

To: Prof. Brian Josephson <bdj10@cam.ac.uk>
 Cc: Prof. Peter Littlewood <hod@phy.cam.ac.uk>
 Prof. Howard Georgi <georgi@physics.harvard.edu>
 Prof. Daniel Marlow <marlow@princeton.edu>
 Sir Martin Rees <mjr36@cam.ac.uk>
 Prof. Geoffrey Burbidge <gburbidge@ucsd.edu>
 Prof. Freeman Dyson <dyson@ias.edu>
 Prof. Stephen Hawking <S.W.Hawking@damtp.cam.ac.uk>
 Prof. Stephen Hawking, care of <arobinson@perimeterinstitute.ca>
 Prof. James Peebles <pjep@princeton.edu>
 Prof. Steven Weinberg <weinberg@physics.utexas.edu>
 The Editor <letters@thetimes.co.uk>
 The Editor <letters@sunday-times.co.uk>
 Dr. Michael Brooks <info@michaelbrooks.org>
 Subject: A Nobel Response
 Date: 27 March 2009

Professor Brian D Josephson
 Director, Mind-Matter Unification Project
 Theory of Condensed Matter Group
 Cavendish Laboratory
 Cambridge, UK

Dear Esteemed Professor,

Your reply of 23 March 2009: "I did give you an answer, and the answer was 'no'. Sorry if I was unclear. bdj"

Thank you very much for your above response. From its tenor, I shall now take it as a definite "no" to my question: "DOES THE MOVING BODY CONTRACT TRANSVERSE TO MOTION?"

Coming from a Cambridge authority with a Nobel to boot, it will also be considered as confirmation with conviction, as per your own guiding principles (Box 1, below), and not as parroting of a textbook like a student (see also Box 2). In other words, it is not an off the cuff remark with a seeming security in number from the vast mainstream of physicists who would endorse your view – despite the fact that, in your own words (Box 1), "this should not necessarily be taken as proof that the said idea is absurd."

As a true scientist, therefore, do kindly take that one last complementary step here to substantiate your answer – that this zero transverse contraction has indeed been derived from first principles or verified experimentally by you or anyone else in the literature.

Before that, however, please drop me a quick line to say that you can kindly extend to me this one final favour. I shall then rush the US\$25,000 plus fees and other costs by courier to your physics department head, Prof. Peter Littlewood, to whom you may present your findings to, in your own words (again Box 1), "judge how well these stand up to detailed scrutiny." Hopefully, for the future of good and wholesome science, Prof. Littlewood, too, will kindly consent to this, and, if convinced that the transverse contraction is indeed a nonevent in moving bodies, donate the money to you or to your worthy Mind-Matter Unification Project. Although a pittance (if not an insult) to a Nobelist, please do accept it at least as a token of my gratitude to you for relieving me of this obsession that physics in its entirety has indeed been unified in my propounded singular model.

In the alternative, it may seem easier for you to show the fallacy of any one of the related following.

1. My derivation of the longitudinal and transverse contraction factors is from first principles (a physics first), as given in chapter 4 of my book as well as in section 5 of: www.sittampalam.net/Synopsis.htm; it springs from the most important of all insights in physics: THE ATOM IS A BREATHING ENTITY; in oblivion of which fundamental fact, quantum physics will NEVER emerge from its present "counterintuitive," "weird" and "bizarre" world or ever find unification with the rest of physics, least of all between mind and matter.

2. The longitudinal and transverse contractions are the direct consequences of the all too familiar inertial and centrifugal forces, respectively; these are explained and illustrated in detail under sections, “Inertial Forces” and “Centrifugal Forces,” in www.sittampalam.net/RelativityII.htm. (Denouncing transverse contraction would now amount to denying centrifugal and centripetal forces that counteract in curvilinear motion; though zero, in net, in rectilinear motion, the transverse forces are still there with the contractions in general motion.)
3. The other renowned Nobel laureate receiving this, Professor Weinberg, could kindly add his expertise on this. Breathing in and breathing out are complementary; one CANNOT occur without the other; nucleons and electrons are the constituent particles of the breathing atom and are also nature’s basic magnets; they breathe in at the south pole (magnetic influx) and breathe out at the north (magnetic efflux), effecting the atomic respiration (and the atom’s natural vibration) overall; a particle of matter can thus be only a dipole, if at all magnetic; hence, the “magnetic monopole” is purely a theoretical construct (akin to an envisioned one-hand clapping!) and – an absolute nonentity in nature.

Box 1

One of my guiding principles, also, has been the scientist's motto 'Take nobody's word for it' (nullius in verba), a corollary of which is that if scientists as a whole denounce an idea this should not necessarily be taken as proof that the said idea is absurd: rather, one should examine carefully the alleged grounds for such opinions and judge how well these stand up to detailed scrutiny.

Brian D Josephson (Nobel 1973), University of Cambridge; <http://www.tcm.phy.cam.ac.uk/~bdj10>

[This has graced the top of my web page, www.sittampalam.net/FusionEnergyII.htm, for several years now]

Box 2

No, according to the standard theory. The standard argument is that with a transverse rod you can check identity by coincidence of ends and there's no reason for one to be longer than the other. The argument doesn't work with longitudinal motion since overlap is a function of time owing to the relative motion. If this is unclear take two rulers and the difference will I trust then become clear. bdj

[This is Prof. Josephson’s kind response of 18 September 2008; the “No” here, however, did not sound all that definitive to my question, “DOES THE MOVING BODY CONTRACT TRANSVERSE TO MOTION?”]

In conclusion, the physics orthodoxy can ill afford its continuing complacency, if not charade, under the icon of Einstein. (Physics is not a religion but the bedrock of science concerning observation of, and experimentation with, solely natural phenomena, and should be free of all unverifiable ‘thought experiments’ even in part.) Its dogmatic ‘standard models’, as taught today, are no longer viable or justifiable for continuing research at public expense. Just as importantly, the future welfare of its faithful and innocent charge and that of the generations to follow should be uppermost in its mind and sincere. And the time for change is now – in the overwhelming final light disseminated here on the nature of things.

Or, call my bluff and expose my own insincerity here... please?

Thank you again and with best regards.

Yours sincerely,

Eugene Sittampalam

PS: My letter of last week to you and the three other professors (in reference to *The Times* article, “13 Unsolved scientific puzzles,” by Dr Michael Brooks) may now be accessed on: www.sittampalam.net/TheProfessors.pdf.

Simon Eugene Sittampalam
 Sea Spray, 645 Beach Road
 Jaffna, Sri Lanka
 Tel: +9421 222 6851
 E-mail: eugenesittampalam@gmail.com
 Website: www.sittampalam.net
