

Persian CPH E-Book

Theory of CPH

Section Five

Opinions About CPH Theory

Hossein Javadi

Azad University, Tehran, Iran

Javadi_hossein@hotmail.com

بخش پنجم

اظهار نظرها در مورد سی.پی.اچ

مقدمه

یک نظریه بنیادی که مدعی ترکیب همه نظریه های معتبر فیزیکی است، کاملاً طبیعی است که با حساسیت طرفداران آنها مواجه شود. این حساسیت ها از چند نظر قابل بررسی است:

یک - برای انسانهای علمی، یعنی کسانی که به علم و دانش از دیدگاه تلاش برای شناخت جهان در محدوده ی کاری خود به آن می نگرند، دانش و اندوخته ی علمی ایشان، قسمتی از هستی آنان و چه بسا بخش مهمی از موجودیتشان را تشکیل می دهد. چنین انسانهایی در والاترین مرحله ی تکامل انسانی قرار دارند و بسیار ارزشمندند. این افراد با نظریه های جدید که دانش ایشان را هدف قرار داده و با دگراندیشی قصد دگرگون سازی آن را دارد نمی توانند بسادگی کنار بیایند. چون بحث تنها به به دانش محدود نمی شود و اساساً به محتوای وجودی آنها مربوط می شود. لذا در مقابل نظریه های انقلابی شدیداً مقاومت خواهند کرد. بهمین دلیل می توان گفته ی ماکس پلانک را صائب دانست که می گوید "در فیزیک وقتی یک نظریه جدید مطرح می شود معمولاً مخالفانی دارد، اما سرانجام این نظریه قبول عام می یابد، نه به این سبب که مخالفین این نظریه مجاب شده اند؛ بلکه به این دلیل که آنان پیر شده و مرده اند."

دو - کسانی که از دیدگاه خودخواهی به آن برخورد می کنند و مشکل، درستی یا نادرستی نظریه جدید نیست، بلکه مشکل در این است که چرا به ذهن خوشان نرسیده است. معمولاً برخورد ایشان بصورتی است که بهر طریق ممکن مانع از نشر و توسعه ی نظریه شوند. حتی با اهانت های غیر اخلاقی و نامحترمانه تلاش می کنند بانی نظریه جدید را در هم بشکنند.

سه - گروه سوم کسانی هستند که در آرامش ناشی از پذیرش عام اندوخته علمی خود بسر می برند و از هر چیزی که مخل این آرامش کاذب باشد، آشفته شده و تلاش می کنند عامل آن را کنار بزنند.

چهار - کسانی که خود نمی اندیشند و بازگو کننده نظرات دیگران هستند و چون جو مخالف را قوی می بینند، بشدت به مخالفت بر می خیزند و حتی به مصداق "کاتولیک تر از پاپ" خود را متعصب نشان می دهند و بعناوین مختلف تلاش می کنند نظریه و بانی آن را هدف حملات خود قرار دهند.

پنج - کسانی که با دقت افراطی و نوعی وساس به نظریه ی جدید می نگرند. اما پس از مجاب شدن، خود کمر همت به دفاع از آن بر می بندند و از بیان دیدگاه خود نگران نیستند.

شش - کسانی که از نظر روحی و فکری آماده ی پذیرش دیدگاه های جدیدند و اندیشه های گذشته نمی تواند آنها را ارضا کند. معمولاً این افراد از طرفداران نظریه های جدید خواهند شد و بزرگترین و مهمترین حامی آن بحساب می آیند.

اما در حالت کلی می توان نظر گاندی را صائب دانست آنجا که می گوید **"اول سکوت می کنند، بعد مخالفت خواهند کرد و سرانجام می پذیرند"**

اگر نظریه ی کوهن را در مورد انقلاب های علمی درست بدانیم، هر نظریه ی بنیادی زمینه ی یک انقلاب علمی را فراهم می سازد و بتدریج صف انقلابیون و ضد انقلاب مشخص و روشن می شود. معمولاً ضد انقلابیون تا آخرین لحظات و آخرین پایگاه ها دست از مقاومت بر نمی دارند. اما در علم این جای خوش بختی است که قدرت سیاسی و قضائی جامعه در اختیار دانشمندان نیست. والا با دگراندیشان علمی همان می شد که در قرون وسطی شد. این روشها و برخوردها به دلایل مختلف بخاطر درستی یا نادرستی نظریه های جدید نیست. اول آنکه درستی یا نادرستی هیچ نظریه ای قبل از بحث و تبادل نظر مشخص نیست. دوم اینکه برخورد با نظریه های نادرست است که ظرفیت پذیرش اندیشه های نوین جامعه علمی را مشخص می سازد. سوم از میان هزاران نظریه تعداد اندکی با عنوان درستی قابل بحث اند، و از آن میان یکی امتیازپذیرش عام را خواهد داشت. پس، نظریه های نادرست برای بحث، همان قدر اعتبار دارند که نظریه های درست. اما در مراحل بحث و تبادل نظر است که امتیاز یک نظریه بر سایر نظریه ها مشخص می شود. و در یک جمله بذر نظریه های بزرگ در بستر نظریه های مختلف کاشته می شود و از آبشخور ظرفیت برخورد با نظریه های نادرست سیراب می شود.

این مقدمه را با گفته ی فاینمن زینت می دهم " اگر همواره مانند گذشته بیندیشید، همیشه همان چیزهایی را به دست می آورید که تا بحال کسب کرده اید." و با سخنی از پاستور پایان می دهم " در هر حرفه ای که هستید نه اجازه دهید که به بدبینی های بی حاصل آلوده شوید و نه بگذارید که بعضی لحظات تاسف آور که برای هر ملتی پیش می آید شما را به یاس و ناامیدی بکشاند. در آرامش حاکم بر آزمایشگاهها و

کتابخانه هایتان زندگی کنید. نخست از خود پرسید: برای یادگیری و خودآموزی چه کرده ام؟ سپس همچنان که پیشتر می روید پرسید من برای کشورم چه کرده ام؟ و این پرسش را آنقدر ادامه دهید تا به این احساس شادی بخش و هیجان انگیز برسید که شاید سهم کوچکی در پیشرفت و اعتلای بشریت داشته اید. اما هر پاداشی که زندگی به تلاشهایمان بدهد یا ندهد هنگامی که به پایان تلاشهایمان نزدیک می شویم، هر کدامان باید حق آنرا داشته باشد که با صدای بلند بگوئیم: من آنچه را در توان داشته ام انجام داده ام. -

لویی پاستور

در ادامه مواردی بسیار اندک از برخوردها با نظریه سی. پی. اچ. آمده است، اگر می خواستم تمام مطالب را در اینجا گرد آورم، مثنوی هفتاد من کاغذ می شد. با این وجود قضاوت نهایی به وجدان انسانهای آزاد اندیش و آینده موکول می کنم.

شاد و پیروز باشید

حسین جوادی

یک جهان پنج بعدی

بتازگی من این افتخار را داشته ام، که تئوری همه چیز جدیدی، بنام CPH سی. پی. اچ. را، مطالعه کنم. نظریه سی. پی. اچ. از طرف یک فیزیکدان ایرانی بنام آقای حسین جوادی طرح شده است. تئوری آقای جوادی من را به یاد موندولوژی لاینیتس میاندازد، مدلی از جهان که به پلورالیسم متمایل بود. پلورالیسم لاینیتس به پلورالیسم اتمیستها (از دموکریت تا راسل) نزدیک تر بود، تا به پلورالیسم ارسطو.

موندولوژی لاینیتس سالهاست که توجه من را جلب کرده است، یعنی از ۲۵ سال پیش که اول بار درباره آن در آثار برتراند راسل خواندم. فلسفه "اتمیسمن منطقی" خود برتراند راسل را در اتمیسمن منطقی - یک پارادایم یا یک هدف شکست خورده مفصلاً بحث کرده ام.

