiments of Maurice Allais on the gravitational effects of eclipses in the 1950s, repeated by others, that suggest gravity to be a real force that can be blocked" [8-9].

Also involved in this confirmation by Alois Mair was Anton Zeilinger's group at the University of Vienna, who created entangled pairs of twisted photons and showed that the twist resides in each photon. A twisted photon appears to travel along a helical path, subject to the fact that its position at any point can only be inferred as a matter of probability in quantum mechanics, giving a spread out quantum wave function similar to that of non-twisted light. My theory explains both the questions of probability and the spread out wave in terms of random contacts of my particles spinning in the same direction, which then have random variations in orbit size giving the spread out wave. And this explains the many frequencies of vibration in string theory, because energies of spin are exchanged in every random contact. Clearly, my rings are the loops of string theory.

The 'others' mentioned regarding the gravitational effects of eclipses were stated in the New Scientist article [8] to be "Three Romanian scientists (no names given), during an eclipse of 1961. Then in 1970 Erwin Saxl and Mildred Allen (USA) repeated the experiment and concluded that "gravitational theory needs to be modified" [9]. They even recorded a weak effect with their torsion pendulum during a lunar eclipse. Allais had previously found that the rate of rotation increased and decreased in the

course of a day, highly indicative of my conclusion that gravitational fields are interdependent, as argued in my 2006 paper [10].

Predictions 3 & 4 (Mass is Spin; Angular and Linear or orbital Momentum are Interchangeable)

Section 3.2 of the 2007 paper [3] explained experiments of the late Professor Eric Laithwaite. I referred to the 1974/5 Royal Institution Christmas lectures. These included his work with linear motors and one of the lectures included his amazing demonstrations with gyroscopes. Videos of the demonstrations can be found at [11]. This site also contains a link to an extract from his book, *Engineer Through the Looking Glass 8* [12] that contains drawings and explanations.

I devote much space to this in my second paper including diagrams which need to be seen and understood via my explanations, which then lead to the only reasonable conclusions, that mass is decreased along the axis of spin and that changes in the orbital speed of the suspended gyro can only be explained via changes in spin rate. [11]

Section 3.3 of the 2007 paper [3] covered the experiments of the late Dr. Bruce DePalma and others with spinning balls and gyros as follows:

"Details (as far as they appear to be available) of the experiments of Dr. DePalma and others with spinning balls and gyros are included in appendices 1 & 2 (see long version of this (2007) paper at [10]). I have included the gyro drop experiment first because there is a reasonable description of the apparatus and methodology, and the results are clearly displayed and analysed. Unfortunately this is not the case (as far as I have been able to ascertain so far) in respect of the spinning ball experiments. The general results only are stated and analysed by DePalma in Appendix 2. In the case of the gyro drop experiment, it is clear that the direction of motion is along the axis of spin, and the results appear to confirm that a spinning gyro falls (accelerates) faster than the same gyro with no spin. The analysis of the results suggested that the increased acceleration was equivalent to a "fictitious" force increase of 0.024 lb in the 7.23 lb weight of the non-spinning gyro. In my view, however, the acceleration was not caused by an increase in the weight of the gyro, but rather by a decrease in its inertial mass along the axis of spin, as also suggested by the experiments of Professor Laithwaite. This corresponds to an increase in inertial mass in the plane of spin."

Although the experiments of Dr. DePalma and others with spinning balls are not entirely clear, the fact that he concludes that balls with spin have trajectories in which the spinning ball goes higher and falls faster than the non-spinning control, implies the same reduction in inertial mass, provided that we can assume that the balls were spinning in a plane at right angles to the path of motion in which the plane of spin faces forwards. The inertial effects of spin also appear to be confirmed by the following quote of DePalma included in my Appendix 2 [10] (2007 paper [3]):

“If a rotating object is collided with an identical non-rotating one the non-rotating object is rebounded a greater distance than it would have travelled had it been struck with the same identical object non-rotating. A rotating object struck by an identical non-rotating control rebounds less than it would had it not been rotating.”

Prediction 5 (Planets Spiral Out)

In Section 3.3 of the 2007 paper [3] I provided evidence to suggest that planets do indeed spiral out as suggested in these gyroscope experiments, by losing energy of spin. Russian *Izvestia Nauki* states: [13]

“According to estimates by Prof. Sergei Novikov, the day grows longer by 0.0023 seconds every one hundred years. As a result, the distance between Earth and Sun grows by 22.6 m per year. The estimates are based on data provided by high-precision lasers used for monitoring space satellites.

