

To: Dr Alison Wright [naturephysics@nature.com](mailto:naturephysics@nature.com)  
 Cc: Mr Ehsan Masood [ehsan@lead.org](mailto:ehsan@lead.org)  
*The Guardian* [science@guardian.co.uk](mailto:science@guardian.co.uk)  
 Subject: That Single Theory  
 Date: Monday 14 September 2009

This letter in essence:

All that I beg of you, Learned and Privileged Ladies and Gentlemen, is your response along these lines:

“Submit your paper for formal peer review. Being a *scientific* journal, we shall give you a *scientific* reason should the paper be found unacceptable for further consideration. Avoiding generalities, at least one scientific reason will be given, specifically, if your propounded all-embracing concept is not consistent in itself or with observations.”

I shall accept that decision without question, and promise not to bother the scientific community thereafter.

Dear Dr Wright,

Thank you for the immediate reply. I received it in less than three hours of my e-mail [letter](#) to you of the 7th inst. I only hope you had time to read it fully, along with at least the [Synopsis](#), for the quick response.

I shall address here very briefly the right and proper concern you expressed: “that unless your work were to provide explicit new experimental evidence of the greater predictive ability of your proposed framework over conventional understanding, we would be unlikely to consider it for publication in *Nature Physics*.”

This predictive ability has indeed been the unassailable virtue of my work. (My book and webpage illustrations are, in fact, replete with predictions.) The singular model was conceived initially for *simple answers* to questions besetting fundamental physics. Being the right model, that ability naturally extended also as its *predictive power* and asset. Reassuringly, since the time the book was published, quite a few “new experimental evidence” have already come in only to hallmark the stronghold, with nary a contradiction; and the trend continues to date.

In order not to take too much of your time here, highlighted below are just two pivotal cases, I and II – from the cosmos to our own terra firma – now consuming much human resources and funds. Though brief, the two and all others can be clarified further on request. Do kindly go through them; it will not be a waste of your valuable time.

Again, it is only a peer review that I ask, not necessarily publication, and I would insist that it is only right that I pay, in full and beforehand, for what may be a special favour for me. Money is no object at all. You may kindly commission any person(s) for the review. If the monetary cost cannot be reckoned now, I can at least rush you the US\$25,000 or even GB£25,000 immediately from my savings now with NS&I, Blackpool, UK. Having worked as an engineering consultant for the richest company on earth, the Arabian American Oil Company (ARAMCO), with the world’s topmost project management teams, like (Houston-based) Fluor-Daniel and others, on a North-American professional’s pay, paying for the service here would only seem proper for me. Moreover, if my paper is shown to be fundamentally in error – and the earlier the better – you will, in fact, be saving me many times over. (I can get back to my profession fully and recoup the money in no time, instead of wasting my time flogging the dead horse here!) And the science mainstream will have one less crank to contend with, sending also a clear message to others of the ilk and iconoclastic league wielding bricks and stones outside its stately establishment!

Finally, if my paper for peer review is: (A) Acceptable: *Nature Physics* will have nothing to lose but everything to gain from the exercise, also for its public image in this age of IT when even the lay community is becoming far too well informed to judge matters for itself. (B) Not acceptable: then *Nature Physics* may do well to call my bluff to expose my own insincerity here. Or, with all due respect, the Nature Publishing Group should at least call an internal meeting: Basically, to find out of what exact scientific guidance NPG is to its readers, especially to the young – where nestles today the potential scientific trailblazers of tomorrow. Here, Mr Masood’s “a single theory... would we be able to see one coming?” and (I) may be taken as themes; editors of other physics journals and heads of university physics departments, as guests, could usefully contribute.

Nothing personal whatsoever to you or any other individuals at *Nature Physics*.

Thank you and with kind regards,

Sincerely,

Eugene Sittampalam

## I. The Antineutrino Debut

Current theory tells us the Sun and stars are fuelled primarily by nuclear fusion (at their cores). Observations, however, have been consistently contradictory to that view – a theoretical construct at a time when even the solar wind was not known to exist; neither much was known of the Sun and, least of all, of stars and galaxies at the time. The theory's well-known failure is, perhaps, what is called today – the solar-neutrino problem.

We now know the solar wind to consist mainly of protons and electrons; and, inexplicably, the solar corona to be very much hotter than the solar surface (photosphere). According to my model, the formation process for galaxies, stars, planets and moons is, in principle, one and the same across our observable universe (2) – and it is one *not* of accretion and nuclear fusion but simply of nuclear *fission and fragmentation*. (Core fusion is the consequential secondary reaction under the backpressure of fission, as in the H-bomb.)

Neutrons are copiously produced in fission reactions; and the decay of the short-lived neutrons, to protons, electrons and electron-antineutrinos, emerge as – the solar wind (3), the stellar wind and the galactic wind (4), from an overall halo. In the Sun, this final neutron decay peaks just above the photosphere, causing the corona, where the intensity of the violent particles causes the temperature peak, and the momentum it imparts sustains the wind. In oblivion, researchers were looking simply for neutrinos from the (secondary) core fusion process.

