

# **REPORT**

## **Possible Evidence of the Greatest Ever Crime Against Humanity?**

Robert F. Beck  
[www.einsteins-revolution.com](http://www.einsteins-revolution.com)

October/November 2006

## Contents

Introduction	3
Background to my involvement	4
The Evidence	7
Conclusions	13
Recommendations	13
Appendix 1 Email correspondence with other NPA members regarding April 2006 conference	15
Appendix 2 Correspondence with Revd. Dr. John Polkinghorne KBE FRS	22
Appendix 3 Correspondence with the Archbishop of Canterbury	28
Appendix 4 Correspondence with the Prime Minister and Government departments	35

## Introduction

The dangers of climate change are now regularly headline news. Report after report confirms and adds to evidence of looming catastrophes on an unprecedented scale. Yesterday(29/10/06) BBC Breakfast mentioned a recent report envisaging disastrous consequences of climate chaos in Africa, one of many areas where it is the actions of the wealthiest nations that will be responsible for untold suffering amongst the poorest and most vulnerable.

But we in the UK are also not immune from possible disaster. The current that drives the Gulf Stream is already showing signs of faltering (30% reduction reported in New Scientist), threatening our very way of life and prosperity. Even the US is arguably already starting to reap the consequences (New Orleans), and other great cities and low lying areas there are threatened by a combination of increased atmospheric energy and probable rises in sea levels, not to mention the economic and political consequences of global catastrophes and instabilities. Ultimately, the whole World and World order is under threat, the consequences of which could bring widespread suffering exceeding all that mankind's arrogance and stupidity managed to inflict upon itself in the last century.

Today (30/10/06) I find that another report, by renowned economist Sir Nicholas Stern, echoes these fears quantitatively (up to £3.68 trillion recession and 200million refugees) and predicts "massive recession" unless money is spent now tackling the problem. I have to say that such figures may represent spurious exactitude, but I have to agree that the scale of the figures has to be considered possible, or even exceedable.

The danger of this report, however, is naivety about the prospects of achieving solutions without radical new technologies that can benefit all nations. And Stern, not a scientist, offers the highly dangerous opinion that CO2 levels 25% above current levels would be high – but acceptable. Working on this basis is a huge gamble. I doubt if Stern was aware when drafting this report that scientists are now saying that the vast, sub-Arctic forests and bogs may be just one degree centigrade away from disastrous and unstoppable thaw, with decaying vegetation releasing huge volumes of methane, a much worse greenhouse gas than CO2, in a self-reinforcing accelerating mechanism (ground warming through less reflection). And temperature increase is fastest in these areas, giving us perhaps ten years to avoid disaster by reducing carbon emissions, not stabilising them at a higher level. See New Scientist, 30 Sept. p. 8.

Sir Nicholas Stern and others should note that this New Scientist report ends with the following quote and comment "The Boreal region is like a giant carbon bank account. At current prices in the European carbon emissions trading system, Canada's stored carbon alone would be worth \$3.7 trillion." (Canadian environmental consultant) I wish the report had clarified which dollars, presumably Canadian, but a massive figure anyway, and the report concludes "And if Hansen (NASA) is right that the carbon and methane stored in the boreal regions has the potential to transform the world into "another planet", then the boreal region may be worth a great deal more than that.

This is just one of various dangers. This must be seen as the third great war for civilisation and we need another Churchill to adequately warn us of the harsh realities and to encourage us to face them sensibly and logically. It is not logical to impose green taxes on aircraft flights whilst actively encouraging increased numbers of them! And we cannot naïvely ignore the likely actions of others such as the USA, India, China etc. The bottom line is that without the rapid development of adequate new technologies, applied on a global scale, we may be sunk.

But what if the technology that could have prevented this situation has been potentially available for half a century, but has deliberately been suppressed for reasons that are no longer valid and represent self-interest that globally is criminally negligent? Such action, if continued in the light of these now apparent consequences, would amount to the greatest ever crime against humanity, and of course, arguably, maybe the greatest ever sin.

This report sets out the evidence that I have recently become aware of and my own particular reasons for considering the possibility of its validity.

## **Background to my involvement**

Since early 2004 I have been constantly increasing my efforts to make physicists, the government, the media, the press and the Church, and the public via my book, aware of my firm belief that God has given me a new understanding of the true meaning of relativity and other knowledge that means that genuine anti-gravity, not just means of achieving lift, has to be possible.

Understandably at first perhaps, I was ignored as a probable crank, though I insisted that as the dangers of climate change became ever more apparent, it had to be logical to at least open a debate about my claims. Regrettably, much time has been wasted in what seems to have been grim determination by almost all to ignore what I was saying, though I can see various reasons for some doubting my credibility. I can, however, now provide authoritative support for the possibility that I am right, in the form of the views of scientists willing to consider ideas contrary those which mainstream physicists appear to be happy to consider as almost “set in stone”; an approach which to my mind is unscientific, and even puzzling bearing in mind the current impasse in physics. The facts are as follows.

In the summer of 2003 I was a retired town planner seeking a quiet and humble existence primarily as a carpenter and tool sharpener, many years after taking some personal interest in relativity whilst doing “A” levels and two years of an engineering degree in the 60’s. I was recovering from a recurrence of the health problems (anxiety & depression) that had led to my retirement from local government in 1984, which were this time triggered by a string of misfortunes that also led me to re-affirm my Christian faith in a decision to trust God no matter what.

In October 2003, I have no doubt, as a consequence of this decision, I had experiences which convinced me that I was being given an understanding of relativity clearly beyond my own ability to reach. The experiences continued for about two weeks, and exactly one month after the first revelation I completed a 10,000 word paper, which was understandably naïve, following decades of isolation from the scientific community, but which I have refined following further private study and submitted to a conference of primarily scientific dissidents (NPA), but in association with the highly respected American Association for the Advancement of Science, held in Tulsa in April this year. Email correspondence, including favourable comments received is included in Appendix 1.

Note in particular that the person who had read and commented on all 82 papers, and was in the process of a thorough study of both Newton’s and Einstein’s views, said of my linking of mass and spin that I was “on the right track”. Note also that I agreed with Russian Professor Kanarev’s views on space, time and matter and that there is no electron orbit, suggesting a mechanism by which they vibrate in place when shared between protons. I learned today from another NPA member that micro-photos taken in recent years appear to confirm this. Others

confirmed their support or agreement on other details and most of the participants were concerned about current mainstream interpretation of relativity.

In addition to these favourable comments I was greatly encouraged to find several people with much greater scientific qualification coming to similar conclusions to me, some backed up by maths, on various matters, from the structure of particles to the nature of space and time (including the view of several that  $c$  can be exceeded) and other problems concerned with the meaning and interpretation of relativity. Several others, including Professor Kanarev, argue as I do that electrons are composed of rings; others agree with me that photons are comprised of many smaller particles; and another Russian, now working in the US, Alex Tsybin, agrees with me that gravity can be explained by the action of neutrinos, which move in spirals as I correctly theorised shortly after I completed my first paper late in 2003, purely from my interpretation of relativity.

But from the start, I had been so confident that my own level of knowledge of physics, now being enthusiastically expanded, confirmed the likelihood of the validity and huge significance of my new understanding, that I had immediately embarked on an attempt to elicit comment from those in the scientific community that I thought surely must be interested. With letters to a selected few, completely ignored, apart from the singular and notable exception of the late Professor Sir Hermann Bondi (who agreed that  $c$  should not be considered as a cosmic speed limit) I began to suspect that the physics establishment does not like to communicate with “outsiders”, a suspicion that appeared to be confirmed as the number of unanswered letters and emails grew exponentially, and from other material I was reading. Earlier this year I sent 1000 emails in two weeks to staff and graduate students at several top colleges, with just one reply, wondering how I managed to get his email address!

I had, quite early on, realised the difficulties I would have in publishing papers or embarking on or instigating meaningful debate, so I started working on two books early in 2004. The first of these, *The Special Theory of Reality*, was self-published in ebook form late that year and as a paperback early in 2005. It contained my reasons for believing that genuine anti-gravity must be possible based on my own theory and very strong evidence to suggest that human levitation was a real, scientifically explainable phenomenon, based on information that I am also convinced I was led to by Divine guidance. Such evidence includes the observations of a former President of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, William Crookes.

With very little money for publicity, I have sold only a handful of copies so far, but profit is not my motivation and I have sent many copies to scientists, the press, media, Church, politicians and others, expressing my now ever growing concern that nothing but anti-gravity will be sufficient to prevent the disasters mentioned above.

Following the conference in Tulsa, I became aware of little known evidence, from experiments in the seventies, appearing to confirm my own controversial view of mass (dependent on spin). This prompted me to write (or Email) again to top scientists, the Prime Minister, Lord Sainsbury (science and innovation), Archbishop of Canterbury, the press and media, arguing that there were experiments that could be repeated verifying my view of relativity and thus the possibility of anti-gravity, which appeared to me to be probably a grossly under-funded area of research given its significance to climate change.

I also wrote again to the Rev. Dr. John Polkinghorne, who had appeared on the BBC documentary about Einstein, and was one of the only men of science willing to express any view, albeit a very strange one to me in saying that my statement that mass depended on spin

was “incomprehensible to physicists”. This is strange in that gyroscopic action is clearly and most obviously an inertial effect of spin, and of course, the view was subsequently expressed by a truly open-minded physicist, with particular interest in this field that I was “on the right track” to link mass and spin. I had not persisted with Dr. Polkinghorne because of his age, but now that it was predicted that 400million could die as a consequence of climate change, I felt that he, in his role as a man of God, might be keen to consider the experimental evidence I had found with an open mind. His reply suggested the contrary. (See Appendix 2)

The replies from government departments and from the Archbishop of Canterbury’s office and the latter’s failure to reply regarding my wish to be sure of knowing his personal opinion on a matter that involves the suffering of millions, leaves me pondering two possible options: 1. these people find simple logic difficult or 2. these people have something to hide. These particular letters and replies are included in Appendices 3 & 4. By “these people” I do not necessarily mean the Prime Minister and Archbishop of Canterbury personally, because I cannot be absolutely sure that they have personally read my correspondence. The purpose of this report is to try to ensure that they do become aware of the full significance and possible validity of all that I am saying.

I can see no reason why Lord Sainsbury should not find it entirely reasonable and totally justifiable in the dire circumstance that we now find ourselves, simply to require of the scientific community that they are certain, beyond reasonable doubt, that their understanding of gravity is adequate to rule out the prospect of anti-gravity and that they have given adequate consideration to what I and others are saying and to all relevant experimental evidence. It is ridiculous to suggest that Lord Sainsbury requires personal understanding of the science to do so. And whether or not my publishing venture is promoted in the process is hugely insignificant compared with the wider economic considerations and the seriousness of the situation, as now confirmed by Sir Nicholas Stern. I continually repeat that my primary objective is not to make profit but to expand understanding, and that I will give as much profit as I can to charity.

I would be astonished if the Archbishop of Canterbury (amongst others, including the Prime Minister) has no interest in seeking opinion regarding the possibility that my view of relativity, and possible insights into creation, can be tested experimentally and thus give credibility to my claim of Divine guidance on a matter of huge significance, in scientific, religious and humanitarian terms.

It is against this background that I now present the evidence that has come into my possession very recently. I cannot guarantee the validity of all this evidence; I have to say that I expect the vast majority of physicists to ridicule most of it, and others to probably deny other aspects. This does not mean that I have lost all respect for mainstream physicists. Far from it; and I have huge respect for the efforts and achievements of many in the past; but I can see that they are locked into error that is a huge stumbling block, causing a recognised current impasse that is leading some to much greater nonsense and wild speculation (parallel universes) than even this evidence may represent. I can only express opinion based on my own particular knowledge and experience, which may well help those with an open mind to determine the likelihood or not of some of the astonishing claims it contains being other than a hoax, misunderstanding or ill-considered opinion or speculation.

