

```

*   *****   *   *   *****   *   *   *****   *   *   *****
*   *           *   *   *           **  *   *           *   *   *
*   *****   *   *   *****   *   *   *****   *   *   *****
*   *           *   *   *           *   **  *           **  **   *
*   *****   *****   *****   *   *   *****   *   *   *****

```

News of the International Society Of Unified Science, Inc.

Volume II, Number 1

Autumn, 1988

Few will deny that it is relatively easy in science to fill in the details of a new area, once the frontier has been crossed. The critical event is turning the unexpected corner. This is not given to most of us to do ... By definition, the unexpected corner cannot be turned by any operation that is planned.

If you want advances in the basic theories of physics and chemistry in the future comparable to those of the last two centuries, then it would seem essential that there continue to be people, in a position to turn unexpected corners. Such a man I have ventured to call the uncommitted investigator.

Dr. James B. Conant

NEXT ISUS ANNUAL CONFERENCE

Early August, 1989 PORTLAND, OR

CONTENTS:	PAGE
Minutes of Thirteenth Annual ISUS, Inc. Conference August 12-13, 1988 Portland, Oregon	1
ROLE OF THE AMATEUR IN SCIENTIFIC PRACTICE AND THEORY by Frank H. Meyer	4
PROPOSED HEARING FOR ISUS AND DEWEY B. LARSON Letter to Professor K.V.K. Nehru, India from Professor J. Edward Anderson, U.S.A., Oct. 1, 1988	8
PROPOSED HEARING AT BOSTON UNIVERSITY Letter to Dr. Lawrence Sulack from Professor J. Edward Anderson, U.S.A., Oct. 29, 1988	9
D.B. LARSON'S QUALIFICATIONS AS AN UNCOMMITTED INVESTIGATOR Letter to Dr. J. Edward Anderson from Dr. Frank A. Anderson, Oct. 22, 1988	11
Letter to Mr. Patrick Young from Dr. Frank A. Anderson, Jan. 31, 1988	13

MINUTES OF THE BUSINESS MEETING OF THE 13TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF  
THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY OF UNIFIED SCIENCE

Saturday, August 13, 1988 at room 317 of the Jade Tree Motel, Portland, Oregon. The business meeting of the International Society of Unified Science was called to order at 2:14 pm by Frank Meyer, president. Nine members were present: Frank Meyer, Rainer Huck, Ronald Satz, Ron Blackburn, Robin Sims, Phil Porter, Larry Denslow, Hoyt Stearns, and Dave Chance.

1. A motion was made to dispense with the reading of the minutes of last year's meeting and approve them as printed in Reciprocity. The motion carried.

2. Treasurer Rainer Huck then read his report (which was prepared with the help of Robin Sims). As of August, 1987 the balance was \$4111.83. The income for 1988 was \$2144.29 and the expenses were \$2248.66. So the balance as of August, 1988 is \$4007.46. ISUS is in excellent financial condition. The treasurer's report was approved.

3. The president then asked for Old Business. The following topics were discussed.

a. mailing list: member Ed Navarro now has responsibility for both the membership and subscription lists. He has printed out a state-by-state listing of members and subscribers and has also printed out sets of mailing labels.

b. advertising: no ISUS/North Pacific Publishers advertising was done this past year.

c. gift subscriptions: member Porter moved and member Huck seconded that the staff of Reciprocity decide who gets free issues. The motion carried.

d. editor's report: Frank Meyer is now the managing editor of Reciprocity. Members Nehru, Porter, and Sammer are associate editors. Two issues were published last year; 1 issue has been published this year, with more to come. The printing cost is 2 1/2 ¢/page, and the postage amount is 8 1/2 ¢ per copy mailed. The publishing of ISUS News is scheduled to be resumed. Currently 250 copies of Reciprocity are mailed out per issue, and Meyer's goal is eventually to mail out 500 copies. The editor's report was approved.

