Theory of Everything

September 20, 2014 at 8:24am

Public

One Day scientists and everyone will acknowledge that what they currently think of as "natural" is not only Supernatural in origin; but Supernatural in essence.

Definition of **gravity** in English: **gravity**. noun. 1 **Physics** The force that attracts a body toward the center of the earth, or toward any other physical body having mass.

https://www.google.com/webhp?sourceid=chrome-instant&ion=1&espv=2&ie=UTF-8#q=gravity+physics+mistakes

http://csep10.phys.utk.edu/astr161/lect/history/newtongrav.html

I have met far too many people who THINK that ALL modern scientific theories and formulas are PERFECT FACTS, INFALLIBLE TRUTH, regardless of the many that over time have proven to be false. https://www.google.com/webhp?sourceid=chrome-instant&ion=1&espv=2&ie=UTF-8#q=superseded+theories Despite the fact everyone knows we are ALL fallible, these modern scientists just won't consider that revered formulae and theories they grew up on could possibly be among the group of those properly classified as disproven and superseded. They will laugh at, snidely assume I have never read or studied scientific disciplines, and otherwise attempt to denigrate me with ad hominems BEFORE THEY EVER EVEN READ or sometimes even look at my arguments as to why I claim much of modern theoretical physics is fiction today; not science.

https://www.facebook.com/notes/michael-swenson/religion-in-the-name-of-science/710078699071092

I tell them every connotation I've heard or seen regarding the endless versions of the big bang theory is rubbish. That the formulae F=ma and e=mc^2 are clearly misunderstood and misused today; generating fallacious notions about observable reality. https://www.facebook.com/notes/michael-swenson/how-to-know-truth-in-a-world-of-lies/622590531153243

e=mc^2 is directly related to F=ma These formulae are attempting to determine the exact amount of measureable force/energy acting upon mass/matter by multiplying by a factor of ONE that designated mass to designated acceleration. both formulae deal with velocities or kinetic energy acting upon mass. What is really being stated here? F=ma MEASURABLE FORCE is directly proportional to a change in velocity(s) applied to a given mass. Basically, when mass is removed from both equations we get a form of the identity principle. Force or a Form of Energy is Acceleration/Velocity(s). Sure; understood and defined. What else determines Force or Forms of Energy? Is it really such a break-through to state one form of force/energy is motion, velocity, acceleration? People claim both these formulae have been proven. If so, I ask them to SHOW ME. Just HOW was applied force measured? (actually observed) Some people tell me nuclear bombs prove e=mc^2 Really? how did they measure the force of such explosion? I'm curious; show me. I suppose what I am saying is that I agree with the fact that more velocity applied to mass will generate more force; what I find I am in disagreement with is that either of these formulae **precisely** predict actual observed force. (the problem with most working systems is that such precision is PURELY THEORETICAL; NOT OBSERVED) And again, I explain some of the reasons why in the aforementioned notes. But another reason is systems on planet earth, experiments are never really in an isolated environment; (one or more of the various kinds of energy are always present and such formulae have no variables expressing those one or more factors; so intrinsically are flawed in their attempt at simplicity for the complex universe we all exist in) They tell us the obvious, more applied energy or more energy in = more energy out. e=mc^2 could just as easily been e=m multiplied by any enormous velocity will automatically give you enormous energy or force (it's only the identity principle). pulling the speed of light squared out of thin air doesn't mean that AN EXACT AMOUNT OF ENERGY HAS EVER BEEN MEASURED ON A MASS THAT WAS ACCELERATED TO THE SPEED OF LIGHT SQUARED. In other words e=mc^2 HAS NOT BEEN OBSERVED OR PROVEN; but mass millions think so. (I have many examples of people I have personally encountered asserting this). Increased Velocity = Increased Energy (the identity principle) proving that the EXACT AMOUNT OF ENERGY OUT when applied to mass is EXACTLY mass * (1)c^2 has NEVER BEEN OBSERVED. Energy in = EXACTLY Energy out in a system has never been observed because, in reality, there are MANY other factors present (other sources of energy and mass acting upon whatever is being observed).

Many Physicists tell us there are no overrun systems. But is that true?

https://www.youtube.com/results?search_query=overunity+systems+more+energy+out

https://www.google.com/webhp?sourceid=chrome-instant&ion=1&espv=2&ie=UTF-8#q=fire+department+has+running+overunity+hot+water+system&tbm=vid

https://www.google.com/search?q=fire+department+using+overunity+water+boiler+system&espv=2&biw=1066&bih=702&tbm=isch&tbo=u&source=univ&sa=X&ei=NCMXVIrDHcyVyASXkoGIAw&ved=0CDgQsAQ&dpr=1.5

http://panacea-bocaf.org/cavitationheaters.htm

Students and instructors of theoretical physics will tell you formulae have been proven that have not and things are impossible that are observably already in operation today. (like overunity systems) So PLEASE TRY NOT TO LAUGH AT OR DENIGRATE PEOPLE WHO TRY AND WAKE YOU UP TO THE NEED TO THINK FOR YOURSELVES, EXAMINE EVERYTHING YOU ARE TOLD; DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT IT IS TRUE BEFORE ASSUMING IT IS. Remember, the only Gospel Truth is GOD ALMIGHTY; everything you are taught by other fallible persons like myself or anyone else in flesh and blood; SHOULD BE EXAMINED THOROUGHLY (repeating experiments designed to "prove" a theory is just monkey see; monkey do); RATHER do your best to examine what is taught from as many angles as possible, SEE IF YOU CAN THINK OF WAYS to disprove an asserted "law", "theory" or "postulate"; before jumping on the bandwagon of acceptance of anything you are told.