I do wish to draw the readers prior attention to the fact that my own particular conclusion about anti-gravity, that I reached in 2004 and is included in my published book, with no knowledge whatsoever of any of the research contained in the interview now mentioned, is that high levels of power are unlikely to be required but rather finding exactly the right (probably high)

frequency, e.g. that of the iron nucleus or related to it in some way. It is also important, in assessing the implications regarding profit over progress, to take into account the clarifications I make about Tesla and its significance to the quote involving J. P. Morgan.

## **The Evidence**

The main evidence, to which I will refer is a video interview to be found on the following website:

<http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=3808996975040613718&hl=en>

This will be compared and analysed with information contained on the website of American Tim Ventura, who brings together much information in this field:

[www.americanantigravity.com](http://www.americanantigravity.com)

I shall also refer briefly to an alleged historic pact between the Church and science regarding unified field theories, as set out on the following website:

[www.einsteinconspiracy.co.uk](http://www.einsteinconspiracy.co.uk)

The video interview to be found on the first website is quite long, over 52minutes, but I urge all interested in this report to watch the whole interview for two reasons. Firstly, this helps to judge the sincerity and credibility of the interviewee, and secondly, this is necessary to understand the full implications and the relevance of my comments here.

The interview is conducted by members of an organisation called Project Camelot, who explain themselves on their website as follows:

PROJECT CAMELOT's purpose is to provide a vehicle for researchers and 'whistleblowers' to get their stories out.

Many who are challenging current paradigms have concerns about being attacked personally or in other ways prevented from doing their work.

Our purpose is to help.

The interviewee, Ralph Ring, is a Korean war veteran who, with no real qualification or experience, apart from his own interest in magnetism and natural laws, discovered what seemed to be a natural ability to come up with solutions to problems posed in a research facility in Southern California called Advanced Kinetics, soon after he found work there as a laboratory technician in the 50's.

Frustrated with Advanced Kinetic's preoccupation with maintaining continued funding rather than actually finding solutions, the shredding of his paper outlining his own experimental findings (analysed below), and even a visit from three "men in black", Ring resigned.

He then became involved with a group calling themselves "understanding" set up by one Daniel Fry, that included Otis T. Carr, a man who knew the renowned great innovator Nicola Tesla, who I can confirm had made huge contributions in the field of electrical generation and transmission following his move to New York in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century and very nearly beat Marconi to the invention of radio. I will discuss his ideas on high power wireless electricity transmission later.

Carr, using knowledge passed on by Tesla, that few could understand, had apparently been working on levitating discs in Oklahoma but was becoming concerned regarding scrutiny and even his own safety. So the Understanding group moved him to a safe house, a cabin in California, where he and Ring apparently had fruitful discussions.

Tesla and Carr were clearly men of inspiration with the knowledge to make sense of the cutting edge technologies they were involved in. Ring, on the other hand demonstrates more of an intuitive kind of insight, without the benefit of adequate study to make complete sense of it. We thus find, as the interview continues, that Ring becomes a little hesitant in his explanations (sound waves? electricity?) and is ultimately astonished and bewildered when Carr is found premises adequate to continue his work and eventually demonstrates mind blowing effects to Ring, including apparently a ten mile trip in a levitating craft, with strange effects on perception of memory and time.

Two weeks after this trip, apparently, there was a raid by government agents, who shut down the operation, confiscated material, and banned Ring from further contact with Carr. This may have transpired because flights of the craft produced by Carr had been spotted, or because Carr had a meeting with a representative of General Motors, hoping to get backing for an enterprise with huge potential benefits to mankind, but instead elicited the quote mentioned by Ring, referring to levitating craft: "put 'em up and we'll shoot 'em down".

The account of the mysterious flight, or transportation of some kind, is the point where many may suspect that Ring was either the subject of a hoax (unlikely considering the action that followed) or complicit in one now, or perhaps that his memory is now deceiving him. The only way that I can throw light on this, apart from the relatively small value observation that this man comes across to me as probably genuine and does not mention a book that he might profit from, is by analysing some of the details in the light of my own particular knowledge and experience.

I will start with experiments, official and private, while he was working for Advanced Kinetics. Firstly, Ring's experiment with his own cathode ray tube may be difficult to explain by standard physics. In theory the electrons should deviate most at low power and thus low speed, which is why the experiment that Ring was introduced to used high power to propel the electrons at high speed to give minimum deviation. In my theory both the magnetic field and the moving electron are spirals and rings of anti-neutrinos (maybe also including neutrinos), and the electron, unless given high momentum, and depending on the orientation of my hypothesised outer ring, may progress not in a straight line but a spiral (helix) by virtue of the inertial effects of its spins (external and internal). This appears to be exactly what Ring describes. The tiny particles comprising the slow-moving electron may thus be picking their way round the spirals of similar tiny particles comprising the field with thus less interaction, that cannot be avoided at greater speeds.

The levitation of a ping-pong ball utilising, apparently, ultrasound in a 15 inch woofer speaker (normally low frequency) may be explainable by waves (air particles) as Ring supposed. But this would surely not have caused Dr. Weinheart to shred Ring's paper and result in a visit from three "men in black". Weinheart would have just smiled and said "Nice try Ralph, but what you have demonstrated is explainable by existing physics and does not represent a breakthrough in understanding that we are looking for".

One can keep a ping-pong ball in the air by blowing from underneath at appropriate speed, so that the momentum of air particles destroyed by the ball exactly balances the force of gravity. So it is not inconceivable that a much lesser volume of particles (ultrasound waves) at much higher speed could have the same result, but why only at 28,000 cycles rather than as a progressive effect?

It has to be remembered that the cone of the speaker generates the sound (or ultra-sound) waves in the air, but this is achieved by the frequency of the electric current in the coil attached to the cone. As I have mentioned, I had previously concluded that levitation, including that of the human body, for which there is considerable evidence as a genuine phenomenon, must depend upon something very specific rather than high levels of power. And I am sure that this must operate at sub-atomic level, probably at a very specific frequency of atomic and sub-atomic vibration. This maybe why Weinheart knew that Ring was onto something significant, a solution that may make further experimentation (and funding) in this field unnecessary. Note Weinheart's words: "we get paid handsomely for looking for answers – not finding them."

But it may also have been that Weinheart was taken aback that someone with as little knowledge (apparently) as Ring, had discovered something significant or already known and highly classified, which necessitated the visit by the three men in black suits to find out how much Ring actually knew and from what source; and if he was likely to understand fully what he had actually discovered. Was he a spy? If not, might he inadvertently disclose the key frequency? No doubt Ring's background was investigated and it was decided that he had very little understanding of the effect he had discovered. Perhaps he was watched for a while to rule out espionage.

We then come to the aluminium plate that was apparently jellified, so that Ring was able to push his hand in and out of it. Again Ring's lack of knowledge is evident in thinking first of sound as the answer rather than electricity, though he seemed undecided as to which. The strength of materials is determined by the role played by electrons, so one must suspect a more likely high voltage effect that maybe removes structural electrons. Is this feasible? It appears so if you are familiar with the Hutchison effect as referred to by Tim Ventura in his long article entitled "The Ultimate Hutchison Effect" to be found on the second website given above. I have also read articles theorising this removal of electrons.

Ventura's website is an excellent source of information regarding anti-gravity research from which it is clear that there are experimental results from several researchers that are difficult to explain in terms of established theory. Canadian John Hutchison is by far the most impressive in this field, but no one has been able to replicate his results, and it appears that Hutchison is not able to explain them except as sporadic and thus somewhat unpredictable effects of his salvaged high voltage apparatus, including a Tesla coil (for the production of both high voltages and high frequencies). It is important to note, however, that Hutchison has been banned from further experimentation by the Canadian Government, apparently following effects that put him in danger.

Well photographed and documented results include exactly the same jellification of aluminium produced by Carr that Ring apparently interacted with half a century before. But his most impressive results show the levitation of many objects of many types of materials. Tim Ventura refers to serious attempts that have been made to replicate Hutchison's results without success.

Several months before seeing Ring's interview, I had suggested to Tim Ventura that his next step should be to consider the evidence that I had found indicating human levitation to be a real, scientifically explainable phenomena, and that the reason why others could not replicate Hutchison's amazing effects might be that Hutchison himself was affecting them by his own presence and interaction. This is why I did not immediately scoff at what no doubt many would think "science fiction nonsense", including myself three years ago, because Ring's almost unbelievable account of how ultra-marine was selected fitted with both a very particular frequency and human interaction.

Those few familiar with my book and first paper, including my M.P., will realise that the way Carr explained time to Ring is essentially what I have been saying since October 2003, and we both use the same words: "time does not exist". I do not, however, agree that everything that exists is the product of our own imaginations, just that what is called "paranormal", including telepathy, psycho-kinesis etc. is most probably explainable by the encoding of information at lower levels than have yet been discovered, in the spirals of neutrinos spinning at many frequencies, which I also think explains string theory and the very nature of quantum mechanics. I have a possible explanation for the time and memory effect experienced by Ring but this may take up too much space here and detract from following the important basic facts.

Apparently the reason given by the government agents (FBI according to Ring, and maybe CIA) for shutting down Carr's operation was "attempting to overthrow the monetary system". Presumably because General Motors and the government feared that technology becoming suddenly available, that existing manufacturers did not understand and which in particular did not depend heavily on gasoline (petrol), would de-stabilise the capitalist economy (stock market, tax revenue etc.)

So we are left to ponder the possibility that the development of the technology that could have had a huge effect in reducing greenhouse gas emissions and other pollution (including possibly lead in petrol as the reason for some very unsound reasoning), was deliberately suppressed in the USA from the 50's on, perhaps so that research could be focussed purely on possible military applications. You will find almost daily TV programmes (Discovery mainly) dealing with the latter scenario and as related with other conspiracy theories.

As to the possibility that far more efficient, wireless energy transmission was also suppressed because there was no way of metering it, it appears that Tesla's ideas in this respect were found to be unworkable after he died in 1943, and though we may suspect that vested interests found a way of influencing this conclusion, it has to be borne in mind that my source claims that millions of dollars were subsequently spent on the possible military/ defence applications of his ideas for a defensive "death ray", based on the same basic principles, including maybe some aspects of Reagan's SDI in the 80's, with no success (so far). It is also my own opinion that even if it were theoretically possible, maintaining a constant and adequate nationwide (or even relatively local) supply could prove extremely hazardous, both directly to human health and as the result of accidental or deliberate extraction of too much power. But I have to say that I could be wrong on this; Tesla clearly had much greater expertise than I in this field.

But the important point that I wish to make is that we must not see Tesla as discredited as a result of this. By any standards he was clearly a brilliant, able and highly productive innovator and inventor, who made a huge contribution to the technological advances that sustain our current way of life. It is probably true to say that he outshone Edison and Marconi and may well have suffered injustice as a result, robbing him of the distinction of inventor of the radio. We must consider the possibility that the knowledge he passed on to Carr could be the key that can save humanity from untold suffering and set mankind on a new course.

My next evidence, I present with some hesitation and reluctance. The idea repulses me and I hope it is not true. But if it is true, it is so contrary to my philosophies on both science and religion that I must see it refuted or exposed.