4. The president then called for New Business. The following topics were discussed.

a. back issue ordering: member Sims moved (with amendments by member Porter) and member Blackburn seconded, to make available back issues of Reciprocity, at the rate of \$4 for one issue, \$3 for two to five issues, and \$2 for six or more. The price for the whole set is to be determined at the

rate of \$2/issue. Member Huck is to handle this service. A caveat is to be added to orders, stating that not all papers published are to be considered "canonical"; i.e., many of the papers are "work-in-progress" only. An order form with index is to be put in Reciprocity annually. The motion carried.

b. cosmic proton mass: At the urging of Dennis Cravens, an outside DOD observer, member Blackburn moved and member Porter seconded that Larson and Satz calculate the theoretical mass of the cosmic proton (and publish the result in Reciprocity). If possible this is to be done before the upcoming experiment to measure its mass. Member Sims and Larson himself, who was sitting in at the meeting, urged extreme caution. Nonetheless the motion carried.

c. Boston University meeting: President Meyer then discussed Prof. Ed Anderson's forthcoming invitation to ISUS to send a representative to Boston University for a meeting with the physics faculty. Meyer read letters from members Nehru and Halprin on this subject, and member Chance made some additional remarks. Larson stated that for himself one session would be sufficient to provide an introduction to the theory and, in any event, we have to "take what we can get." In the long run a "court of inquiry" would be best. Member Porter moved and member Huck seconded that Larson be the representative and Satz be the alternate for this very important meeting. The motion carried.

d. promotion of Reciprocal System: President Meyer stated that ultimately we would like to have our own school to teach the Reciprocal System. Member Satz stated that another long term goal would be to produce a two hour animated film which would graphically show how the system operates. Member Huck moved and member Sims seconded that member Denslow make a video tape of his basic teaching of the Reciprocal System; ISUS would fund the rental of the equipment. The motion carried. President Meyer agreed to rewrite one of the current ISUS brochures, and member Satz agreed to study the feasibility of writing and mailing a 3 or 4 page press release to the hundreds of science and engineering magazines here and abroad. Member Stearns suggested that we seek foundation grants. Member Denslow suggested that we think about developing a logo for ISUS.

e. reprint: Member Huck moved and member Sims seconded that ISUS undertake to reprint Larson's Case Against the Nuclear Atom, subject to a \$1000 cap on expenses (for approximately 500 books). (North Pacific agreed to give permission for this project). The motion carried.

f. liquid state papers: Member Satz asked if the liquid state papers are ready to be published. Larson responded that they will indeed be ready soon, but not this coming year.

g. conference video taping: Member Chance video taped most of this conference and suggested that the highlights be made available for sale. Member Porter moved and member Huck seconded that Chance proceed as he wishes and split the profits with ISUS. The motion carried.

h. rebinding: The bookbinding of Basic Properties of Matter has turned out to be unsatisfactory. It was agreed to rebind those volumes not yet sold and any that are sent back. (But no announcement will be made).

5. Next the elections were held.

a. Board Elections: Members Anderson, Huck, Long, Meyer, Satz, and Studtmann were up for reelection (and there was one additional opening). The following were nominated: Anderson, Meyer, Huck, Satz, Stearns, Denslow, and Mitchell (William). The nominations were closed and a vote was taken for election by acclamation. It carried unanimously. So, the 1988-1989 Board consists of the following individuals: Anderson, Meyer, Huck, Satz, Stearns, Denslow, and Mitchell (with two years to go at the end of next year); Nehru, Porter, Sammer, and Sims (with one year to go at the end of next year); and Blackburn, Curtin, Halprin, and Navarro (up for reelection next year).

b. Elections of Officers: The offices of president, secretary, and treasurer were uncontested; Meyer, Satz, and Huck retained their offices unanimously. For vice president, members Halprin and Blackburn were nominated, and Blackburn won in a close vote.

6. Next Year's Convention: Only one nomination got seconded-- Portland, Oregon, the home of Dewey Larson. The convention will probably be held August 11th and 12th, at a nearby college with suitable facilities (dormitory rooms, cafeteria, blackboards, and overhead transparency projectors). Member Porter agreed to be in charge of making arrangements.

7. Acclamations: The membership unanimously acclaimed the Larsons' for graciously inviting us over for two evenings, Dewey for finishing Basic Properties of Matter, members Sammer and Porter for their fine work in producing the book, member Chance for video taping the conference, and the Jade Tree Motel and Multnomah Library for the free meeting rooms.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:03 pm.