I appealed (in 2003) to Prof Giorgio Gratta, Stanford University's KamLAND Collaboration team leader, to also kindly check out the electron-antineutrinos as per my model; and a useful correspondence ensued (5). An interest was also developing in Russia and the Netherlands (in 2004) with the Earth's core in scope, but they were calling for funds (6). Sensing this, probably, the Gratta group had that ultimate and all-American reason – pioneers! – to jump the gun for the cheaper geo-centre focus; and focus they did (in 2005) – with astounding result: "It's a revolution," exclaimed Prof Gratta! (7). I then reiterated my plea next for the solar corona (7), though of higher project cost. You may kindly get the latest on these from the gentlemanly Prof Gratta himself.

Concluding, a common formation process rules our observable universe. The current bottom-up theory is in such irreparable disarray that it led even *Nature* to put out a virtual obituary following the latest jab into the heart of the suffering old model, captioned: **RIP Physics?** Please see (8), where my comment is the third there.

## II. The International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor (ITER) Project

According to current theory, the stability of an atomic nucleus is independent of its motion in space. However, my model reveals that even a so-called stable nucleus can break apart with increasing speed – fundamentally due to the spin of the individual nucleons constituting the nucleus. The deuteron (2 nucleons) and the triton (3 nucleons) are the primary fuel particles in the ITER; and they can break down appreciably into their nucleons at excessively large {vibrational} speeds (at around a hundred million degrees Celsius), increasingly fuelling only turbulence – never fusion – in the tokamak; please see (9), especially the section: "The Hard Evidence."

The clearest signal of the (gradual) rise in fuel concentration, followed by this (abrupt) nuclear dissociation en masse ('boiling') at a particular temperature was seen in the sawtooth rise-and-fall pattern of the plasma fuel temperature; the sudden drop being caused by the absorbing of ('nuclear binding' or 'latent heat') energy. Queried for explanation, Dr Duarte Borba, EFDA Associate Leader for JET, Abingdon, UK, was kind to reply: "The reason for this is being investigated." For a more complete story, with illustrations, please see (10).

- (1) [www.sittampalam.net/NobelResponse.pdf](http://www.sittampalam.net/NobelResponse.pdf)
- (2) [www.sittampalam.net/TheCosmos.htm](http://www.sittampalam.net/TheCosmos.htm)
- (3) [www.sittampalam.net/TheSun.htm](http://www.sittampalam.net/TheSun.htm)
- (4) [www.sittampalam.net/TheSuperwind.htm](http://www.sittampalam.net/TheSuperwind.htm)
- (5) [www.sittampalam.net/KamLAND.Test.htm](http://www.sittampalam.net/KamLAND.Test.htm)
- (6) [www.sittampalam.net/EarthCentral.htm](http://www.sittampalam.net/EarthCentral.htm)
- (7) [www.sittampalam.net/TheAntineutrinoDebut.htm](http://www.sittampalam.net/TheAntineutrinoDebut.htm)
- (8) [http://blogs.nature.com/news/thegreatbeyond/2009/08/rip\\_physics.html](http://blogs.nature.com/news/thegreatbeyond/2009/08/rip_physics.html)
- (9) [www.sittampalam.net/ITER.Test.htm](http://www.sittampalam.net/ITER.Test.htm)
- (10) [www.sittampalam.net/NaturePreprint.pdf](http://www.sittampalam.net/NaturePreprint.pdf)

PS:

To make any final decision easier here, you may consider this quick and simple way: You could kindly phone any or all of those eminent and uppermost-echelon physicists, including Nobel laureates, to whom I sent/copied (1), above, to confide at least in you their individual opinions on that letter. (I am yet to receive one!) Thank you.

PPS:

Marc Abrahams, editor of the bimonthly magazine, *Annals of Improbable Research*, and organizer of the Ig Nobel Prize, wrote the following, in *The Guardian* of 18 May 2004, under the heading: **Move over, Einstein.**

“... The public may scoff at these, but it's possible that somewhere **in the midst of this list is a theory that really does explain everything.**”

He then went on to list his chosen five books. Mine was the third on that list, with these lines: “**And now, the long awaited... Theory of Everything, by Eugene Sittampalam. The book's back cover makes an interesting offer: ‘The author welcomes a refutation from any reader and offers hereby all his profits from this work – up to one million US dollars – to the first reader to successfully do so.’**”

Stephen W Hawking was the only other name of prominence to me on the list. His book, *The Theory of Everything: The Origin and Fate of the Universe*, was listed fourth, without comment.

Knowing the not so ignoble antics of Marc Abrahams, I would like to think that he played on his words “in the midst” to allude, literally, to “in the middle” – or the third in his lineup of five! It would not be surprising, either, if he had this gut feeling of his all reassured following a tête-à-tête with his next-door department neighbour, Howard Georgi, at Harvard! Theoretical Particle Physicist, Prof Georgi reviewed my work in full (for a fee) before the book was published; sadly(?), he failed with the Harvard Physics Department to refute my work, despite the US\$25,000 cheque he held with him (and still does, perhaps, as a collector’s item or, as he put it in his own words in a letter to me, "...as a memento of this rather unusual experience”).

---

Simon Eugene Sittampalam  
Sea Spray, 645 Beach Road  
Jaffna, Sri Lanka  
Telephone: +9421 222 6851  
E-mail: [eugenesittampalam@gmail.com](mailto:eugenesittampalam@gmail.com)  
Website: [www.sittampalam.net](http://www.sittampalam.net)

---