"Mass is a measure of how much material is in an object, but weight is a measure of the gravitational force exerted on that material in a gravitational field; thus, mass and weight are proportional to each other, with the acceleration due to gravity as the proportionality constant. It follows that mass is constant for an object..." - http://csep10.phys.utk.edu/astr161/lect/history/newtongrav.html The author then caveats this true statement by stating the theory of relativity makes exception (when it doesn't - this TRUE observation is another PROOF that e=mc^2 is FALSE)

Our CREATOR NEVER INTENDED YOU TO FORGO THE USE of your senses or mind. :) One or more of these kinds of the following factors (list below of forms of energy) are present in all we observe and yet many of those laws and theories have not one representative constant or variable recognizing this fact.

Thus, when attempting to OBSERVE F=ma, we might see an impact crash test. We know the acceleration based on observing the speedometer, distance traveled and elapsed time from when the auto began moving to the impact, we know the mass based on the weight of the car with respect to the gravitational constant of earth, we have impact sensors that can measure the force of impact. (Has

anyone ever seen the results?) A few people on earth have; very few. Did the formula predict the results? exactly? If you tell me these formulae are PROVEN; beyond all doubt; tell me how many permutations of various repeatable experiments did YOU run. I only make these statements because 1) I want you all to stop accepting as Gospel anything and everything THOUGHT of as "science" or told you in the name of science or by some "scientific expert" (THEY ARE NOT GOD! THEY ARE NOT INFALLIBLE!) and 2) I want you to learn that the ONLY RELIABLE SOURCE OF TRUTHFUL KNOWLEDGE IS OUR CREATOR; so that YOU seek to LEARN FROM HIM DIRECTLY! (note: I firmly agree that force will increase proportionately with applied energy to the mass; but I will never agree that mass is force and force is mass or that energy is mass and mass is energy; I only believe these formulae were suggested as a means of predicting GENERALLY (not EXACTLY) force generated by another acting force upon matter or mass.) The reason I say GENERALLY is because ALL OBSERVABLE MASS AND ENERGY is in the presence of MORE THAN JUST velocity and acceleration in the universe. Mass and energy observably on earth is in the presence of other mass and other forms of energy; even in the most controlled experiments. THOSE OTHER FORMS OF MASS AND ENERGY ALWAYS EFFECT to a greater or lesser extent THE RESULTS (actual observed force or energy generated). So the only PROVEN facts about F=ma and especially about the extremely flawed e=mc^2 is that there is a proportional relation of applied energy to mass and the resulting energy or force out. (contrary to the implication that many think is EXACT - see the overunity examples above and below if you are still in doubt of that)

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Forms_of_energy

- 1 Mechanical energy
- 2 Kinetic energy
- 3 Potential energy
- 4 Mechanical work
- 5 Elastic potential energy
- 6 Surface energy
- 7 Sound energy
- 8 Gravitational potential energy
- 9 Thermal energy
- 10 Chemical energy
- 11 Electric energy
    - 11.1 Electrostatic energy

        - 11.2 Electric energy
        - 11.3 Magnetic energy
        - 11.4 Electromagnetic energy
    - 12 Nuclear energy

Kinetic

(≥0), that of the motion of a body

Potential

A category comprising many forms in this list

Mechanical

The sum of (usually macroscopic) kinetic and potential energies

Mechanical wave

(≥0), a form of mechanical energy propagated by a material's oscillations

Chemical

that contained in molecules

Electric

that from electric fields

Magnetic

that from magnetic fields

Radiant

(≥0), that of electromagnetic radiation including light

Nuclear

that of binding nucleons to form the atomic nucleus

Ionization

that of binding an electron to its atom or molecule

Elastic

that of deformation of a material (or its container) exhibiting a restorative force

Gravitational

that from gravitational fields

Intrinsic, the rest energy

(≥0) that equivalent to an object's rest mass

Thermal

A microscopic, disordered equivalent of mechanical energy

Heat

an amount of thermal energy being transferred (in a given process) in the direction of decreasing temperature

Mechanical work

an amount of energy being transferred in a given process due to displacement in the direction of an applied force

I suppose you were wondering by now; isn't this supposed to be about gravity. I had to set the stage; because of how many think we are certain what gravity is these days. (I find those who laugh at me, are only really making themselves look rather foolish in the process; especially when in the not too distant future all these things they are so sure of will vanish in the pile of discarded and forgotten wild imaginations that were once considered factual in the past). Please keep in mind just because you were taught something in school, doesn't mean it's true or factual, even if you paid high dollars for that "education". Remember, what little we really know about our world and the universe; before laughing at others for expressing a differing perspective. How many are aware of just some of these current technologies? https://www.facebook.com/notes/michael-swenson/current-technologies/642285139183782

Likewise, I try not to reciprocate against those who laugh at me when I say most all of mankind knows little to nothing about gravity. They can quote the general definition and HOW GENERAL IT IS!