Ronald W. Satz  
Secretary, ISUS

Frank H. Meyer, Long-Time Member, American Physical Society

The Oxford Dictionary discloses that the word 'amateur' is a French word, derived from the Latin, amator, A LOVER: also from amare, to love.

The dictionary mentions several connotations. I note two of them of present interest:

1. one who cultivates any study or art, from taste or attachment, without pursuing it professionally.
2. a person who does something more or less unskillfully.

Dewey B. Larson at 90 has been and is a professional engineer and a life-long amateur physicist in the first sense of this word.

I think that we of ISUS,INC. have ample evidence that a number of my professional physics colleagues, who have heard about Mr. Larson and his Reciprocal System of physical science, without bothering beyond a perfunctory glance to examine him or it, prefer to dismiss its author with contempt as an amateur in the second derogatory sense of this term.

In my opinion as a professional research physicist and/or physics and philosophy professor for more than half a century, Dewey B. Larson, in fact, has done what my profession has professed it would do and has not yet begun to do: he has successfully revalued and unified physical science. I and my associates of ISUS,INC., make a claim that we think we can sustain with an abundance of evidence: that the Reciprocal System of physical science, originated by Dewey B. Larson, is the only unified general theory of physics.

The modern profession of physicists generally has not lately acknowledged that anyone other than the professional physics experts can have made or have made any lasting contribution to the production of the science of physics. This attitude is due more to ignorance of the history of science, particularly the history of physical science, than to anything else.

As the cartographer, Charles H. Hapgood, in the Preface to his MAPS OF THE ANCIENT SEA KINGS, has pointed out:

"I have....long felt that the amateur has a much more important role in science than is usually recognized. I teach the history of science, and have become aware of the extent to which the most radical discoveries (sometimes called 'breakthroughs') have been opposed by experts in the affected fields. It is a fact, obviously, that every scientist is an amateur to start with. Copernicus, Newton, Darwin were all amateurs when they made their principal discoveries...."

In the nineteenth century people without the benefit of a doctorate or any other graduate or even undergraduate degree in physics have made great contributions to the development of physics. Michael Faraday has made forever possible the major process by which electrical power is commercially produced not only in Great Britain and the U.S.A., but also elsewhere on earth. So far as I

know, Mr. Faraday earned no college degree at all and began his career in natural philosophy as a glass washer in Humphrey Davy's Laboratory. People from other professions in previous centuries, like Dewey Larson in this century, amateurs in physics or uncommitted investigators in natural philosophy, have made as great contributions to the evolution of physical science as any professional physicist. Physicians, such as Thomas Young, Hermann Helmholtz, Julius Robert Mayer, with little formal education in physics, nevertheless, made contributions to the creation of new physics comparable with those made by any living member of the American Physical Society. Sadi Carnot, a professional engineer in the military at the age of 18, also was an uncommitted investigator or amateur in physics, who discovered the second law of thermodynamics and so contributed to establishing the physical science of thermodynamics.

With a doctorate earned at the Polytechnic Academy in Zurich in 1905, Albert Einstein in the same year reported four great discoveries in physics: the photon theory of light, the equivalence (not the identity) of mass and energy, the theory of Brownian motion and the special theory of relativity. While these discoveries are included now in the graduate education of the professional physicist, the credit for them first belongs appropriately to Einstein, the student, the amateur, the uncommitted investigator, rather than to his professors.

Let's examine the last listed of Einstein's discoveries, the special theory of relativity. In formulating the relativity theory, Einstein was opposed by his contemporary profession, because he dared to question the theory of space and time, postulated more than two centuries earlier by another uncommitted investigator, Isaac Newton. Newton assumed that space and time are absolutely unrelated and that motion is merely a property of matter. While Einstein agreed with Newton that matter is prior to motion, he chose to question Newton's mistaken surmise about the unrelatedness of time and space. Einstein expressed his skepticism about this conjecture of Newton by assuming instead that space and time are inseparably related in a 4-dimensional stationary space-time continuum, to which the concept of motion is not applicable, certainly not directly. It appears to be not well-known even among physicists that in the later years of his life, Einstein came to doubt the truth of this basic premise of his relativity theory:

"I am tending to the belief that it is impossible to advance further with the continuum theory." -Albert Einstein

Thus, unlike many of his followers among professional physicists, Albert Einstein remained an uncommitted investigator in a profession, in which the amateur is rare, at least in this century, and usually is regarded as a suspicious character, no matter what his achievements, and often is even ostracized.

