

***FUTURESCIENCE* and the shameful face of Physics**

A Conspiracy Unfolds in the field of Physics By Maurice Cotterell

In December, 2007, I sent a copy of my Paper *How Gravity Works* to Dr Robert Kirby-Harris, the head of the Institute of Physics in London. There was no reply. After two months I wrote again, requesting a reply. Three weeks later someone else replied, on his behalf, saying ‘The Institute of Physics does not publish original research, the Institute of Physics Publishing Ltd [their subsidiary Company] does’.

I redrafted the Paper to meet the submission requirements of the Institute of Physics Publishing Ltd. and mailed two copies to the Editor of the IoP journal *Classical and Quantum Gravity*. They replied, within 20 working hours. They could find no fault whatsoever with the contents of the document but refused to publish it because, they said;

1. ‘...it is completely new’
2. ‘...there is nothing in it that we have been working on’ , and
3. ‘...it contains no mathematics’.

It was rejected on behalf of the British Institute of Physics by the literary editor of a magazine. They would not even allow experts in the field to see it or peer review it, so afraid are they of the contents. The orthodox scientific community do not want you to understand how gravity works; they are paid billions of dollars annually to search for the cause of gravity, thus defeating any incentive to find one. If they were to accept *How Gravity Works* then funding would stop and an army of physicists and mathematicians would be thrown out of employment overnight. What they fail to appreciate is that facts do not cease to exist simply because they are ignored. ‘The truth of today is the heresy of yesterday’. The truth about gravity is the Science of tomorrow.

July 2015

I recently mailed a copy of my Paper *How Gravity Works* to a Physicist who responded by saying: ‘I note that page 1 of your Paper claims the electron to be coil-shaped, when it is a *well established fact* that it is round, so I will not read any more of your Paper’.

This deserves comment:

The ‘round-electron’ fiasco

FUTURESCIENCE—*forbidden science of the 21st-century*, which explains how gravity works, was first published on March 22nd, 2011. It explains how the gravitational mechanism can only be explained after firstly changing the shape of the neutron from a perceived sphere into a ‘spike’ shape (the ‘spiked-neutron’), and only after changing the perceived shape of the electron from the conventional ‘negative-sign’ to a ‘coil’ shape. [This allows the atom to become dynamic (alive), revealing that the atom is actually electric for half of the time, and magnetic for half of the time and not, as hitherto perceived, as purely ‘electrical’; which explains why the gravitational mechanism could never have been understood previously.

In the original Paper *How Gravity Works*, and in Chapter 1 of *FUTURESCIENCE*—to facilitate explanation—the electron is illustrated as being ‘*cylindrically-coil-shaped*’. But then p3 of the Paper clearly states: ‘The electron need not be *cylindrically-coil-shaped*, it could be ‘*spherically coil-shaped*’ [like the continuous peel of an orange]. The original edition of the book [and subsequent editions] state the same, and illustrate the electron as being *spherically-coil-shaped* on p67.

But, just 8 weeks after the publication of *FUTURESCIENCE*, a strangely suspicious story appeared in Nature Magazine claiming that ‘after 10 years of research, physicists had discovered that the electron was ‘perfectly round’’. This so-called new discovery of the ‘round electron’ would allow Physicists to issue a misleading statement saying... ‘*How Gravity Works* depends upon the electron being ‘cylindrically coil-shaped’ when it is actually ‘round’ and therefore *How Gravity Works* is unworthy of serious scientific consideration’.

An examination of the facts suggests that the announcement amounts to an attempt by Physicists to crowd-out the discovery of *How Gravity Works* and reveals, firstly, that they failed to read the Paper, beyond p2, and failed to read *FUTURESCIENCE*, beyond p66.

And there was another crucial factor they had failed to consider; a ‘perfectly round-electron’ would undermine the entire credibility of the Standard Model of Physics, because it would not allow for the electrical polarisation of the electron.