On the third website, someone with considerable knowledge of the history of the development of unified field theories, Roger Anderton, says:

“There has been a great number of scientists working on UFT, and academia responds by ostracizing them whenever possible. All of the scientific issues raised by this theoretical development touch upon issues such as the paranormal and ETs that Academia wishes to be in a state of denial about.

I have now been in contact with various people that have been working on these theoretical ideas either directly or indirectly, and was amazed to be informed that Scientific Academia had made a deal a long time ago with the Religious Priesthood that “they” have agreed censorship between them. This agreed censorship seems to be another reason why UFT is not allowed to be talked about too much; because it would impinge on religious beliefs.”

If this is true, it is one more reason, in addition to those set out in Chapter 5 of my book, why my own experience is not ostracism (which I would have preferred and could have responded to) but a generally universal, extreme and determined avoidance of any comment. There have, as I have stated, been one or two very slight exceptions, but apart from other dissidents (see Appendix 1) and very brief comment from the then very elderly and now late Sir Hermann Bondi, no indication of any desire to consider what I am saying with an open mind.

I passionately believe that the historic problems between science and the Church stem from a lack of open-minded humility (read on in Roger Anderton’s website for facts), mainly on the part of the Church in the past, but with the pendulum now tending to swing more in the other direction, perhaps encouraged by the Church, with scientists fearful for their funding if they refute the certainty of big bang theory (see [www.cosmologystatement.org](http://www.cosmologystatement.org)). Expressions such as “standard model” as applied to particle physics and cosmology do not engender a truly open-minded approach. The wider “Church”, especially in the USA, still has problems in that some wish to suppress science in favour of their own interpretation of the “literal truth” of the Bible.

I have reason to sincerely believe that God wishes me to convey to the World that mankind’s future depends on its ability to find the value of open-minded humility. The lack of the ability to say “maybe we are getting it wrong” is the cause of all our great problems, from terrorism and wars to pollution.

No science and no religion should ever insist that they cannot be wrong. Humility is the hallmark of true faith and the essence of good science, and it must be our guide if we explore the universe. Certain knowledge is, I think, revealed on a need to know basis. Attempts to define

God and his creation may have seemed necessary when the populace was relatively uniformed. But now may be the time that it is necessary for all to open their minds to the possibility that we are ready to be given greater and clearer understanding. But we are not ready to receive it unless we demonstrate the open-minded humility to admit our own fallibility. If the insistence that certain ideas are beyond discussion is preventing understanding that could lead to new technology with the potential to avoid great suffering, I say that simple logic demands that it is time for a rethink.

I shall, therefore, be sending copies of this report, inter alia, to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Pope, asking if they are aware if any such pact ever existed, and if so, if they are willing to dissociate themselves from it in the interests of discovering both the knowledge that could save mankind from untold suffering, and the truth of my claim that God has given me knowledge that could lead to a true unified field theory, with all forces, matter and energy being explainable by the same mechanism (spirals and rings of fast-spinning neutrinos and anti-neutrinos or possibly even smaller as yet undiscovered particles).

I shall be asking again, in the light of the evidence contained in this report, if they have any interest in calling for the experiments of the late Bruce DePalma, (who I understand died young in suspicious circumstances) that appear to verify my view of inertial mass, to be repeated and improved so as to indicate the validity of my claim of Divine revelation of the true meaning of relativity and the nature of gravity.

The experiments I mention (trajectories of spinning balls) and also those referred to by Dr. DePalma regarding the collision of spinning balls, carried out by others, need to be repeated in such a way that the effects of air resistance and friction are clearly ruled out (it is not clear to me if DePalma did this), and so as to examine my claim that anything that spins, naturally follows a curved path in the absence of all other forces (in apparent contradiction, or perhaps clarification, of Newton's first law of motion). Such experiments are best done in space, but should perhaps be preceded by relatively simple and inexpensive terrestrial ones that indicate if I may be right or wrong by confirming the results stated by DePalma.

But either way the question remains: why, so far, has no one been able to accept the simple logic, that if simple, relatively inexpensive experiments can be repeated, that could conceivably lead to technology that can change the entire future of the human race and prevent untold suffering, whilst maintaining and improving current lifestyles, they simply have to be carried out no matter how small the perceived chance of success, especially when the only alternative appears to be action that will simply spread the misery more evenly and almost certainly unsuccessfully?

The situation has drastically changed since General Motors (allegedly) said of levitating craft "put 'em up and we'll shoot 'em down". Now, the only sane way to maintain the hopes and aspirations of those seeking life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, so that others can just "live", is to give them jobs putting up quiet, non-polluting, energy-efficient craft that no sane person should ever wish to shoot down! Regrettably the insanity of war and terrorism will continue, so the "insane" will still "shoot 'em down", but perhaps some will have learned enough of the value of an open mind to sow the seeds of a peaceful (multi-faith) future and take us beyond this planet with a better attitude than epitomised the exploration of this one. And future 9/11s will not be as devastating because there will be no need to carry huge quantities of explosive fuel.

## Conclusions

The evidence presented in this report, including my own experiences, all suggests for various possible reasons, that technology and the theory behind its development, that could have very substantially reduced the effects now recognised as primary contributors to disastrous climate change, may have been seriously and deliberately inhibited over the last 50 years.

Those who may have been aware of this in recent years would, in the light of what we know now, be collectively guilty of the greatest ever crime against humanity and possibly the greatest ever sin, if this is true and they do not take appropriate action now.

Economic considerations are now significantly different to those applying in the last century. There is now greater risk to stability, the capitalist system and to all humanity from ignoring this possible radical new technology than from suppressing it.

I have strong reasons to suspect that I have been given knowledge that could assist in the understanding and development of such technology now, but time is rapidly running out. Experiments that may verify my claims are possible (unlike much of recent modern physics). In addition to those mentioned above it should be noted in the copies of correspondence that follow that I have suggested experiments to the National Physical Laboratory that might verify my explanation of the constancy of  $c$  and my view that it is exceedable, with obvious implications regarding the exploration of the Universe.

It is, therefore, logical that these experiments be carried out with utmost urgency (less so perhaps with the speed of light, though this may equally verify my source) and that all possible encouragement and assistance be given to all researchers in this field, whether theoretical or experimental. I also have reason to suspect that such research may link up with work in the field of new energy sources. Professor Kanarev is working in this field and is struggling with financial difficulty, despite claims of success in his experiments and ground breaking theoretical ideas for which there is evidence of possible verification. It is an absolute nonsense that Kanarev, and probably others do not receive all possible support.

## Recommendations:

1. The Canadian government and others must reflect on whether the danger of John Hutchison's experiments to himself and possible to others is:
  - (a) the only reason they were stopped; and
  - (b) now a justifiable risk that those willing to take should be permitted in light of the huge potential benefits to all humanity.  
(subject to the provision of government funded safe premises and facilities)
2. All governments should be asked, via the United Nations, if they will now collectively agree to openly share knowledge of all research and development in the field of anti-gravity technology.
3. The United Nations should consider a resolution requiring all participating nations to give high priority to the funding and encouragement of research

in the fields of anti-gravity and new energy sources and related theories, including analysis of all sources of relevant information as opposed to only peer-reviewed papers.

4. Questions should be asked in the House of Commons to ensure that the Prime Minister, the Government and the whole House is clearly aware of the evidence contained in this report. The Prime Minister should be asked if he considers that it is appropriate that Lord Sainsbury should limit his contact with scientists to matters limited by the extent of his own scientific expertise. This should be followed by asking the Prime Minister if it is appropriate for the Government to satisfy itself that the scientific community is not missing a vital aspect of knowledge or information that might be of crucial significance to the world-wide battle with climate change. The Prime Minister should be asked if he will now request Lord Sainsbury to reconsider my suggested draft letter to physicists.
5. All concerned, including the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Pope the scientific community, the press and the media, must ask the following questions:

“What if Beck is right in his claim of Divine revelation?”

“How do we discern this matter?”

The answer to the first is that this means that there may be an answer to climate change that may not only mean maintaining and vastly improving current lifestyles; intelligent application of this technology need not threaten the capitalist system, as apparently feared in 50's America, but would kick-start the global economy, bringing growth and huge benefits, in contrast to the dire forecasts of the Stern report and in accordance with its most sensible suggestions.

And I am able to offer a clear and obvious answer to the second question: ask those who are able to carry out the relatively simple and inexpensive initial experiments I can suggest, improving on those mentioned and conducted by the late Dr. Bruce DePalma, to do so (preferably in various universities in different countries). If I am wrong, how much is lost? If I am right, how much stands to be gained? Surely Sir Nicholas Stern would agree.

# Appendix 1

## Email correspondence with other NPA members regarding April 2006 conference (I have emphasised important comments in red)

From: "Charles Weber" <isoptera@mchsi.com>  
To: "Robert Beck" <robert.beck@ntlworld.com>  
Subject: Re: Tulsa 06 The Special Theory of Reality  
Date: 16 March 2006 02:41

Dear Robert Beck,

Your hypothesis seems plausible to me, although I can not imagine what experiment would validate it directly (but then that goes for almost everything else I have seen written about the fundamental nature of subatomic particles).

I do have suggestions for the suggestion box, though. That is to write a brief summary of what your hypothesis is regarding rotating particles in the first paragraph. This would be enormously useful to the reader and make it much easier to get on top of later on. Also, it might be a good idea to leave out "human levitation", at least early on, since it would tend to be a turn off for most, and your hypothesis does not depend on anything like that.

Also posting in html instead pdf would be helpful to the reader since he could click on any URLs directly and it would still be printable.

Sincerely, Charles Weber

From: "Robert Beck" <robert.beck@ntlworld.com>  
To: <marquardtp@gmail.com>  
Subject: Tulsa 06  
Date: 17 March 2006 11:11

Copied to all submitting papers

Dear Peter,

You may have noticed that we share very similar views on the importance of clear definitions and terminology, but I wonder if you have also noticed that we are both saying that waves have to be comprised of many particles.

Charles Weber has observed that it would have been helpful if I had included a summary of my view on particles earlier in the paper. Unfortunately I had just posted the final version. I had, as suspected, found a few mistakes which I have corrected in the attached version.

I think the clearest evidence that we are both right stems from work on twisted light, which shows that individual photons carry orbital angular momentum. To me, work at the RHIC at Brookhaven is a pretty clear indication that quarks are also comprised of very tiny particles with the inherent ability to reform into other particles. I have emailed many at Brookhaven with this view. No reply, of course; they seem sold on the crazy notion that energy itself can be converted to matter, despite the view of their own Richard A. Mould, author of Basic Relativity, that such interpretation is incorrect and a misunderstanding of mass/energy equivalence.

I hope that you can follow my logic that if we start with the principle of impotence, it is clear that energy has to be considered as relative, and that my thought experiments arrive at a clear and simple view of mass/energy equivalence based on the smallest possible particles in motion, which also explains why we must consider our concept of time (i.e. relative rotations) to change with speed, without the paradoxes involved in considering time to be something that "flows" at different rates.

It is then possible to arrive at a sensible reason for the constancy of  $c$  in which photons can go at any speed, but with rate of rotation and thus frequency (because light is comprised of many particles) changing with relative speed, so that it is only at  $c$  relative to us that light manifests as such.

And when we see that considering dimensions to have changed, even those which cannot physically do so, is a means of describing relative or curved motion in terms of increasing values of  $p$ , all the paradoxes and nonsenses of

relativity can be removed. Dimensions do not actually change! But unfortunately they may appear to change in experiments because particles, with the structure that I suggest, must change in size with speed because their rate of spin must change. This, however, is a three-dimensional change and thus nothing to do with the predictions of relativity.