جالب است بیادآوریم که لاینیتس جقدر از مفهوم \times کنش در فاصله Action at a distance \times ، در تئوری جاذبه نیوتون، آشفته شد، که تا حد مجادلات زشتی با نیوتون جلو رفت. در واقع، درست است که دعوای آنها بر سر حساب انتگرال و

دیفرانسیل، درباره اختلاف بر سر درستی یا غلطی تئوری نبوده، و بر سر این بود که کدامیک از آنها اول Calculus را اختراع کرده است، اما نزاع آنها بر سر \times کنش در فاصله \times ، اختلافی واقعی بین آندو بود، که حتی تا حد مشاجره درباره الهیات هم گسترش یافت.

جوادی نیز سعی دارد موضوع کنش در فاصله را با تئوری تبدیل کمیت برداری نیرو و vector quantity و کمیت عددی انرژی scalar quantity توضیح دهد، و قتیکه او نشان میدهد حاصل ضرب یک کوانتوم نیرو در طول پلانک برابر یک کوانتوم کار

$$Wq=fg.Lp$$

است. بنابراین نظیر لاینیتس، برای جوادی، هیچ عملی (کنشی) در فاصله وجود ندارد، و فضا از گراویتون ها پر شده است، که بر هم متقابلاً اثر میگذارند. برای جوادی گراویتون ها چیزی نیستند، غیر از سی. پی. اچ، و قتیکه گردش

Spin

دارد، و سی. پی. اچ. Creation Particle Higgs ذره بنیادی جهان است، با جرم ثابت، در حرکت ثابت، در چارچوب ساکن Inertial frame به عبارت دیگر، تمام جهان یک دنیای ساده ۵ بعدی است (متذکر شوم که در اینجا گردش Spin به مثابه یک بعد در نظر گرفته شده است). مدل جوادی، نه تنها ناسازگاریهای مکانیک کوانتا و تئوری نسبیت را توضیح میدهد، حتی مسائل فیزیک کلاسیک را بهتر از تئوری ۱۰ بعدی ریسمانها توضیح میدهد. مثلاً از آنجا که نیرو کمیتی برداری است، ثبات مقدار حرکت Conservation of momentum در هر سه بعد فیزیکی همزمان حفظ میشود، در صورتیکه جرم و انرژی کمیت های عددی هستند، یعنی ثبات جرم و انرژی

Conservation of mass and energy

یک بعدی حفظ میشوند، حد اقل و قتیکه با مکانیک کلاسیک سر و کار داریم. حال تبدیل پذیری نیرو و انرژی در تئوری سی. پی. اچ، این مفاهیم اساسی فیزیک را یکسان میکند. در نهایت نظریه سی. پی. اچ، چالش اصلی فیزیک معاصر، یعنی اتحاد سه نیروی طبیعت را ممکن میکند.

البته من بایستی همچنین ذکر کنم که از دیدگاه تکنولوژی، موفقیت **نانو تکنولوژی** یکی از بهترین اثبات های اتمیسم است. همانگونه که در ۱۹۵۹ فاینمن گفت، نانو تکنولوژی چیزی نیست جز ساختن مجدد جهان "از اتم تا اتم". مضافاً آنکه بخاطر آوریم آنچه برتراند راسل درباره آنالیز نوشته بود:

”یک هدف که در همه آنچه من گفته ام جریان دارد، مدلل کردن آنالیز است، یعنی که تدلیل اتمیسم منطقی، نظری که میتوان در تئوری، اگر نه در پراتیک، به نهایت بسیط دستیافت، که از آن دنیا را ساخت، و آن بسیط ها simples آن نوع واقعیت را دارند که متعلق به هیچ چیز دیگری نیست.

در سطور زیر من تحلیل خود از مونادولوژی لاینیتس را، از دیدگاه فلسفه علم، ارائه میکنم، به این امید که در عین آنکه بحث های تئوری سی. پی. اچ. در مجامع فیزیک جریان دارد، من بتوانم کمک کنم بحث های مشابهی درباره مدل سی. پی. اچ در محافل فلسفه علم شروع شود.

متن زیر برگرفته از <http://www.ghandchi.com/۳۹۴-MonadsCPH.htm> نوشته آقای سام قندچی مقیم آمریکا است. برای مطالعه سخنرانی ایشان در سال ۱۹۸۴ بر کلی کالیفرنیا تحت عنوان فلسفه علم در قرن بیستم به لینک زیر مراجعه فرمایید

<http://www.ghandchi.com/۳۵۸-falsafehElmEng.htm>

JAVADI'S CPH

Welcome to One of the Largest and Most Visited Sources of Philosophical Texts on the Internet. ۴۰,۰۰۰ - ۶۰,۰۰۰ Visitors Each Day and Still Rising –

LEIBNIZ'S MONADS AND JAVADI'S CPH

Sam Ghandchi

After the ۱۹۷۹ revolution, Sam Ghandchi, as a co-founder and member of the editorial board of Nedaye Azadi, co-published this daily afternoon paper in Tehran, till the paper

and all other free papers of the time, were shut down by the Islamic Republic in ۱۹۸۱. Nedaye Azadi was a democratic paper similar to Peyghame Emrooz, Ayandegan and other similar papers of those three years of semi-democracy in Iran of ۱۹۷۹-۱۹۸۲. The back issues of Nedaye Azadi may still be available in the archives of Library of Congress.<http://www.ghandchi.com/۳۹۴-MonadsCPHEng.htm>
Persian Version: <http://www.ghandchi.com/۳۹۴-MonadsCPH.htm>

LEIBNIZ'S MONADS AND JAVADI'S CPH

Recently I had the pleasure of studying a new TOE (Theory of Everything) called CPH [<http://www.ghandchi.com/iranscope/Anthology/hjavadi/CPH-English.htm>]. CPH has been proposed by an Iranian physicist by the name of Hossein Javadi.

[<http://www.ghandchi.com/iranscope/Anthology/hjavadi/index.html>].

Mr. Javadi's theory reminds me of Leibniz's Monadology, a model of the world with a tilt to pluralism [<http://www.ghandchi.com/۳۰۱-PluralismEng.htm>]. Leibniz's pluralism is closer to the pluralism of atomists (from Democritus to Russell), than to the pluralism of Aristotle.

Metaphysics [<http://www.ghandchi.com/۳۹۲-AristotleEng.htm>],

Aristotle, in contrast to the atomists, as I have discussed in details in my paper *The Status of Monism and Pluralism in Aristotle's views pluralism as a conceptual notion, where the "order of explanation" is monistic, whereas the "order of sense", is pluralistic. In that paper I summarized Aristotle's view as follows:*

"...[For Aristotle,] there is a hierarchy of concepts that refers to concrete things and in the order of explanation, the universals are first and particulars are last, whereas in the order of sensation, the particulars come first and universals are the last. In the order of sensation, the most fundamental concept is substance which is followed by the concepts of unity (or being) and first principles. In the order of explanation, it is the opposite and first principles are the primary concepts followed by unity (or being) and substance...To discover whether plurality or unity are primary in Aristotle's metaphysics, we should ask which one is prior in the order of sensation, because Aristotle, in all his philosophy, gives primacy to the sensible things rather than to the abstract ideas...Aristotle writes in his Physics "The universal is more knowable in the order of explanation, the particular in the order of sense [Book I, ۱۸۹a ۵-۱۰, BW, p.۲۲۸]."

