

In the Memory of Robert J. Heaston.

A few days ago I have learned, that Robert J. Heaston has died February 20. It is very sad!

At first I had known work of NPA Newsletter Editor Robert J. Heaston, when I read Newsletter, Volume 12, Number 2, July, 2006. This journal was devoted to the review of works of all 82 participants of a conference in Tulsa, OK on 3-7 April 2006. I not was the participant of this conference and NPA Secretary Neil Munch kindly has sent me this Newsletter.

I was struck with the large and highly skilled work of Robert J. Heaston for this review. This work is so remarkable, that I want to stop on it in more detail.

All reports of the participants of a conference he has shared on 6 themes: A, B, C, D, F, G:

SUMMARIES OF ALL NPA 2006 PAPERS

A. Much-Encompassing Theories of Physics.

B. Special Relativity.

C. Light and Optical Experiments.

D. Gravity, Light and Microphysics.

F. Electrodynamics.

G. Energy and Planetary Science.

As it is visible from these themes the papers represented a wide range of different areas of a science. I had doubt, as far as authentically could one man survey all these reports. When I have read the review of my reports in two last Newsletters, I was convinced that Robert J. Heaston rather authentically transfers the contents of the papers. How he made it? The method of work above the review of the papers he has left to us in it Newsletter. I bring it completely, as it is useful to each of us.

“Tips for Summarizing by Bob Heaston

It might be a good idea to describe the basic approach used in these summaries. They are not easy to prepare. Five steps are involved.

Turn Off Your CRITIC. The first step is to read all of the background material without criticizing what is being read. The intent is to capture what the writer or speaker has to say and be able to repeat it in his or her words.

Discover the Basic IDEA. Next, try and capture the basic concept, idea, or pattern that the writer wants to get across. Where are they going with the paper?

Identify the PROCESS. How are they developing their ideas? What are the steps? What type of argument or mathematics is being used? Are assumptions stated? *Pick out the PRODUCT.* What is

the product of the process that captures the grand idea? Is the process the product? What is the deliverable? Answer the “So What?” question.

Assess your UNDERSTANDING. What have you learned from the paper? Is it useful in your work? Does your understanding help you to know the writer better? Now let loose your critic. Some of the papers are good science—some are not, but everyone had the opportunity to be heard or read. After going through this process, several papers have proven useful to my work. I have also gotten to know each of you better.

Remember: *Critic, Idea, Process, Product and Undertaking.* The first two belong to the listener or reader; the middle three belong to the presenter. The intent is to summarize: Idea, Process, and Product”.

Maybe, there is one from the members NPA who on submitted algorithm by Robert J. Heaston will continue the review of the reports of the participants of NPA conferences.

Robert J.Heaston has finished the review

List of Papers, Authors, Addresses,

in which the all necessary information about the authors of papers was resulted.

Except for all it, in this release Newsletter he has given

Tribute to Caroline Thompson,

which has died on February 8, 2006, i.e. prior to the beginning of the conference. Robert J. Heaston informs us the brief items of her life and work, and also results words of Caroline Thompson about the condition of contemporary science. These words are overendowed bitterness and pain for destiny of a science, destiny of growing up generation, and, hence, for the future of all mankind. Therefore after Robert J. Heaston in shorthand form I bring her words.

“Tribute to Caroline Thompson

She wrote the following comments in her last paper that should be an encouragement to every NPA participant.

“I present here some of my thoughts on the nature of light ... I am aware that they are speculative. I know that in places I may have laid myself open to ridicule. This is inevitable, as I am working on my own, apart from very valued exchanges over the Internet. One person learning mainly by studying published papers, whose meaning and real achievements are rarely transparent, cannot know everything in such a wide field. Something that is quite clear, though, is that the formalisms of quantum theory and relativity theory have, for the best part of a century now, been acting as straightjackets, preventing real understanding. Some of the concepts deserved to last this long, but not the particular formalisms, devised to account in clumsy, incomplete ways for phenomena whose detailed nature was but dimly perceived, whose complexities were yet to be revealed.