I have written to the UK National Physical Laboratory, setting out my theory and suggesting experiments with the single photons they are able to create, which could verify my explanation of the constancy of  $c$ . First that claimed not to have received my letter, but then they said that if I sent another copy they could not guarantee that I would receive a reply, and of course, I did not.

I wonder if the NPA might resolve to inquire of this and similar establishments, capable of carrying out experiments with individual photons, if they have considered testing the hypothesis (now suggested by various people) that photons can travel at relative speeds other than  $c$ , and whether this corresponds to a change of frequency.

Robert F. Beck

[www.einsteins-revolution.com](http://www.einsteins-revolution.com)

From: Robert Beck  
To: robert@drheaston.com  
Sent: Thursday, March 16, 2006 2:56 PM  
Subject: Tulsa 06 - logarithmic sensing of time

Dear Robert,

On the BBC at the moment Mikio Kaku (City University of New York) is presenting a series of programmes on time. So far this has been somewhat disappointing in not giving a logical viewpoint of the true meaning of time, but the last programme did contain experimental evidence of the logarithmic sensing of time.

A volunteer was dropped from some height into netting and the adrenalin rush enabled him to discern the momentary flash of a number on a hand held device that was normally too fast to perceive.

I think that Mikio made it clear that it was the perception of time that slowed down, but I think that he could have made the whole situation clearer if he had said that it was the perception of the relative frequency of events (pulses) that had actually changed, because time is not a "thing" that can be perceived.

It is, of course, theoretically possible that the actual frequency of pulses decreased with the change in gravitational potential, and I think that my theory confirms this particular aspect of relativity as a matter of conservation of energy, but this effect would surely be negligible on this scale.

Of course, when I say "the actual frequency" I mean the frequency relative to some other frequency that we happen to have chosen as standard.

**Do you concur?**

Robert F. Beck

From: "Dr. Robert J. Heaston" <robert@drheaston.com>  
To: "Robert Beck" <robert.beck@ntlworld.com>  
Subject: Re: Tulsa 06 - logarithmic sensing of time  
Date: 18 March 2006 22:58

Good Day Robert,

You raise a fascinating question. **Yes--I concur in a qualified manner:** In extremis people sense time differently than in a normal situation. The recent book by Malcolm Gladwell, *Blink: The Tipping Point*, Little, Brown, and Company (2005), discusses unconscious processing that leads to what he calls variously, thin-slicing, rapid cognition, first impressions, mind reading, and other forms of snap judgments. In one instance a policeman sees his bullets hitting his target--a man's head. There is no sound of his gun firing. All sensing is slow motion. Gladwell

gives other examples of where time appears distorted and sensing varies from normal expectations. It is a fascinating read.

Without knowing the timing of the number pulse, the number of digits in the flash, the size of the image, whether the man saw the pulse while approaching it, or on passing it, whether the man expected the pulse, prior training, or the full objective of the test, it is hard to give an interpretation of any gravitational field effects.

Over the years, I took three so-called "speed reading" classes. At one point, I could easily see and remember 8-digit numbers flashed at one-hundredth of a second. I also was clocked at reading over two-thousand words a minute with seventy-percent comprehension (not theoretical physics). I could not recite much about what I read, but I could answer all sorts of questions. Training can give us skills beyond expectations. Of course, if we don't continue to use them, we lose them.

Thank you for another datapoint. Kaku will probably write a book about these lectures, if he hasn't done so already.

Regards,

Bob Heaston

From: "Robert Beck" <robert.beck@ntlworld.com>  
To: "Ph. M. Kanarev" <kanphil@mail.ru>  
Subject: Re: From Kanarev  
Date: 26 March 2006 11:50

Copied to all submitting papers

Dear Professor Kanarev and others,

Please note that I should be correctly addressed as just Mr.

Professor Kanarev raises very important questions which are both fundamental and in some case specific, and he goes on to ask how we should evaluate answers.

I will keep my comments here brief, apologise for the length of my paper, and focus on how my paper and my book provide possible answers to the issues raised by Professor Kanarev, to whom I am most grateful for this opportunity to comment. I will refer not only to his submission here, but also to other work on his website.

Firstly, **what Professor Kanarev and I say about space, time and matter are, I think, very similar**: matter makes no sense without space, and time makes no sense without matter, and there has to be a unity in the way we consider all three. I go perhaps a little further in analysing this unity and conclude that that time, mass and energy are all purely, just considered aspects of relative motion. This gives clarity to mass/energy equivalence and time dilation.

Spin is a fundamental component of mass and energy, necessary for the consideration of time, which considered in isolation of any other source of energy, is required by conservation of energy to change with speed (translation - which becomes the second aspect of energy) and gravitational potential. Seeing time in this way confirms this aspect of special relativity in a way that resolves the twins paradox, because time is not seen as some "thing" which flows at different rates, but purely as a considered aspect of motion.

From this, and an attempt to make sense of increasing values of pi, and the vexed questions of changing dimensions generally, I conclude that dimensions do not actually change. It is just that considering them to change is a useful way of describing curved motion, which implies that particles must follow curved paths as they spin and that the universe is rotating. This means that general relativity is not so much wrong, as considered from the wrong perspective. Looking at it in this way gives a simple definition of quantum general relativity, where the curvature of motion of the tiniest particle also depends on total mass and energy present.

I thus conclude that the most fundamental of particles form into rings or spirals depending on relative translation (neutrinos?) so that particles such as electrons and quarks are comprised of rings within rings of many such particles, with force carrying particles and radiation being simply rings with translation (spirals or spirals plus rings).

**This is also similar to what Professor Kanarev has independently concluded from a more analytical and mathematical approach**, but he has considered that the rings in the electron may form into a toroidal shape. I should

like to propose to Professor Kanarev, therefore, that the answer to his very specific question as to how combination is possible via the electrons may lie in my gyroscopic interpretation of rings within rings. As I have shown in my explanation of exclusion principle, with an alignment of rings extending through the proton in only one axis (similar to his "spindle"), we can also have an alignment through electrons so that the spiral connects two protons through an electron, allowing it to be shared.

**This idea can only be right if Professor Kanarev is correct in his very thoroughly evaluated conclusion that there is no electron orbit.** I think that it is rather that the emission of the linking spirals is discontinuous, but highly regular, as spinning outer rings gain and loose containment of inner rings, which explains the wave-like behaviour and the Born interpretation, but with no orbit.

I think that my brief, all inclusive answer to Professor Kanarev's 15 points on how to evaluate solutions lies in what I refer to in my book as "The special principle of reality", which could also be called the "Cinderella principle". This states that "reality is that which fits best for now".

In physics this should mean "what appears to answer the most fundamental of questions and the greatest number of question". So perhaps a truly objective approach should be to list these questions in order of significance and to award points accordingly, weighted to reflect the degree to which the answers are supported, firstly by observational evidence, secondly by mathematical or other verifiable confirmations, and thirdly by overall unity and simplicity.

My theory, being primarily heuristic, and with very little mathematical justification, may satisfy two of these criteria reasonably well, in that there is a very high degree of simplicity and unity, and I am able to cite, inter alia, things such as twisted light and helicity of neutrinos as observational confirmations, with interpretations of Brookhaven results, the gravitational effects of eclipses and computer simulation, significant but less conclusive. But also in my favour is the number and wide spectrum of answers that I am able to suggest and the significance of some of these, such as the constancy of  $c$ , duality, the nature of quantum mechanics, applicability of string theory, quantum general relativity, sensible interpretation of relativity with Newtonian gravity explained as a real force based on the simple mechanism of the spiral, through the strange mysteries of quantum and particle physics with suggested actions for every force, right up to the pattern of the solar system and galaxies.

I would, therefore, suggest that, considered together, Professor Kanarev's ideas and mine, should score highly enough to recommend further consideration by others, especially by those with the mathematical ability to either confirm or refute our suggestions.

I also propose that my suggested points scoring system be debated as something which would need to be overseen by a hierarchy from colleagues up to government appointed (or elected) panels, with papers having provisional and final ratings based on a periodically and democratically considered consensus of point apportionment.

I am not going to propose how funding might be related to this other than to say that it would require exceptionally careful consideration.

Robert F. Beck (Mr.)

From: "carl littmann" <carllittmann@earthlink.net>  
To: "Robert Beck" <robert.beck@ntlworld.com>  
Subject: Re: your Big Wave Model, etc.  
Date: 03 April 2006 02:37

Carl L to R. Beck,

Thanks for your correction on who said (or thinks) what; and expanding upon your own thinking.

**Everything you say relates intelligently to something deserving of (I think) generally favourable and lengthy comments;** but I'll just mention a few:

I've read that Heisenberg's last years were spent formulating a concept of "Grainy, quantitized" space, itself; and I believe a key term is "Granular" which will likely be the correct conclusion of a wide diversity of approaches to "space" or "aether". And that, I think, would even apply to a "combinatorics approach" to the universe-----in the spirit of Descartes' statement, ""Give me (only) matter and motion and I'll give you (entire) universe"".

((I say that even though Descartes, I think, made some errors; and concocted a rather smooth aether, entirely filling up even infinitesimal Voids in the universe, i.e., which I think he was wrong--on.))

Now, on the subject of water, rotations, rings, spacings, extension, etc; there was recently a PBS special dealing with Leonardo Da Vinci's writing and his diagrams relating all that -- to the human heart-----which Da Vinci dissected, studied, and drew pictures of the heart and tricuspid? actions, etc. Da Vinci claimed that the nature of water (watery blood) and its rotational-whirlpool actions promoted the closing action of the heart valves and the successful, optimum circulation. And then (in the PBS special), a few top heart surgeons and heart researchers were interviewed, One specifically mentioned that.. "all that is a rather new aspect being explored regarding circulation--only being written about in the last 10 or 20 years", but that he, himself, was now diving into Da Vinci's work to study its various relevancies and clues to the future.

Best regards,

Carl L

From: "Henry Palka" <h\_palka@yahoo.com>  
To: <Robert.beck@ntlworld.com>  
Subject: NPA Papers  
Date: 10 July 2006 16:14

Dear Dr. Beck: I am a fellow member of the NPA. Would you be so kind as to send me a copy of your paper, THE SPECIAL THEORY OF REALITY? **It was highly recommended to me.** Thank you, Henry Palka

From: "Joan Heaston" <joan@drheaston.com>  
To: <Robert.beck@ntlworld.com>  
Subject: Your NPA Paper  
Date: 18 July 2006 00:25

Good Day Robert,

When you sent your note to Neil and I and the other NPA members and Billie Westergard, I thought of some comments that I wrote on your paper on the Special Theory of Reality when I read it . **We have similar ideas** but we are coming at them from different directions. First, a little background.

When I returned home from Tulsa, I started almost immediately to read all 82 NPA papers and summarize them from notes, abstracts, papers and email comments. I read a few papers each day. In addition, I decided to read a little about Einstein each time I read the NPA papers. By the time I completed all the NPA papers I had read over 1000 pages about Einstein. I decided that my paper on The Constant Gravitation Potential of Light, which Billie mentions could be improved, so I drafted a new paper on The Derivation of the Einstein Field Equations of General Relativity from the Newton Gravitation Law. I plan to submit it in two parts to Galilean Electrodynamics. These two parts are attached. The two parts contain many quotations on how Einstein derived his field equations. There are gaps, but it is obvious how Einstein sidestepped some options that change the interpretation of general relativity and gravity.