Based on the two interpretations of Aristotle's metaphysics in this paper, plurality is next to particulars and unity is next to the universals. Therefore, plurality has primacy in the world as it is, and unity has primacy in our ideas and explanations. In other words, unity is the farthest from the perceptive reality and may be even subjective, and plurality is the closest to the perceptive reality and is the state of objective reality. Thus I can conclude that pluralism is what is defended in Aristotle's Metaphysics, though as I explained, with all the intricacies of Aristotle's unique metaphysical scheme [http://www.ghandchi.com/۳۹۲-AristotleEng.htm]."

Leibniz's Monadology has fascinated me for years, ever since reading about it the first time in Bertrand Russell's works twenty five years ago. I thoroughly discussed Bertrand Russell's own philosophy of Logical Atomism in Logical Atomism: A Paradigm or a Lost Cause [http://www.ghandchi.com/۳۹۳-RussellAtomismEng.htm]. The following is what I wrote in that paper about the similar challenge of Leibniz's Monadology and Russell's Philosophy of Logical Atomism:

"...the subjective notion of truth is objectified when he [Bertrand Russell] claims that the truth of the world can be reduced to "facts that make up the truths of the world." This was very similar to Leibniz's Monadology where the subjective notion of mind was *objectified* by monads. The atoms relating to the truth in the objective world, according to logical atomism, are not particulars, relations, or qualities; but a unique unity of them corresponds to the truth, i.e. the atomic facts. Thus, these atomic facts, though complex, are not reducible to their parts as if the objectification of truth is a ghost holding them together [http://www.ghandchi.com/۳۹۳-RussellAtomismEng.htm]."

It is interesting to remember how Leibniz was so much perturbed with the concept of *action at a distance* in Newton's gravitational theory to the point of ending up in the wicked arguments with Newton. In fact, their fight about calculus was not a difference about theory, but was rather about who invented calculus first, whereas their disputes about action at a distance were their real *disagreements* which were even raised to a theological dispute.

Javadi is also trying to answer the issue of action at a distance by his theory of transformation of the vector quantity force and the scalar quantity energy, when he shows a quantum of work can be defined by a quantum of force multiplied by Planck's Length ($Wq=Fg.Lp$). Thus just like Leibniz, for Javadi, there is no action at a distance, and the space is filled with gravitons, that interact with each other. For Javadi, the gravitons are nothing but the CPH when it has a spin, and CPH (Creation Particle Higgs) is the basic particle of the world with constant mass moving at constant speed in an inertial frame.

In other words, the whole world is a simple five dimensional world (spin is considered a dimension). Javadi's model, not only explains the inconsistencies of quantum mechanics and relativistic theory, it even explains classical issues better than the ۱۰-dimensional model of string theory. For example, force being a vector quantity, means that the

conservation of momentum conserves in all three physical directions at the same time, whereas mass and energy being scalar quantities, means the conservation of mass and energy conserve one-dimensionally, at least when dealing with them in classical mechanics. Javadi's model, through the transformation of force and energy, makes these fundamental concepts of physics identical. Eventually the CPH Theory, makes the main challenge of modern physics, the unification of the three forces of nature possible.

Of course, I should also note that from the technology standpoint, the success of nanotechnology (<http://www.ghandchi.com/۳۰۶-NanoEng.htm>) is one of the best corroboration of atomism, because nanotechnology is nothing but rebuilding the whole nature artificially "atom by atom" as Feynman said it in his ۱۹۵۹ speech. Moreover, let's remember what Bertrand Russell wrote of analysis:

"One purpose that has run through all that I have said, has been the justification of analysis, i.e. the justification of logical atomism, of the view that you can get down in theory, if not in practice, to ultimate simple, out of which the world is built, and that those simples have a kind of reality not belonging to anything else [Russell, Bertrand, The Philosophy of Logical Atomism, LK, p. ۲۷۰]."

Below I present my own analysis of Leibniz's Monadology, from the viewpoint of philosophy of science, hoping that while the discussions of CPH theory continue in the physics community, I can help similar discussions about the philosophical model of CPH theory to start in the circles of philosophy of science [<http://www.ghandchi.com/۳۵۸-falsafehElm-plus.htm>].

Overview of Leibniz's Monads from a Philosophical Perspective

In the opening of "Principles of Nature and Grace" [Leibniz, G.W., Philosophical Papers and Letters, Leroy Loemkev Edition, University of Chicago, ۱۹۵۶, Vol. II, p.۱۰۳۳-۴],

Leibniz defines 'substance' in a Cartesian style as 'a being capable of action;' and 'simple substance' as 'that which has no parts.' Then Monads are introduced as equivalent to 'simple substances' and he continues by asserting "*Monas* is a Greek word signifying unity or that which is one.' Plato refers to Mind as *the* Monad [Aristotle, De Anima, The Basic Works of Aristotle, Richard Mc Keon Edition, ۱۹۴۱, P.۵۴۰] and most commentators think that Leibniz, contrary to Plato, Aristotle, and Descartes (his principle inspirers), has actually made mind divisible in his metaphysic and has presumed its parts as Monads. Thus, it is believed that the nature of Monads is mental. On the other hand, Leibniz's referring to Monads as 'true Atoms of nature' [Leibniz, Monadology, George Montgomery's Translation, Open Court Publ, Illinois, ۱۹۸۰, P.۲۵۱] bears a certain resemblance to ancient Greek atomism. Nevertheless, most commentators agree that Leibniz's Monads differ from the atomists' atoms insofar as the former do not embody

extension whereas the latter do, i.e. the Monads are not geometrical points and are metaphysical points [Copleston, Frederick, A History of Philosophy, Vol. IV, The Newman Press, Maryland, 1960, P.266]. Therefore, despite the undeniable resemblance of Monadology to atomism is undeniable, the nature of these "atoms" (i.e. the Monads) remains to be investigated separately and I will do this scrutiny in the following lines.

Revealing the differences and similarities of Leibniz's Monads with Plato's Forms, Aristotle's substances, and Descartes' simple substances is not enough to fathom the nature of Monads. Various commentators stressing the different qualities of Monads alleged in Leibniz's numerous works have mostly proposed these elements to be mental and some even believed them to be material elements. In my opinion, the problem of these commentators is that they are limited to the framework of Western philosophy in which ultimate reduction is either mental or material and this fact has been the reason for futile attempts to classify Leibniz as an idealist or a materialist. Although Leibniz was essentially familiar with Western philosophy and certainly Plato, Aristotle, and Descartes had great influence on his thought, nonetheless his speculations about the nature of simple substances (Monads), is unique and in a sense resembles some of the Eastern philosophies.

I think it is evident from the book *Monadology* that Monads are the basic blocks or the atoms of the world. That this reductionism was accepted by Leibniz can be gathered from his presumption of the world to have 'true atoms.' Thus, the question is what is the nature of his reductionism—is it materialist, idealist, or is it something else? Materialists reduce all reality to some kind of material principle and synthesize the world from this principle, e.g. some of the modern atomists presume the atomic particles (or sub-atomic particles) as the basic blocks of the world and biological elements (like DNA or RNA) or mental elements (neurons) are assumed to be ultimately comprised of material sub-atomic particles (i.e. electrons, mesons, etc.). The idealists reduce all reality to some kind of mental principle and synthesize the world from this principle, e.g. the subjective idealists consider everything to be in our mind and some quantum physicists similarly believe that the existence of electrons depends on our thought. The foregoing may be regarded as a brief sketch of materialism and idealism in Modern philosophy and science.

In the East, especially in Indian philosophy (e.g. Vedanta philosophical systems), there is another kind of reductionism, almost unbeknownst to Western concepts, which we may call biological reductionism. In this thought, the ultimate biological elements are not molecules of ultimate material elements. Instead, the ultimate material elements (e.g. electrons) are comprised of ultimate biological elements (whatever they may be called). From such a perspective, electrons are even more "biologically" ultimate than RNA/DNA, and still the ultimate biological elements are to be found in the elements comprising electrons, in short the ultimate biological element are the building blocks of even the electron and sub-atomic particles. Probably, if we would like to express such an ideology today, the best word for the ultimate element would still be Entelechy, the word that Leibniz used interchangeably for Monad.