A reconstruction indicates that Earth was revolving like crazy some 3 billion years ago. One day comprised 19 hours back then; it is expected to equal 25 hours in 100 million years.”

The same report claims that the radius of the Earth is increasing by 1mm per year, which accords in principle with my theory of interdependent gravitational fields, though the reasons suggested are different.

Predictions 6 & 7 (Anti-gravity in Local & Non-local Fields)

Section 3.4 of the 2007 paper [3] contained observational evidence of a quasi-scientific nature. Under this heading I provided a vast amount of information, which individually can only be described as anecdotal, but via the consistency that I demonstrate, I suggest that it is reasonable to ascribe to this evidence, in total, a high degree of probability that anti-gravity technology has existed on this planet, certainly for over a hundred years, and probably for thousands of years, with evidence confirming or implying the likely validity of my predictions 6 & 7.

Prediction 8 (Helicity and mass of Neutrinos)

I predicted that neutrinos have helicity before knowing that this was accepted theory – see any current particle physics textbook* (which my theory further explains), and that neutrinos can have mass (variable) before this was confirmed (I do not have references for the latter but this is very well known). *E.g. see Burcham and Jobes [14].

Predictions 9-11 (Black Holes, Planets and Moons)

Predictions 9, 10 & 11 are included in my first paper (2006), [10]. Prediction 9 (stars forming from material ejected by black holes) has been observed twice very recently. [15-16]

The evidence for the Earth spiralling out as contained in my second paper, is given above. As is now well known, it was sub-

sequently confirmed that Mars once had oceans, which is consistent with it having spiralled out.

When I made prediction 11 I did not know that at about the time of Einstein's death it was reported that Jupiter periodically becomes unstable and loses material. More recently moons have been observed forming in Saturn's rings. Carolyn Porco, of the Space Science Institute in Boulder, Colo., and her colleagues suspected these peculiar moons could be formed mostly from Saturn's rings; findings which are detailed in the Dec. 6 2007 issue of *Science* [17].

Evidence of our moon spiralling out, as provided in my 2006 paper [10] is that lunar laser ranging, carried out since reflectors were placed on the Moon during the first Moon landing give many, highly accurate measurements indicating that since 1969 the lunar distance has been increasing by an average of 3.8 cm each year. Whilst this time period is reasonable in terms of experimentation generally, it has to be remembered that it is very short indeed in the time-scale of Earth/Moon existence. There is, however, one further observation that gives at least some indication that increasing lunar distance could be a long term phenomenon. In the second century AD Ptolemy refined the previous calculation of Hipparchus of Nicea (190-120 BC) to give a lunar distance of about 376,000 km, which although thought to be an underestimate, suggests that the current very accurately known figure of 384,403 km (mean) may well have increased over this very much longer period.

Predictions 12-14 (Rotating Universe, Background Radiation, Galaxies)

This was the evidence provided in my first (2006) paper [10]:

NASA's Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy probe revealed a surplus of microwaves coming from the galaxy's centre [18]. Apparently these microwaves are typical of those generated when high energy electrons and positrons spiral around magnetic fields, which immediately made me think of Stephen Hawking's description of supermassive black holes at the centre of galaxies [19]. Possible evidence of a rotating universe was provided by Joao Magueijo and Kate Land at Imperial College, London, early in 2005 when they identified an alignment in aspects of background radiation detected by WMAP. [20] (See also p.35 of New Scientist article by Marcus Chown, “End of the beginning” 2 July 2005 p.30-35) [21]

I have, since writing my first paper, been made aware of a study that shows axes of galaxies aligned to Magueijo and Land's “Axis of Evil”, which is entirely consistent with my prediction that bodies with spin follow a curved path in the plane of spin [22], and that at least two other recent studies also indicate an axis in the universe. Damien Hutsemékers of the University of Liège in Belgium analyzed the polarization of light from 355 quasars and found that as the quasars get near the axis, the polarization becomes more ordered than expected [23]. A study of 1997, and several other studies dating back to 1946 have indicated an axis, as mentioned in [24]. Unfortunately, no references are included, but discussion of the work of G. Gamow (1946) & K. Gödel (1949) is helpful.