The key assumption that was prevalent when Einstein derived the field equations was that gravity could only be coupled to matter through energy. On the other hand, Newton assumed that gravity was coupled to matter through spin, rather a center-seeking centripetal force. Book I of the Principia is entirely about centripetal force. Book III has a Scholium at the beginning that states that "The force which retains the celestial bodies in their orbits has been hitherto called centripetal force, but it being now made plain that it can be no other than a gravitating force, we shall hereafter call it gravity." If gravity depends upon a centripetal force, **then mass which is affected by gravity can certainly be based upon spin. You are on the right track.**

Moreover, if the maximum possible Newton gravitational force is considered to be equal to a centripetal force of an object spinning at the speed of light, this equality reduces to the mass-energy equivalence of the gravitational potential energy, which Einstein had to assume to derive his field equations of general relativity. Consequently the equivalence principle assumes that inertia in translation is equivalent to gravity in rotation. Einstein essentially assumed a limit to gravitational collapse in his derivation. Therefore, **singularities are impossible.** Details are in the papers.

I like your grappling with the definitions of time, energy, mass, gravity, light, motion, space and spacetime. I will have to reexamine my papers to see how I define these terms. Although, I have to confess that, as a chemical engineer specializing in energy conversion processes, I am wedded to the concepts of energy and thermodynamics. I am an old dog.

You also might check the NPA papers of Klyushin, Lucas, and Ginzburg who are all working on ring models of particles.\* In addition, I am attaching a NPA 2005 paper that I presented at the 12th NPA that discusses a disk-like particle shape that has quantum-gravity characteristics.

One last comment. On page 4 of your paper you state, "The greatest danger in science is assuming that something has to be right." In my opinion science cannot exist without assuming that something is right. The foundation of science is to say, "If something is right, then this must happen." The danger is in becoming emotionally attached to your assumptions and claim them as dogma. That is probably what you meant. I enjoyed reading your paper.

Regards,  
Bob Heaston

\* There are a few others not mentioned here, including Professor Kanarev

NPA\_Dissidents@yahoogroups.com

From: "Roger Anderton" <R.J.Anderton@btinternet.com>  
Date: Fri, 14 Jul 2006 18:31:29 +0100  
Subject: Re: [NPA\_Dissidents] New member

Hi Robert.

Unfortunately I am in the same position of there being too much to read, and being unable to read everything.

I have read your "Comments on paper".

Yes, light can be represented as a many-particle object, smaller than the photon; a sort of substructure. This has been proved by the Experiments of James Watson, and Baranski the man who Einstein said had the UFT, says about it having substructure. Some of the papers on UFT are at: Observer Physics website.

I agree with "I believe that the problems of modern physics stem essentially from the casual, imprecise and not universally agreed use of words that result in woolly thinking and unclear communication." -- And my take on "that" is that it means -- Einstein has been misunderstood and misinterpreted by a lot of people.

On the Revolution issue: Einstein supposedly revolutionised Physics in 1919, then there was the Quantum Revolution; but the revolution of Einstein's UFT got stalled; I call it conspiracy - but what type of conspiracy is arguable; I think now that maybe the average person just can't cope with information overload and switches off (it might be that type).

Regards Roger

NPA\_Dissidents@yahogroups.com

From: "J Raymond Redbourne" <ray\_redbourne@mountaincable.net>  
Date: Tue, 31 Oct 2006 12:15:51 -0000  
Subject: [NPA\_Dissidents] Re: Interview with an electrogravitics developer of Tesla's experiments

Hi Robert,

Thank you for that note. It certainly has some merit.

There have been some microphotos of atoms in crystal matrices in the last few years, that indicate a possible arrangement where the particles vibrate in place.

Ray.

**Note:** This was in reply to mine copying my mail of 26/3/06 to Professor Kanarev and others (above) that confirmed my agreement with Kanarev on the question of no electron orbit.

## Appendix 2

### Correspondence with Revd. Dr. John Polkinghorne KBE FRS

Revd. Dr. John Polkinghorne, K.B.E., F.R.S.  
Queens College  
Cambridge  
CB3 9ET

07 May 2006

Dear Dr. Polkinghorne,

About 15 months ago, following the BBC Horizon programme on Einstein, I wrote a very long letter to you setting out my theory, which I knew had been revealed by God. Unlike almost everyone else in academia, you did me the courtesy of a reply, for which I am very grateful, even though you implied doubt as to the authenticity of my source in alluding to the complexities involved.

I have hesitated in pursuing the matter further with you, and my view that complexity may be symptomatic of error, as it seemed an unnecessary imposition, especially having realised that you are older than I anticipated from your appearance in the programme about Einstein. But I feel that I must now draw to your attention that my faith regarding this revelation grows at the same rate as my concern for the future of the planet and the fate of mankind. I now have significant evidence (experimental and other) in support of my claims and for the prospect of functional anti-gravity in transport.

I can only do what I feel led by God to do, and having found vast numbers of academics, the press the media, and politicians completely disinterested even in the possibility that God continues to reveal truth at appropriate times, despite the fact that anti-gravity may be the only way that many millions can be spared great suffering, that I must return to those men of God who must surely be interested to know if there is any prospect that what I am saying can be verified.

In this respect I shall be writing again shortly to the Archbishop of Canterbury (having written first on 14/12/03), drawing attention to experimental and other evidence that continues to mount, strongly suggesting that God has indeed revealed aspects of creation to me, but expressing grave concern that I have found huge reluctance in all levels of society to even acknowledge the fact that I am claiming God as the source of knowledge of immense value to mankind.

In my letter of 14/12/03, I doubt that I got the personal attention of Dr. Williams, at least to a degree that would make clear the huge significance of the scientific implications of my claims. It may well be, therefore, in your unusual position as a man of faith and science, that you may be able to influence the only man with authority to question the Prime Minister and the great institutions of this country on the wisdom of ruling out the possibility of God's intervention at a time when selfish and atheistic tendencies, or misguided religious fervour may be putting mankind at greater risk than ever before.

Please consider the evidence that follows, pray about it, consider that Einstein was convinced that a beautifully simple solution could be found, consider the possibilities if I am right and the consequences if I am right but ignored, and decide if it is reasonable to suggest to the Archbishop, or others, that it is not out of the question that the ideas I proclaim with great certainty to be from God are already indicated to be possibly correct by experimental, observational, or other evidence.

In contrast to my long letter, which in hindsight was not conducive to your easy comprehension, I give first, three simple postulates, which I believe can make complete sense of relativity, and on which my theory depends:

1. Mass is spin
2. Spin results in curved paths
3. The universe is rotating

### Regarding 1.

I was recently made aware of experiments carried out in the seventies by the late Dr. Bruce DePalma of Caltech, that demonstrate an increase of inertial mass with spin (spinning ball experiments). I have yet to find a clear and full description of his methodology, but the results he claimed must warrant further experimentation, especially as my assertion that neutrinos can have mass, and that this can be variable, has also recently been confirmed.

### Regarding 2.

I suggested as a result (first in 2003), that neutrinos and anti-neutrinos must move in orbital and helical paths to provide the basic structure of particles and radiation. I had no idea at the time that this helicity of these tiny particles was actually discovered by M. Goldhaber and co-workers in 1958, and that, just as I suggested to explain attraction and repulsion, only left-handed neutrinos and right-handed anti-neutrinos are observed in nature (page 244 of Particle Physics by Martin and Shaw). Now that my assumption that neutrinos have mass has been verified, my claim that such spirals can explain forces and orbital angular momentum in photons (as demonstrated by work on twisted light), has to be considered as a real possibility.

I have also found, having recently submitted a paper for consideration at the 13<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference of the NPA, in association with AAAS-SWARM, that I am by no means alone in suggesting that particles are comprised of rings or that neutrinos can explain gravity (see copies of emails attached, which contain favourable comments on my paper). You will also find from his website that Professor Kanarev in particular, provides strong mathematical and analytical support for this view and also has ideas very close to mine on time, space and matter. The fact that we both claim guidance by God and independently concluded that electrons may not always orbit, must surely be recorded and its significance pondered in case this is subsequently verified, as should the relevance of the Navier-Stokes equations, as proposed by another participant, and for which I suspect that God had previously guided me to as a possible means of others demonstrating my conclusion that the circular motions of particles can mimic a wave.

My paper, which goes on to suggest (as Dirac, but not for the same reasons) that the gravitational constant reduces, suggests many answers to patterns in the solar system and problems with galaxies. There is a strong and growing group that agrees with me that the Earth and other planets expand and there is accurate lunar laser ranging measurement of our Moon in support of my argument that moons move away from planets because their fields are ultimately dependent on the Sun.

### Regarding 3.

In 2005 researchers at Imperial College identified an alignment in background radiation that was dubbed “an axis of evil” and could be construed as possible verification of my third postulate. This is taken so seriously that experiments have been proposed which may confirm it. Again, when I proposed this in 2003, purely from my logical analysis of relativity, based on that which was clarified in my mind when I prayed in tongues, I had no idea that others had suggested it.

My paper discusses why this and my first two postulates, together with my views on time, energy, and space, provide an alternative view of relativity without paradox. Almost all participants at the recent NPA conference in Tulsa identified problems with relativity. It may take a while for most of these people to see the logic of my views on time and energy (especially time, which appears to be a huge stumbling block for everyone), but I am totally convinced of my clarity of thought in this respect. I have just advised them that my views on mass may well be verified already, and I am growing in confidence that I may well be the only person on the planet that understands the true nature of Einstein’s huge achievement, also based I suspect, on revelation from God via the strange dream in his teens.

I have also provided, as further evidence of the hand of God in this matter, a letter that appears on Professor Kanarev’s website. I also have very strong reasons for believing that my explanations of the solar system have depended on the guiding hand of God in the life of New Zealander David Hardy, which indicates the question of God’s perfect timing in both our lives.

Since first writing I have found a website that brings together much work in the field of anti-gravity ([www.americanantigravity.com](http://www.americanantigravity.com)) adding considerable weight to my view, based very much on my own theory, and exceptional evidence for human levitation, that this has to be possible. But regrettably, the Canadian government has banned the most successful experimenter from further work. The true reasons for this must become a matter for

urgent global debate, and co-operation in this field must be a matter for the United Nations to address. If governments are limiting research for military purposes it is a disgrace of epic proportions now that the impact of climate change is accepted as grounds for great concern, with hundreds of millions likely to face starvation, not to mention the prospect of wars over limited resources. Only one person in the UK (that I am aware of) officially receives funding in this field. If politicians, the press, the media, and the scientific community are happy with this, it is a matter for the Church to ask why and whether there is genuine commitment to pursuing every avenue in the avoidance of humanitarian disasters on an unprecedented scale.

If you are able to provide an email address I can provide easy access to my Book and Paper and many other sources; or perhaps you can delegate or request the help of others in gathering information and reporting back to you. This may even prove to be a beneficial exercise for some students. It is, however, by no means necessary that you spend much time and effort on this. The logic of the situation is that, even if there is thought to be only a small chance that I am right, it has to make sense that the possibility is not overlooked and debated as a matter of urgency, given the ever-growing dangers and the obvious positive effects of anti-gravity.

Remember that I am not seeking your endorsement that I am right, only that there is evidence to say that it would be very foolish to rule out the possibility that I may be right, and not to question the folly of not carrying out experiments that I can suggest.

Please also note that I have suggested to the BBC, an organisation I now suspect (with others) of organisational atheism, that they may wish to suggest how much of the profits from my book should go to charity. There are issues here that make profit irrelevant, except in easing the burden on the Tax Credit system.

Yours sincerely,

Robert F. Beck

From: Revd Dr John Polkinghorne, K.B.E., F.R.S.,  
Fellow.

Queens' College,  
Cambridge,  
CB3 9ET.


Mr R.F. Beck, Woking.