This then calls-for a cover-up; to which they respond by saying ‘but we do not actually believe that the electron is ‘perfectly round’! [see the quotation from the article]:

‘Many physicists are intent on finding out whether the electron is actually slightly squashed, as some theories predict. If the deformity is there, further refinement of the technique that made the latest measurement should pin down the deformity in the coming decade’. —this means that they can change their mind at any time, over the next ten years, in regard to the shape of electron—an open admission that they are unsure as to what the shape of the electron actually is.

But, why let the truth stand in the way of a good story.

All the Physicists then had to do was to wait for Nature Magazine to swallow the ‘round-electron’ sleight-of-hand, in the knowledge that the rest of the media would follow, lemming-like, without a single question being asked. This is the way of fraudulent Physics by proxy. This is how cul-de-sac Scientists, fearful of their own inadequacy, disseminate propaganda and deliberately destroy new discoveries that do not fit in with their view of the world—and in so doing delay scientific progress for decades.

Clearly, the announcement was aimed at destroying the sales of the book. But those who have read the book have no doubt about the efficacy of *How Gravity Works*: the proof of the pudding is in the eating; *FUTURESCIENCE* is now in its 4th hardback edition.

Their claim that the electron is round

Examination of their claim exposes a web of deceit that includes scientific misrepresentation, experimental vandalism, experimental error, incompetence of the highest order and ‘suicidal-physics’ which undermines their own ‘Standard Model’.

Here is a transcript of the article from NATURE article, of May 25th, 2011, and from The Daily Telegraph [26th May], followed by a commentary:

Rounding the electron

Physicists step up the search for particle's predicted deformity and hope to solve antimatter mystery along the way by Edwin Cartlidge

Now that's precision measurement: the electron is a perfect sphere, give or take barely one part in a million billion.

The result comes from the latest in a long line of experiments to probe the shape of the fundamental particle that carries electrical charge. "If you imagine blowing up the electron so that it is the size of the Solar System, then it is spherical to within the width of a human hair," says physicist Edward Hinds at Imperial College London, who led the team responsible for the minuscule measurement.

But this is more than a quest for accuracy. Many physicists are intent on finding out whether the electron is actually slightly squashed, as some theories predict. If the deformity is there, further refinement of the technique that made the latest measurement should pin down the deformity in the coming decade. The discovery would show that time is fundamentally asymmetrical, and could prompt an overhaul of the 'standard model' of particle physics.

Although the electron has traditionally been considered to be an infinitesimally small point of charge, it actually drags a cloud of virtual particles around. These fleeting particles pop in and out of existence, and contribute to the electron's mass and volume. All experiments so far have revealed that this cloud is perfectly spherical, but hypothetical virtual particles predicted by extensions to the standard model would make the cloud bulge slightly along the electron's axis of spin. This bulge would make one side of the electron slightly more negatively charged than the other, creating an electric dipole similar to the north and south poles of a bar magnet.

Physicists argue that we would expect to see this electric dipole in a Universe which consists overwhelmingly of matter. Although equal quantities of matter and antimatter are thought to have been created in the Big Bang, we see almost no antimatter in today's Universe. This asymmetry not only implies a cosmic favouritism for matter, but also suggests that physics does not always work the same way when time is run backwards instead of forwards.

Evidence of this asymmetry could be found by playing a film of a spinning, slightly squashed electrons in reverse. Although the direction of the electric dipole would remain unchanged, the magnetic dipole around the electron—which depends on the direction of its spin—would flip to the opposite direction.

The latest study, published today in Nature, looked for the effect of this asymmetry on the spins of electrons exposed to strong electric and magnetic fields—but found nothing. Indeed, the researchers say that any deviations from perfect roundness within electrons must measure less than a billionth of a billionth of a billionth of a centimetre across.

“If you imagine blowing up the electron so that it is the size of the Solar System, then it is spherical to within the width of a human hair.”

Edward Hinds Imperial College London

The results are important in the study of antimatter, an elusive substance that behaves in the same way as ordinary matter, except that it has an opposite electrical charge.

For example, the antimatter version of the negatively charged electron is the positively charged anti-electron, known as a positron.

Understanding the shape of the electron could help researchers understand how positrons behave and how antimatter and matter differ.