"the force that attracts a body toward the center of the earth, or toward any other physical body having mass. For most purposes Newton's laws of gravity apply, with minor modifications to take the

general theory of relativity into account." - https://www.google.com/webhp?sourceid=chrome-instant&ion=1&espv=2&ie=UTF-8#q=gravity%20definition

All mass has gravitational energy associated with it according to this definition. Gravity increases proportionately with the amount of mass. Can any of those who laugh as I question the validity of e=mc^2 tell me why? Can you explain PRECISELY what causes gravity. Mass? WHY? What property of mass is generating gravity? What is REALLY holding protons and neutrons together? Why does a specific number of neutrons and protons define each atomic element and how do those particular protons and neutrons know to "gravitate" to form one element from another? Are all protons the same? Are all neutrons the same? Are all electrons the same? Are all quarks the same? Tell me O' Master Alchemists; if you know! Anyone who knows why some neutrons and protons bond to make one element as opposed to another, please comment below; or if you can answer these questions. Or if you have further insights into gravity and its cause other than an apparent property of mass; force associated with mass. Many can regurgitate definitions, theories, formulas but very few can demonstrate proofs for or against them and even fewer truly understand gravity or we would be using it; since it is ever present with mass, for energy. And if mankind REALLY understood it, we would have anti-gravitational levitation, propulsion and interstellar travel by now. So please don't sneer in derision when I say the truth that each of us knows VERY, VERY LITTLE about the universe in which we exist. And encourage communication and debate about even assumed "facts"; especially "scientific" ones.

https://www.facebook.com/notes/michael-swenson/too-many-are-turning-science-into-a-religion/711197568959205

For example, I agree that energy (ability to do work) existed BEFORE mass; that energy was necessary to bring mass into existence. (That's Biblical) and yet only recently is such being suggested as one of the connotations of the "big bang theory". (Another IDEA that FAR TOO MANY THINK is FACT - https://www.facebook.com/notes/michael-swenson/so-you-think-the-big-bang-is-scientific/620654451346851) universal expansion is occurring from the origin of time and space (the Beginning when Our Creator brought the universe into existence) - https://www.facebook.com/photo.php?fbid=451991028213195&set=a.115635768515391.22520.100002069048072&type=3&theater energy, mass, time emanates from the origin; it wasn't an explosion and the mass and energy within the universe at one time was all gathered together and superheated before it was spun by our Creator and flung outward into space; following that event virtually countless explosions occurred, collisions, which would send the spinning burning masses in various directions, just like when two spinning balls or spinning tops collide of various sizes and densities. I'm not talking about a theory; but what our Creator showed me; that is why I am able to say rubbish to some of these popular notions; even though I have had so many laugh at me for doing so.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ri3R6vFVfEg

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=u-xUAC9ya3o

I am not writing these notes or making these statements to make anyone look foolish or feel bad or deceived or uneducated. I only intend to hopefully persuade people to seek our Creator and to learn from Him directly and REALLY THOROUGHLY examine anything and everything you are taught or told is factual or truth; especially in the name of science these days.

We know that no two people perceive the world alike (some people have better vision than others, some their sense of smell is more acute, some hear better than others and how would any of know what colors look like to someone else unless they tell us.) The truth is we all perceive/observe reality in very unique ways! https://www.google.com/webhp?sourceid=chrome-instant&rlz=1C1GIGM_enUS535US535&ion=1&espv=2&ie=UTF-8#q=synethesia No two of exactly the same! every organism on earth UNIQUE! sure there may be similarities in "twins" or even "clones" but the moment they are observed, environmental factors and even the observer effect begins to create perceived and apparent dissimilarities! Based on such observations, I would say that no two stars are exactly alike either, no two galaxies, no two rocks and I would go so far as to propose that even atoms are unique! What I observe about the universe is that all observable matter IS NOT CONSTANT; NOR ASSOCIATED ENERGY WITH SUCH MATTER OR ACTING UPON SUCH MATTER! Not constant in any way! The ONLY CONSTANT I know of is our Eternal Creator; in fact His Unchanging Nature is One of those noted factors that distinguishes Him from all the rest of His Creation!

http://biblehub.com/hebrews/6-18.htm - God's Promise is Certain…17In the same way God, desiring even more to show to the heirs of the promise the unchangeableness of His purpose, interposed with an oath, 18so that by two unchangeable things in which it is impossible for God to lie, we who have taken refuge would have strong encouragement to take hold of the hope set before us. 19This hope we have as an anchor of the soul, a hope both sure and steadfast and one which enters within the veil,…

and

http://biblehub.com/hebrews/13-8.htm - 8Jesus Christ is the same yesterday and today and forever.

http://biblehub.com/malachi/3-6.htm - 6"For I, the LORD, do not change; therefore you, O sons of Jacob, are not consumed.

So all these "laws" talking about "constants" are false (unless what you are actually witnessing/observing is EVIDENCE OF GOD!) DNA is unique; so we recognize that the UNIQUENESS of all life forms is due to INFORMATION, DISTINCT and PRECISE INFORMATION. Why wouldn't that be true for planets, stars, rocks, elements, even atoms? Wouldn't it follow that UNIQUE QUALITIES REGARDING ALL MASS has to be attributed TO UNIQUE circumstances, forces, that relate to that unique object/mass/matter? for example, imagine a single photon traveling through space, is that single photon going to encounter the EXACT SAME forces and mass of any other photon? NO! So for those who want to claim universal laws, constants about mass and matter, I ask that you consider the wording I suggest below which would attempt to show the UNIQUE forces acting upon a given mass in a region of space time WITHOUT EVER STATING SOMETHING we don't observe in reality. Forces/ENERGY and MASS VARY! THEY ARE NOT CONSTANT! Two objects and forms of energy may be similar, may possess like characteristics and properties, BUT THEY ARE NOT EXACTLY ALIKE; for many reasons. It is a vain attempt therefore to put constants into formulae about the observable universe INSTEAD OF THE TRUTH; use VARIABLES! Otherwise, you are making approximate and general calculations (varying degrees of error); not nearly as precise as many scientists claim these days.

So in examining gravity, I choose to listen to those who seemed to have understood it better than just reciting the common definition.

