

# You forgot "www." at the beginning of the server name!

You have accessed this page though an incomplete server name: ufomind.com instead of www..com --- so some services may not work. Please go to the [correct address for this page](#) to make this message go away.



## Aliens On Earth.com

Resources for those who are stranded here



### Navigation

- [UFOs](#)
- [Paranormal](#)
- [People](#)
- [Places](#)
- [Area 51](#)
- [Random](#)
- [Top 100](#)
- [Catalog](#)
- [What's New](#)

### Search...

...for this word in:

- Page Titles
- Page Contents
- Book
- Title/Author

[Help](#)

### New Catalog Items (Random Selection)

- [The Starr Report](#) (used pb) Kenneth Starr - \$2.00
- [Growing Up Brady: I Was a Teenage Greg](#) (new trpb) Barry Williams - \$12.00
- [UFO Magazine](#) - Assortment
- [Goodbye Darkness: A Memoir of the Pacific War](#) (used hc) William Manchester - \$8.00
- [Fighter: The True Story of the Battle of Britain](#) (used hc) Len Deighton - \$5.00
- [Quest for the Presidency 1992](#) (used hc) Peter Goodman & Thomas M. DeFrank & Mark Miller & Andrew Murr & Tom Mathews - \$8.00

[Other New Items](#) | [Main Catalog Page](#) | [Subjects](#)

2000+ new & used titles, including hundreds you won't find at Amazon!

### [Log-In Here](#)

For Advanced Features

[Mothership](#) -> [People](#) -> [B](#) -> [Boylan](#) -> [Dispatch](#) -> Here

[Our Focus](#)

### Dispatches from Richard Boylan

## Fw: Shulman on Sarfatti on P-Q consciousness

From: "Richard J. Boylan, Ph.D."  
 Subject: Fw: Shulman on Sarfatti on P-Q consciousness  
 Date: Thu, 13 May 1999 21:34:15 -0700

-----Original Message-----

From: ACC <nicolai\_tesla@msn.com>  
 To: 'J. Sarfatti' <sarfatti@well.com>  
 Cc: 'Richard J. Boylan, Ph.D.' <drboylan@jps.net>; 'ronsp@ucia.gov' <ronsp@ucia.gov>; 'M Thorn' <mthorn@ix.netcom.com>; 'Kim Burrafato' <Lensman@stardrive.org>; 'Uri Geller' <Urigeller@compuserve.com>; 'Chris Penrose, Ph.D.' <Penrose@cmlab.sfc.keio.ac.jp>; 'Ira Einhorn' <User886114@aol.com>; 'Jacques Vallee, Ph.D.' <Mabillon@pacbell.net>; 'Gary Schwartz, Ph.D.' <Gschwartz@u.arizona.edu>; 'Ron Anastasia, Ph.D.' <Rjon11@aol.com>; 'Nick Herbert, Ph.D.' <Quanta@cruzio.com>; 'Fred Alan Wolf, Ph.D.' <Fawolf@ix.netcom.com>; 'newphysics@mail.msr-wetware.com' <newphysics@mail.msr-wetware.com>  
 Date: Thursday, May 13, 1999 10:23 AM  
 Subject: RE: Shulman on Sarfatti on P-Q consciousness

>[Again, hurriedly dictated over the cellphone to me by Jack, he was on his way to an American Science Foundation meeting, he chairs, so I apologize in advance for any typos I introduce, this was dictated but not proofread -

