

RECIPROCITY

Published By:
The New Science Advocates
P.O. Box 223
Watervliet, N. Y. 12189

SPECIAL ISSUE

SEPTEMBER 1971

We do not anticipate that it will be feasible, in the ordinary course of events, to publish this newsletter more frequently than every two or three months, but Mr. Larson has informed us that he intends to make a trip to the Midwest and East Coast in October or November to speak at several locations where invitations have been extended or are in the process of being arranged, and we feel that we should get this information out to those who might be interested in attending one of the meetings already planned or in arranging for additions to the schedule.

While this is the primary purpose of this special issue, we are distributing it more widely than would be necessary for this purpose, as we wish to acquaint the members and friends of our organization with the fact that speaking trips of this kind are being made by Mr. Larson, frequently to California and less often to areas more distant from his home in Oregon. As more of our members gain familiarity with the new system of theory other speakers are also becoming available.

If all of the plans now under consideration materialize, the schedule for the forthcoming Eastern trip will include one or more stops in each of the following states: Wisconsin, Michigan, Kentucky, and New York. Details of the schedule are being arranged by Dr. Paul F. deLespinasse, and anyone who may be interested in attendance at one of the planned meetings, in setting up an addition to the schedule of this trip, or in being included in the planning for other similar trips at later dates or to different geographical areas, should get in touch with him. The address is: Dr. Paul F. deLespinasse, Adrian College, Adrian, Mich. 49221.

PROFESSOR MEYER'S PAPER

Because of developments that have taken place since the date of our first newsletter, it has been necessary to change the arrangements that were originally made for the reproduction and distribution of Prof. Meyer's paper on the perihelion precession. This will result in some delay, and we are mentioning the matter here to let all those concerned know that the copies of the paper will be forthcoming within a reasonable time.

MEMBERSHIP

We have received a number of inquiries regarding membership in our organization, of which the following from a physics professor is typical: "I should like to join and support NEW SCIENCE ADVOCATES, if membership is open and a contribution acceptable". In order to avoid the necessity of answering all of these inquiries individually, we are making the following statement regarding membership: For the present, it is our intention to keep the organization on an informal basis; that is, so far as we are concerned, anyone who is interested in the Reciprocal System

of physical theory, and subscribes to our contention that it should be more widely understood and more extensively investigated, is within the fold, so to speak, irrespective of whether or not he is, as yet, fully convinced of the validity of the theoretical system, and irrespective of whether or not he is willing, as matters now stand, to take any overt action toward our objectives. On this basis we now have between several hundred and a couple of thousand "members", depending on just where we draw the line.

Of course, we extend a special welcome to all those who are willing to put their shoulders to the wheel in one way or another: by encouraging friends and colleagues to become acquainted with the new system of theory, by using it in the classroom, by arranging meetings at which qualified speakers from our group can explain and discuss it, by conducting research which extends the application of the theory to new areas and by publicizing such developments, by assisting in the routine work of our organization, and so on. A financial contribution, as suggested in the letter which we quoted, is always appreciated, as even a group of volunteer workers has expenses to meet, particularly where publicity is involved. Sooner or later we may find it necessary to organize in a more formal manner and collect dues, or at least make a charge for the newsletter, but for the present we are operating on a flexible basis and keeping all options open.

PHILOSOPHERS AHOY!

It must be conceded that a detailed verification of the conclusions reached by development of the consequences of the fundamental postulates of the Reciprocal System is a monumental task. Nevertheless, as pointed out by Prof. Dr. F. Schmeidler of the University of Munich in a review of Larson's New Light on Space and Time, it is a task that the scientific community cannot afford to shirk. "Only the most careful investigation of all of his (the author's) deliberations can show whether or not he is right", Prof. Schmeidler asserts, and he cautions that "The official schools of natural philosophy should not shun this (considerable, to be sure) effort. After all, we are concerned here with questions of fundamental significance". But it is a major undertaking that will require cooperation by many workers in many fields of physical science; it is not the kind of a thing that an individual can reasonably be expected to carry out on his own.