I think the above is the crux of Leibniz's theory of the nature of Monads. The Monads are neither mental nor material, but rather they are biological, that is the ultimate blocks of the world are biological elements--Entelechies. Entelechy was postulated by Aristotle in his biology, but for Aristotle, Entelechy was not prior to material elements. Leibniz

borrowed the word but changed its status, elevating it to the supreme position of the ultimate constituent of the world. Using this conception of basic elements of the world, he views 'matter' as described below:

"Every portion of matter may be conceived as like a garden full of plants, and like a pond full of fish. But every branch of a plant, every member of an animal, and every drop of the fluids within it, is also such a garden or such a pond [Leibniz, G.W., Monadology, *ibid*, P.۲۶۶]."

The above perspective is so common among many pantheistic schools of the East that occasionally some mystic philosophers can be found *talking* to stones or other inanimate objects. Actually, the above obliterates the distinction between inanimate and animate objects by making everything animate. Moreover, Leibniz considers Entelechy as being also the basic element of Soul or Mind and clarifies it:

"If we wish to designate as soul everything which has perceptions and desires in the general sense that I have just explained, all simple substances or created Monads could be called souls. But since feeling is something more than a mere perception I think that the general name of Monad or Entelechy should suffice for simple substances which have only perception while we may reserve the term Soul for those whose perception is more distinct and accompanied by memory [*ibid*, P.۲۰۰]."

In other words, Soul is just a kind of Entelechy and he later assumes it to be the 'dominating Entelechy' of animals [*ibid*, P.۲۶۷]. The above thoughts have led to Leibniz's fantastic belief that "...animals and souls begin from the very commencement of the world [*ibid*, P.۲۷۰]". Also his belief in metamorphosis [*ibid*, P.۲۶۷], and his final word which very much resembles the Eastern immortality of organism rather than the Western immortality of the soul. He writes:

"I believe, therefore, that if the animal never actually commences in nature, no more does it by natural means come to an end. Not only is there no generation, but also there is no entire destruction or absolute death [*ibid*, P.۲۶۸]."

The biological nature of Monads makes their essential qualities to be *apperception* and *appetition* and even motion itself [Leibniz, G.W., Principles of Nature and Grace, Philosophical Papers and Letters, Vol. II, P.۱۰۳۴-۳۶]. Moreover, their relations are not by efficient causes (monads are 'windowless') and they are related by final causes. This is why he considers final causes as the principle of efficient causes and gives priority to final causes [*ibid*, P. ۱۰۴۰]. His God is *not* the Unifier but rather the Harmonizer of the world of Monads. Even this concept in Leibniz, which separates him

from his colleague and contemporary Spinoza, very much approaches some Eastern pantheists' beliefs in Harmony rather than a Western view of Unity of the world. The views that give primacy to final causes and their refutation by Spinoza have been discussed in details in Sufism and Fatalism [<http://www.ghandchi.com/۳۰۴-SufismEng.htm>]. The intricacies of Leibniz's metaphysical scheme and its relations to the nature of Monads shows why he arrived at the picture of the world as the "City of God" with a dominant monarch, God, as the ultimate Monad and the Creator of this world.

Sam Ghandchi, Editor/Publisher
IRANSOPE
<http://www.iranscope.com>
April ۳, ۲۰۰۵

Related Articles:
The Status of Monism and Pluralism in Aristotle's Metaphysics
<http://www.ghandchi.com/۳۹۲-AristotleEng.htm>

Logical Atomism: A Paradigm or a Lost Cause
<http://www.ghandchi.com/۳۹۳-RussellAtomismEng.htm>

Pluralism in the Western Thought
<http://www.ghandchi.com/۳۰۱-PluralismEng.htm>

Other Articles
<http://www.ghandchi.com/SelectedArticles.html>
Source:

Philosophical Texts on the Internet

<http://evans-experientialism.freewebspace.com/ghandchi.htm>

, Muahdeeb Saladin teamwork_cph@yahoo.comIn
mu_ahdeeb@yahoo.com

....just curious...if he were not Iranian...would he then be "not polite?" Arak is a eautiful place in Iran, most are polite there...but then again...so are many other peoples in other countries as well...are you then Iranian, since you are polite? I believe Hossein/Amir Javadi is "polite" because he is who he is, not because he lives in Tehran...Please, do not

take this personally, I am just a curious type of person.

Kindest regards,
Muaheedeb

Tom KeithFrom:

cph_theory@yahoogroups.comTo:

absolutedaether@yahoogroups.com ; InfoPhysics@yahoogroups.comCc:

Sent: Friday, July 10, 2008 0:21 AM

Subject: Re: [cph_theory] Fw: [InfoPhysics] Einstein Defends Classical Physics and Quantum Theory

Allen,

It is great that gravity particles acting like a homing beam to self-powered particles servo-feedback make sense to you.

Hossein's CPH_theory GUT was started 0 years before the Keith-Motorola Mechanical Energy Relativity and GUT.

Hossein assumed particles emit particles to shift mass. The Keith-Motorola GUT assumed particles emit particles to shift mass also. It is uncanny how much Hossein's CPH-theory GUT and the Keith-Motorola Mechanical Energy Relativity and GUT have in common.

Tom

>light_rock@yahoo.comFrom: "Allen Francom" <

>InfoPhysics@yahoogroups.comTo: <

Sent: Friday, July 10, 2008 0:09 AM

Subject: Re: [cph_theory] Fw: [InfoPhysics] Einstein Defends Classical Physics and Quantum Theory

Yes, I see now why you are hanging out here. How do you see the "two slits" experiment "working" in your view Tom?

In Hossein's model, I think CPH simply have to be everywhere, "making up 'empty' space" and then the two slits deal has a "medium" in which to operate still rather classically.

Although I still don't see for sure how to make a particle like an electron with CPH. An electron would be some sort of self standing cluster, either that or a "hole" in the "soup" that is simply propogating...

?

-AEF

John ObrienFrom:

javadi_hossein@hotmail.comTo:

Sent: Friday, July 08, 2005 9:08 AM

Subject: TOE

I've missed your writings. How are you doing? I hope all is well. I need more good Idea's. These groups are talking too much about Individuals and not enough about Idea's. I've done some calculations on your Plank's Gravity formula and it is very close to Hubble's constant. How did you Know? Can you expand please? I Thank you for your good Idea.

John

Allen FrancomFrom:

cph_theory@yahoogroups.comTo:

[Robert O'Keeffe](#) ; [Wave-Structure-Matter](#) ; [Absoluteaether](#)Cc:

Sent: Saturday, July 02, 2005 9:04 AM

Subject: Re: [cph_theory] Fw: G.S .. Sandhu's Elegant "The Elastic Continuum of Nature"

IMHO "elasticity" is "necessary" for an Aether. It is the equivalent of "computational overhead". As any primal "goop" that is "kinetic" and "makes everything else" (reductionist), the "goop" must present a "tax" of itself as it performs "this" vs. "that". Spin vs. Velocity(CPH), heat vs. cold, attraction vs. repulsion... The "archetype" is simply "as you get more of this, you have less of that". Seems to work rather nicely... everywhere.

This "archetype" is "elastic" in any measurable "reality".

Beneath reality, or "whatever is actually real and makes reality go", some sort of something is the archetype of this archetype and viewable - WELL, as also "elastic" in this sense.

Seems to be inescapable. And add the "path of entropy"... like a rubber-band unwinding... Nowhere to run.

-AEF

> wrote:light_rock@yahoo.com--- Allen Francom <

>

> wrote:jim@xanthus.net> --- Jim Whitescarver <

>> Allen,

>> Special relativity does not limit the proper

>> velocity of the traveler.