12 May 2006

Dear Mr Beck,

Thank you for sending me a copy of your further thoughts. I have to say honestly that I do not agree at all with them. For example, to a physicist to say that 'mass is spin' is simply unintelligible. Mass is concerned with inertia (resistance to change of motion), while spin is concerned with rotation (a measure of angular momentum). I am sorry - we just have to disagree.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "John Polkinghorne". The signature is written in a cursive style and is underlined with a single horizontal line.

Revd. Dr. John Polkinghorne, K.B.E., F.R.S.  
Queens College  
Cambridge  
CB3 9ET

18 May 2006

Dear Dr. Polkinghorne,

Please let me know if this continued correspondence is in any way a bother to you. I respond only because of the potential suffering of a great many, and confused as to why you appear to be closing your mind to the possibility of Divine revelation, but assuming that there must be a very good reason why you have not requested further details of the experimental evidence that I mentioned, appearing to confirm a link between inertial mass and simple spin (rotation). Perhaps you did not read beyond the simple, but unclear statement that “mass is spin”, suspecting it to be a glib assumption and unclear without definition of “spin”. I was trying to be brief and avoiding repetition of what was implied in the experimental evidence that followed, which perhaps you missed.

This is the fifth drafting of this reply, each following prayer and the earnest desire that my words be from God and that I do not misjudge you, but I cannot escape the logic that even those with faith seem to find it hard to accept that God should choose to reveal truth to others. Even my best friend ever, a catholic now living in Rome, has ceased replying, presumably because my book criticises the big bang. If your mind were truly open you would surely have been interested to read on and discover that it was not your agreement that I was seeking. Confirmation that I am right will take many minds. The tragedy is that not one will listen with an open mind, and I know, with great assurance, that grows forever stronger, that truth was revealed to me only after I had found the same open-minded humility that I now seek in others.

Understanding gravity is a secondary issue; I have no doubt that God is seeking first that mankind finally learn open-minded humility. This does not imply that you have not given an honest and carefully considered opinion, because I am sure you have. It means that only those who choose to believe that God reveals truth will find what he chooses to reveal only to the humble.

I can see the problem you have in seeing a link between mass and rotation; it is not immediately obvious. I had the advantage in that God had previously revealed to me the significance of spin to pretty well everything else, starting with time, as I was filled with the Holy spirit and prayed in tongues, so I had to suspect a link, especially having seen Professor Laithwaite’s demonstrations with gyroscopes, but could see no way of demonstrating it.

Two more incidents of praying in tongues strongly suggested that this idea could well be right and that it may also clarify relativity, but I was then given an amazingly simple thought experiment that convinced me. I had to consider a universe consisting solely of the smallest and most fundamental particles that can exist, with no spin but random straight-line, uniform motion in any and all directions. Ultimately collisions would impart spin on some of the particles (easily confirmed by observing a game of pool, and implying only a degree of elasticity and friction between particles). Newton’s first law required that those particles not involved in collisions must continue with the same motion and thus energy, so conservation of energy required that the particles that now also had energy of spin must have reduced translation, and the faster the spin the more constrained translation would become, making spin and inertia appear equivalent.

The first (previous) mass-related answer to prayer, was that I should read again what Einstein had to say about rotating bodies. Still I could not work it out, so in the early hours of the following morning, when my thoughts are usually clearest, I thought long and hard until I finally gave up, but then spontaneously began praying in tongues again. Immediately after, I knew that I had to think about two massless discs moving in space, one of which started to spin. At once I could see a logical interpretation of increased values of  $\pi$  that implied that the spinning disc must accelerate, i.e. move faster or follow a curved path (so that a point on its circumference would follow a longer path, cycloid or hypercycloid respectively) making it appear to be in a gravitational field and, unlike the disc with no spin, appear to have mass.

Because I had given relativity considerable thought many years ago, and always questioned the idea of absolutely nothing being curved, I had suspected that this idea could bring some logic to this notion. This appeared to be clarified in the next thought experiment that I was given, as mentioned above, of the universe of nothing but

fundamental particles. Conservation of energy clearly ruled out linear acceleration and required that curvature of motion, that maintained conservation of energy, was the only solution.

My second postulate, that spin results in curvature of motion, followed, and seemed to confirm Einstein's conclusion that heat has mass, because fast spin must ultimately make orbit impossible, giving only vibration. I could also see that these ideas appeared to give very simple clarity to the question of mass/energy equivalence, and when I read Richard A. Mould's views on this in *Basic Relativity* I could see that it fitted exactly. On page 117 he says:

"You can imagine that energy and mass are really the same thing, and that this thing simply manifests itself in different ways. In one form we recognise it as mass, and in another form we recognise it as energy. In one form it reflects the inertial properties of matter, and in the other form it is a measure of the work related activity of matter. You can think of  $E = mc^2$  as representing a change of this things units as from feet to inches or, in this case, a change of dimension from kilograms to joules. Consequently, neither mass nor energy can be destroyed and the other created in its place. Total mass and total energy are equivalent, not interchangeable in that way." (The underlining of "matter" is mine, because this is fundamental to my theory.)

Regrettably, current experiments are being misinterpreted because of the erroneous notion that matter and energy are two different things. It is also interesting to note his comment in the preceding paragraph that "it is reasonable to speculate that the rest mass of an object is also a measure of some kind of internal energy." This accords with my conclusion that mass is dependent upon spin.

It is not necessary here to go into the quite lengthy case for this making complete sense of relativity. This is set out best in my paper and also in my book. I only mention these two, God-given, thought experiments to demonstrate that my linking of mass and spin is not just a wild notion, but logically deduced and Divinely inspired. To me, especially with the experimental confirmations that I later discovered relating to helicity of neutrinos and recently their variable mass and then Bruce DePalma's demonstration of increased inertia with spinning balls (which he doubted for lack of understanding), this is infinitely more "intelligible" than "curved space". It is, however, important to point out that mass as we understand it so far, and the possibility of gravitational field, depend on combinations of spins as in gyroscopes and groups of gyroscopes, which is why I deduced this as the structure of particles, an idea which then seemed to answer a great many questions.

Most significantly perhaps, my interpretation means that the curvature of motion of the tiniest particle, depending on spin and translation, is then dependent on total mass, energy and momentum, giving quantum general relativity.

I am not aware of any observational evidence for the Higgs boson nor for any other ideas on the cause of inertial mass, so I think that the experiments of Bruce DePalma must be carefully considered and repeated, with caution regarding the implications of my second postulate, but bearing in mind my analysis of mass and energy, which resolves Dr. DePalma's concerns over the question of conservation of energy, which in any event do not appear to me to be logical; energy is needed to impart the spin. I have enclosed Bruce DePalma's analysis of his experimental results, but I do not agree with all his interpretations and I am still trying to find a clearer description of his methodology.

If I may say so, without casting any aspersions on the intelligence of physicists, the whole subject has become so complex, with all having to specialise, that "seeing the wood for the trees" is a real issue. At the last Solvay Conference, Nobel prize winner, David Gross admitted to a period of "utter confusion" in physics and suspected that they were missing "something fundamental".

I think that it is reasonable to say that many ideas in Physics are "unintelligible". Indivisible particles being in several places at the same time (Feynman and Hawking) is unintelligible. The big bang is unintelligible. How a point particle can have alignment is unintelligible. The idea of energy as an entity is unintelligible when it is clearly relative. Curved space is unintelligible. I could go on and on. My three simple postulates, and where they lead, can bring sense to all this nonsense, if only physicists will open their minds and consider the logic and the evidence, and the possibility of error. But you have to remember that it took God to explain it; it is bound to seem unintelligible without following the God-given arguments.

Nobody can see that energy has to be something in motion. This led me to the conclusion that particles, fields and radiation must be comprised of smaller spinning particles, and yesterday, realising that I had missed the last paragraph on page 152 of *Quantum Theory for Beginners* (McEvoy & Zarate), in which you appear on the facing page, I realised that this is entirely consistent with the way that Dirac was able demonstrate the equivalence of the ideas of Heisenburg and Schrödinger. The paragraph reads as follows:

“The concept of a continuous field, introduced by Faraday and others..... could now be **broken up into bits** in order to interact with matter, already known to consist of discrete entities like electrons, protons etc. Dirac’s new approach could treat light as waves **or** particles and give the right answer. Magic!”

Not “magic” at all, but logic. And taking this further, realising that particles like electrons, quarks, bosons and photons etc, can be “broken up into bits” can make sense of the alignment of electrons, double slit experiments and much, much more, including a clear and easily visualised mechanism which makes interaction possible, as explained in my paper or my book, *The Special Theory of Reality*, which I should be very pleased to trade for a copy of *The Quantum World*, if you happen to have a spare copy (not to worry if you do not – I expect I can find a copy).

I expected those physicists with reputations and funding at stake, and with atheistic views, to be slow to open their minds. I am staking more than has ever been staked in the history of humanity (the crucifixion excepted) that you will show the way, not by agreeing that I am right, but by supporting my appeal to the Archbishop of Canterbury (see letter enclosed).

Yours sincerely,

From: Revd Dr John Polkinghorne, K.B.E., F.R.S.,  
Fellow.

Queens` College,  
Cambridge,  
CB3 9ET.

Mr R.F.Beck,  
Woking.


25 May 2006

Dear Mr Beck,

I am responding to your long second letter and the copy of your book that you sent me. You and I are just not going to agree and I do not think we should continue the correspondence.

If mass is proportional to spin, this would require a new dimensional constant of nature. It would also require explanations of why particles of the same spin have different masses (e.g. electrons and protons), and why particles of zero spin have non-zero mass (mesons).

Yours sincerely,



I did not continue this correspondence, despite having answers to these problems, in respect of Dr. Polkinghorne’s wishes, because it was clear that this was either a bother to an elderly gentleman or he was, for some reason, determined not to consider my position carefully.

He appears not to wish, or be able to differentiate between spin as in  $\text{spin}1/2$  etc. and the simple concept of rotation, which I tried to make clear I was referring. Mesons are, as I have interpreted it, two quarks together, which to me means that the quarks rotate together and thus in opposite directions thus meaning they have mass but no net direction of spin.

## Appendix 3

### Correspondence with the Archbishop of Canterbury

Dr. Rowan Williams  
Archbishop of Canterbury  
Lambeth Palace  
London  
SE1 7JU

10 May 2006

Dear Dr. Williams,

Climate change

I have written to you before (14/12/03) and, fully appreciating that it is humanly impossible for you to assimilate every detail of the mountain of correspondence that you must receive, I doubted that you realised the full significance of what I was claiming at the time, which was not immediately obvious amongst the personal circumstances from which it stemmed. Also, the relevance to the fate of mankind was by no means as clear to me then as it has gradually become. The essential thing to me then was simply to put on record that God was the source of my information that, amongst other things, gravity was a real force that can be defeated.

Unfortunately, it has now become a matter of the greatest possible importance and urgency that I draw your attention to the realisation (and much more) of a prediction that I made at the time that must be of great concern to you, in your formal capacities and quite simply as any Christian or anyone with true faith in God. I now know exactly what I must humbly request because it has become apparent that disinterest in the possibility of divine revelation exists not only as I anticipated, in the scientific community, but appears to be symptomatic of widespread and growing atheism in the press and media.

I have been striving with the full extent of my mental and physical resources, in the hope of rendering that prediction, which contained an element of humorous irony, of little or no significance. My task was to convince mankind of the need for open-minded humility, starting with science, but including all eventually, but especially governments and terrorists (with the modern day Church not entirely excluded but considerably less wanting than for much of its history). The huge scientific significance of what had been revealed to me was of secondary importance, to myself, all mankind and God I believe. Quite simply, I think that the fate of mankind and the possibility of it playing a role in the universe, hangs in the balance of its ability to finally learn open-minded humility.

