

Forward

“Peer” Censured Science and the Discoveries Provided by Quantum-Dimensional Geometry

If one cools the surface of a polyethylene tank sufficiently rapidly and sufficiently uniformly, one will produce capacitance-field energies for the polyethylene hydrogen bonds which are deficient in charge. The field's charge will be less than the elementary charge of the bond's orbiting electron. Since all quantum orbitals are fixed in electron voltage, the field's voltage cannot be adjusted downward to increase field charge to equality with the orbiting electron. The electron must fall out of the quantum orbital into an Euclidean orbital where orbital electron voltages are composed as a continuum. These Euclidean orbitals with non-quantum, “continuums” of electron voltages only exist at the shell boundaries of the orbital shell/subshell structure. The radiation output by shell-boundary orbitals must be *negative radiation*. Negative radiation frequencies can only be entangled by quantum orbital electrons using an investment of energy from the nucleus. The expenditure of nuclear energy to entangle negative radiation frequencies results in a loss of heat by the molecule. Shell-boundary negative radiation frequencies can cool the molecule and provide a radiological heat exchange. This has been revealed by a new technology.

While the existence of a negative radiological heat exchange might be questioned, the data which has proved it still needs to be explained. Engineer David Rule invented a polyethylene cooling tank which operated as a “non-thermodynamic heat exchanger.” The heat exchange was not “*a direct heat flow between the liquid and the surroundings cooling walls*”¹. There was none of the variance in temperature across the liquid which is characteristic of contact heat transfers. Rather, liquids were uniformly cooled across the radius of the tank, with only a “1° F” variance between top and bottom. This uniformity was so consistent that it prevented temperature-caused, specific gravity currents from forming. These “super still” liquids were routinely cooled to below freezing temperatures without forming ice in the tank. If the surface of the super-chilled liquid is disturbed, ice will immediately form throughout the tank.

Measurement of a reversal of the 1° variance between top and bottom under super chilling proved that the lower specific gravity of ice was not caused by the change in state, but shared a “j” graph of temperature-induced specific gravity with liquids which had been chilled to below freezing temperatures. None of this had ever been observed using thermodynamic heat exchangers.

David Rule's negative radiation heat exchanger will be lost to humanity as a practical technology; lost despite having application in many commercial settings; lost despite having been observed over many years operating in an industrial setting. It will be lost because “negative radiation” does not exist in the contemporary scientific catechism. It will be lost because the device cannot be patented by its operational principles; lost because David Rule cannot offer his negative radiation heat exchanger with any credibility since its operational principles have no scientific recognition. An attempt was made to preserve Rule's discovery as a practical technology by demonstrating its scientific credibility.

In 2008 a mathematical formula for the “negative-radiation heat exchange” was developed from research using the Balmer-Shell boundary frequency known colloquially as “black light.” The return glow from cotton fibers bathed in 365 nm “black light”² dropped cotton temperatures as a function of the number of hydrogen bonds in the molecule and Planck's Constant³. When this inductive formula was applied to Rule's “non-thermodynamic heat exchanger,” it accurately derived the tank's maximum “per-hour” cooling capacity. The research report was rejected by all scientific journals. It identified an unrecognized quantum-dimensional phenomenon and was, therefore, excluded from the scientific press by gatekeeper bias.

We sought access to the scientific “peer-review process” through the physics department of a nearby major university. The data supporting Rule's “non-thermodynamic heat exchanger” was presented to the chairman of the department in the hope that university confirmation of the data would stand as an initial

¹ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Heat_transfer

² Actually 364.572 nm. It is the boundary of the Balmer shell of the Rydberg distribution which establishes the electron orbital shell/subshell structure. The Balmer series is the visible spectrum of hydrogen light emissions, the frequencies of which are found by the following formula:

$$f = \left(1/2^2 - 1/n^2\right)(\text{root frequency} = f_{\text{root}}); \{ \text{Balmer boundary} \} = (f_{\text{root}}) / 2^2 = c / 4(91.143\text{nm}) = c / 364.572\text{nm}$$

³ See *The Quantum Dimension*; Paradigm Publishing, 2009. p. 134, p. 161. and p. 154.