Special Relativity, IMHO is some of that unfortunate "platonic philosophy", it is "ideal" not exactly "real".

Now, I am NOT saying it is wrong.

I'm saying it is stated "idealistically" and is

in fact failing to take into consideration discrete space and ALL of its implications.

What I like about Hossein's CPH...

There is $\text{Grad } V_c = \cdot$

There is Spin/Velocity each granted a Division of a Total. As spin increases, velocity must decrease, and vice versa. CPH in this way capture the principle that

I would stress...

Matter cannot do both extreme velocity and also continue to be matter...The "fabric" or "state space" that the matter is, is in, has limits to how much of one thing it can do at once vs. how much of another thing it can do at the same time.

There seems to be a relationship here. Such that it precludes achieving or

exceeding c... and still allowing enough "clocking" to stand up matter without it falling to pieces... disintegrating, radiating, performing the E conversion of $E=Mc^2$...

-AEF

>light_rock@yahoo.comFrom: "Allen Francom" <

>InfoPhysics@yahoogroups.comTo: <

Sent: Monday, March 14, 2005 8:01 AM

Subject: Mike - one more - CPH - Re: [InfoPhysics] Rhythmic Time as de Broglie Eigenstates

Hi Mike,

One more, this time focusing on Hossein's CPH. Hossein's principle issue is the conversion of force and energy and I feel that he has proposed something very good. However, CPH appear to live in a background such as space and time or spacetime GR. It is very clear to me that in order for Hossein's CPH to work ultimately and perform "unification" that the CPH must also "make spacetime". On that, I have numerous times tried to call attention to the fact that CPH are completely lacking a concept of "computational adjacency". The whole of spacetime and matter must be a fabric of CPH for GR to work and CPH to "stand". Therefore CPH must be in constant daisy-chain contact with each other, even if they exchange relative "position" --soup-like--

So far Hossein has neglected to provide a model or basic proposal of adjacency. If and when he does, CPH become a "brane" of discrete elements. Physical mathematics become easily scaled against that sort of background, where all scales would be "some sort of network" if we leave "spin network" to that which is "material". Bottom line, without a computational adjacency, CPH are phantom particles that can never interact with each other because currently they do so by assumption of space/distance and "collision detection". This whole thing led to me thinking about "lattice" or "fabric". Ultimately, CPH must be "going" which gets to

both Jim's vague "signal clock thingness" and Qi Gong cosmology and as stated qabbalistically, "The Kinetic Principle".

---->

Jim describes this as self-crossing and therefore self-state-spacing. CPH are missing out on the self-referential something. That is as best as I can word it. Makes sense ? I don't know what to suggest to Hossein, but I believe he has heard me clearly on this one and has said so.

Maybe it is too much to chew at once. Maybe Hossein with CPH has "half the picture". With a little help, I think CPH can do something more fun so far than InfoPhysics, and that is, yield a model that we can run in a computer because all the little details necessary to "run a model" are almost in there. InfoPhysics, on the other hand, has not so clearly defined a "momentum" and seems to require "the whole signal of the universe of bits" in order to operate.

No offense to anyone.

But it would be fun to "run something" on a desktop computer.

-AEF

>wilmac@aapt.net.auFrom: "Mike" <

>InfoPhysics@yahoogroups.comTo: <

Sent: Monday, March 14, 2005 8:40 AM

Subject: Re: Mike - one more - CPH - Re: [InfoPhysics] Rhythmic Time as deBroglie Eigenstates Right. I have this admittedly vague sort of synthesis buzzing in my head that takes a bit of loop theory, sets up your adjacency, and somehow then produces Hossein's Higgisy things..... The beauty of loop theory is that it creates space by adjacency of clocks! Exactly what you've been saying all along! Then the spin networks can make waves and particles..... it's great stuff and sooooo close to your own concept.....

mac

From: Allen Francom

To:

Sent: Wednesday, May 26, 2004 12:18 PM

Subject: Hey Hossein... CPH

I think I see very clearly now why force and energy conversion is so very important.

This is a result of thinking about Jim's theory and bits, and what could possibly process them. I don't know when I will have the time, but it shouldn't take too long, but I'll have a program that runs.

Do you have Windows or Linux?

<http://www.prismnet.com/~aef/yinyang.html>

THX
-AEF

SEANFrom:

<mailto:cassinihuygens@yahooogroups.com>To:

Sent: Saturday, June 12, 2004 6:36 PM

Subject: Re: [Cassini Huygens] Desgin of CPH

Dear Hossein,

Thanks for your postings and welcome to our group. I'm really glad you could join us. Allow me, if you will, to introduce you to the group. **Hossein (Amir) Javadi is a quantum Scientist/Theorist and is a world leader in his field.** His brilliant CPH theory is not an easy read. I've been following it's progress for some time now and although I can't claim to *truly* understand all of it's concepts, I suspect We will hear a great deal more of it in the future. Hossein is Iranian, and has endured a long fight for recognition in his own country.

SEAN

"Jose Molina" <chepemolina@yahoo.com>

Dear Amir

I want to Know how the cph theory explain the interaction at distance (like a changing polarization ,to a pair of photon the other mathc the same polarization instantly even at far distancy) the information between the two particles travel at high speed more than the light .In the cph theory you have Vc that is $\gg c$:How much greather is VC than c.

String Theory implies more than ϵ (space and time) dimensions to explain this interaction($\backslash\backslash$ dimensions).

sincerely

Jose

Jose MolinaFrom:

Hossein JavadiTo:

Sent: Thursday, April 10, 2008 7:06 PM

Subject: Re: Joe; Entangled PArticles interaction at distance

Dear Amir

I have studied the cph theory recently .I think it would be a consistency theory.specially when you see the conversion from energy to force You can count with my help .We'll be in communication

sincerely

Jose

Jose MolinaFrom:

Hossein JavadiTo:

Sent: Monday, June 07, 2008 0:02 PM

Subject: Re: I need Your Help

Dear Hossein

Sorry for not answer you as soon as posible but i was sick "dengue " and i revisited my mail until now .

I glad that this group is very active an they are working in cph theory .I was thinking in cph and I believed for the moment you can utilizate diagrams (like Feynman diagrams) to explain the interaction of cph and force . And I was thinking to use tensor and vector calculus to explain the interaction between force and energy but only is a idea i will in contact with you an Allen

sincererly

Jose Molina**From:**

cph_theory@yahoogroups.com**To:**

Sent: Thursday, June 24, 2010 10:13 PM

Subject: [cph_theory] casimir effect and CPH

the quantum field theory predict a vacum density energy the evidence of this energy is the cassimir effect this is a small attractive force between two conductive neutral plates placed parallel each other between a small vacum space distance.this force is consequence to quantum vacum fluctuation

$F = \pi \cdot h \cdot c \cdot A / (\epsilon \lambda \cdot a \epsilon)$ where A=area,h=plack conts,c light speed

quantum mechanic atribute this force to the interaction of virtual particles aniquilation this concer to chp study interaction coverted to force in energy if we have a piston "empty of vacum"(or empty)and we pull from the piston to increasing the volume of vacum we increse the vacum energy because the increase in volume by the force applied to the sistem into the piston.we increase space and flux of cph

Jose Molina**From:**

[Hossein Javadi](#)**To:**

Sent: Wednesday, April 14, 2008 10:30 PM

Subject: Re: Joe; Entangled Particles interaction at distance

Dear Amir

I see an analogy between the cph theory and the string theory in cph carry gravity force and have an external force applied to it it take spin and convert or can be see like graviton .or cph can transform in a different particle depending what circumstance or external force interact with it . In string theory depending of the vibration of the string.it can see with some quantum properties like spin and momentum and the string function or transform in the respective particle .I dont know if the observation is agree with the cph theory

Sincerely

Jose

SEANFrom:

Hossein JavadiTo:

Sent: Thursday, August 14, 2008 10:19 PM

Subject: Re: Thanks.