There are several good reasons for questioning the continuum postulate of relativity theory indeed:

1. It implicitly denies that space is a progression with time and has led some relativists into the absurdity of denying that time flows equably with space, thus repudiating the common sense and Newtonian view that time at least is or may be a progression.
2. Perhaps Einstein's greatest contribution to the theory of space-time was his recognition that space and time somehow must be and are related, since this challenged and led eventually to the overthrow of the mistaken proposition that they are not. Einstein's own theory about how space and time function together, however, requires further examination and is questionable. Einstein died without ever comprehending that

motion constitutes the essential physical relation between space and time, since Einstein followed Newton unquestioningly in supposing that matter is prior to motion as well as to space. In fact, space-time and motion are identical. The Reciprocal System of physical science defines motion as the relation between two uniformly progressing reciprocal quantities, space and time. That is, space-time is prior to matter and is primarily related to motion. Space-time progression at unit speed(speed of light) and speed displacement from unit speed, including light,electricity,magnetism,matter(gravitational motion), so-called 'anti-matter'(named 'cosmic matter' in the R.S.) are so many diverse forms of motion.

3.The reciprocal character of the relation between space and time as motion excludes the postulated assymetrical dimensionality of space(3) and time(1), assumed in the theory of relativity, since the character of the relation implies that the dimensions of time(3) must be and are the same as the dimensions of space(3).

4.Finally, the physical space-time continuum is not a simple continuum, like the real number system, because physical space-time,unlike specious space and time, are not infinitely divisible. The universe, according to the Reciprocal System, is composed entirely of one component, motion, EXISTING in three dimensions and in discrete units. By reason of the reciprocal character of the relation between space and time, each individual unit of motion is a relation between one unit of space and one unit of time,motion at unit speed, which the R.S. identifies as the speed of light.

In the endeavor to unify physics quantum mechanics had better be reexamined as well as relativity physics. The supporters of the Reciprocal System observe that generally the quantum physicists and the relativistic physicists mutually and unquestioningly support each other's paradigms. The workers in quantum mechanics see no inconsistency in accepting the infinite divisibility of space and time, while teaching the finite divisibility of light,electricity,magnetism and matter. The supporters of the R.S.,however, see the discreteness of light, electricity,magnetism and matter as a necessary consequence of the existence of discrete units of motion and finitely divisible units of space and time.

On this score a challenge to allwho work to revalue and unify physical science has been proposed by Albert Einstein:

"From the quantum phenomenon it appears to follow with certainty that a finite system of finite energy can be completely described by a finite set of numbers(quantum numbers). This does not seem to be in accordance with a continuum theory and must lead to an attempt to find a purely algebraic theory for the description of reality. But nobody knows how to obtain the basis of such a theory."

I know somebody who has discovered ,learned and knows how to obtain the basis of such a theory. The Reciprocal System of physics, authored by Dewey B. Larson, provides a description of physical reality, employing only finite mathematics and quantum numbers, e.g. a triplet of quantum numbers to characterize and distinguish any atom of any chemical element of matter. In truth, one of the main essential features of the Reciprocal System of physics is that it begins by excluding infinity from the physical universe:

"Infinity is excluded from the physical universe, since we are defining motion as a relation between a time magnitude and a space magnitude and we deduce that the quantity of motion is finite. Since all physical entities and phenomena are manifestations of motion, they are measured in terms of  $1/n$  and  $n/1$ , where  $n$  is finite. No infinities are possible. This is one of the many places where the Reciprocal System of physics has the advantage over conventional theory, in which infinities are a considerable source of embarrassment. As Richard Feynman put it: 'If we get infinity, how can we ever say that this agrees with nature?'"

-Dewey B. Larson

Because of the lack of awareness among present professional physicists that a unified general physics is presently in actual existence, the practise of the science of physics, including relativity and quantum physics, is quite unable to exclude infinities from the modern theories of physics.