>Rita]  
>  
>To the "Boylan" LIST:  
>  
>This demonstrates a proof to my proposal that Sarfatti, threatened by what  
>was suggested in my last letter, would resort to name calling and self  
>preserving defamation. Phew, what a mistake, to try to come to someone  
>like Sarfatti's aid by voicing some support for him - he attacks ANYTHING  
>he can't fathom.  
>  
>I'm going to respond in the same tone to Jack Sarfatti, now watch how he  
>gets even more defensive. By the way, I had no idea he was a 'Moslem'....  
>  
>Saints be praised I'm glad that, being "Jewish formerly orthodox", I have a  
>thick skin...<G>  
>  
>Inasmuch as he also does not understand either sarcastic prose or facetious  
>modality language groups, and obviously never understood those lessons on  
>deep structure his professors tried to teach him as an undergrad...  
>  
>Here goes (I hate piddling contests... damm):  
>  
>---Body of reply to Sarfatti:  
>  
>Resorting to name calling, Sarfatti?  
>  
>You have never done an analysis before on a semiconductor, or you'd know  
>how dumb you look to my engineering staff (all 45 of them snickered at your  
>letter this am and said: "there's a guy with his head in the sand"). I was  
>even tempted to send it to Lawrence Berkeley and to Intel, for comment, but  
>I didn't want you to  
>completely lose your stature in the scientific community just because you  
>made one tiny little mistake in self-defense of your ego:  
>  
>For a TCAP Memory to switch in  $10^{-15}$ th, each gated junction within them  
>would have to operate at about  $10^{-17}$  or less, not  $10^{-13}$ , you big dummy!  
>(to quote Don Rickles!) For those who don't know, a femtosecond is  
>actually 1 millionth of a billionth of a second. In fact, the single gate  
>latch speed of a TCAP is .5 femtosecond, about 1/4 the orbit rotation of an  
>E1 (sp??) electron in time, as that's about how long it takes to elevate  
>its rotation due to the divot trap present in the Silver Alkane junction.  
> Today we use a cascade delay to load the TCAP memory for both Accumulators  
>and for Solid State Hard Drive applications, which  
>requires us to do  $8 \times 32$  in about 128 femtoseconds. Thats a ram panel that  
>has a 128 femtosecond 'clock cycle' Sarfatti, using metaphors you can  
>understand.  
>  
>Faster than anything you've even theorized about in your Quantum Computing  
>Universe, Sarfatti. So you think you're smart? In your dreams. (to quote  
>any young So. California starlet in any recent Grade B movie)...  
>  
>Like: You claim Stephen Hawking's principles of Time and Axes of Time  
>'stream' are wrong? No such thing as a Time Stream? Well, since thats  
>just an alternative term for Time Line or Flow, and Axes refer to the polar  
>chart of Time v. Anti Time, then you'd simply be pulling hairs on

syntax,  
>rather than using your brain to think for a moment. Can't let  
creative use  
>of language in, either,  
>I see...  
>  
>I agree with Hawking and you're full of s--t, Sarfatti - you talk  
smart,  
>but you think way below your self estimation.  
>  
>Provide a mathematical theory on the transcendence center of a Black  
Hole,  
>will you, that defeats Stephens proofs (they're published in the  
Jnls. of  
> U. Cambridge & the Royal Society of Mathematics) and then maybe I'll  
>consider your proofs. Meanwhile, you're a gone goose: I wouldn't  
hire you  
>to push brooms here, much less to develop a mathematical or  
scientific  
>theory or a device... we'd be taking our lives in our hands using  
>reasoning like yours, its so far off what's real. Anyone who would  
would  
>be a bigger  
>fool than you!  
>  
>While you're at it, since you think you know so much, why not give me  
a  
>treatise on Shakunle: Spiral Geometry/Transfigural Math, the ecology  
of the  
>event horizon of a Black Hole. I doubt you have any idea what either  
of  
>these two colleagues are talking about. So, you go supercritical in  
you  
>mind, because of your ego, deeply invested in these emails, and the  
>misperception that everyone who reads them believes you a genius...  
leading  
>your mind astray. I note you resort to third party aphorisms from  
Freud and  
>others: have you had your head examined lately, Sarfatti? I think  
you  
>could use some analysis, because you believe your aphorisms to be  
>meaningful, when, in fact, its just your multiple personality  
disorder  
>acting up, pretending to be a segway. Its actually MPD, Jack,  
>try to keep it chilled, people might put two and two together.  
>  
>Thirdly, why don't you go educate yourself at the Lockheed Martin or  
>McDonald Douglas library on neural-ganglia flight suit interfaces, or  
>review the works of the late Chuck Honorton or his Psychophysical  
Research  
>Lab, before you go judging telepathy and how it works,  
interior/anterior  
>modulated electromagnetic hyper-resonances caused by electronic  
activity  
>within the brain, and find out what Area L17 and L18 of the Brain ARE  
>before you go opening your mouth again, as its already completely  
occupied  
>by both of your feet, and its looking for more feet every time it  
opens.  
> And try consulting with experts on Brain function, you clearly  
haven't  
>the ability to UNDERSTAND telepathy, much less to BE a telepath or  
even  
>accept its existence. I'd solicit Uri Geller on the subject, but I  
think  
>he has his hands full: Uri's pretty smart, Jack, and I think he can  
help  
>you grope with the possibility both spiritual and technological of  
the  
>possibility that psi has its real and its fantasy components in  
modern  
>thinking and belief. But trying to hide the real by trying to  
interpose  
>the fantasy is bad debating style, and you appear to prefer to  
resorting to  
>that than expanding your personal ability to understand the words you  
read.  
> You choose to use expressions like "Who is that F--k". That's real  
crass  
>from a real low end mentality. I'd say its beneath you to behave  
that way,

