Mark R. Anderson

November 4, 1991

Dr. Ben Bederson
Editor
Physical Review A
1 Research Road Box 1000
Ridge, New York 11961

Dear Dr. Bederson,

Having read your letter of September 4 several times, I must confess to confusion regarding the status of manuscript # AC4589 and the policy of Physical Review A on dates of submission, priority, and content. To be sure that I was not reading it incorrectly, I asked several colleagues for their own reading, and all were left equally unclear regarding the meaning of your letter.

Specifically, I had written to you to ask to retain the original submission date of the above manuscript (11/30/1981, ms #AL2056), as the peer review comments had been proven incorrect; I included specific reasons for this. This matter has not been addressed.

Insofar as your earlier letter stated that the journal "only published new theories," I understood that you were rejecting the work as not being new. Since neither I nor the several other physicists I have spoken with know of papers that would have priority, I asked for your mention of any such papers. This matter also was not addressed in your letter, and I therefore continue to assume that there is no paper with priority.

You did state in your letter, regarding "papers that attempt to cast some aspect of fundamental theory into a new light --- arriving at a deeper understanding of natural phenomena" that "our journal cannot take on the job of hosting such papers."

Certainly the work of Hal Puthoff, who has published numerous papers on related subjects in your journal in recent years, would fall into the same definition.

In summary, I believe that the paper submitted to you in November of 1981 contains an original and correct theory of physics which would be of interest to the community at large. The theory is internally consistent and testable, and the paper contains specific geometric and mass distribution predictions. The theory presents a unification of general relativity and quantum mechanical principles which derives from the physical characteristics of the vacuum, and which is testable through measurements upon electromagnetic radiation.

The original peer review objection, essentially that electromagnetic radiation is not properly described by string-like mathematics, must now be put aside, as most physicists today accept the beauty of a family of string mathematical approaches as suitable for the unification of all interactions, including the electromagnetic.

I look forward to your response on this matter.

Sincerely,

Mark R. Anderson

Telephone (206) 378-3431 Fax (206) 378-7041
P.O. Box 1304 Friday Harbor Washington 98250