Boston University

College of Engineering  
110 Cummington Street  
Boston, Massachusetts 02215  
617/353-2814



Department of Aerospace  
and Mechanical Engineering

October 1, 1983

Professor K. V. K. Nehru  
Department of Mechanical Engineering  
P.G. School, J.N.T. University  
Hyderabad - 500 028, India

Dear Professor Nehru:

I am sorry to be so slow to respond to your letter of September 3. Dr. Arthur G. B. Metcalf, Chairman of the Board of Trustees of Boston University, based on my conversations with him about the Reciprocal System, has expressed willingness to sponsor a seminar at Boston University by a proponent of RS. I have been in correspondence with Frank Meyer about this matter and based on discussions at the ISUS meeting in August he has informed me that the ISUS board recommends that Dewey Larson himself be the seminar speaker. I have thus conveyed this information to Dr. Metcalf, who, through the appropriate channels, has extended an invitation to the Head of the BU Physics Department to invite Mr. Larson to give a seminar. The matter now rests in the Physics Department, and I am still waiting to hear from them. A colleague of mine who is a theoretical physicist knows the relativists and has promised to inquire.

At the present time, my position, that of my colleague, and that of Dr. Metcalf is that, while we have not had the opportunity to study RS enough so that any of us can staunchly claim to be advocates, we are advocates of learning about new (to us) ideas. I myself have studied some of Dewey Larson writings to the point that I find them most fascinating and most difficult to dismiss. I have also read some of your papers in Reciprocity, but have not been able to dig enough into the fundamentals enough to be able to derive results like yours myself. I have been deeply involved in another area involving gaining acceptance of a new technology, and cannot allow myself to be distracted in the major way that I think I would need to really come to grips with RS.

It is therefore much too early to honor requests like yours. Wishing you the best, I am

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Edward Anderson".

Edward Anderson  
Professor

cc: Frank Meyer

Boston University

College of Engineering  
110 Cummington Street  
Boston, Massachusetts 02215  
617/353-2814

Department of Aerospace  
and Mechanical Engineering



October 29, 1988

Dr. Lawrence R. Sulack  
Chairman  
Department of Physics  
590 Commonwealth Ave.

Dear Professor Sulack:

It has been about a month since we had a brief discussion about the possibility of inviting Dewey Larson to a Physics Seminar at Boston University.


While I haven't had the opportunity to study Larson's theory in enough detail to be a strong advocate, I have studied it enough and have read and talked to enough others to believe that Larson may well have an approach worthy of the attention of the physics community. I enclose several reviews of Larson's books by scientific journals.

As I understand it, Larson developed his framework of physical theory, which he calls the Reciprocal System, out of extensive analysis relationships between properties of matter, much of it in the study of crystalline material. After decades of work, he began to see that the relationships could be understood only on the basis of a new view of space-time, and that all could be derived from two fundamental postulates, stated in the enclosed review by David Halprin. Over more decades, Larson found that, without the aid of any supplementary or subsidiary assumptions, and without bringing in anything from experience, he could produce a complete qualitative and quantitative description of the basic features of the physical universe from the depths of the atom to quasars and black holes.

The fact that, while much has been written by and about Larson and his Reciprocal System, it has not yet become generally accepted by the physics community, is not necessarily surprising. From what I have read thus far, thorough study of his work requires at least three attributes in one very intelligent person: a willingness to expend a great deal of intellectual energy with no guarantee of success, the humility to set aside what one "knows" long enough to follow through on the new ideas, and the emotional strength and self confidence needed to resist possible admonishments of colleagues who would dismiss the new ideas based on cursory analysis.

While not a physicist myself, I spent most of my time as a doctoral student at M. I. T. studying physics, particularly relativity theory and quantum mechanics, out of interest in understanding how the physical world works, and I have been most interested in following developments in physics through the years thereafter. I am aware that a number of top physicists have commented that fundamentally new ideas are needed and that, while modern physics can calculate a remarkably wide range of phenomena, a unifying theory is still a mystery. Dewey Larson, as an uncommitted investigator outside the cultural domain of physics seems quite possibly to have developed such a theory. If he is correct, and there is a whole organization of people called the International Society of Unified Science that believe he is, he must go down in history as perhaps the greatest scientist of all time. I urge you to give him a hearing.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "J. E. Anderson", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

J. Edward Anderson  
Professor

encl.