>but I'm beginning to doubt that.  
>  
>Why you criticized me: this stuff is beyond you! Way beyond. The  
science  
>of human brain-brain and brain-machine interfacing is way beyond the  
DSM4  
>and way beyond many at the NIH, so why not you?  
>  
>By the way, I find Ed O'Neill (Al Bundy) very funny, because he gives  
me  
>good reason not to worry about guys like you trying to influence  
others  
>with your lack of recognition of what's real: Sarfatti-- you AREN'T a  
very,  
>very smart guy. Bright? Yes, but I've met guys who on a bad day make  
you  
>look like a chipmunk.  
>  
>Welcome to the REAL WORLD, Jack Sarfatti!  
>  
>I don't find you particularly knowledgeable. And I ain't even  
anyone,  
>compared to some. End of discussion.  
>  
>---End of reply to Jack Sarfatti, whose probably just dangerous  
thinking  
>himself very smart.  
>  
>  
>ACC's website is at <http://accpc.com>. The Orb Site is at  
<http://www.orbsite.com> .  
>  
>The ASF's ACSA website is at <http://www.acsa.net>.  
>  
>As to the mission of educating a Jack Sarfatti to the error of his  
ways and  
>misdemeanor? "This letter is programmed to self destruct in 13  
seconds, if  
>you are captured, the Secretary will disavow any knowledge of its  
>existence."  
>  
>Yes, that's right... MISSION IMPOSSIBLE.  
>  
>Yes, we've mathematically proven that Gravity is a push not a pull...  
that  
>the microkernal singularity was the source of the Big Bang.  
>But go try to prove that in an email to Jack Sarfatti? You take your  
>reputation in your hands because Jack Sarfatti believes he knows  
everything  
>there is to know about everything. So: "letting it in", ain't in his  
>repertoire. Jack Sarfatti believes he's world famous. So  
considering what  
>others think about him ain't in the park. Its enough for him to  
believe  
>himself world famous.  
>  
>Me? I believe I don't know enough yet. I consider my self to just  
be come  
>guy from NJ working on a supercomputer sending an email or two to a  
group  
>of prestigious guys with excellent educations and possibly open  
minds.  
> Which of us is smarter? Which of us is more famous? Does it really  
>matter what our self opinion is, when it comes down to it?  
>  
>You figure it out. Does it really matter?  
>  
>Thanks again to Rich Boylan for allowing this stuff in to this  
otherwise  
>prestigious circle... I've been reading the emails from Dr. Boylan  
for  
>more than a year and trying to figure out how some of what I read is  
>erroneously arrived at by otherwise seemingly sound minded guys like  
>Sarfatti, who later turn out to be rude jerks.  
>  
>Thanks again, Dr. Boylan... at least I feel better for having told  
that low  
>brained, high ego'd miserable self possessed guy off for being rude  
and  
>wrong. There is considerable lack of self esteem in anyone who can  
neither