Hi Hossein,

I've been thinking a little about your situation. I'm very pleased to have your friendship, but I am also very impressed with CPH theory. It needs to be promoted. I see your problem here. On one hand, you are faced with old, stubborn men who simply do not wish to understand anything new. Not only do they not understand, they actively oppose you. And yet, you need the backing of your government to properly promote your theory.

The only way forward here would seem to be promotion in the West. The more popular your theory becomes here, the harder it be for your government to continue ignoring you. What can I do to help promote CPH theory here in England? Who are the people I need to talk to? How do I go about this?

I have a fear that one day, some western scientist will simply copy your work, call it something new and claim credit for it. That would be a great shame. Besides, CPH theory is important, and I'd like to help a little more.

Sincerely,

SEAN.

From: Mike

To:

Sent: Monday, July 05, 2004 2:01 PM

Subject: Re: [NPA_Dissidents] OK Hossein, I visited the site.

> J Raymond Redbourne wrote:

> However Hossein, you discuss matters like a gentleman, and I very much appreciate

> that. I certainly wish you well in your endeavors. If you are proven right, then you will
> be my teacher, as long as you don't try Mike's riveting gun teaching technique.

Best regards, Ray.

The riveting gun technique only works while the kids are too small to fight back. I know. I still bear the scars - but man, I DID learn those basics, even though my old physics teacher was a truly hated man... He got the job done though....

BTW. You're right. Hossein is a real gentleman, and I like him heaps, even when I'm not sure what the heck he's on about.....

mike

From: Mike

To:

Sent: Monday, June 21, 2004 2:18 PM

Subject: Re: [cph_theory] Actually - Let's do this only (tx,ty,tz) forgetF, and T is macroscopic.

newton117@cox.net Tom Keith

Hossein,

We will never forget our humble and brilliant physics pioneer.

Your friend

Tom

From: Mr Jim Stevenson

To:

Sent: Sunday, May 16, 2004 12:08 AM

Subject: Your post today

Dear Javadi Hossein,

I was very pleased by your post today in our forum. I am pleased to see you are willing to use the word "force" as so many that have studied the spaghetti of superstring are afraid of the word now. I agree with much of your concepts. I have thought for many long hours on the amazing congealed energy that lies within every particle. An incredible energy that is not only able to continue the spin, but in science, able to effect it's position and behavior in the universe, virtually forever... Consider the lonely photon which has traveled "billions" of years through the universe, and still hits our collector and is able to release energy. Amazing. How is this possible. What an incredible universe we are in...

Thankyou,
James Stevenson

My Very Dear Friend Hossein:

Thank you for your kind reception to my come back. I often think of you and wonder what you are doing. I apologize if I have repeated any of your original theories, but please understand that I totally lack the mathematical concept of theories and am reliant upon logic as my only source of understanding. Perhaps this is a blessing in some ways, but it is likened to sailing a ship at full anchor.

Hossein, I would be interested to know what your specialty is. I feel like an ant among giants because of my inability to pursue the mathematical aspects of Theoretical Quantum Physics. I deeply appreciate your friendship and the friendship of the entire group.

Your friend, always, Roy

Dear Hossein!

You are welcome.

I disagree with your assessment about the incompatibility of cph-theory with other theories of a unification nature. cph-theory has some very good premises, the most important one, which I tried to describe to you and Allen, but which you both either misunderstood or ignored. This is illustrated on your homepage and involves the CHANGING of cph-Higgs-Energy THROUGH COLOUR into all of the other particles of the Standard Model.

George and I are NOT competing with your brainchild Hossein; we are trying to help you to get all the good aspects of cph-theory (there are some bad ones in my analysis of it) out in the open and linking them up with other models. You seem to be unable to see the parallels, Allen seems to be less prejudiced in that regard, maybe because his scientific training is unpretentious.

You are too defensive about your own position Hossein, you seek acknowledgment (don't we all) and you attempt to further the case of the cph-model in raising certain issues and then download the most advanced supporting material from other sites (say kiarashniknejad).

You have a unique and valid premise with cph-theory Hossein, you do not need the indirect acknowledgment of the "experts" to bolster your case- stand on your own convictions. This is not to say, that you shouldn't use the expert's work. Use it whenever you can, but indicate just where the experts agree (and disagree) with you. The explosion of Black Holes is a furphy, for example. All the expert papers you have downloaded would

strongly disagree with your analysis of exploding Black Holes. They admit micro-primordial Black Holes (which are very very hot) to explode after having shrunk to Hawking Entropy Limits; but they now make a clear distinction between microscopic and extremal Black Holes and the Cosmological Ones (limited to a minimum mass of a little over 1 tons).

Now many researchers (remember those are the papers you are downloading as files), even take issue with calling those 'Black Holes', they (**Susskind, Strominger, Vafa**) would prefer a link to say magnetic monopoles or Cosmic Rays or Gamma Bursters - a more fundamental particle origin, perhaps.

But enough of this; your basic ideas are very good and deserve further investigation. Your best avenue is to investigate the mechanism of transformation. How does the Graviton change in gauge association into the weak-interaction weakons for example. This engages the Higgs-Restmass-Induction Mechanism and relating the masses of the weak- vector bosons (W and Z) to the Higgs-Boson .

If you use your physical intuition and describe the cph-particle as a chromodynamically unified colourcharge (such as is done in QCD); then you will make rapid progress.

Some mathematical application will however be required.

Best of Wishes and many Greetings to you Oh, I should clarify when I'm being especially dumb. When I said "Higgs Particle" I meant "CPH". It's not quite the same thing. In retrospect, it seemed like it is important to make this distinction. I'll try not to goof like that anymore.

-AEF

> wrote:rnboyd@mip.net--- Robert Neil Boyd <

Millenium Twain,
(Now I understand your name better.)
I have never seen this brilliant work before! And it is such a pleasure for me to read :)
Looks like I was on the right track with everything! I'm so happy you published it.
This is VERY important work! From my perspective...

I hope that some of my expressions have found equal favor with you.

Best Wishes,

Neil

Robert Neil Boyd wrote:

I figured I should add this: The deal is this...

"Theory" is the search for an expression of rules. Rules such that when we "operate" the rules, they "predict" experiential results.

Higgs Particles fall out of Higgs Field "or compose it" and this is very interesting, how they 'got there', if memory is working this fell out of electro-weak unification (ex post einstein)

Hossein has come up with CPH Theory and it honors the name "Higgs" as it is quite Higgs-like.

CPH Theory has two significant properties and one of the two properties has two expressions.

One property that Hossein has written is a "Total Internal Value" and this is divided between two sub-values in proportion, those being "Spin" and "Velocity".

The unwritten property required is "reason to exist one moment to the next" or "internal time" inside the CPH 'particle'. The reasoning behind all this has to do with a very good question, how does force convert to energy and how does energy convert to force. "No unified theory will succeed unless it answers this question" - Hossein

Hossein is brilliant, this is a fantastic observation, and is a gauntlet laid before the physics community. Whereas General Relativity is a "description" of what happens Macroscopically...

QM, QED, QCD are all descriptions of what happens microscopically.

The "Higgs Particle" is a theory that is very suggestive of "forming space and gravity and everything else in space and gravity".

CPH Theory ultimately does this same thing. The "dimensionless elements of fabric" are a clear expression of the same required "rules", Spin/Velocity become "send/receive" against a total internal "cpu speed". $\text{Grad } V_c = \cdot$ in all reference frames, and in

the computational model "cpu speed" is constant and must be divided proportionally between send/receive. CPH have constant velocity, computational CPH have constant ticking rate.