At first, having decided contrary to the plan set out in my first letter, that I must give God the glory from the outset, I thought that most physicists would, quite understandably, find it very hard to accept error and the loss of face involved (the crux of my prediction), and especially the implication that science could not be entirely divorced from faith. But surely, I thought, some would be interested enough to give some consideration to the possibility of a revelation from God, especially one with potential to bring about huge benefits; and then the logic, simplicity and extent of what I had been shown would be hard to dismiss and would open a debate. What I have found, however, in the years and months that followed, of intensive study and research, and endless attempts at communication in letters, emails, ebook and paperback (with a second almost finished), paints a picture of not only of disinterested atheism, but of dogma that compares to the worst aspects of misguided religion in the past. Worldwide, physicists face losing funding if they contradict the big bang.

So I turned to publishers, the press and the media, only to find the same grim determination to avoid the possibility that God reveals anything. I persisted with even greater determination, self-publishing my book, continuing my studies and regularly contacting all, including ever more physicists and the BBC on many occasions, with regular

new evidence supporting my theory. In this time I found no new evidence to contradict it and constant confirmations. Regrettably the BBC, happy to give publicity to a museum of witchcraft, and much that is either trivial or repulsive, appear to consider that the possibility of a revelation from God with the potential to avert massive suffering, is not newsworthy!

With reports of the dangers of climate change becoming ever more regular and alarming I have actually pleaded with the BBC and asked other news channels to help me draw attention to the fact that I am saying that God may have provided an answer to climate change and, indeed, the possibility of an amazing future for mankind. Reports of a possible 400 million facing starvation as a result, and many more in my view suffering and dying from related wars and disorder must be taken seriously, and I have no doubt that this is a growing concern to you.

My dilemma is how to convince you about the most profound matters of science. Hopefully my first letter (also enclosed) provided evidence of my own humility, sincerity and faith. The fact that I have offered (via the BBC) to donate much of any profit from my book to charity establishes my motives.

God and, inadvertently the BBC, may have provided a possible answer. I wrote to the Revd. Dr. John Polkinghorne (a theoretical physicist who studied under the great Paul Dirac at Cambridge) shortly after he appeared on a Horizon programme about Einstein in early 2005. His first reply was not encouraging, but I had gained sufficient knowledge by then to appreciate the comment he made on the complexity of modern physics and chose not to bother him further on realising that his TV appearance belied his age. I know that it is this complexity that results from fundamental error and confusion, which makes it hard to see the wood for the trees. Einstein talked of a beautifully simple solution and I know that this is what God has revealed, but it means that established physics is riddled with misconception and absurdity.

You will see from the attached letter, however, why I have just written again, with now significant experimental and other evidence in support of my theory and of the possibility of that which I have no doubt that God wishes to convey: that anti-gravity can be achieved. This does not establish the certainty that I am right, but the possibility can surely not be denied.

My specific request is, therefore, following consultation with Dr. Polkinghorne if you think it necessary, that you consider possible approaches to the Prime Minister, Lord Sainsbury, the Directors of the Institute of Physics, Royal Institution and Royal Society, calling for urgent debate and action (above standard procedures) to consider not only my claim that God has revealed a true understanding of relativity and the precise nature of all forces including gravitation, but all evidence for the possibility of the development of functional anti-gravity devices as a means of achieving huge reductions in the use of fossil fuels. You may wish to advise all these that, with the exception of the Royal Society, I have written to all before, and having failed to find adequate interest or possibility of getting a paper published, I have recently submitted a paper which is currently being considered by the American Association for the Advancement of Science via an organisation based in America for dissident scientists called the Natural Philosophy Alliance.

You will note from my letter to Dr. Polkinghorne, that the most successful experimenter has been banned from further work by the Canadian Government. I understand that safety issues may be involved, but I suspect that governments may have reasons for not being entirely open and that I may be able to anticipate the response of the Prime Minister and Lord Sainsbury. I also suspect that scientific institutions will resent any "advice" from the Church.

This may even be a matter that you might consider appropriate to discuss with the Pope, especially bearing in mind the international nature of the problem and my suggestion that this is also a issue for the United Nations, and much more than just a question of science, with implications justifying your stance on recent wars, suggesting a more productive approach to terrorism, and even attitudes that require discussion and agreement on response to possible alien contact. Further verification of my theory, via experiments that are perfectly feasible, must also be construed as evidence of the existence of God (or in purely scientific terms, a higher intelligence capable of communicating at a higher level). Any other conclusion would imply a level of knowledge and ability that I did not possess at the time i.e. at 3/10/03, when I was little more than a carpenter and tool sharpener, having not seriously studied science for forty years, and recovering from a period of severe depressive illness.

I know that Prince Phillip and possibly even the Queen and The Prince of Wales may well be interested in the prospect of anti-gravity and other issues that I mention. The issues that I have raised on the question of ever-growing atheistic tendencies may already be well known, and a matter that you discuss in these circles and with others. This, and the prospect of humanitarian disasters, should, in my opinion, justify your intervention and extend the debate on science and faith, so poorly put on TV recently by Professor Dawkins, in contrast with the clarity of thought of Lord Winston.

My second book, in which I have a great deal to say on matters of science and faith, has been delayed by the amazing ways that God has recently provided me with the further knowledge to explain much in the solar system and beyond, but I have pleasure in enclosing a copy of my more scientific publication *The Special Theory of Reality*.

This, however, does not present my theory quite as clearly as my paper, which goes on to explain the solar system and galaxies. This, and other information, is available on my website [www.einsteins-revolution.com](http://www.einsteins-revolution.com)

I pray that God will continue to bless you with the great wisdom and courage that you have already shown.

Yours sincerely,

Robert F. Beck

Enc. Copy of letter dated 07 May 2006 to Revd. Dr. John Polkinhorne, K.B.E., F.R.S.  
Copy of my first letter dated 14 December 2003



 THE CHURCH  
OF ENGLAND  
LAMBETH PALACE

Mr R Beck  
17 Larchwood Rd  
St John's  
Woking  
Surrey  
GU21 8XB

Mr Andrew Nunn  
*Premises and Administration Secretary to  
The Archbishop of Canterbury*

22 May 2006

*Dear Mr Beck*

The Archbishop of Canterbury has asked me to write thanking you for your 10 May letter on climate change and for the copy your book *The Special Theory of Reality* enclosed with it.

Dr Williams does appreciate what it involves for people to write, sharing their thoughts and work with him, as well as the prayerful consideration that lies behind it. Regrettably, however - as I am sure you will understand - the demands upon his time prevent him from answering each letter personally. Thank you, nevertheless, for taking the trouble to write to Dr Williams.

With very best wishes,

*Andrew Nunn*

Dr. Rowan Williams  
Archbishop of Canterbury  
Lambeth Palace  
London  
SE1 7JU

24 May 2006

Dear Dr. Williams,

Climate change

With the greatest possible respect, and because I suspect by the level of correspondence that you must receive that you are still not personally aware of the importance and significance of what I am saying (for which I blame myself and possibly your advisors), I must seek vitally important clarification. See reply enclosed.

I apologise for my persistence but I know that I have been chosen for this task because of my persistence. I do not give up and I do not intend to give up until those with the ability to make a difference take note and act appropriately.

To make it absolutely clear what I am saying I will put it as briefly but clearly as I can:

Hundreds of millions face starvation, and many (including other species) face continuing disasters of many kinds, as a consequence of continued reliance on fossil fuels, much of which is generated by the need to overcome gravity. God has made two things absolutely clear to me:

1. Relativity and thus gravitation is universally misunderstood, the result of which is that the possibility of anti-gravity is not taken seriously, (except for a handful of mavericks, some of whom are claiming some success, startling success in one case) whereas I have not the slightest doubt that God is offering this knowledge, subject to:
2. Mankind must first demonstrate open-minded humility.

So far the worldwide scientific community, the press and the media have demonstrated not one iota of this quality. I must, therefore, now see if even the Church is willing to consider the possibility that God reveals truth at appropriate times and in appropriate ways.

Never, at any time since Christ's first coming, has so much depended upon the willingness of mankind to make the right choice. This is no matter for a standard reply because I am not just offering my own opinion and conviction, I have experimental evidence that strongly suggests that my interpretation could well be correct.

So I must put the question clearly and unequivocally:

Is it logical, reasonable and appropriate to Christian belief that the possibility that God reveals truth is ignored when so much is to be gained and the cost of further experimentation is miniscule by comparison, except perhaps in terms of the pride of those who insist that they have to be right and threaten loss of funding to dissenters?

Yes! I can provide you with evidence that the latter is going on. You must be aware that far too many, including terrorists and governments, are willing to inflict harm on the basis that they have to be right. Many have been given the opportunity to set an example, by opening their minds to the possibility of error, including the possibility of God's existence, and so far all have failed.

If you also have chosen to close your mind to the possibility that God has revealed knowledge capable of averting great suffering, that is one thing; but if this is my erroneous assumption it cannot remain unclarified. I need to know if it is actually your personal choice to doubt this possibility without requesting those with the knowledge to understand, to consider the hard experimental evidence that I have discovered and mentioned.

Please do not be tempted to think that this matter can safely be left to the scientific community. There has, during two and a half years of persistent attempts of many kinds, apart from two so far unproductive exceptions, been almost universal and total resistance to respond to me in any way.

But there is one ray of hope that you might exploit. Very recently Sir Roger Penrose apologised for not responding regarding three letters and my book and expressed some interest in what I was now saying, but could not guarantee that he could find time to prepare a considered reply. But it is unfair to Sir Roger, and not in the interests of quick and efficient resolution, that he should accept the entire burden of consideration.

What I am now requesting is: (1) that you write a brief letter to the Prime Minister, with copies to those mentioned in my last letter, now including Sir Roger Penrose, simply suggesting that anything at all that suggests some answer to climate change that can be tested must be tested; and that based on this letter and the attached analysis of experimental results, there may be some possibility (that you are unqualified to judge) that the current view of mass is wrong and mine is correct, which clearly has implications for relativity and gravitational theory. (2) That you discuss with the Pope the desirability of making this a matter for the whole world of science to consider simultaneously, so as to rule out the military implications.

Much that is theorised in physics today cannot be tested by experiment. What I am saying can be, and initial experiments need not be elaborate or expensive. In the circumstances it is lunacy of the first order if they are not repeated and extended to test my interpretation of relativity and the possibility of anti-gravity. Unfortunately Dr. DePalma is dead.

The first step must be some level of discussion in Government and then with the hierarchy of the scientific community as to the most appropriate way of testing the validity of my claims, which surely, if there is no other way of BOTH reducing the terrible threat that faces us, AND AT THE SAME TIME, offering a way of maintaining our way of life, upon which economic prosperity and thus the prospect of avoiding yet further suffering also depends, must demand high priority. That is unless the ability of mankind to think logically is (as I fear from much recent nonsense) actually declining, perhaps as another terrible consequence of pollution.

Yours sincerely,

Robert F. Beck

Copies to: The Pope, The Prime Minister, The Rt. Hon. Humfrey Malins C.B.E., M.P.  
Mr. David Attenborough c/o BBC TV.

Enc: Copy of reply from Andrew Nunn dated 22/5/06  
Three-page analysis by Dr. Bruce E. DePalma of his spinning ball experiments.