>laugh at themselves nor listen to someone else's reasoning without  
harsh  
>and cruel criticism: I'd say that that proposition would reflect an  
>evaluation: true self esteem is utterly bereft from the soul of Mr.  
>Sarfatti. I withdraw my support for his paltry acerbic-isms, as they  
>bespeak a man with his head buried deeply in a Rogets searching for  
big  
>words to express that thing I smell (sniff, sniff), yes, that's it:  
fear.  
>  
>Out and out ego-driven fear.  
>  
><S>  
>  
>Jack A. Shulman  
>CEO/ Chief Sci  
>American Computer Company  
>  
>  
>  
>-----Original Message-----  
>From: J. Sarfatti [SMTP:sarfatti@well.com]  
>Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 1999 6:01 PM  
>To: ACC  
>Cc: 'Richard J. Boylan, Ph.D.'; 'ronsp@ucia.gov'; 'M Thorn'; 'Kim  
>Burrafato'; 'Uri Geller'; 'Chris Penrose, Ph.D.'; 'Ira Einhorn';  
>'Jacques  
>Vallee, Ph.D.'; 'Gary Schwartz, Ph.D.'; 'Ron Anastasia, Ph.D.'; 'Nick  
>Herbert, Ph.D.'; 'Fred Alan Wolf, Ph.D.';  
>'newphysics@mail.msr-wetware.com'  
>Subject: Re: Shulman on Sarfatti on P-Q consciousness  
>  
>  
>  
>ACC wrote:  
>  
>> [The following was rather hurriedly dictated to me by Jack Shulman  
in his  
>> car, its not proof read... Rita - one of Jack's admins at ACC]:  
>>  
>> Thank you, Richard, for forwarding that to me. The next time I  
build a  
>> Silver Alkane Metal Insulator Dielectric Semiconductor, I'll  
remember to  
>> send a white paper on Electron Traps to these guests on your list,  
>because  
>> they really need to get up to date info in their noggins...  
>>  
>> Imagine what they might say were someone to tell them that an  
Electron  
>Trap  
>> Junction can switch at upwards of 100-200 femtoseconds? Do the  
people on  
>> this list know what a femotsecond is? I assume so...  
>  
>[The Real Jack]  
>  
>Fine, so what?  $10^{-15}$  sec so you get  $10^{-13}$  sec switch. Nice, but so  
what?  
>  
>k =  $2 \times 10^{10}$  Hz/degK = 1.4 cm/degK  
>  
>kT(room temp) =  $2 \times 10^{13}$  Hz  
>  
>>  
>>  
>> Guys, (hey, Jack, learn to spell, its Shulman, not Schulman, what,  
>> deliberately misspelling my name to insult me? If so, you're  
funny...  
>take  
>> a number!): Now I think I know why people are yelling on your  
channel at  
>> each other.  
>  
>[SMI^2LE ing Jack]  
>  
>Paranoid too? They yell because they are low life momzas who don't  
know  
>nutin!  
>Also some of them are not-sees.

>  
>  
>  
>  
>>  
>>  
>> Some of you may need to educate yourself, no offense, but I think  
you're  
>> missing more than a few facts.  
>  
>[Wolf Gang]  
>  
>And youse guts are missin a few screws in your lite-bulb.  
>  
>>  
>>  
>> By the way, its quite common to feel an overwhelming need to shout  
at  
>Jack  
>> Shulman, when he tells you something that challenges your well  
educated  
>> belief systems. But people:  
>>  
>> Aren't you even remotely familiar with such things as the  
"Anti-Time Axis  
>  
>  
>  
>> v. Time Axis" in the principles of Time, as espoused,  
>> for instance by such as Stephen Hawking? And you call that "This  
is  
>> wrong."  
>  
>[The Supremes]  
>  
>It ain't even wrong, Baby.  
>  
>>  
>>  
>> Come ON! There are different formats in theory specifying energy  
and  
>> quanta levels for same which travel along the TIME and the  
Anti-TIME  
>> stream, guys.  
>  
>[Tsvi Stein]  
>  
>There ain't no "time stream" in relativity which is the "block  
universe".  
>The  
>arrow of time is not so simple.  
>  
>  
>> This is SIMPLE stuff. Get with it. The human brain has the  
>> ability to sense energy via its Neural Ganglia wiring, it is  
fundament  
>ally  
>> capable of being a measurement "device", among its other  
attributes.  
>> Because it does so, it has the ability to sense forms of  
compatible  
>> energy, in space around it, and our conscious mind gropes to put  
same  
>into  
>> a proper focus within the known constraints of our respective  
reality.  
>  
>[Dr. Freud]  
>  
>What nut house did you escape from? Stay calm. They are coming for  
you.  
>Nurse  
>Ratchett where are you now that we need you?  
>  
>>  
>>  
>> Hence, the Brain's fundamental ability to communicate psionically,  
which  
>> appears to extend from the area of memory and false memory, L17 and  
L18  
>and