Dr Jony Hudson, from the Department of Physics at Imperial College London, said: "We're really pleased that we've been able to improve our knowledge of one of the basic building blocks of matter.

It's been a very difficult measurement to make, but this knowledge will let us improve our theories of fundamental physics.

People are often surprised to hear that our theories of physics aren't 'finished', but in truth they get constantly refined and improved by making ever more accurate measurements like this one."

The Big Bang created as much antimatter as ordinary matter, according to the currently accepted laws of physics.

However, antimatter has only been found in minute amounts from sources such as cosmic rays and some radioactive substances since the concept was conceived by Nobel Prize-winning scientist Paul Dirac in 1928.

Imperial's Centre for Cold Matter aims to explain this lack of antimatter by searching for tiny differences between the behaviour of matter and antimatter, which have so far not been observed.

Had the researchers found that electrons are not round it would have provided proof that the behaviour of antimatter and matter differ more than physicists previously thought.

This, they say, could explain how all the antimatter disappeared from the universe, leaving only ordinary matter.

Professor Edward Hinds, research co-author and head of the Centre for Cold Matter at Imperial College London, said: "The whole world is made almost entirely of normal matter, with only tiny traces of antimatter.

"Astronomers have looked right to the edge of the visible universe and even then they see just matter, no great stashes of antimatter.

"Physicists just do not know what happened to all the antimatter, but this research can help us to confirm or rule out some of the possible explanations."

The research is published in the journal Nature.

Comments on the information, as reported by Nature and The Daily Telegraph articles;

1. Timing of the Nature magazine press release

The timing of the 'findings' is suspicious. If the researchers have made the measurements over the past ten years, as they claim, then why release the results only 8 weeks after a new theory [in *FUTURESCIENCE*], explaining how gravity works, is released, if it were not simply intended to discredit the new discoveries?

2. Irrelevance

The spherical shape or otherwise of the electron is irrelevant to the gravitational mechanism as set down in *How Gravity Works*, which shows that an electron can be coil-shaped and spherical at the same time. The claim by Nature therefore affects in no-way the efficacy or otherwise of *How Gravity Works*.

3. Scientific' misrepresentation and vandalism':

The Telegraph article states that the Centre for Cold Matter studied electrons inside molecules called ytterbium fluoride:

Molecules do not contain electrons. Molecules are made of atoms, and atoms contain electrons.

The experiment was carried out on the 'wrong' molecules:

The experiments were carried out on an unusual material, a combination of the rare-earth-element ytterbium [with 70 electrons, 70 protons and 103 neutrons—which is an isotope (an unbalanced atom)] and fluoride, an active type of fluorine [that contains 9 electrons, 9 protons and 10 neutrons, another isotope], neither of which are part of the gravitational mechanism.

The experiment was not carried-out on the 'right' atoms:

Why would any researcher carry-out an experiment to ascertain the shape of an electron using such an arrangement of molecules? Why not choose the simplest of atoms, hydrogen, which has only one simple single electron, to ascertain the shape of the electron? The experimenters have chosen the wrong atoms upon which to base their experiments

The experiment was not carried-out at the right temperature:

Why not carry-out the experiments at ambient temperatures, rather than on unrepresentative super-cooled Cold Matter? Gravity exists on Earth at ambient temperatures. The experiments have been carried-out at the wrong temperatures. *FUTURESCIENCE* shows that the gravitational mechanism depends upon gravity waves that radiate from the hydrogen atom at ambient temperatures, not rare-earth elements at super-cooled temperatures. Notice, also, the duplicity; neither article claims that the hydrogen electron is spherically-shaped, and neither claims that electrons in other atoms 'involved in the gravitational mechanism at ambient temperatures' are spherically shaped.

The idea here is to persuade the reader that all electrons are spherically shaped, in the naive and mistaken belief that a spherically-shaped electron would, in some way, undermine the gravitational mechanism put forward in *FUTURESCIENCE*.

