



The Theory of Multidimensional Reality

By



Douglas B. Vogt

Member of the Geological Society of America

Research Funded by
The Diehold Foundation, Inc.

Published by
Vector Associates
JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA
2015

VECTOR ASSOCIATES

PO Box 19792

Jacksonville, Florida 32245

Copyright © 2015 by Douglas B. Vogt

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced by any mechanical, photographic, or electronic process, or in the form of a sound recording, nor may it be stored in a retrieval system, transmitted, or otherwise copied for public or private use—other than “fair use”—without the written permission of the author or his assignees. Quote of less than 500 words are permissible, with proper credit given.

First Printing 2015

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Names: Vogt, Douglas B., 1947- author.

Title: The theory of multidimensional reality / by Douglas B. Vogt,
Member of the Geological Society of America.

Description: Jacksonville, Florida : Vector Associates, 2015. | 2015 |
Includes bibliographical references

Identifiers: LCCN 2015044520 (print) | LCCN 2015045690 (ebook) |
ISBN 9780930808105 (alk. paper) | ISBN 093080810X (alk. paper) |
ISBN 9780930808112 ()

Subjects: LCSH: Science--Philosophy. | Reality. | String models. |
Quantum theory.

Classification: LCC Q175 .V6384 2015 | DDC 111--dc23 LC record
available at <http://lccn.loc.gov/2015044520>

ISDN 978-0-930808-10-5

Table of Contents

Preface	1
Chapter 1	
Defining the problem and recognizing there is a problem	3
Science philosophy	5
The weakness of mathematics	12
Where did the error start	13
How our science philosophy was changed	15
The essence of the problem	15
Chapter 2	
The Theory of Multidimensional Reality	17
The basic theory	17
Creating analogies to describe and information theory of existence	18
The videotape analogy	18
Relationship between matter, energy, information, and reality	20
What is light and what is time.	21
The computer analogy	22
The main clock cycle	23
Cooperating evidence	28
The synchronizing and resynchronizing frequencies	28
Redefining dimensions	30
The first dimension	30
The second dimension, the transmission dimension	31
The third dimension of matter	32
The fourth dimension	33
The fifth dimension	33
The sixth dimension	34
The seventh dimension	34
The eighth dimension	36
Gravity	36
Gravity wave experiments that may prove the universe is a hologram.	38

Quasars and where the energy comes from	38
Kirilian photography and the phantom leaf effect	41
Multidimensional Reality explanation	42
Proof of the carrier wave of existence	46
Mysteries of the pyramid	46
The explanation of these mysteries	47
Chapter conclusion	49
Chapter 3	
The Atom and how it is created	51
What we know about the Atom and the light they produce	51
Atomic jumping beans	54
Subatomic Tracks	54
String theory verses quantum mechanics	56
Some basic physics terms	58
Planck's constant	58
Planck's length	58
Planck's time	59
The natural logarithm e	59
The basics of the model	60
The carrier wave concept	62
Planck's constant	63
The information for the elements	64
The Delay in the propagation of the information	66
Modeling the atom	67
Closed-end string theory	69
The electron	70
Black body radiation	70
Fine structure	71
Fine structure constant	71
Isotopes and error in the Universe	73
Atomic fusion and fission	75
Deja Vu	75
Chapter 4	
Why was the Universe created?	77
In the Beginning	77
Summary of what we think we know	77
The answer is in Genesis	78
An advanced civilization—The Builders	79

The simple reason	79
Man	81
The ultimate question: why was the universe created?	81
The answer	82
How about us?	83
Conclusion	84
Appendix A	Table of Stars 85
Appendix B	The elements spectral lines 91
Appendix C	Spectral lines of the Carbon Atom 97
Appendix D	Unusual proof of the Carrier wave 99

Dedication

To

I had to think hard about who I would give the most credit to my ability to prove this information theory of existence. I came up with the following scientists: Dr. Thomas Gold, Dr. Bart J. Bok and the hundreds of other astronomers, astrophysicists, mathematicians who work tireless hours late at night trying to measure the distances, location and output of the stars in our Galaxy. For their great work in producing catalogs of the stars and trying to make sense of the great mystery, they see in the heavens. Without their work, I would have had a much harder time trying to prove the Theory of Multidimensional Reality.