Prediction 15 (Photons Split & Recombine)

There is a computer simulation indicating that spinning particles, with spin in the same direction, giving orbits dependent on rate of spin, could well be a feasible solution. In the computer simulation of a flock of birds it was found that realism could be achieved by applying just two components: a tendency for 'birds' to maintain some degree of separation, and a tendency to return to the flock. If particles spin in the same direction, they bounce off each other, thus satisfying the first requirement. Because they orbit, the second requirement is met. And it was found that the simulated flock, on encountering an obstacle, would split into two flocks and recombine into one flock after the obstacle [25].

Prediction 16 (Speed of Light and Photons)

Experiments have confirmed that photons can indeed travel at speeds both faster and slower than c , though the former is called "quantum tunnelling" in an apparent attempt to avoid contradicting special relativity. I will have to add references when I can find them again (New Scientist articles in recent years). Most physicists should be well aware of such experiments.

Predictions 17 & 18 (Communicating Plasma & Forces)

In my opening remarks I made the point that I was able to predict straight away on reading of the apparent ability of blobs of plasma gas to 'communicate, replicate and grow' (Xmas 2003 New Scientist [2]), that this would be via the exchange of encoded helices, whereas as indicated below, others did not come to exactly the same conclusion (even verifying my explanation of helical interaction to explain forces) until 2007. To demonstrate that four physicists from four academic institutions in three countries agree exactly with my prediction made three and a half years earlier, I include the following abstract and list of authors from a paper of August 2007: "**From plasma crystals and helical structures towards inorganic living matter**" [26] (note in particular my red highlighting):

"Complex plasmas may naturally self-organize themselves into stable **interacting helical structures that exhibit features normally attributed to organic living matter**. The self-organization is based on non-trivial physical mechanisms of plasma interactions involving over-screening of plasma polarization. As a result, **each helical string composed of solid microparticles** is topologically and dynamically controlled by plasma fluxes leading to particle charging and over-screening, the latter **providing attraction even among helical strings of the same charge sign**. These interacting complex structures exhibit thermodynamic and evolutionary features thought to be peculiar only to living matter such as bifurcations that serve as 'memory marks', self-duplication, metabolic rates in a thermodynamically open system, and non-Hamiltonian dynamics. We examine the salient features of this new complex 'state of soft matter' in light of the autonomy, evolution, progeny and autopoiesis principles used to define life. It is con-

cluded that complex self-organized plasma structures exhibit all the necessary properties to qualify them as candidates for inorganic living matter that may exist in space provided certain conditions allow them to evolve naturally."

"From plasma crystals and helical structures towards inorganic living matter"

V N Tsyтовich^{1,5}, G E Morfill², V E Fortov³, N G Gusein-Zade¹, B A Klumov² and S V Vladimirov⁴

1. General Physics Institute, Russian Academy of Science, Vavilova str. 38, Moscow, 119991, Russia
2. Max-Planck-Institut für Extraterrestrische Physik, 85740 Garching, Germany
3. Institute of Physics of Extremal State of Matter, Russian Academy of Science, Moscow, Russia
4. School of Physics, The University of Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia
5. Author to whom any correspondence should be addressed.

Prediction 19 (Encoding of Massive Amounts of Information)

In 2007 I found very dramatic confirmation of this in learning of the work of Dr. Peter Gariaev and his team with laser light and DNA [27]. Frog DNA was apparently changed to salamander DNA simply by passing low energy laser light from the latter and on to the former. Also demonstrated was the 'phantom DNA' effect [28], which appears to be related to the 'twisted light' effect, further adding weight to my explanation of why spiral motion is 'natural' as provided in my 2007 paper [3].

See also New Scientist 15 January 2011, p8. Nobel prizewinner Luc Montagnier has also provided evidence of the 'teleportation' of DNA. Scepticism is expressed in the article, particularly because Montagnier claims water acquires an imprint of the DNA structure. But it has to be remembered that huge financial interests are threatened by scientific evidence in favour of homeopathy. The truth is that there is now massive evidence from scientists and researchers around the world confirming the structure and memory of water. See 'Water' in the website provided at [10] for a summary of this work by the following list of scientists and researchers:

Prof. Rustum Roy	University of Pennsylvania
Dr. Kurt Wutherich	Nobel Prize winner
Prof. Martin Chapman	South Bank University, UK
Dr. Alexander Solodilov	Russian Academy of Natural Science
Prof. Vladimir Voeikov	Moscow State University
Dr. Masaro Emoto	Researcher, Japan
Allois Gruber	Researcher, Austria
Leonid Izvekov	Water Structure Research, Russia
Prof. Victor Inyushin	Kazakhstan University
Dr. Perl Laperla	Medical doctor, USA
Ogun Bolson	Doctor, Tibet
Vlail Kaznacheev	Medical Academy, Novosibirsk
Prof. Vyacheslav Zvonnikov,	Medical doctor
Prof. Konstantin Korothov,	Russian Academy of Sciences
Prof. Effe Chow,	Executive Council on Alternative Medicine
Prof. Gerbert Klima,	Institute of Nuclear Physics, Vienna
Dr. Wang Guikua,	Academy of Agronomical Science, China