THE CHURCH  
OF ENGLAND  
LAMBETH PALACE

Mr R Beck  
17 Larchwood Rd  
St Johns  
Woking  
Surrey  
GU21 8XB

Mr Andrew Nunn  
*Premises and Administration Secretary to  
the Archbishop of Canterbury*

2 June 2006

*Dear Mr Beck*

The Archbishop of Canterbury has asked me to write thanking you for your 24 May letter and to reply. Many people approach Dr Williams with ideas, asking that he adopt or promote them. Unfortunately they all too often see support from the Archbishop as the key to success, rather than the intrinsic merit of their idea. It is not therefore the Archbishop's practice to support new, untested initiatives. With regard to your proposition that relativity and thus gravitation is universally misunderstood, Dr Williams is not a scientist and he is unable to assess the merits of your idea. If as you suggest you have approached members of the scientific community and they have not responded it may be that they have in fact assessed your idea and found it without merit. As I say, it is not something that the Archbishop is qualified to give an opinion about.

*Mr Nunn*  
*Andrew Nunn*

Dr. Rowan Williams  
Archbishop of Canterbury  
Lambeth Palace  
London  
SE1 7JU

6 June 2006

Dear Dr. Williams,

Climate change

Once again I must apologise for my persistence, but I have to ask: is there not one person, with any level of faith anywhere, with mankind facing the greatest crisis in its history, willing to give adequate and reasonable consideration to the possibility that God may be offering help?

The attached reply indicates that whoever read my last letter did not even reach the bottom of the first page! There you will find, not the ridiculous notion that I expect you to assess scientific merits (which, as I acknowledged in the middle of the second page, you are not qualified to judge) but the following question, put clearly and unequivocally, as a matter of Christian faith:

“Is it logical, reasonable and appropriate to Christian belief that the possibility that God reveals truth is ignored when so much is to be gained and the cost of further experimentation is miniscule by comparison (with the consequences of climate change), except perhaps in terms of the pride of those who insist that they have to be right and threaten loss of funding to dissenters?”

Once again, I must doubt that you have had time to personally read my letter, and as all this is being recorded in my autobiography to be published shortly, it is a matter of important historical accuracy that I do not misrepresent the precise extent of your personal opinion in this matter.

It is not necessary in the least for you to understand any more than the simple facts that I am claiming absolute assurance that I was baptised by the Holy Spirit and have found experimental evidence that is clearly verifiable by the scientific community, in support of the implication that God has given me understanding that can unlock the current impasse in physical understanding. The assumption that the wider scientific community has yet given careful consideration to my claims is false. A few other dissenters see merit in my claims, and are coming to remarkably similar conclusions, but time is rapidly running out.

So I must put the question even more clearly:

Is your carefully considered personal opinion that, where the matter is claimed to be capable of verification by further scientific experiment, that the possibility that God reveals truth to the humble at appropriate times and in appropriate ways should remain untested, when it may hold the key to the prevention or reduction of suffering on a scale never seen before?

I will copy this to those before, but this time including Her Majesty the Queen, in her roles as head of state and defender of the faith.

Yours sincerely,

Robert F. Beck

Copies to: Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, The Pope, The Prime Minister, The Rt. Hon. Humfrey Malins C.B.E., M.P., Mr. David Attenborough c/o BBC TV.

Enc: Copy of reply from Andrew Nunn dated 2/6/06  
Copy of my letter dated 24/5/06

The lack of any reply so far to this letter is a matter of serious concern to me, and leaves me no option but to consider seriously the possibility that Roger Anderton may be right. I am, however, still not happy to assume that this matter has adequately reached the personal attention of Dr. Williams. I trust that all the information contained in this report will satisfy those in a position to ensure this happens.

## Appendix 4

### Correspondence with the Prime Minister and Government departments

The Rt. Hon. Tony Blair, MP  
Prime Minister  
10 Downing Street  
London SW1A 2AA

14 June 2006

Dear Prime Minister,

#### **Climate Change –an answer!**

I am very grateful for your reply of 9 June (attached), but this only confirms precisely why I have been saying since 2003/4 that new technologies are the only real hope.

Historically, this is where we have excelled in leading the World forward and we can do it again, if I can only convince you to give the highest possible priority to encouraging and funding much greater research in the field of anti-gravity technology.

Please may I suggest that you ask Lord Sainsbury to send a letter based on the enclosed draft to as many physicists as he considers appropriate, which I recommend should include Sir Roger Penrose (who has expressed some interest in what I am saying- if he can only find time).

I can only reiterate that my view of relativity can easily be tested by those with the resources and understanding to repeat and extend the experiments of the late Dr. Bruce DePalma (Caltech/MIT), perhaps followed by experiments in space, which will finally unite quantum mechanics and general relativity and explain gravity as a real force (interaction of neutrinos) that has to be capable of disruption.

It is my view that your attached letter also makes a very good case for international co-operation on an unprecedented scale, with defence implications and secrecy (on this particular aspect of research) sacrificed for the overwhelming common good of mankind, to ensure that the prospect of this greatest ever advancement in the history of mankind does not come too late.

Yours sincerely,

Robert F. Beck

Copy to: Lord Sainsbury, Sir Menzies Campbell CBE QC MP, David Cameron MP  
Humfrey Malins CBE MP, Editor, The Times

Note: The Prime Minister's previous reply of 9<sup>th</sup> June 2006 is not included here because it is lengthy and based, I am sure on a standard letter sent to many others. It is essential to realise that the draft below is my composition.

Suggested Draft

From Lord Sainsbury of Turville,  
Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Science and Innovation

To selected physicists and institutions with interest in the question of gravitation,

#### CLIMATE CHANGE

The Prime Minister has asked me to draw your attention to his letter setting out his thoughts on this subject for all those who, quite understandably, are concerned over this challenging issue.

Clearly we must leave no stone unturned, so the Prime Minister has also asked me to draw your attention to correspondence from someone claiming to have a new and more complete understanding of relativity and

gravitation, suggesting that genuine anti-gravity should be possible, which as you may know is something the Government has actively considered in the past.

Apparently Mr. Beck's very unusual circumstances have made it difficult for him to publish a paper in the usual way or to obtain any significant response from numerous and continued attempts at correspondence with those in mainstream science. His paper has, however, recently been considered at the 13<sup>th</sup> annual conference of the NPA (Natural Philosophy Alliance) in coordination with the American Association for the Advancement of Science in Tulsa, where he claims to have some favourable responses and indications that others, such as Russian Professor Kanarev, whose work in the field of alternative energy sources may be known to you, are coming to similar conclusions in respect of the structure of particles such as electrons, with others agreeing that gravity could result from the action of neutrinos, which are known to move in spirals and have recently been confirmed to have variable mass.

Mr. Beck suggests that experimental evidence in support of his revolutionary view of mass was provided by the late Dr. Bruce DePalma at Caltech/MIT and other former experiments with spinning balls, which are easily repeatable and extendable to verify his interpretation of relativity that a fundamental component of mass depends on simple spin and, contrary to Newton's first law, anything that spins must follow a curved path, as suggested by the helicity of neutrinos. He suggests that this can unify quantum and relativity theories, explain string theory and provide Einstein's "beautifully simple" solution, with anti-gravity essentially a matter of identifying the appropriate low-energy frequency.

In light of the huge contribution that anti-gravity could make to the fight against the worst aspects of disastrous climate change, in a way that can uniquely provide positive economic and lifestyle benefits, the Government is prepared to discuss the practicality and funding of these experiments and others that may lead to workable anti-gravity, subject to your comments on their relevance and repeatability and the prospect of Mr. Beck's interpretation being correct. His paper is available via his website.

I am sure that the PM's letter will leave you in no doubt that this extreme situation warrants some departure from standard procedures and the suspension of preconceptions to ensure the objective and urgent consideration of anything with any prospect of averting that which could become the source of unprecedented suffering.



10 DOWNING STREET  
LONDON SW1A 2AA

From the Direct Communications Unit

27 June 2006

Mr Robert F Beck  
17 Larchwood Road  
St Johns  
Woking  
Surrey  
GU21 8XB

Dear Mr Beck

The Prime Minister has asked me to thank you for your recent letter and the enclosure.

He hopes you will understand that, as the matter you raise is the responsibility of the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, he has asked that your letter be forwarded to that Department so that they may reply to you direct on his behalf.

Yours sincerely

S CAINE



Department of Trade and Industry

Office of Science and Innovation

V 310  
1 Victoria Street  
London SW1H 0ET

Tel +44 (0)20 7215 3886  
Fax  
Enquiries +44 (0)20 7215 5000  
Minicom +44 (0)20 7215 6740

[www.dti.gov.uk/science](http://www.dti.gov.uk/science)  
[Angela.Venters@dti.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:Angela.Venters@dti.gsi.gov.uk)

Mr Robert Beck  
17 Larchwood Road  
St. Johns  
Woking  
Surrey GU21 8XB

10 July 2006

Dear Mr Beck,

#### Climate Change

Thank you for copying your letter to the Prime Minister to Lord Sainsbury, in which you ask for Lord Sainsbury to send out a letter outlining your work. I have been asked to respond on behalf of Lord Sainsbury.

I am sorry that Lord Sainsbury does not have the resource to assess individual projects such as the one you describe. As such, it would not be appropriate for him to send out a letter endorsing your work. May I suggest that you continue working towards publishing your work in a peer-reviewed and respected journal, as this is likely to be the most effective way of developing interest in your work?

Thank you for your interest and commitment to this vital issue.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Angela Venters  
Energy and Environment Issues Team  
Office of Science and Innovation

I was tempted many times to comment on how illogical and stupid this is in current circumstances, or that, as seems to happen with the vast majority of people these days, Lord Sainsbury and Dr. Venters, had not even read fully and carefully enough. It is absolutely clear that I was expecting Lord Sainsbury to be guided by those with the relevant knowledge. But I have long suspected that a hidden agenda may be involved, that the evidence in this report might imply. This may have been reasonably considered to be in the national interest in the past, but now must be the time to review this position.

7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Eastbury House  
30-34 Albert Embankment  
London  
SE1 7TL

Email: [ccu.correspondence@defra.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:ccu.correspondence@defra.gsi.gov.uk)  
Website: [www.defra.gov.uk](http://www.defra.gov.uk)



Mr Robert F. Beck  
17 Larchwood Road  
St Johns  
Woking  
Surrey  
GU21 8XB

CCU Ref: 259875/GH

22 September 2006

Dear Mr Beck,

**CLIMATE CHANGE AND ANTI-GRAVITY RESEARCH**

Thank you for your letter of 14 June 2006 to the Prime Minister regarding the issue of climate change and funding for anti-gravity research. Your query was passed to the Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs as climate change issues fall within our remit. I have been asked to reply and apologise for our delay in so doing.

As I am sure you will appreciate, Government departments must be impartial and therefore cannot endorse commercial products or projects. I suggest that you contact other Universities with details of your work and ask for their assistance.

I welcome the news that you are working on innovations which will benefit the environment and I wish you every success for the future.

You may be interested to see our website which contains a lot of information about what Defra is doing for the environment:

<http://www.defra.gov.uk>

I hope that this letter addresses your concerns.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Grant Hibberd".

Grant Hibberd  
Customer Contact Unit



Is "Customer Contact Unit" appropriate for deciding action on which the future of humanity may depend?!!!  
No doubt millions of starving Africans will be hugely relieved to know that the British Government is completely impartial about ideas that may in any way help!

Did I ask for anything that would directly promote my published book? Did I not mention "numerous and continued attempts at correspondence with those in mainstream science"? Is the entire future of humanity to depend on the lack of comprehension and sense of people such as this? Of course he was told what to say, but anyone with logic and conscience should surely have objected.