Let's examine some of those claiming to have developed anti-gravitational devices. (typically other kinds of energy are set against the gravitational constant of earth; but let's see if we can find ANYONE actually understanding what fundamentally causes gravity, and is harnessing that cause for some use.)

https://www.youtube.com/results?search_query=chittum+anti-gravity

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hYJXE4FCm7Q

https://www.google.com/webhp?sourceid=chrome-instant&ion=1&espv=2&ie=UTF-8#q=grebennikov

http://ancientcolonytheory.com/secret-of-viktor-grebennikov-anti-gravity-revealed/

http://pesn.com/2012/09/27/9602196_Coral_Castle_Busted_--_Interesting_but_not_Magic/ - I still like the man's devotion and determination, what a legacy to have built by himself.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bXDXcXFhMnw

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7Lka6d6DDBs

http://www.keshefoundation.org/new-horizons/gravity/69-gravity-en.html

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=M2uaSaVWDuY

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_zpsEO5t-TM

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tlx2PgESXhs

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GeyDf4ooPdo

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=w5hQJNpWBP4

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=R0MZzvbDOzE

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=g4lW7xydnH8

https://www.google.com/webhp?sourceid=chrome-instant&ion=1&espv=2&ie=UTF-8#q=floating%20globe%20desk%20toy

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_Jh1pFy_XGY

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=669AcEBpdsY - acoustic levitation

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fgHvC55AKig&list=PL1173CB4357E57EF7 - Bernoulli's principle

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4z4QdiqP-q8

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yd9DgsI95hc

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aF92B6Gon3M - coanda effect

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sdGVI7kJld0&list=PL064C6D65A65F1F4B

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WKiQqORDnJQ

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GkGkYbqqGkM

https://www.youtube.com/results?search_query=personal+flying+platform

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6vwcIO9M-uE

https://www.youtube.com/results?search_query=gravity+generator+free+energy+load+test

http://sunearthday.gsfc.nasa.gov/2008/TTT/60_magfield.php

https://www.google.com/webhp?sourceid=chrome-instant&ion=1&espv=2&ie=UTF-8#q=earth's%20magnetic%20field

http://lasp.colorado.edu/~bagenal/3750/ClassNotes/Class13/Class13.html

http://www-istp.gsfc.nasa.gov/earthmag/planetmg.htm

http://aether.lbl.gov/elements/stellar/strong/strong.html

http://physics.bu.edu/~duffy/EssentialPhysics/chapter29/section29dash1.pdf

http://www.dummies.com/how-to/content/how-to-calculate-the-force-of-gravity-on-the-earth.html

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vZ6c3hI_1GI

https://www.youtube.com/results?search_query=levitating+monk

https://www.facebook.com/notes/michael-swenson/ufology-quest-for-truth-about-aliens-part-1/674598659285763

The more I read of the "laws" and "theories" of physics/theoretical physics; the more I realize just how many of them violate the scientific principle. The scientific method has NOT been applied to these laws and theories! (DESIGNED to "prove" experiments, is NOT following the scientific method; it is only looking for and creating confirmation bias in support of an idea.) Accurate observations lead to Truth, but designed experiments are as deceptive as the tricks of magicians. For those who say the universal

gravitational constant has been proven; tell me how you traveled from galaxy to galaxy and accurately observed and measured this "gravitational constant"? At most, I will agree that SOME tests/experiments have been performed with the INTENT to "prove" the stated concepts. (experiments DESIGNED to prove something, are not proofs - citing permutations observed all over the world and the observable portion of the universe thus far that PRECISELY COINCIDE with said formulae would do a much better job); coincidental correlations aside. (misapplication of cause and effect)

A more comprehensive unified theory would state what we observe appropriately: For a Given Instance of Time and a Given Object/System/Mass; Energy out of that Object/System/Mass is the Net Applied Energy (in all its forms) to that System/Object/Mass (total mass under the influence of that Net Applied Energy) MINUS The Net Applied Energy acting upon it and any mass in opposition to the System/Subject Mass/Designed Load/Desired Trajectory/Net Work/Force of any given object. Total Energy Out of a System is the Sum of All Forms of Energy and Mass Applied to that System MINUS All Forms of Energy and Mass Acting in Opposition to that System/Object/Mass. Since most objects in the universe are spherical in shape, this would be represented by utilization of the Standard Model (vector calculus) (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kinematicsand http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bra%E2%80%93ket_notation#mediaviewer/File:Vector_components_bases_projection.svg, and http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bra%E2%80%93ket_notation to Resolve all Vectors/Velocities and Net Energies that Aid the Vector/Velocity of the Object/Sphere in motion. All Vectors that approach up to 180 degrees within the current trajectory/Vector of that given object aide in a proportional way that object in motion along its current trajectory; all Vectors 180 degrees or greater do not. (Any mass or energy "pushing" an object, that sphere, along its current trajectory is adding to the Net Sum of Kinetic Energy Applied, anything that is pulling or pushing in opposition to the current trajectory/vector of that object/sphere is detracting from that Net Sum of Applied Kinetic Energy; cumulatively.)

So the sought after "**theory of everything**" would be:

For a given instance of T(Time) and a designated region of S(Space): the ToE(TotalEnergyOut) is the Difference between the Ne(fav)(NetAppliedEnergy;in all its forms) to the ToM(TotalMass for the given T(Time) and S(Space) *acting in favor* of the System/Object/Mass being measured; under observation and Ne(opp)(NetAppliedEnergy;in all its forms) to the ToM(TotalMass for the given T(Time) and S(Space) *acting in opposition* to the System/Object/Mass being measured; under observation.