“The problem of the 20th century has been that fundamental physics has become so large, in terms of the human and financial resources tied up in it. An enormous resistance has evolved to new ideas, for these are developed by individuals and small groups, who are inevitably a tiny minority. Proponents of the ruling theories have acquired almost absolute power, controlling the text books, the funding, even, to a much larger extent than is healthy, the media. They have the power to destroy the livelihood of the “young person” who steps out of line. For myself, though, I have no livelihood. So long as I speak only the truth, without libel, the freedom of thought that we are all supposed to share is for me a reality!”

In two others NPA conferences 2007 and 2008 Robert J. Heaston selected other headings, which corresponded to themes of the reports. These reviews were interesting to all and even to the authors of the reports. From the review the author learned, what questions have caused interest, what from them are the important achievement, and above what it is necessary to continue to work, that they have attracted attention of other researchers.

I consider, that the reviews of the NPA papers, executed by Robert J. Heaston, are the important result of a world science. I offer to issue them by the separate book “Summaries of NPA 2007 - 2008 Papers”, by Robert J. Heaston. This book remains by eternal memory not only for Robert J. Heaston, but the unique thoughts, ideas and results of many talented people will be embodied in it. I am sure, that future generations will come back repeatedly to them.

I still want to mention the one interesting work of Robert J. Heaston. I have sent him for the review my paper “The Real Forces and Unreal Hypotheses”. In the answer he has sent me his paper “Reconstruction of the Derivation of the Einstein Field Equations of General Relativity”.

His paper has struck me with large amount of careful research work. But, as personally I am well familiar with essence of the Theory of Relativity and I treat the Special and General Theories of Relativity rather negatively, in the letter from 14 June I have stopped only on this question:

“I have read your paper “Reconstruction of the Derivation of the Einstein Field Equations of General Relativity”. I liked your method of the analysis of the scientific problem. You have executed large work at reconstruction of the derivation of the equations of the General Theory of Relativity (GTR). One of yours conclusion state: “The most significant conclusion of the reconstruction of the derivation of the Einstein field equations of general relativity is that his equations remain as a great intellectual achievement, but they must be interpreted in a different manner”. However I disagree with it.

I do not consider that the field GTR equations are a great intellectual achievement. I think that these equations are large fallacy, which is simple by essence and is complex by form.

The essence consists that the bodies are attracted one to other by Newton force. The proofs about the other character of the interaction force between bodies do not exist.

And the complexity of the form of representation of field GTR equations has given that nobody understands that such is GTR and for what it is necessary.

In an outcome of study of the problem of bodies' interaction I had come to conclusion. The all computing of moving observable celestial bodies with a high exactitude have justified by the Newton law of gravitation. Other data on difference of the attraction force from the Newton law are not present. All conclusions of GTR about black holes, extending universe, Big Bang, gravitational waves etc. are errors. Therefore the GTR is need thrown out and is need forgotten”.

Now I want to note importance of Robert J. Heaston's paper. It has restored the derivation history and logic of Field Equations of General Theory of Relativity. It is very important, because nobody understands of the essence of these equations and the all GTR.

For confirmation I shall bring an example of works the Australian physics Steven J. Grothers. In frameworks GTR he proves, that the black holes, extending universe, Big Bang and gravitational waves cannot be. During some years the physicists were not found any mistake in works by Steven J. Grothers. Why? Because in the world nobody understand GTR.

I think to this Robert J. Heaston's paper will be addressing both supporters of GTR and its opponents. Here they can find out for themselves many answers on their questions.

Robert J. Heaston was the outstanding researcher. He had huge erudition. And all his scientific work was devoted to search of Scientific Truth. We shall remember him always! And ours followers will not forget him!

A chief scientist of the Institute of Earth's Cryosphere of Siberian Branch of Russian Academy of Sciences, doctor of physical-mathematical sciences, professor of theoretical and applied mechanics
27.02.2009

Joseph J. Smulsky

Institute of Earth's Cryosphere, P.O.B 1230, 625000, Tyumen, Russia.

<http://www.smull.newmail.ru/>