-AEF

"Gary S." <garys_rk@yahoo.com> wrote:

--- In free_energy@yahoogroups.com, vcrepair@j... wrote:

Dave's theory has to accommodate Hossen Javadi's CPH theory ;-)

Date: Sat, 8 Sep 2006 13:03:04 +0430

From: "Hossen Javadi" <javadi_hossein@h...>
> Subject: The Limits in Universe
>
> The Limitations in Universe
>
...

willmac@austarnet.com.auMike

I've been "Aha"ing for quite a while now on that one. Random thought - try close packing CPHs like little ball bearings.. Each one touches 12 others. Information can move through such a "structure" without anything happening "at a distance". No distance. Indeed without anything even moving!

Funny you should mention that Mike. I've been trying for a while now to make a case for this sort of thing in CPH_Theory, and earlier this evening I sent an email that is summarized pretty much exactly:

"What if CPH don't move like particles, what if they are only 'adjacent' and communicate"

Then mass is a standing signal and gravity is the necessary adjacent trough. All via higgs ocean. Higgs particles then are not something to detect, as they don't move. They are "fabric", only signals "move" in the fabric. This would make Jim smile.

> Just information transfer. Take a bunch of CPHs,
> and whack one on one side of the bunch, and another
> pops out on the other side, but there has
> been no movement between them.

Yes.

> Space as a concept in which objects move isn't

> required at this level, BUT time is, because the
> information takes time to get from one side to
> the other.

Yep.

> The only question is, how fast? Is it c
> or does that emerge later?

I have good reason to think it is probably $\sqrt{2}$ times c .

Computational issues. $\sqrt{2}$ times c allows a higgs particle to "be" and also allows it to "signal". The signal is at least $1/\sqrt{2}$ the internal computational clock cycle, if not $1/\sqrt{2}$ rd, $1/\sqrt{2}$ th, etc.,

> If it's not c , what is it? Instantaneous?
> Just very very very fast? Uncertain? Hmmmmmmm.....

I think HUP is ready for this explanation. A standing wave/signal has "adjacency", it is "propogating". Meanwhile, back at the ranch, more signals are propogating too.

A $\sqrt{2}$ -dimensional CPH-like "element" in an ocean, necessarily has the internal force of change, or "tick tock". It CANNOT tick AND tock at the same exact instant. If it ticks another "element", and a third element ticks IT before it goes "tock"...

Automatic "uncertainty" due only to lots of information processing happening very quickly but only from our perspective.

I am almost certain that "fluid" or "fabric" CPH are computationally less intensive than free-moving-in-relation CPH as 'particles'. That means Occam's Razor. If it is computationally less intensive... then... "Hmn..."

> Funny how there's always a "Hmmm" after an "Aha"
> isn't it.....?!

Yep.

Thank you again so very much Mike for going "Aha !" It means I'm not totally onkers. A little only!

-AEF

Hi Hossein,

Regarding "signals":

Let a CPH be an "object":

```
Private "hidden" TotalChange_ergy = Constant \ \ \
Private "hidden" PercentSpin = 0. ' initially
Private "hidden" PercentVelocity/Swim = 0. ' initially
Private "hidden" List_Of_Adjacent_CPH ' at least two

Public Function CollideSpin(adjacent_cph)
    return spinpercent_exchanged
Public Function CollideVelocity(adjacent_cph)
    return velocitypercent_exchanged
```

Public Thread_Execute Live_Run_Go
Any time a CPH "bumps" another CPH it has to
do so by "calling a function".
Any time a function is called on a CPH by another

CPH both CPH change.

Any time there is change there is "signal", and
"exchange" of information.

So... CPH are constantly "signaling" each other,
that is all that they do actually.

So far in CPH Theory, we assume that CPH actually
"move" or "exchange adjacency" also, relative
to one another.

(I am presenting a sharp contrast for the
purpose of considering what "signaling" means)

IF, however, CPH do NOT "move" in relation to
one another...

THEN...

Mass has to be a "standing wave" of CPH, made mostly of the signal and leastly of the CPH involved.

In order for a model like this to work, it is necessary to consider what might possibly happen to the "total" of each CPH.

At first glance, the total might need to be flexible.

What might need to remain constant is the "clock speed" of the heart of a CPH,
Public Thread_Execute Live_Run_Go()

A standing wave by signaling is computationally more efficient than "particle exchange" or sub-quantum "motion" of sub-quantum "particles".

A standing wave of CPH in the form of mass necessarily draw upon the Clock-Cycle-Orientarion of "space cph" to continue standing.

There is automatic/inherent "gravity" that way, and there is also a "reason" for acceleration and deceleration of a standing wave in the "field" of a larger standing wave (of course, it goes both ways)

This is more elegant than particle exchange all the way from the earth to the moon and vice versa.

Also, the standing wave of earth, makes a standing trough (through) the moon, and on to the other side, without necessarily being 'blocked' - or at least not necessarily very much so, or perhaps instead "added to".

I think this is possibly simpler than what you have been describing so far.

Also it "fits" nicely the concept of "higgs ocean".

Also it makes it possible to have less than

$\lambda \cdot \epsilon \cdot +/-$ CPH in a photon or electron. A lot less.

The details are eventually important.

However,

My description is the way it is for right now just for the basic idea only, and to draw a contrast.

?

-AEF

$>E=Mc^2$

Well, I kinda like Hossein's CPH and inherent consideration of how force converts to energy and vice versa. Based on the simple properties of a common sub-quantum "higgs" particle...Powerful question to ask. How exactly does force convert to energy and vice versa and the bottom-most layer of reality ?

Hmn...

From: SEAN.

To: "Ali Ghasempouri"

Cc: "Hossein Javadi"

Subject: Re: TeamWork

Sent: Wednesday, August 18, 2010 10:30 PM

My Dear Friends,

Thank you for your mail. Indeed, Hossein is a great friend and a very great scientist.

I am not myself a professor, or even a scientist. I am simply a passionate amateur.

My primary interest is in helping to promote CPH theory here in England and anywhere else I can.

Is there any way in which you can help here? Do you have any contacts in England who may be able to help? Do you have any ideas or thoughts as to how promotion is best achieved? These are the areas I hope to work on and I would appreciate your help.

It is a pleasure to hear from you all. You are the next generation of Iranian's and your dedication to promoting knowledge and culture in your country is very much to your credit. I will look forward to working with you in the future.

Sincerely,
SEAN.

From: Jose Molina
To: Ali Ghasempouri
Subject: Re: TeamWork
Sent: Thursday, August 19, 2004 2:10 AM

I Glad to hel you .and excuseme to answer as soon as posible

sicerely
Jose Molina

riott_nyte@yahoo.com Riott:

> Imagine an independent object spinning freely, and
> this object is in the shape of a rod. We'll give
> this object 2 points.

> B-----A-----B
> C-----B-----A-----B-----C

> Now, if point B rotation is at the speed of light, C
> is now at 2^ that speed. What happens to point C?
> Does the structure break down before this can
> happen?

My opinion, for what it may be worth, is that there will be an explosion long before B reaches light speed. My reasoning is legion ;) Not only classical mechanics...

> I realize this seems as if I'm pushing thresholds
> which can not be done, but imagine that the line
> above is not a rod but rather the imaginary line

> through the center of a photon or CPH.

Through a single CPH, and maybe a photon, it doesn't matter.

Time and space result from CPH, they are self-consistent at their own scale.

Time and distance do not effect CPH, CPH have the effect of producing time and distance. (My opinion, not necessarily Hossein or anyone else's)

What then would it mean to do as you suggest with a single CPH ?

It would mean Hawking Radiation, and what would appear to be quantum tunnelling, that sort of thing, at that scale, and things could look really wierd, time and distance-wise, but only at that scale, only using time and distance as we tend to think of them, not resulting from something more fundamental, both of them, from the same "goop".