For a Given Object; For designated T and S: ToE = Ne(fav) *acting favorably upon* ToM(of the Given Object) - Ne(opp) *acting against* ToM(of the Given Object)

Within a System (Machine Designed for Work); For designated T and S: ToE = Ne(fav) + Netmass *acting favorably upon* ToM - Ne(opp) + Netmass *acting against* ToM

The result of Ne would include variables representing all known forms of energy and the sum of all such forms present; the values of which would then be entered as observed or resolved by current methods, vector calculus, etc. It would also be necessary to determine free Kinetic Energy resulting from the Applied Total Energy and the Potential Energy that would Increase or be Stored by the observed Mass within T and S.

A System of more than one object would necessitate determining the net applied energy acting favorably and against each object and how it relates to every other object in that system. If a Machine is Designed for Work and the Mass/Load (acting in opposition to) that Machine/System exceeds the ToE and the mass of that machine; then of course it will fail. If the Machine has (within itself) Mass and Ne acting in opposition to the Mass and Ne acting favorably upon that Machine; it will also fail. A system or designed machine would therefore be precisely calculated by considering the ToE (total energy out) of each of its several components as opposed to the total Load and the total opposition of mass and energy acting against the desired ability to work of the design itself.

I didn't mention the "product" of mass and the Net Applied Force; because it is my contention that nuclear force (strong and weak) and the fundamentals are part of that "Net Applied Force" (all forms of energy) and that mass is NOT energy. As such, more mass INDICATES more APPLIED ENERGY, thus it is unnecessary to state that the energy out of a system is the "product" of the Net Applied Energy and the mass of that system; when part of the Net Applied Energy is within the Mass and holding it together. (that part of the Net Energy is canceled out from the equation UNLESS you are destroying the mass or changing it; as in nuclear fission/fusion; then that nuclear energy (strong and weak force) is part of what can be expected to be released to a greater or lesser extent; in varying degrees depending on the specific method that mass is being fundamentally transformed by) Finding out the RELATIONSHIP of just how much energy is holding a hydrogen atom together versus a uranium atom etc. is something I believe has NOT been ACCURATELY observed to date. And since I further consider that gravity is NOT a universal constant, I believe that different amounts of force, energy and types of force energy are present when observing any object large or small and that is why I believe the wording above more accurately reflects what we observe in our world and what we know of the universe at present.

I read contradictory information in what is being taught as basic physics. In one sentence we read that gravity relates directly with mass and is inversely related to the distance between two or more mass objects. In another sentence we read gravity bends light. In another sentence we read photons are

observable particles but have no mass. Gravity is a force fundamentally generated by mass. In another, Gravity brought mass into existence. (see the numerous violations of the Law of Non-contradiction in such statements?) Gravity is energy. I have seen light reflected, refracted and evidence that it has even been slowed and stopped; but I personally have never seen light bent by gravity and can't find any observable evidence for such a claim. Yes, I have read the articles about the astrophysicists who claim that such proof is demonstrated by observed stars behind other stars or objects in space; but at the distances involved and elapsed time; even at the speed of light, I have yet to see any formal exclusion to the possibility that they are observing the light that was emitted from the star before moving behind the obstructive object(s) and that at some point that light may well be interrupted/unobservable from earth or space telescope source. Or that many other possibilities for lensing of light have been excluded. (In other words since all things including light are moving as waves, frequencies, over great distances we are bound to observe the amplitude of that wave and still images are bound to capture that amplitude fluctuation; since we are rotating, any time elapse photography would then show arcs that reflect the amplitude of the light stream (wave/frequency and the motion of rotation of our observation of the star/object as it moves through space (causing arcs to appear in such photographs). If you look at the end of corkscrew closely you can see the spiral of the metal and that metal forming the spiral has a certain diameter; but if you look at it further and further away; directly from the end, then it begins to appear like a single circle of larger diameter. There are other things to consider when photographing light wave intensities other than the motion of the object emitting such light and just gravitational force acting upon such lightwave; before the camera captures the image. So a lightwave at the very edge of an object in theory at times would have part of that wave obscured and part would pass. (objects emitting light at the very edge could only APPEAR to have light bending in this way; and the intensity of such observed light would be diminished but still appear as an obstructed visible object due to the frequency of light.) http://earthweareone.com/our-model-of-the-solar-system-has-been-wrong-this-entire-time/ keep in mind not just planets travel as spiral sinusoidal waves but stars and galaxies as well (all mass; down to small particles). Understand "lightwave" in this context is referring to a similar effect as when you wave a sparkler really fast in the night and see the trail of light. Much of distant starlight is so distant that we observe not the diameter of the object per se, but have to define the frequency of the object itself, our vector of observation, distinguish the diffusion or glow from what we perceive to be as the object in that moment. Consider possible optical illusions, reflections, lensing and/or mirror effects caused by any means. Consider all plausible causes of red shift; color shift; not just the current popular notions. So when we look at distant stars in the glow of each may be such objects to small for us to detect presently and that the apparent diameter could in fact be not the actual diameter of the object but includes the area occupied by its wavelength and frequency of travel in varying degrees, proportionately to such factors not only of the object observed but also as to vector(s) of observation and distance. Optical illusions due to atmospheric conditions have been observed, photons can be physically slowed (like all mass) they bounce off other mass (like all mass) and in all ways demonstrate properties of mass; yet are being called "massless particles". So THERE ARE OTHER EXPLANATIONS TO CONSIDER for light bending, refracting, reflecting, distorting, color shifting, than any of the theses and journal submissions I have read. It's as if Light traveling through galaxies suddenly is different than light traveling through our own atmosphere! YOU NEED TO CONSIDER **ALL** THE OBSERVABLE PROPERTIES OF LIGHT WHETHER OR NOT IT IS TRAVELING ON OR NEAR EARTH OR THROUGH GALAXIES BEYOND! (Most

