



Close

**From:** Cook, Nigel B

**To:** Cook, Nigel B

**Cc:**

**Subject:** RE: Your\_manuscript LZ8276 Cook

**Sent:** 02/01/2003 21:13

**Importance:** Normal

Dr Brown,

When I first worked out a less rigorous treatment, using the simple pressure analogy and the Hubble law, which was in the year 1996, I submitted it to Nature. The 8 page paper predicted that at very large distances there was no gravitational retardation due to the mechanism of gravity being weaker. They refused to print it.

In 1998 Dr Perlmutter discovered the gravity problem at extreme distances, a lack of retardation (or, conversely, an acceleration if you assume that gravity still operates at the same strength everywhere).

So the experimental discovery came after the predictive proof. I have the dated letter from the editor at Nature to prove this assertion.

If you wish to insult me, go ahead. The mathematical proof still stands. It will not further my career. Because the thing was not published by Nature when submitted, it will be deemed an ad hoc proof, so I won't be getting any prizes.

Best wishes

NB Cook

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

**From:** Cook, Nigel B

**To:** 'Physical Review Letters '

**Sent:** 02/01/03 21:01

**Subject:** RE: Your\_manuscript LZ8276 Cook

Dr Stanley G. Brown

The paper is a step by step mathematical proof. I have deliberately excluded any speculation from the paper. It is also very brief. An earlier 8 page version which compared the predictions of the proof to the recent cosmological results of Dr Perlmutter on redshifts of supernovae showed that the current problem with the "slowing down" of the expansion of the universe is solved by this mechanism of gravity.

I have no ambition to make any gains from this enterprise. If you feel that the mathematical proof contains an error, then point it out.

Rewrite the paper, or ask me to do so. There is an inexcusable level of ignorance in modern physics concerning the mechanism of gravity. This proof will stimulate debate. Please let me know if you have checked the proof and found an error. I am a genuine scientist, interested in science, rather than a pompous or egotistic idiot, so if you feel that there is a fault, let's sort it out and advance the state of the art.

Best wishes and all that.

NB Cook

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

From: Physical Review Letters

To: s0210616@glos.ac.uk

Sent: 02/01/03 17:47

Subject: Your\_manuscript LZ8276 Cook

Re: LZ8276

Proof of the mechanism of gravity  
by N. Bryan Cook

Dr. N. Bryan Cook

Challinor 49

Univ. of Gloucestershire

POB 220, The Park

Cheltenham, GL50 2QF

UNITED KINGDOM

Dear Dr. Cook,

Physical Review Letters does not, in general, publish papers on alternatives to currently accepted theories unless stringent requirements are met. Speculative papers that lie outside the mainstream of current research must justify their publication by including a clear discussion of the motivation for the new speculation with reasons for introducing new concepts. If the new formulation results in contradictions with accepted theory, then there must be both a discussion of what experiments could be done to show that the conventional theory needs improvement, and an analysis showing that the new theory is not already disproven by existing experiments.

Upon examining your manuscript, we conclude that it does not satisfy these requirements. Therefore, it is not suitable for publication in Physical Review Letters.

Yours sincerely,

Stanley G. Brown

Editor

Physical Review Letters

Email: prl@aps.org

Fax: 631-591-4141

<http://prl.aps.org/>