> Now, to explain Independent Rotation.

>

> Independent Rotation Theory: Is the combined forces

> on a free unattached object which produces a

> rotation in which counteracts overbearing forces so

> that the object remains in balance.

What is an example of this ?

> Rotation Chain Theory: is that Independent Rotation

> is the flexible variable/force that brings all

> things into balance from the atomic

> level to the astronomic level.

> Picture Independent Rotation as the flexible law

> that gives and takes to balance others.

What is flexing ?

> Knowing that an object has a "flexible" point which

> can be manipulated. We now have the power to

> speed/slow down this rotation by exposing the object

> to various forces. For example: Heat. And

> thus causing the above "rod" scenario to be feasibly

> attempted.

> I can't recall any names at the moment (to lazy to

> look it up), but there are several failed attempts at

> causing a photon to enter a time travel state. The

> procedure behind this project is by placing

> the photon in a sealed cylinder and applying laser

> (heat) wrapped around the inside of this cylinder.

> The lasers serve 2 purposes: 1. It traps the photon

- > inside the cylinder. γ . It causes the photon to
- > increase in speed. The reason this experiment fails
- > is because they did not take in account for
- > Independent Rotation.

What about calling it, something more along the lines of, but not quite exactly "Internal Propulsion" or "Internal Clock"...

- > Even though the Photon increases in speed, its
- > Independent Rotation shifts to balance itself.

Look again at CPH and see the relationship between Spin and Velocity, or as we can maybe call it now, Spin and Swim. Also lookup "Moebius Strip" on google.

Nice spinning type dealy-bob stuff. What if a teeny tiny CPH looks like one of those ?

-AEF

MCorey1334@aol.comFrom:

To: javadi_hossein@hotmail.com

Subject: Re: Accelerating Universe

Date: Fri, 14 Nov 2003 21:20:20 EST

Thanks so much for this very interesting article. The universe is always more clever than we can ever imagine. God's Power and Providence is SO incredibly evident to me throughout all of cosmology.

Humdilla!

I'm presently in Dallas, TX visiting a medical clinic. Do you live anywhere near here? Did I happen to meet you last August at a camp in Massachusetts? How did you hear about me?

Warmly,

Michael A Corey, Ph.D.

joe.russo@us.army.mil Joe Russo

Dear Hossein Javadi

Great posting, Bravo;

I can see some very interesting feedback on this posting, and I can see it now, the words at NASA. "Huston, we have a life force amongst us."

newton112@cox.net

To: President Mohammad Khatami - President of Iran,

Subject; Your research and analysis on photons are brilliant.

Mr. President,

Hossein Javadi is an Iranian physicist who is a genius.

Hossein has done ۲۰ years of theoretical physics research.

Hossein has developed brilliant classical physics relativity and classical physics grand unified theory.

I, Tom Keith, am a retired engineer with Motorola.

I have done ۱۱ years of theoretical physics research.

I also came up with a Keith-Motorola classical physics relativity and classical physics grand unified theory.

All physics empirical data show Hossein Javadi and myself have an important proven classical physics relativity and proven classical physics grand unified theory.

I know you will understand the importance of these physics theories to Iran and the world science community.

Hossein Javadi's physics papers and the Keith-Motorola physics concepts are published on the yahoo non-political science group absoluteaether.

I hope you or your assistant can join absoluteaether yahoo discussion group and review and support this major breakthrough in physics.

Hossein Javadi joined absoluteaether the first week of September, ۲۰۰۳. President Mohammad Khatami, you only need to start reading yahoo group absoluteaether messages ۸۶ and above to review the physics discussions between Hossein Javadi, myself Tom Keith, and other members of absoluteaether.

Sincerely

Tom Keith, Mesa, Arizona

Anthony L. PerattFrom:

Dear Hossein,

I have very briefly read through your letter and find your work fascinating. Unfortunately programmatic responsibilities at Los Alamos at the present time but when I call for papers for the next journal on this topic, I can send your manuscript to referees for comments.

Sincerely,

Anthony L. Peratt

REP From:

Hossein JavadiTo:

Sent: Monday, August ۲۶, ۲۰۰۲ ۱۰:۰۶ PM

Subject: Re: please advise me

Dear Hossein;

One of my dearest friends was Hossein Firouzi of Iran. We worked together at SMU on fabricating solar cells/theory. I quit just shy of completing paper for Phd in Physics ... at Texas A&M University: previously in Phd program in plasma and nuclear physics at MIT. So it's not herr professor or herr doctor: just plain ol' Bob. Therefore I cannot advise you: you know more I'm sure.

I am studying the history of physics, esp. through the turn of the past century, in order to write a book on same. My belief is that the so-called Lorentz contraction -- discovered through experiment ... and not by Lorentz or Fitzgerald, -- is really at the heart of the problem. It in itself predicts the limiting velocity of light: and this limiting value was conceptually used by Michaelson and Morley, n.b., the interferometer experiments (incl. 2nd order effects), to dispute aether drag or even its presence. I think a big error was made here but can't prove it. Perhaps they showed constancy in the speed of light as measured by moving observers: but (to my mind) did not disprove the concept of the aether! In fact, they may have given an indirect proof of it.

Your ideas about the structure of the photon are new: are they not? Perhaps you are on the trail of the link that binds quantum to classical mchanics and ... shows the aether as a possible substrate! Good luck and best wishes ...

Bob

prodos@prodos.com

Dear Hossein,

Good morning.

Thank you for your reply. I think we can have two look on subatomic. Wave theory and particle theory are same. At end these two theories must reaches to unify results.

In my theory any inertial frame has an especially constant limitation speed and it is speed of light on that frame. Cause force acts on speed of light and limitation of speed in an inertial frame depends to its force.

Sum of two velocities never can be over than the limitation of speed. In my theory there is not any infinity in the universe. I accept TEW, but I think a questionable problem in TEW is the effect of external force. I think the external force cannot change the amount of speed.

by applying the speed of photons can be altered ادعاAre you saying that TEW claims force to photons? If so, that is incorrect. TEW does not make any such claims.

Best Wishes,

PRODOS

zeoez@comcast.net

I have great interest in physics and astronomy, but unfortunately I'm not in the position to discuss these subjects in extensive detail. I have to say that this here in my opinion is the best theory of gravity-unification I've ever heard of.

Although this is not the first individual to come up with this theory, it seems to explain mysteries of the universe in a much less complex way. many great

Regards

Zeoez

ragnarok@cytechcis.net

Good Morning Hossein,

I'm just getting up, so I will email later on this morning, but I am glad to see that we agree on the uselessness of the geometrical topography of the universe. Both Einstein and Wheeler were just trying to give a more comprehensive picture of what they were seeing mathematically when developing this "theory." It is of NO practical use otherwise and many, who didn't understand why this theory was developed, misused it and led many astray.

Have you ever read the works of Gustaf LeBon? His books "The Evolution of Matter" and "The Evolution of Energy" are part of my collection and even Einstein sent LeBon's daughter a letter telling her that her father was more correct than he in understanding things on an atomic level than he. Even though I have not read your CPH Theory yet, I would think that the two may have some things in common. Do you have a web site with your theory stated? I will share my theory later today as well. Must go now, but I'll drop you an email later on today. Oh, and yes, mathematics is a great "tool" to use when working on these secrets of the universe, but that is all they should be, not as the main determinant of theory as it is used by many theoretical physicists of today. I think we both agree on this. Even the illustrious Michael Faraday shied away from mathematics and his theories are more solidly based on observation. Once Maxwell arrived on the

scene, Maxwell then added some mathematics...which are still debated today...yet Faraday's observations are not, they are accepted for the most part. Take care.

Regards,

Sig