FRANK A. ANDERSON, Ph.D.

*Registered Professional Engineer*

410 South 11th Street  
Oxford, Mississippi 38655

Wednesday, October 12, 1988

Dr. J. Edward Anderson  
College of Engineering  
Boston University  
110 Cummington Street  
Boston, Massachusetts 02215

Dear Dr. Anderson:

I am writing to you at the suggestion of Professor Frank Meyer, President of the ISUS, and would like to introduce myself. I am Associate Dean Emeritus and Professor Emeritus of Chemical Engineering, School of Engineering, The University of Mississippi. I am also a long-time member of the Board of Directors of the International Society of Unified Science and have served a term as President of the ISUS. Although I am in my tenth year of "retirement" I am still active in some academic and professional areas as well as in church and civic affairs. In recent years my ISUS activity has been confined to occasional lectures on basic Reciprocal System theory and to writing letters to selected individuals in an effort to promote interest in the R.S. My academic background is in chemistry and chemical engineering and is weak in fundamental physics theory. Consequently I am not in the best possible position to espouse a rethinking of physics fundamentals.

In his last two letters to me Frank Meyer has spoken highly of you and your interest in advancing the cause of the ISUS. I sincerely appreciate your efforts on behalf of the ISUS and especially your effort to obtain a hearing for the RS at Boston University. I tried to do the same thing a number of years ago here at the University of Mississippi with limited success. It appears that the physicists and other scientists who attended our symposium, held in connection with the annual convention of the Society, were interested only in their own specific research and were not willing to take the time to return to a study of fundamentals, i.e. analyze the foundations of modern physics.

Despite my admitted weakness in physics fundamentals I have long had a "gut" feeling that something was wrong in physics, a feeling that was reinforced when I learned about the Reciprocal System and Dewey Larson's tremendous 50 year-plus effort to develop a logical structure for the science of physics. Because I feel strongly that the science "establishment" has the responsibility to study and evaluate all serious investigations and ideas concerning the structure of science, especially physics, I have been baffled and disappointed in the unwillingness of the establishment to study and put the RS to test. If there is a basic flaw in Dewey Larson's development it needs to be pointed out and the RS dumped on the mountain of wrong ideas and theories that characterize the course of science during the past 3000 years. If, on the other hand, the

RS is a valid structure and has produced the long-sought unified theory then the science establishment, if it is to be true to itself, must acknowledge Larson's tremendous achievement and "get right".

One of the high points in my life was getting to meet Dewey Larson in person and listening to him discuss his development of the RS. I have all of his publications and have tried to distill the essence from each despite the fact that I cannot follow much of his reasoning. His works bear out the fact that Dewey Larson is an unusually gifted individual. Never have I run across anyone whose thinking is as devastatingly logical as his is. Yet he is modest and free of the arrogance which characterizes so many of the great. He appears to understand his position as a maverick and to accept without bitterness the failure of the establishment to give his life's work a respectable hearing. If the RS is shown to be a correct representation of the physical structure of the universe Larson will go down in history as one of the most brilliant thinkers ever to have appeared on the face of the earth. At the same time the establishment will be ridiculed for not offering Larson his day in court. All Larson has ever asked of the establishment is to be shown where his development is wrong and he has gone astray. If Larson is wrong, and nobody has yet found a fatal flaw in his work, it will not be because he is a fraud or charlatan.

For your information I am enclosing a copy of one of the letters I have sent out during the past 10-12 years in the hope of getting Larson and the RS a hearing in the scientific world. In this case, and in most cases, I have never even gotten an acknowledgement of one of my letters.

I sincerely hope you will have success in helping to get Larson the hearing he so richly deserves. If I can provide you with helpful information or be of assistance to you in any way, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely,

Frank A. Anderson

cc: Professor Frank Meyer

FRANK A. ANDERSON, Ph.D.  
CONSULTANT

*Registered Professional Engineer*

410 SOUTH 11TH STREET  
OXFORD, MISSISSIPPI 38655

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

Mr. Patrick Young  
Chief Science and Medical Correspondent  
Newhouse News Service  
c/o Editor  
Science Digest  
888 Seventh Avenue  
New York, New York 10106

Dear Mr. Young:

Congratulations on your excellent article, "A Maverick Inventor Who Fought and Won", which appears in the January 1984 issue of SCIENCE DIGEST!