>> the amigdala (sp? -- Jacks' secretary asks), according to J. Norseen of Lockheed Martin (correct me if I'm wrong, John), is apparently derived from the Mother-Child neural connection during fetal development, and in most people stays immersed in the subconscious, however in some, it emerges and becomes a fully functioning telepathy. And, in some, the telepathy is able to read the energy compatible with this function that also travels along the anti-time stream, hence precognition. Is it picking up 'mentation' from others in the future of the present time line? Probably. Does it permute or alter the future time line, seems likely, as if the individual who senses an event from mentation that modulates energy passing into the past along the Anti-Time stream, does something about what they think they "sense", it could have a paradoxical effect, in essence, cause a time paradox, but one with, perhaps, minimal consequences for what you and I call 'the present'. Which, of course, does not mean that Jean Dixon knows anything at all about the future... (a little humor). But Uri? I'd imagine that Uri is far more developed than Jean in his particular psi-abilities.

>

>[The Real Jack]

>

>Wipe the foam from your mouth. Your neurons have fried, your synapses have dried.

>Surely you must be joking?

>

>>

>>

>> C'mon, this isn't too hard for you to deal with, is it? Sci Fi Hogwash,

>> you say? Puhleeze, its real simple stuff. Its a shock

>

>[Jack]treatment for you.

>

>> that the psychs still classify everyone who thinks themselves psychic as a schizophrenic.

>

>[Jack]

>

>In your case they seem to have a point.

>

>> Some are, some aren't.

>>

>> As to the sub-atomic space: I have news for you, a real wakeup call for you.

>

>[Jack the Sane One]

>

>Define "sub-atomic space". You mean anything less than an Angstrom? What's the Big Deal?

>

>>

>>

>> Matter and Energy are composed of smaller fundamental resonances or shall we call them "resonant forms" each of which contributes a component constituency to the matter or energy of which they are a part.