In addition, I published an article [29], which included the following highly significant experimental confirmation :

“Recent work at the SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory and several universities in Sweden and Japan, however, is shedding new light on water's molecular idiosyncrasies and offering insight into its strange bulk properties [30].

Recently, Nilsson and colleagues directed powerful X-rays, generated by the Stanford Synchrotron Radiation Lightsource at SLAC and the SPring-8 synchrotron facility in Japan, at samples of liquid water. These experiments suggested that the textbook model of water at ambient conditions is incorrect and that, unexpectedly, two distinct structures, either very disordered or very tetrahedral, exist no matter what the temperature.

In a paper scheduled for publication in the *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, the researchers reveal the additional discovery that the two types of structure are spatially separated, with the tetrahedral structures existing in "clumps" made of up to about 100 molecules surrounded by disordered regions; the liquid is a fluctuating mix of the two structures at temperatures ranging from ambient to all the way up near the boiling point. As the temperature of water increases, fewer and fewer of these clumps exist; but they are always there, in clumps of a similar size. The researchers also discovered that the disordered regions themselves become more disordered as temperatures rise.

“One can visualize this as a crowded dance restaurant, with some people sitting at large tables, taking up quite a bit of room - like the tetrahedral component in water - and other people on the dance floor, standing close together and moving slower or faster depending on the mood or 'temperature' of the restaurant; like the molecules in the disordered regions can be excited by heat, the dancers can be excited and move faster with the music," Nilsson said. "There's an exchange when people sitting decide to get up to dance and other dancers sit down to rest. When the dance floor really gets busy, tables can also be moved out of the way to allow for more dancers, and when things cool back off, more tables can be brought in.”

It should be noted that the quote of Nilsson is very close to that previously offered by the Prof. Martin Chapman in the above list, as provided in the summary on my website. I offer further opinion as to the mechanism involved in that summary.

Note also that I have also heard that Dr. Tszyan Kanchzhen of China has demonstrated that chicken's eggs can be modified by waves encoded with duck DNA. Of 500 eggs so treated:

- 480 hatched
- 80% had flat, duck shaped heads
- 90% had a shift in the position of the eye
- 25% had some webbing between the toes

This is only hearsay so far (for me), but bearing in mind the work of both Gariaev and Montagnier, I fully expect others to produce further evidence of these effects.

Prediction 20 (Telepathy and Other 'Paranormal' Effects)

From my summary of work done on water note: “We have carried out many experiments on the effect that quite diverse factors have on water: magnetic fields, electrical fields, various objects including human presence, including emotions. It became clear that positive and negative human emotions are the strongest element of influence.” Professor Konstantin Korothov. The work of most of those in the long list of people from my summary can be seen to provide support for such statement from many areas of research. Thus it is suggested that 'paranormal' may be 'normal' at an unrealized scale, because it is clear that the amount of information that can be encoded in light, fields and other radiations implies a mechanism based on something smaller than indivisible photons.

Conclusion

The extent and diversity of both these predictions and the verifying evidence, covering work done by so many others, suggests very strongly that curvature of motion with spin may be more accurate than curvature of space with mass, which I have heard that Einstein went along with rather than being satisfied that this was an entirely appropriate description.

My work includes many other predictions, on the structure of most hypothesized particles for instance (including most recently, the Higgs boson as my rings from which all 'particles', including force carrying, and radiations are made). Experimental confirmations of these predictions will be difficult without adequate notice being taken of much of the information I provide above, especially the polarity of mass. But as the past seven years of continually finding verifications suggests, I expect the list to continue to grow.

Acknowledgements

This work may not have been achieved without the encouragement of Bob Fritzius and Greg Volk and especially the help of the latter, but most of all the help and knowledge of my Daughter Cara Beck. I also wish to pay tribute to the work of far too many scientists, past and present, to mention individually here, that have played a vital role in building up a picture of reality that I hope to have made clearer. But to God be the greatest glory, from whom my understanding, and surely the understanding of many of these others, has come.