all the light shift theories I've read exclude common factors of everyday gradients that have prismatic effects or other versions of color shift - I make these specifically with regard to those stating coloration is a definitive means to measure stellar age, temperatures etc.; precisely, with no exceptions. I see a complete disregard for MANY factors that can cause various colors to be observed when looking at stars.) But if gravity is (and I agree that it does) acting upon photons, then I would say that is further proof photons are NOT massless. For light diffusion to occur and so much so that at great distances we cannot even perceive light sources proves that photons have mass; (not massless).
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hubble_eXtreme_Deep_Field - "The faintest galaxies are one ten-billionth the brightness of what the human eye can see." Scientists try to explain that dark matter and dark energy are playing a part in such observations. I see that as yet another way to explain the Biblical Account:

http://biblehub.com/genesis/1-4.htm - The First Day: Light…3Then God said, "Let there be light"; and there was light. 4God saw that the light was good; and God separated the light from the darkness. 5God called the light day, and the darkness He called night. And there was evening and there was morning, one day.

Think of what it means that all objects in our universe great and small are traveling as spiral sinusoidal waves (have frequencies) at varying velocities and vectors and yet from our vantage on earth, we can observe twelve predominant costellations for millenniums, so constantly that some civilizations used them to define epochs. Others see correlations directly to historic and current events. Various languages, cultures and times (over centuries apart and all over the world recognized the Gospel Account. Some even attribute correlations between them and specific people. (the twelve tribes, the annunciation of Christ)

https://www.google.com/webhp?sourceid=chrome-instant&rlz=1C1GIGM_enUS535US535&ion=1&espv=2&ie=UTF-8#q=twelve%20constellations%20and%20the%20twelve%20tribes

https://www.google.com/webhp?sourceid=chrome-instant&rlz=1C1GIGM_enUS535US535&ion=1&espv=2&ie=UTF-8#q=Missler%20mazzaroth

https://www.google.com/webhp?sourceid=chrome-instant&rlz=1C1GIGM_enUS535US535&ion=1&espv=2&ie=UTF-8#q=the%20stars%20announced%20Christ%20birth%20and%20death

There is no doubt that civilizations that didn't even have a Holy Bible used the stars in the manner described in the Biblical Account.

http://biblehub.com/genesis/1-14.htm - The Fourth Day: Sun, Moon, Stars14Then God said, "Let there be lights in the expanse of the heavens to separate the day from the night, and let them be for signs and for seasons and for days and years;15and let them be for lights in the expanse of the heavens to give light on the earth"; and it was so.…

A few wicked persons; in the name of "science" try their best to omit any reference that actually EXPLAINS PRECISELY WHAT WE OBSERVE (the Holy Bible) because they do not WANT to acknowledge our Creator or Intelligent Designs; as such their findings are put forth in a way to support absolute fiction (imaginations in the form of postulates, laws, theories they desperately adhere to in a vain attempt to suppress Truth). I simply refuse to accept by blind faith all such notions put forth; even though others CLAIM they have been proven.

http://www.s-cool.co.uk/gcse/physics/uses-of-waves/revise-it/electromagnetic-spectrum - "All the parts of the electromagnetic spectrum can be **reflected, refracted** and **diffracted** which shows that each part is a type of wave. In fact, the electromagnetic spectrum is a whole continuous family of waves. They are all transverse waves. They all travel at the same speed through space. This speed is 300,000,000 m/s (the speed of light) this can also be written as 300 thousand km/s.Read more at http://www.s-cool.co.uk/gcse/physics/uses-of-waves/revise-it/electromagnetic-spectrum#CEPBsJ0sU4yBbW0W.99" THINK about this statement! photons have mass (can be bounced off other mass, obstructed by, SLOWED, even "stopped") BUT ALL THOSE VARIOUS WAVELENGTHS AND FREQUENCIES all travel at "the constant speed of light", the SAME speed! RUBBISH! (yes, I know they caveat with "the speed of light in a vacuum" STILL RUBBISH!) gravity bends light, affects light, can cause optical illusions of light, lensing and such, but even though we see gravity slow and speed objects having mass up, (comets and such that approach our sun, planets, etc.) light is the EXCEPTION, photons are the EXCEPTION, to gravity affecting velocities of travel for objects having mass. (photons have mass, regardless of how small and light has never been observed at the supposed maximum velocity, other than in perhaps controlled "experiments" designed to support that fiction and false assumption.)

To all of modern theoretical physcics concepts. I respond with SHOW ME (and not with cleaverly designed experiments; but with permutations of vast multitudes of accurate observations; empirical evidence! We all have access to the largest database in the world (the Internet) and I haven't seen such proofs posted there. I have seen FALSE support in the way of such nonsense like "massless particles",

"energy at rest" and DESIGNED experiments proposed with specific intent to support their fiction. I do not agree that energy and mass are equal terms, synonymous terms, or force and mass, and in many of these laws and theories ASSUMPTIONS are being made that are inherently unobservable. (like the universal constant in e=mc^2 or the assumed gravitational constant; regarding all mass in the universe) How much of the universe have we observed? enough to say that all things are bounded by this imagined limit? NO! each and every soul on earth doesn't even know 1% of everything there is to know about our planet; let alone the universe! I say that simply by considering the fact that there are BILLIONS of people on planet earth, mass millions of species, the majority of the surface covered in water the depths of which have not even remotely been explored, and billions of web pages in the Internet database; let alone books in libraries all over the world. We all really don't even know a FRACTION, and a very minute fraction, of even 1% of all that knowledge. https://www.youtube.com/results?search_query=most+unusual+things+in+the+world And yet we have the audacity to claim universal laws regarding our entire universe; even though most of these "laws"; claiming to be scientific, truly have NOT had the scientific method applied to them! https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_JkoOSygnGs Does anyone have observable data from the astronauts that landed on the moon showing some basic experiments that would have at least aided in confirmation of these so called "laws" and "theories"? A few simple experiments/observations would have greatly aided public education.