However, this does not mean that verification of the validity of the new system is beyond the capability of an individual, because the form of the theory is such as to enable the verification to be accomplished in a very simple and easy manner. As explained in an article in the first issue of this newsletter, every previous theory has found it necessary to begin with assumptions about the particular field to which it applies. Theories of liquids are based on assumptions about liquids, theories of cosmic rays on assumptions about cosmic rays, and so on. But the Reciprocal System derives all of its conclusions in all physical fields from a single set of assumptions about the nature of space and time. The probability that these totally unprecedented results could be obtained from an erroneous set of

assumptions is obviously close to zero, and hence all that is required in order to verify the validity of the new system of theory is to examine the development of thought and to confirm the assertion that the conclusions which are reached do, in fact, follow from the basic premises. This is something that any literate person can do; it does not require a physicist, or even a scientist.

But even though almost anyone can carry this verification far enough to satisfy himself, there is need for more detailed and systematic study, so that the authenticity of the development can be publicly attested by independent investigators. This is a task that is particularly appropriate for the philosophers. They are specialists in the logical development of ideas, and verification of the legitimacy of the chain of thought leading to each of the major conclusions of the theory is an undertaking that is definitely within their special field of competence. Furthermore, they are less likely than the scientists to allow their appraisal of the development of thought to be influenced by the wholly irrelevant fact that some of the conclusions reached in that development are highly unconventional. In view of the important implications that confirmation of the status of the physical universe as a universe of motion will have for both science and philosophy, this is a unique opportunity for the philosophers to make a significant contribution to the advancement of knowledge, an opportunity to lead the way into a more advanced position rather than, as so often in the past, following in the wake of the achievements of the scientists.

A THOUGHT FOR TODAY

"Obviously the study of nuclear physics in the last fifty years has not produced nearly as many answers as it has produced new questions. What is more, almost all of the new questions have proved to be far more difficult for scientists to answer than the old ones they succeeded in answering."

-- Alan E. Nourse, Universe, Earth, and Atom, page 607

This record of experience with "nuclear" physics is another cogent reason for taking a good look at a non-nuclear physics: the Reciprocal System.

THE QUESTION BOX

Some interesting issues have been raised in response to the invitation to questioners that was included in our first issue. We have selected for publication at this time a question asked by Tom Comella of Mayfield Heights, Ohio, because it illustrates the definite necessity of looking at a new basic theory in the context of its own premises and not in terms of ideas that stem from the theories that are being replaced.

Q. With respect to what is space-time moving? If there is not something more

fundamental than space-time with respect to which space-time, itself, is moving, then space-time cannot properly be said to move (or progress) at all.

A. The term "space-time", as used in the Reciprocal System of theory, is equivalent to, and interchangeable with, the term "motion", in the broadest sense of the latter term, and the general nature of the answer to the foregoing question can readily be seen if the equivalent term is substituted for "space-time" in the wording of the question. No one appears to have any difficulty in recognizing that the end of a unit of time is later -- more advanced -- than the beginning of that unit; that is, there is a progression from the beginning to the end. Furthermore, it is commonly understood that this is simply a progression, not a progression relative to something else, and hence a unit of time, a section of the progression, is a self-contained entity. As the published expositions of the Reciprocal System have demonstrated, the concept of a universe of motion requires that space be defined in exactly the same terms as time, except that it is the inverse quantity. Thus the end of a unit of space is also more advanced -- that is, more distant (the spatial equivalent of later) -- than the beginning; not more distant from something but simply more advanced. Space, too, is a progression, and since both of its components progress, motion (space-time) is likewise a self-contained progression; it is not a "something" that progresses relative to something else.

Of course, a certain amount of mental effort is required in order to lift our thinking out of the grooves in which it has been running so long, but obviously if it is possible to conceive of time as a progression, independently of any hypothetical background -- a mental feat that seems to present no particular difficulty -- then it is also possible to conceive of an inverse quantity of exactly the same general nature. If there is any difficulty in so doing, it does not arise from the nature of the concept itself, but from an unwillingness, or inability, to let go of ideas that are derived from premises that have no relevance in a universe of motion. When space and time are viewed in terms of these concepts there should be no obstacle to recognizing that motion (or space-time) is a similar self-contained progression. According to the fundamental concept on which the new theoretical system is based, the unit of this progression -- the unit of motion -- is the basic entity of the universe; that from which all else is constructed. It cannot be related to anything "more fundamental". The idea of a background to which motion must be related belongs to some concept such as that of a universe of matter; it has no place in a universe of motion, where motion itself is the ultimate reality.

THE MAILING LIST

Like many other aspects of our fledgling organization, the mailing list for this newsletter is in a rather fluid state. If you want to be sure to receive future issues, and have not already been in communication with us on some matter or other, it would be well to drop us a line.