5. Experimental error:

The experiment was carried-out using the ‘wrong method’ and the ‘wrong resolution’:

The ‘Telegraph summarises saying: Using a laser they made measurements of the motion of these electrons looking for any distinctive wobbles—implying that a wobble in a non-spherical spinning electron would in some way indicate the shape of a molecule made-up of a combination of atoms ‘as would occur if the electrons were not perfectly round’. This is a travesty of reason. It is like suggesting that an individual blade on a spinning aircraft propeller must be disc-shaped, otherwise the spinning blades would not appear as a disc when the blade is spinning in a circular motion! The reason a spinning propeller blade describes a circular motion [i.e describes a circle when viewed face-on] is because it is spinning and the individual light waves, reflected from the spinning propeller, striking the retina of the human eye are too quick for the brain to detect. In the same way, firing laser light at a spinning cylindrically-coil-shaped electron would yield the same contradictory result. **Firing laser light at spinning objects reveals nothing about the shape of the object.**

Moreover, the frequency of the laser light used in the experiment limits the resulting resolution; such low-frequency laser light would be insufficient to detect a coiled incision in an electron. This is blatant experimental error. The researchers admit to this saying ‘the resolution might need to be increased 100-fold to detect oblation’ **[which must likewise apply in order to detect the resolution of a coil-incision in a spherical electron].**

The plot thickens; finally, they admit the particles do not exist:

Worse still, the Nature article claims... **Although the electron has traditionally been considered to be an infinitesimally small point of charge, it actually drags a cloud of virtual particles around. These fleeting particles pop in and out of existence, and contribute to the electron's mass and volume. All experiments so far have revealed that this cloud is perfectly spherical, but hypothetical virtual particles predicted by extensions to the standard model would make the cloud bulge slightly along the electron's axis of spin. This bulge would make one side of the electron slightly more negatively charged than the other, creating an electric dipole similar to the north and south poles of a bar magnet.**

This is non-scientific gobbledegook. What begins with ‘the electron IS perfectly round’ now degenerates to ‘a cloud of hypothetical virtual particles in the vicinity of the electron that appears to be spherical’, **conceding that the particles to which they refer do not even exist [that they are virtual] and that they [conveniently] ‘pop into and out-of existence’. True ‘particles’ of matter exist as matter. They do not ‘pop into and out of existence’.**

6. Insisting that the electron must be spherically-shaped contradicts the Standard Model of Physics:

As mentioned earlier, if the electron is perfectly spherical, as claimed, then it could not have a dipole electrical field [hence their preference for, and desperate search for an ‘oblate spheroid’]. They are trying to have it both ways; a case of running with the fox and hunting with the hounds.

The so-called discovery of the ‘round electron’ is a sham, and the associated reports amount to no more than ‘fraudulent physics by proxy’. Is it any surprise that orthodox Science is going nowhere?

And remember this:

The Standard Model cannot explain how gravity works, *FUTURESCIENCE* does.

The Standard Model cannot explain how electricity works, *FUTURESCIENCE* does.

The Standard Model cannot explain how electromagnetism works, *FUTURESCIENCE* does.

The Standard Model cannot explain how permanent magnetism works, *FUTURESCIENCE* does.

The Standard Model cannot explain why protons in the middle of atoms do not spring apart, *FUTURESCIENCE* does.

The Standard Model cannot explain why electrons are not sucked-into the nucleus of atoms, *FUTURESCIENCE* does.

The Standard Model cannot explain why the neutron negative and neutron positive do not annihilate each, *FUTURESCIENCE* does.

The Standard Model cannot explain why atoms are comprised of 8 shells or why the shells contain the number of electrons that they do, *FUTURESCIENCE* does.

The Standard Model cannot explain why stars cluster (Dark Matter), *FUTURESCIENCE* does.

The Standard Model cannot explain why galaxies are double-spiral-shaped, *FUTURESCIENCE* does.

The Standard Model cannot explain how the sunspot cycle works, *FUTURESCIENCE* does.

The Standard Model cannot explain the cause of global-warming-and-global-cooling, *FUTURESCIENCE* does.

Maurice Cotterell, 2015