“peer-review” of the research. We were not fully prepared for the consequences of this presentation.

Our data was summarily rejected, without close examination and nearly instantaneously. The cooling uniformity to the center of the tank— the uniformity which the Rule tank routinely produced— was explained as “loss of heat through the top of the tank.” This instantaneous “dismissal” of the data by a Ph.D. and the chair of a major university physics department was shocking. It was shocking because it was clearly the opinion of ignorance— the opinion of an someone untrained in science but who was posing as a scientist.

The idea that cooler liquids in a tank could transfer heat to warmer ambient air through the top of the tank violates the second law of thermodynamics: “*..spontaneous heat transfer always occurs from a region of high temperature to another region of lower temperature, as described by the second law of thermodynamics.*”⁴ This Ph.D. in physics and the chair of a major university physics department was proposing that “*temperature could be transferred from a region of lower temperature to a region of higher temperature*” in violation of a very basic and well-known principle of physics.

This is not an indictment of an incompetent poseur. It is an indictment of the “peer review” process in science itself. This man’s career had been one long “peer review.” His Ph.D. is the “peer review” of a thesis committee. As a professor, he is the master of a “peer reviewed” scientific catechism. What he is not is a purveyor of scientific knowledge as founded upon the scientific method. “Peer review” science is, by definition, “majority opinion” science. The ease with which this Ph.D. offered “opinion” as science — “opinion” which was completely disconnected with even a minimal knowledge of physics— shows that a new epistemology now dominates. What “is” has come to mean “what the majority believes to be.” “Fact” is no longer determined by the empirical confirmation of hypothesis.

The “peer” censure of science and any inexplicable data is an historical deviation of recent origin. It is an attempt by an entrenched scientific “authority” of minimal competence to insulate the alleged knowledge of “majority opinion” from scientific aberrations. Earlier generations of scientists had felt no similar need to insulate themselves from aberrant science. In the first half of the 19th century, J.S. Russell was allowed to present his discovery of “soliton water wave⁵” to the Royal Society of Edinburgh despite the fact that the soliton could not be explained by contemporary water-wave theory.

Pursuing research into “aberrant science” against the direct orders of his superior, Pieter Zeeman was allowed to present his resultant data showing that the light spectral doublet known as the “D lines” from sodium split into further doublets when placed under a magnetic field⁶. “*In 1896....[Zeeman] disobeyed the direct orders of his supervisor and used laboratory equipment to measure the splitting of spectral lines by a strong magnetic field. He was fired for his efforts, but he was later vindicated: he won the 1902 Nobel Prize in Physics for the discovery of what has now become known as the Zeeman effect.*”⁷ The “Zeeman effect” continues to be aberrant science⁸.

Both Russell’s “aberrant” soliton wave and Zeeman’s “aberrant” magnetic effect upon sodium light doublets have provided crucial evidence for a fourth, unrecognized quantum dimension.

In an age of peer censured science, the discoveries made by the mathematical description of a fourth, unrecognized, quantum dimension must be presented outside the censured scientific press. Those discoveries are much greater than the singular identification of a “negative radiation heat exchange.” Quantum dimensional mathematics have provided a much more detailed and mathematically rational model of the atom than is currently available. This book, which must be published outside of university and commercial “peer reviewed” scientific sources, presents the case for this more detailed and rational four-dimensional model of the atom.

⁴ Ibid. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Heat_transfer

⁵ “Report on Waves”: (Report of the fourteenth meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, York, September 1844 (London 1845), pp 311-390, Plates XLVII-LVII

⁶ Zeeman, P. (11 February 1897). “The Effect of Magnetization on the Nature of Light Emitted by a Substance”. *Nature* 55 (1424)

⁷ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pieter_Zeeman

⁸ Tab- 1-A; “*The Control of Electron Orbitals by Electromagnetic Fields.*” See p.1 for a discussion of the “Zeeman effect.”