References

- [1] Bruce DePalma, “Open Letter”, *Space Energy Association Newsletter* 3 (3) (Oct-Nov 1992), <http://www.padrak.com/ine/INE19.html>.
- [2] New Scientist staff “Best bits of 2003”, *New Scientist*, p. 23 (Xmas 2003).
- [3] Robert F. Beck, “A Heuristic Paper on the Nature of Mass”, *Proceedings of the NPA* 4 (1): 2-15 (2007).
- [4] Robert F. Beck, **The Special Theory of Reality** (Einstein's Revolution, 2004/5), e-book and paperback.
- [5] Alois Mair, Anton Zeilinger et al *Nature* 412: 313 (2001).
- [6] Les Allen et al, *Phys. Rev. A* 45 8185 (1992).

- [7] Stephen Battersby, "Twisting the Light Away", *New Scientist*, **182** (2451): 36-40 (12 Jun 2004). See esp. "The quantum angle" p.40
- [8] Govert Schilling, "Shadow Over Gravity", *New Scientist* **184** (2475): 28-31 (27 Nov 2004).
- [9] Erwin Saxl & Mildred Allen, *Physical Review D* **3**: 823 (1970).
- [10] Robert F. Beck, www.einsteins-revolution.com, "Theories".
- [11] Eric Laithwaite, "The Jabberwock", *The Royal Institution's 1974-75 Christmas Lecture*, <http://www.gyroscopes.org/1974lecture.asp>.
- [12] Eric Laithwaite, **Engineer Through the Looking Glass** (English Universities Press, 1980).
- [13] Sergei Novikov, "Swollen Earth may reach Sun's temperatures and turn into gigantic H-bomb" (2007), <http://english.pravda.ru/science/earth/87745-0/>.
- [14] W. E. Burcham & M. Jobes, **Nuclear and Particle Physics**, p. 162 (Longman Publishing, 1995).
- [15] World Science staff, "Do black holes zap galaxies into existence?" http://www.world-science.net/othernews/091201_galaxy (2009).
- [16] World Science staff, "Explosion shutting down a galactic party: physicists", http://www.world-science.net/othernews/110223_blackhole (2011).
- [17] Charles Choi, "'Flying Saucers' Around Saturn Explained", <http://www.space.com/4711-flying-saucers-saturn-explained.html> (2007)
- [18] Marcus Chown, "Milky Way's Radiation Shows up Dark Centre", *New Scientist*, p. 11 (16 Oct 2004).
- [19] Stephen Hawking, **The Illustrated Brief History of Time, Updated and Expanded Edition**, p. 125 (Bantam, 1996).
- [20] Land & Magueijo, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**: 171301 (2005)
- [21] Marcus Chown, "End of the Beginning", *New Scientist* 30-35 (2 July 2005).
- [22] Claire Bowles, "'Axis of evil' a cause for cosmic concern", http://www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/2007-04/ns-oe041107.php(2010)
- [23] Michael J. Longo, "Does the Universe Have a Handedness?", *arXiv* <http://arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/0703325> (2007).
- [24] "Trumpet Universe and Ascension to the Light", <http://www.trumpetuniverse.net/universalaxis.html>.
- [25] "The Science of Special Effects", Discovery Science documentary first seen by me early in 2004 minutes after typing prediction 15.
- [26] V. N. Tsytovich et al, *New Journal of Physics* **9**: 263 (Aug 2007) doi: [10.1088/1367-2630/9/8/263](https://doi.org/10.1088/1367-2630/9/8/263), <http://science.howstuffworks.com/framed.htm?parent=weird-life.htm&url=http://www.iop.org/EJ/abstract/1367-2630/9/8/263>.
- [27] Peter Gariaev, DNA encoding in laser light Garjajev P. P. Der wellengenetische Code. 1997, ISBN 5-7816-0022-1 (in Russian.) See "Quantum Phenomena in Biology"<http://twm.co.nz/quant-biology.htm#DNA> for English summary
- [28] Vladimir Poponin, "The DNA Phantom Effect", <http://twm.co.nz/DNAphantom.htm> (2002).
- [29] Robert F. Beck, "New science and cost effective medicine", *The British Medical Journal Online* <http://www.bmj.com/content/340/bmj.c1251/reply#233123> (2010).
- [30] Kelen Tuttle, "Researchers reveal the internal dance of water", <http://www.physorg.com/news169314724.html> (Aug 12, 2009).