

IT IS GOOD TO REVIEW

... A RETRACTION OR TWO

(1) Wrong electron symbol used in critique of Wave/Particle Duality.

If anything was wrong with our illustration showing double-spiral wave tracks, it was that a bipolar electron "metaparticle" does not, I think, enter scientific detector traps. What the specialists want is a single-point electron, coming in and looking like it was dragging a zigzag ostrich feather behind it. One look at that and we jumped at the "mistake": How come that little piece of spiral motion track is still attached to the point-pole? What do they mean, "It's a part of the point's "wave nature"? What it can only be is at best the "spatial memory" of the pathway taken by the particle nature of the particle. (Very amusing; but also much beside the point.)

Well, physics will surely make use of the double spiral evidence in another way. We'd have done better if I hadn't over-emphasized the fact that you need a bipolar electron to make twin spiral tracks, which in turn strongly imply the reality of the imperceptible positive pole. Which is important for the incoming era of grand collisions and bipolar particles, but not for understanding their "wave nature".

Wave/particle duality has always been our most active topic in terms of readership, world distribution, and downloads. Retracting our wrong-model gaffe seems useless, but we may face more serious revisions later on.

(2) Like in String theory: I was never able to find out how and where points -- simple points such as the electron's negative pole -- fit into Superstring theory. In nothing I ever read or heard from that extensive edifice did I find out if they thought simple points even existed. I don't know but suspect that Savant Greene got tired of my jokes about the required Saturn-size for a collider to prove the theory of strings. And of course he would never help educate a crank. So...I just retract, herewith, my remarks; my planetary research; and am featuring green in the sixth edition of Metaparticles.

(3) Swiss Scientists

I had forgotten. But sure enough, when I checked back it did seem that almost every time I mentioned the lack of news about the Large Hadron Collider, I had added something or other that might irritate its creators and supervisors. Plus, without doubt, the anonymous telephone caller: He sounded both French and German (which is not easy), so I figured him for a Swiss. He did not think it fair for it to be insinuated that important engineers and scientists were taking more interest in strolling the Alps than in fixing the Collider.

Particularly since it was well known that such people spent much more time in Geneva, he said. I don't know positively whether our retraction should be aimed at CERN, or at a local telephoner...But a Swiss physicist in Arizona? Maybe a professor at ASU in Phoenix.

Well, "Whoever" --- I retract. With whatever graciousness I can muster; and warm feelings for both Geneva and the Alps. Hail Switzerland and next time try e-mail!

(4) Intermission

About these updates that science theorists are getting published all of a sudden. Our leading daughter-researcher required a large manila envelope with which to update me. New material has for a couple of months been scarce for either adulation or finding something to be sportively bad about. She sent so much regarding wave/particle duality that I've suddenly come to feel myself wrongly designed for a sincere understanding of its quantum aspects. Yet I have to admit such an admixture with the physics of Einstein's era seems inevitable. (Right now it strikes me like mixing French and German.)

(5) The Big Bang has been theorized as returning, eventually, from the reaches of the creative explosion. (Do we have that right?)

Why miniaturize every iota of matter? To keep things in hand, is my guess. Returning where? To re-package its original singularity, it's been said. Which must be what is also theorized as the best way to handle things when the universe ends. Stuffing what's left into another singularity.

For some reason I did a small satire (in our Big Bounce article) and now, unchastened but less negative, I wish to retract it. Where anyone got the idea that the descendants of us good people might survive repackaging the cracked-up universe in a nano-scopic dot... I don't recall. But I wrote as follows:

"If any should survive such a trip, they might find themselves housed
in the tightest little condos in existence."

(Polished somewhat by author.)

(Even with improvements one has to admit the above is side-splitting, no?)

(No; it's cruel. Retract.)

Okay, I retract; I'm sorry.

(As a physics humorist/intruder I still retract.)

(6) And finally: About occupied vacuums...and Agreeing to let Einstein's ruling on the speed of light be exceeded.

Occupied vacuums. Yes, I've read and heard what's said. But let's imagine your group of lab scientists finds a modest spatial vacuum and gets an urge: One morning two weeks later they are awaiting your arrival, posed as a Serious Group. You are the leader and hold-out.

They say, "Look; we know Einstein went on record that nothing in existence can travel faster than light, right? We are sympathetic with that, we are for Einstein; but we feel every rule should have an exception..."

Et cetera, et cetera. Turns out they found a quantum-wave in the vacuum and got it to perform a fluctuation. "We are almost sure that's what made the electron-point at the right-hand detector let its wave nature collapse on the floor and relocated itself on the left-hand detector. And listen to this: Our repeated measurements indicate the particle was existing on both detectors at almost exactly the same time!"

(You; or if you prefer to stay out of this, me): "What do you mean 'almost exactly'?"

"Well, our measurements show that unless the light speed exceeds the speed of light, this doesn't work; the point particle stays where it was." "Exceeds by how much?" "Only about a hundredth!" (Radiant smile) And we've got superluminous light-speed!"

— — — — —

In the present phase of the Large Hadron's Pause, it may be regarded as burdensome to bring up the subject once more. But there can now be seen a highly likely connection between quantum physics and such a possibility; and if so, this may be the right time to do so.

In several topics mentioned in Metaparticles there is one you may have noted but dismissed as outré – which it is, New Age, about which I couldn't say; derivative from scriptural sources, which it isn't...and of little importance – which if true, implies I don't know the meaning of the word.

There is no reason to go into the overall picture here, which concerns a continuum of worldfields (or increasingly imponderable areas in the spaces surrounding Earth),. These have always been invisible, and of indefinite relations with humanity. But all that is beside the point. What is of definite importance, if true, concerns the quantum dominion of physics.

I don't know much about quantum physics, except that quanta appear to have become a major factor in the area of particles and (I think) mathematics. But it is undeniable that introducing the quantum into the processes of physics has demanded certain adjustments

to the outcomes of what used to be problems of classical physics – and are now something else. (A naïve way of putting it, but it has been noted by many solid scientists that quantum physics sits more easily with what might be called naïve approaches.)

Since I can't possibly sound scientific about this, kindly grant me the use of my normal expression in difficult areas. What I hope to get across is just this: **If it is now accepted that quantum relations with classical concepts involve adjustments to a level of so-called hyperphysics, I am convinced there exists a logical cause why quantum reasoning requires something not experienced before. I suggest that the range of necessary adjustments, built upon the quantum, introduces a background, original or evolved, that can deal with aspects of materiality as it exists in the “worldfield” just beyond Earth. It is the second such field in a “continuum of ascending domains”.**

What I consider sound-minded support exists for this notation. But I have no time to collect it. I also have no stake in what may be reactions in the future. Such a possibility deserves thought since it seems to fit quantum evidence, and is based on practical and logical methods for distributing a variety of "backgrounds for life".

— — — — — — — —

As for Einstein and the velocity of light, at age 85 I appear to be utterly incapable of questioning his teachings.

Salud!

A. P. Perella

Foreword follows on next page