I've included examples of other forms of energy used to overcome the force of gravity on earth. I've also included some properties of mass that appear to generate forces that can be used to overcome gravity as well. And I made a couple references as to the properties of some planets and our sun. I have the goal of getting people to focus on the best methods observed for harnessing and overcoming the force of gravity.

I think the best method for generating gravity is to mimic those things that generate it on a large scale. Everything we observe is in motion. Those planets and star nearest us are spinning, rotating, those celestial spheres that have magnetospheres, obviously have conductive material acting like rotors and stators (dynamos) generating electro-magnetism on a large scale. If planets are generating electro-magnets observably; then a perpetual motion machine similar to the one demonstrated can generate free energy or electricity in similar fashion as the huge magnetosphere of our own planet. Are the lines of flux around our earth sufficiently concentrated at the poles as to be a possible energy source? Would moving satellites be able to move through the magnetosphere to generate and store energy? (Provide wireless power source around our planet; not just from solar but from the existing magnetic field?) http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2010/11/101118-science-space-full-moon-electric-charge/ (can it be harnessed by satellites or even storage devices on the moon?) Would it be efficient for further space exploration (like a "fueling depot" of sorts)? Or a power source for lunar colonization to practice terraforming techniques before we attempt such colonization beyond?

What can be observed in the above cited demonstrations is that gravity can be overcome and utilized in more or less efficient ways. That there is tremendous amounts of energy force holding the nucleus of atoms together. That rather simple methods like gyroscopes can be used to counter the force of gravity. That magnetism can likewise overcome such force. When you combine what is observed and known in the demonstrations and about the gravitational fields generated in our solar system; it follows that what should be constructed is a spherical shaped device. The outer hull should consist of layers that can house numerous spheres. Within those spheres I suggest liquid conductive material. Try spinning that conductive liquid both charged and uncharged in various degrees of inclination within those layered spherical regions. Try at least two and probably three such liquid charged gyros at various angles, rates of velocity, various charges. I am thinking that two spinning circles of charged liquids (I suggest charged liquids because I believe you can generate higher velocities than charged solids with charged highly conductive liquids) I am thinking that the two charged liquids spinning inside one another can mimic the way planets and stars are generating magnetospheres (spherical electro-magnets, lines of flux in motion) I suggest the third most outer spinning circle of charged liquid (electrically charged liquid gyro) in the outer most spherical region to be used for navigational purposes. (Either repulsion or attraction to existing nearby gravitational forces and electromagnetic forces whether naturally or unnaturally occurring) Basically, utilize a model similar to https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7Lka6d6DDBs; only with pressurized highly conductive liquids. (I keep thinking mercury or similar liquid heavy metal conductive material pressurized for extremely high velocities; while electrically charged and yet also generating electro-magnetic power and similar flux lines as observed in the planets, and sun) I believe this model can serve many purposes including tapping the power generated from nominal input into an electro-magnetic feedback loop such that a portion of the power generated actually charges the interior electro magnets charging the conductive liquids in the layers. (Overunity is a real possibility with electro-magnetic generators especially in models like this; by doing that - taking part of the output power generated and using it to continuously charge the coils that are creating the output power in the first place)

https://www.google.com/webhp?sourceid=chrome-instant&ion=1&espv=2&ie=UTF-8#q=electro+magnet+stays+on+until+off&tbm=vid

https://www.youtube.com/results?search_query=electro+magnet+stays+on+overunity

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zPqEEZa2Gis

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QFZZpKrx8fw&src_vid=n2F_PepgyKk&feature=iv&annotation_id=annotation_131055719

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2nCuGtEDI5g

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=glRuwV9IlaY

Again, utilize conductive liquids in such models as are currently using solids and start testing the net vectors generated by various angles of declination with respect to base gravity, once you have those flux fields spinning like gyros. I had dreams that people would use solids at first because when they tested liquids EMF potential dispersed too quickly (equilibrium was achieved to rapidly to utilize or harness change in potential); but I nevertheless encourage tests to be run to note the electromagnetic field properties of high velocity, pressurized conductive fluids housed within solids and perhaps even interspersed with solids to counter chemical dissolution, isotopes etc. that would prevent harnessing the potential of energy applied to such fluids. Test whether or not it is easier to bring dense solids or charged liquids up to desired velocities and adjusting angles of declination of such spinning masses. (Mimic creation, to unlock knowledge from our Creator).

Compare utilizing dense charged liquids to dense masses. Consider that there is a frequency even to earth. http://www.hese-project.org/hese-uk/en/niemr/natural.php?content_type=R and the earth is traveling (this model exaggerates the motion but aides in visualization) as a sinusoidal wave; while it is spinning. (earth is traveling like a particle and a wave like all mass down to even photons) https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0jHsq36_NTU So at a certain distance and viewing angle the earth would look like a sine wave, like EMF energy observed on oscilloscopes. So gyroscopes; especially at high velocities begin to counter the force of gravity by creating a mass that is no longer in phase with the earth. The force generated by centripetal velocity of that spinning mass begins to approach a Net Vector force that counters the earth's gravitational field. Frisbees if not spun don't counter gravity very well at all. Likewise a tetherball, etc. But it is not just Velocity against Velocity that demonstrates "anti-gravity" (any net force that overcomes the apparent gravity of any given mass, but even mass itself and the way it is designed has been observed as such. https://www.google.com/webhp?sourceid=chrome-instant&rlz=1C1GIGM_enUS535US535&ion=1&espv=2&ie=UTF-8#q=shark%20skin%20antibacterial%20material and https://www.google.com/search?q=beetle+chitin+anti-gravity&rlz=1C1GIGM_enUS535US535&oq=beetle+chitin+anti-gravity&aqs=chrome..69i57&sourceid=chrome&es_sm=93&ie=UTF-8 and more commonly known masses like magnets. In other words everything I have seen known as "anti-gravity" is any energy or