Atomic

```
>> particles are far from the smallest forms in the universe. Its
very tiny
>> out there!
>
>[Jack the Smart One of the Two Jacks]
>
>You are overgeneralizing from  $E = hf$ . There are many wrong turns and
you
>seem to
>take all of them at once.
>
>>
>>
>> For instance, the QED or RIP models of the Photon. The smallest
particle
>> in a photon is a photon itself, you say? Nope:
>
>[Jack the Real]
>
>A photon is not a particle the way an electron is. I mean in Bohm's
"causal
>theory".
>
>>
>>
>> They consist, according to Stephen, of a Real, an Imaginary and a
>Propulsor
>> "sub-particle". I go further in the various parts of my sub-atomic
space
>> theory. I describe what you know as "empty space" as having an
actual
>> fabric, a solidity which you and I can not see, calling it "Vacated
>> Matter/Energy" (wait, give it a chance). This may seem strange to
you
>> classical physicists, but:
>
>[Jack]
>
>Not even wrong. Goofy.
>
>>
>>
>> In my sub-atomic space theory (by the way, some have called it 'Non
>> Heisenbergian Physics" as Heisenberg tends to cloud physics below a
>certain
>> level, it goes opaque, so to speak, - its too easy to hide things
behind
>> "uncertainty", time to 'get certain' instead), each of these 'bits'
that
>> comprise matter and energy, has a fundamental coefficient that
locks it
>> onto one of the Time Axes of the socalled Time Stream: Time
(forward
>> time), Anti-Time(backward in time) and Neutral (neither or both):
the
>> Imaginary Particle within a Photon, has attributes similar to the
>resonance
>> (but not the substance) holoform of a Gage Boson, it has the same
tiny
>> mass, yet it exists and is locked on the anti-Time Axis or stream,
as
>some
>> call it, and hence, that is why I believe Hawking believes its,
relative
>to
>> us, 'imaginary' - an imaginary component, part or particle. I am
>convinced
>> that it skips along (euphemism) space in the Anti-Time 'direction'
so to
>> speak, being bilocated with and connected to (ref. Einstein
Condensate
>> Bilocality Connection province) its paired Real Particle, whose
pairing
>is
>> a Q particle which Stephen refers to as the Propulsor. I agree
with
>> Stephen Hawking (albeit, not possessing his brilliance, I was alone
for
>25
>> years with this theory, until Hawking came along and provided the
>> mathematical proof for this concept).
```

```
>
>[Jack]
>
>This is a bunch of crap. Only idiots will fall for it. You are still
alone
>in your
> padded cell in the Cosmic Nut House of Dr Caligari's Asylum at the
End
>Time's
>Omega House for Fallen Angels.
>
>>
>>
>> The tiny mass of the Imaginary particle is however, forcibly
dragged
>> against its coefficient of time by the Real particle (I consider it
a
>> resonance, not a particle) which violates its ordinary attribute of
"time
>> coefficient", thereby converting its relative tiny mass into an
offset of
>> momentum relative to our space, by the Propulsor 'Q' particle's
>structural
>> bond with the R and the I. This perpetuates the momentum of the
Photon
>> forward in time and space and the Q+R resonances look to us like
what we
>> call a Gage Boson.
>
>You can't even spell it right.
>
>> The formula the QED experts use is
>>  $aT=(mass[I]*p)-(mass[R]/p)$  (leaving out the anomaly formula which
hangs
>on
>> the end with a + in front of it, its quite complex but not relevant
to
>this
>> discussion). The Propulsor, by the way, appears to be neutral in
its time
>> coefficient, sitting at the 0 point of the axis of time, space and
>energy.
>> The Real resonance/particle is in the 'forward' time in terms of
its
>time
>> coefficient, and moves forward, propelled perpetually by the
inversion of
>> the mass in the Imaginary particle/resonance into momentum, via the
>> Q/Propulsor particle/resonance.
>>
>> In layman's terms. Shall I draw pictures, too.
>
>Don't bother. This is noise. More Demons from Hell out of The Worm
Wood.
>Where is
>my Cross, Garlic, Wooden Stake and Silver Bullet? Where is My
Excalibur?
>
>>
>>
>> Sci Fi hogwash, you say eh Sarfatti?
>
>Worse than that.
>
>> Like I said, you need to educate
>> yourself on this 'new stuff', no offense meant, Jack, but you know,
like
>> the Tiny Mass found in a Photon. Still believe that photons only
have
>> 'momentum'? Wrong. They have Tiny Mass, but you probably knew
that.
>>
>> As to the other theory you called "Sci Fi Hogwash", you really need
to
>open
>> up for this wake up call, the near Infinitely Dense particle (or
shall we
>> call it, infinite quantum hyper-resonance, or Absolute
Singularity?) of
>> near Infinite Mass that exists, on a plane all by itself: its own
plane
```

