

The limits of logic

4 Decades of writings of Daniel P. Fitzpatrick Jr.

Believe it or not but there are certain limits that need to be applied to our logic.

There are parameters to be used with our logic that must not be exceeded.

One proof of this is Heisenberg's uncertainty.

I'll give you another proof of the limits of common sense:

Take the Hubble limit. Or better yet think of the furthest possible extent to our universe. Now ask yourself what is beyond that? No one can answer this.

Below you will see that not even our math is exempt.

I'm now quoting from my Encyclopedia Britannica CD ROM 1997:

"Gödel's proof states that within any rigidly logical mathematical system there are propositions (or questions) that cannot be proved or disproved on the basis of the axioms within that system and that, therefore, it is uncertain that the basic axioms of arithmetic will not give rise to contradictions. This proof has become a hallmark of 20th century mathematics and its repercussions continue to be felt and debated."

Kurt Gödel proved - beyond a shadow of a doubt - that if you are totally contained within a subset system then the math, rules and even what you call common sense and LOGIC developed within that system have no relation whatsoever to any universal truth.

Since we are exactly situated like this, here on earth, then this is the trap we have all fallen into.

And there is a definite reason for this.

Both logic and math, I've discovered, are more accurate the closer they are held to one particular spin/orbit frequency system.

This may sound unscientific and weird but I can assure you that my reasoning is sound.

I've never been far from the field of radio and electronics and what I've learned from this now seems to appear in this *Dr. Milo Wolff* type all wave universe that I'm certain we have.

There is no doubt in my mind that like Armstrong's superheterodyne oscillator, we also detect using not one but two basic oscillators: a **transverse** wave oscillator that determines **space** and a **scalar** standing wave oscillator that determines **time**. And it's not only us detecting this way but everything, in both the microcosm and macrocosm, detects everything else the very same way.

String theory logic of a one dimensional string producing a 2D membrane or "Brane" is probably correct.

But a **transverse** wave oscillator in us mixes with these 2D Branes in a **VECTOR** manner to produce 3D **space** and force.

Another **scalar**, phase wave oscillator inside us reacts with our surroundings to produce the items we see and **time**.

Adding the dimension of **time** to a 3D world gives us our 4D spacetime realm where our logic and math work accurately enough providing we take care not to let them stray off frequency too far.

These are the parameters of logic.

To see this as a wave universe you must see the galaxies and super clusters as the low frequency limit of our frequency band and the quark as the limit of our high frequency bandspread limit.

But if you do care to use this picture, you must remember never to mix wave math/logic with particle math/logic. They simply don't mix. Use all of one picture or all of the other. Each logic system **MUST** be held within its parameters.

There definitely is a limit to logic.

Logic must be contained within the abovementioned parameters.

Also, not only can light be seen either as a wave or a particle but everything else can as well.

[Fitz](#)

Evertpost is absolutely correct in stating (below):

>>some of you say GR has all the answers, but clearly GR has come up with gravity waves propagating at the speed of light, which honestly would prevent them from escaping black holes.>>

Yes,

The speed of gravity **MUST** be much much faster than the speed of light says astronomer Tom Van Flandern. Click below.

<http://www.ldolphin.org/vanFlandern/gravityspeed.html>

It would be one thing if **ONLY** Van Flandern was saying this but Yale university has been teaching this for decades now to **ALL** their astronomy students and now Van Flandern has proven this must be so.

With light we get **aberration** because the speed of light is not instantaneous or nearly instantaneous.

With gravity - says Van Flandern - we get absolutely **NO aberration** which can only indicate that the speed of gravity is instantaneous or nearly instantaneous.

Everet Post has a good point here when he says that gravity waves must be going faster than the speed of light to escape a black hole.

Light to us stops at the surface of a black hole or what is called the event horizon but we feel gravity to a black hole inside even further right up to a point well

within the black hole called the singularity.

[Fitz](#)

[web page](#)

Evertpost@aol.com wrote:

Gentlemen, some of you say GR has all the answers, but clearly GR has come up with gravity waves propagating at the speed of light, which honestly would prevent them from escaping black holes. My correspondent *rarydin@earthlink.net* kindly made me aware of that.

I have not heard very valid counter arguments against that proposition, unless one can argue that the near-field seems instantaneous and the far-field represents a propagation aspect. Yet, Mach argued standing in a train that suddently stops, the distant stars are pushing us forward. *He must have been in favor of an instantaneoud gravity action.*

May I suggest that limitations in logic mostly show up through our own reasoning errors by making unwarranted assumptions. For instance, attaching an absolute to quantum i.e., Heisenberg type uncertainty is a striking example. A counter example against this absolute and the validity of a nonclassical statistics can be found in Planck's Radiation Theory of 1913 (see Dover issue). The Copenhageners must have missed this reference to zero-point energy as a consequence of ensemble phase disorder, or they did their best to discredit Planck's argument with invalid arguments. Please be aware that the Feynman Lectures *unwittingly* cite another counter example pertaining to angular momentum.

Finally, Fourier analysis had some early pronouncements to benefit particle-wave discussions. It is man's own uncertainty that lures him into making premature statements about absolute.-
Evert J Post



To read **more** click: <http://www.rbduncan.com/schrod.htm>

For MORE about all this get a copy of "*Universities asleep at the Switch*" from AMAZON.COM

OR

[Order a copy of "*Universities Asleep at the Switch*" **NOW**.](#)

OR -- better yet

[Read "*Universities Asleep at the Switch*" **FREE** in html.](#)

[Read "*Universities Asleep at the Switch*" **FREE** in ADOBE \(slower to load\).](#)

There was a **full** page in the New York Times devoted exclusively about [Fitzpatrick's First Book](#) on June 18th 1967.

"Fitzpatrick's First Book" also in Adobe.pdf - [pge1.pdf](#)

Click above links to read that first book of mine free.

I've found out and published a lot more since then: Over 4 Decades of Fitzpatrick's Books, Papers & Thoughts

<http://www.amperefitz.com/4.decades.htm>

And here's this page duplicated in Adobe.pdf:

<http://www.amperefitz.com/4.decades.pdf>

[*Return to amperefitz homepage*](#)

[*Return to rbduncan homepage*](#)

(c) 2006 amperefitz

All rights reserved

Comments or complaints about anything on this site???

post to: [*Daniel P. Fitzpatrick*](#)

[*World Scientist Database - - Daniel P. Fitzpatrick Jr.*](#)