mass that counters the gravity of any other mass. We see tiny mass easily escape the gravity of earth or defy/counter it all the time. Every time we stand, anything that flies, and most commonly the carrier waves used in television and radio communications; straight up to satellites and directed to transceivers all over the world. Long-wave and short-wave transmissions for various purposes. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Communication_with_submarines So the smaller the mass, the easier it is to overcome gravitational effects by various kinds of applied energy to that mass. So a personal craft could be created simply by what we already know and observe about all things that overcome earth's gravitational constant. (Any craft that does so APPEARS to be "anti-gravitational".) If very dense metal is spun like a gyroscope and various angles of declination then by measuring applied velocity an ideal velocity and angle of rotation that counters "gravity" on earth can be found; simply by putting the stand/mass the gyroscope is fixed to on a scale. At whatever angle and velocity of rotation demonstrates weightlessness or lightest measured weight; is the amount of energy needed (causing rotation of the gyroscope) to overcome earth's gravity; APPEAR "anti-gravitational". That input applied energy is typically done by EMP/EMF, an electric motor, and that load can easily be measured by any standard VOM. So then the efficiency of such a system can be considered against conventional craft and proposed use of such a means of propulsion. BUT, once "weightlessness" is achieved for any given mass, it then takes very little directed energy, vectors/velocities to act upon that mass to achieve desired trajectories and rates of travel along those trajectories. So I suggest COMBINING, mass that demonstrates anti-gravity properties (gyros, sharkskin, beetle chitin, electro-magnetism, frequencies) in the development of any "anti-gravitational" craft. Apparently, that's already been accomplished but is kept secret from the general populace. https://www.facebook.com/notes/michael-swenson/ufology-quest-for-truth-about-aliens-part-1/674598659285763

What the witnesses are saying sounds very probable to me; that three propulsion devices are needed for "anti-gravity" (strictly for stability of such craft) and that EMF or high powered (radio-active) frequencies are used as the propulsion. Makes perfect sense to me. We send data (tiny bits of information along carrier waves; even using lightwaves (huge range of the EM spectrum) to carry data packets ALL THE TIME) It makes sense therefore that INCREASING THE NET FORCE/POWER/ENERGY of such carrier waves could be utilized to carry/propel MORE MASS. So Three Propulsion Units of such DIRECTED ENERGY could be used (as the standard model, vector calculus shows) to resolve against the Net Force of Gravity for any mass (triangulation). As the object distances from the Mass that it is closest to; generating the most gravity, those three propulsion units would need to be adjusted accordingly. (triangulation with respect to the center of gravity of whatever mass is generating the strongest gravitational field acting in opposition to the desired trajectory and velocity). Three would be the minimum needed; more such units would create even more stability. A fourth such unit could be designated solely for directional vectors and housed in a sphere such that rapid change of vectors/trajectories; within 360 degrees is easily achieved.

Quick charge, slow discharge power packs are available now that we have nano-tech capacitance and inductance; as such, the power generated from these models could be stored on such nano-circuits (portable power packs that make all existing batteries obsolete). If anyone out there reads my notes and realizes I have knowledge from our Creator; let's get together and get patents and prototypes underway.

I have seen Revelations from our Creator that could vault humanity into the 21st century and beyond (technologically speaking); but the most important information I wish to convey; is that our Creator wants to personally communicate with everyone! However, He is a Gentleman, He introduces Himself, He sends Messengers to introduce Him, He writes Letters of Introduction, but He does not break and enter into your life; without your permission or invitation. (demons and devils do that and every soul that is not Protected by the God of All Creation can be victimized by such foul and unclean spirits) But the Lord of the Universe, awaits to answer those who call upon Him; to Save to the Utmost all who do so; to Bless, Keep, and Commune with; to Teach and Guide in the Way, the Truth and the Life Everlasting.

http://www.blastthetrumpet.org/PublicLetters/AAAUpdatedPublicAlertsMattersofLifeandDeath/Saved%20By%20Grac1.pdf

After spending a lifetime reviewing the expressed thoughts of scientific "experts" throughout history (including popular "scientists" of today), this individual is far closer to the mark than any of them (MUCH of modern science is scientism - https://www.google.com/search?q=scientism&rlz=1C1GIGM_enUS535US535&oq=scientism&aqs=chrome..69i57&sourceid=chrome&es_sm=93&ie=UTF-8):

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mtBz1roiQR8

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CvDqrSTCcmA - this is FAR closer to explaining the universe in which we exist than those who pose BS like black holes and gravity generated solar systems for observable phenomenon.

Ultimately, GOD, is the Law of the Universe, the Theory of Everything. It is His Thought, His Speed of Thought that are the bounds, the limits, the constants (nothing observed). He is invisible. He is the Source of ALL energy and mass. His Faith and Words Frame and Hold Together ALL mass (His Intelligent

Designs)! He is an INFINITE energy source for ALL the various forms of energy and alone determines the total mass within the universe. Knowing Him is the Ultimate Truth, Sure Knowledge; Sound Science!