As I read your fascinating story about Stanford Ovshinsky my thoughts kept drifting back to an 80-plus year old friend and lone investigator, Dewey B. Larson, who, over a span of about 60 years, has developed a challenging and exciting unified theory of the physical universe. His first book dealing with his work was published in 1959 and bore the title, "The Structure of the Physical Universe". Since that time he has published five additional books devoted to his analyses and findings, the latest one bearing the title, "Nothing But Motion". Not so strangely, the members of the scientific establishment have ignored Larson's brilliant work. It has proven to be almost impossible to persuade any of the leading scientific journals and magazines to review his books, let alone accept an article for publication. There is a small handful of scientists who support and try to promote Larson's concepts through an organization now called the International Society for Unified Science. So far as I know, no one who has taken time to examine Larson's postulates and findings has been able to find a flaw in his basic reasoning. I consider Larson to be one of the most brilliant and devastatingly logical thinkers I have run across in my 40 years of work as a scientist-engineer-educator.

Larson's thesis, in a nut shell, is that our universe is NOT a universe of matter, as Einstein postulated, but a universe of MOTION, a universe in which the basic reality is MOTION, and all physical entities and phenomena, including matter, are merely manifestations of motion. On this basis, for instance, the atom is simply a combination of motions. Radiation is motion and so is gravitation and the electric charge. Larson starts with two postulates that define the characteristics of the fundamental motion, and then demonstrates that a development of the consequences of these postulates, without the aid of any supplementary or subsidiary assumptions, and without bringing in anything from experience, produces a complete qualitative and quantitative description of the basic features of the physical universes and the relations between them. Larson's brilliant analyses

range from the depths of the atom to the quasars and black holes of space.

Because my background in present-day physics is very limited (I was educated as a chemical engineer in the late 30's and 40's), I find it difficult to follow much of Larson's work. However, I have a powerful "gut" feeling that his basic work is correct and that it should be given careful, serious consideration by qualified members of the scientific establishment. Isn't this what the establishment is supposed to do - analyze all theories, discard those that prove to be wrong, and refine those that appear to have merit or are correct? Frankly, I am very disappointed in the establishment because Larson's work has not been subjected to critical evaluation. Larson, it is interesting to note, is much more tolerant of the failure of the establishment to critique his work than I am. Larson deserves a serious hearing by the experts. If they can find anything wrong with his postulates and reasoning therefrom, all Larson wants is to be told where or why he is wrong.

My objective in writing to you is to call Larson and his work to your attention in case you do not know of him and his Reciprocal Theory (motion = space/time, a relationship which points out the reciprocal nature of the two poorly understood concepts of space and time). Because of the tone of your excellent article about Stanford Ovshinsky, I believe you have the feeling and ability to understand and write about another scientific maverick, Dewey B. Larson. If Larson is correct, as some of us in ISUS believe, Larson will go down in history as one of the greatest theoreticians of all time and his unified theory will finally establish a firm basis for an understanding of the physical universe, a goal that has been sought for about 3000 years.

If you would like to learn more about Larson and his work which has led to the FIRST GENERAL UNIFIED PHYSICAL THEORY, a theory which derives the laws and principles of ALL the major branches of science from the SAME few premises, I will be glad to send you a complimentary copy of NOTHING BUT MOTION. After reading this 292-page treatise, I hope you would want to meet Larson and to consider writing his fascinating story, a story which could prove to be one of the most important science stories of all time. Or should you like to communicate immediately with this remarkable individual and uncommitted investigator, you can write to him as follows:

Dewey B. Larson  
755 N.E. Royal Court  
Portland, Oregon 97232

Thank you for your attention to this letter and congratulations once again on your excellent article on Ovshinsky.

Sincerely,

Frank A. Anderson  
Associate Dean Emeritus  
School of Engineering  
University of Mississippi