>of  
>> existence, it is so dense (in fact, a near absolute singularity)  
that it  
>> excluded even its own nearly "infinite" dimensionality from its own  
plane  
>> of singular existence,. This, resulting in it 'projecting' what you  
and I  
>> call "our Universe" of empty space/time with matter and energy,  
etc.  
>within  
>> it, into existence, as a byproduct (which occurred long ago along  
with a  
>> bit of a big bang) of its own same Singularity, does that theory  
remind  
>> anyone of a popular "God Particle" theory found in the modern  
publishing  
>> market? (Well, I left out the part about how it only once existed  
by  
>> itself, but somewhere along the line, it emitted a particle, and  
boom,  
>that  
>> anomaly (two things equal other than Singular Existence) caused the  
Big  
>> Bang) Go ahead, take a shot at it. Anyone?  
>  
>"Who is this Fuck?" Blue Velvet  
>  
>>  
>>  
>> Gee, guys, I thought you were open minded?  
>  
>We are open-minded, but not empty-headed.  
>  
>> It follows that beyond a  
>> particular quantum of mass density, the empty universe (Vacated  
>> Matter/Energy) near such a dense object begins to thin and at a  
certain  
>> density, to us, such an object, which some call a "black hole"  
others a  
>> "quasar", just appears to disappear (without going into all the  
details,  
>> check out Hawking, again, on a Brief History of Time).  
>>  
>> Actually, it doesn't, it goes "subatomic", I propose, to coin a  
simple  
>> term, it passes through the space time limits of our Universe and  
enters  
>> Subatomic Space. Eventually, if it gets 'even denser' (yes, their  
are  
>> levels to this phenomena) it passes beyond Subatomic Space. It  
becomes a  
>> part of that above referenced "infinitely dense particle" that  
exists  
>> outside of our plane of existence, which some like to call a God  
>Particle.  
>> I suppose you all find that humorous. Like, gravity is an  
attractor  
>> force, you say. Nay, I say, it is a propulsor force which pushes  
large  
>> objects in proximity together. They don't attract each other: the  
>Universe  
>> pushes them together due to relative 'Empty Space Displacement'  
resulting  
>> from the area of empty space each 'displaces'. Between them, the  
force  
>> lines are less than outside of their proximity, the net difference,  
>> represents a force that pushes them together, the rest is simple  
>> acceleration due to gravity. Gravity: a push, not a pull.  
>>  
>> Double talk, you say? Nope. Don't count on it being hogwash,  
either.  
>>  
>> Well, I suppose you don't believe in Orbs, either, or was that  
someone  
>else  
>> (\*Daedelous\*)?  
>  
>That's DADA -Less Stupid.  
>  
>>  
>>

```
>> Try taking a gander at http://www.orbsite.com - yeah, go ahead,
>criticize
>> it, yell and scream that you think its a hoax or a scam, feel free,
you'd
>> still be COMPLETELY wrong. The things just materialize in empty
space:
>no
>> strings, no gasses, nothing but a pinpoint of extremely powerful
energy
>at
>> their epicenter, gamma and x ray emissions, small infrared
signature, and
>> this rather odd "Orb" which reflects high intensity halogen strobe
light,
>> through something that we can only describe, at the American
Science
>> Foundation, as "photon sheering reflection". Gosh, get this: they
pass
>> right through solid objects, the Orbs, unscathed. They feel
slightly
>> electrical or gelatinous to the touch.
>>
>> The real question is, what are they? I have my ideas, Richard has
his,
>and
>> I'm absolutely certain you'll have yours.
>>
>> Be well, one and all... Don't shout now, and be nice, if you have
it
>> within you.
>>
>> Hey: they laughed at Nik Tesla and at Henry Ford.
>
>"They all laughed at Christopher Columbus,
> When he said the world was round."
> Fred Astaire
>
>They all laugh at Nik Herbert as well they should.
>
>> For different reasons,
>> of course! I, personally, laugh at Ed O'Neil, I think he's pretty
funny.
>
>You're Weird Man.
>
>>
>>
>> Its fun to think about things differently, guys: give it a shot,
you'll
>be
>> very surprised how not calling someone like me "Looney Toons", or
"Sci Fi
>> Hogwash", might just brighten up your own day.
>>
>> Check out http://www.orbsite.com - even if you do think me
"looney", I'm
>> still curious which of you might have a better idea about how these
Orbs
>> 'work', than just "moisture", "soap bubbles", "headlights" or
"special
>> effects". They're neither (er, none of these).
>>
>> They appear to be real!
>>
>> Thank you for the opportunity to address this prestigious crowd,
Richard,
>> back to running my company...
>>
>> Who am I, anyway, to be addresses such brilliances as these in your
>circle?
>>
>> Just a lowly nobody no one ever heard of before!!
>
>Allah is Just.
>
>>
>>
>
>
>
```

[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [List Surrounding Messages](#)

**This archive of mailing list messages is provided as a free public courtesy. It is maintained automatically. The webmaster has no control over content, does not review these messages and accepts no liability for the accuracy of information contained herein. Responsibility for this material rests solely with the author and mailing list moderator (if any).**

Note: This is a temporary archive only; this message will be deleted eventually. See [main page](#) for more info.

[Mailing lists archived on this server](#)

\*  
\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

**This site is supported by the [Research Center Bookstore](#).**  
Please visit our catalog if you appreciate our free web services.

Created: Fri May 14 02:09:21 EDT 1999