Preface

This book is a pure philosophy of science book. The book presents an information theory of existence that is totally different from what you were taught in college or universities. Earlier versions of the theory were presented in three of my previous books, which covered many other subjects besides science philosophy. The first book *Reality Revealed, The Theory of Multidimensional Reality* dates back to 1977. That book covered the beginning of this theory/philosophy and applied it to some of the phonemes in science. Other authors have “borrowed” this theory of existence and applied it to various subjects. Some authors just changed the name but tried to describe the same thing, but it was obvious they did not understand it. Motion pictures also used parts of the Theory of Multidimensional Reality in various ways. It appears I am the first to describe and apply an information theory of existence to many of the toughest phenomena in the Universe. This current book represents about 45 years of research in most of the hard sciences including astronomy, geophysics, electronics, physics, etc. In my first book, I even had a chapter on psychic phenomena, by which I explained many of the paranormal phenomena using this information theory of existence. Even though there was only one chapter out of twelve that was dedicated to explaining parapsychology, the Library of Congress originally indexed the book *Psychical research*, which I could never understand. In mid April of 1994, I had the opportunity to visit the Library of Congress in Washington D.C. I asked them why they indexed it that way and requested the classification be changed. Much to my surprise they told me that one of the intelligence agencies in the U.S. Government reclassified my book on April 4th just two weeks before, to *Philosophy of Science (Q175.V638 1978)*.

The Theory of Multidimensional Reality answers the three most difficult questions in the Universe: Why was the Universe created? If God created the Universe then who created God? And finally the big one: What is man’s purpose in the Uni-

verse? This philosophy is the only one that can logically answer all three of these eternal questions.

Some of you may think that a science philosophy book is irrelevant to your everyday life. You cannot be more wrong. The philosophy presented is what I call a *Foundation Philosophy*. Such a philosophy is one that everything, including all science observations and experiments, are built upon and filtered through. All philosophies are derived from a foundation philosophy. Currently, society's foundation philosophy is a matter-oriented theory of the Universe thanks to Aristotle and the Church. You will learn where man made a terrible mistake. Such a philosophy prevents man from discovering how the Universe works and that there are cycles in time that almost completely destroys everything we have created including man.

"Let no one be slow to seek wisdom when he is young, nor weary in the search of it when he has grown old. For no age is too early or too late for the benefits of Philosophy." Epicurus, Letter to Menoeceus

Chapter 1

Defining the Problem

There are only two ways to explain how the Universe works. The currently accepted teaching is that matter is the dominant thing in the Universe, and everything could be explained by understanding the relationship between matter and energy. The only alternative explanation is that the Universe is the product of information. The information creates the matter world we live in, and it is transmitted from another time-space relationship, into our time and space to create our reality. Only one philosophy of these two philosophies can be correct.

Some thirty years after my first book *Reality Revealed, the Theory of Multidimensional Reality* (1977), I expanded and refined the theory in my third book *God's Day of Judgment, the Real Cause of Global Warming* (2007). The main purpose of both books was to explain what caused the geomagnetic reversals, the ice ages, mass extinctions and why they occur together. The Theory of Multidimensional Reality is used as the foundation philosophy that explains all of the phenomena associated with these events and why they occur cyclically through time. It has now been 39 years since I first presented this information theory of existence. I felt it was time to dedicate a book covering only the Theory of Multidimensional Reality without the distractions of other subjects. The book will cover how the theory explains all the major building blocks of our Universe such as magnetism, gravity, light, mass, and time.

First let us define what is philosophy. The dictionary definition is: The search for truth wisdom or knowledge through logical reasoning rather than factual observation, an analysis of the grounds of and concepts expressing fundamental beliefs. Philosophy is the theory or logical analysis of the principles underlying conduct, thought, knowledge, and the nature of the Universe. I would disagree with this liberal arts definition and add that a philosophy can also be proven right or wrong by factual observation using the scientific process.

4 Defining & Recognizing there is a the Problem

A philosophy enables us to recognize objects and ideas and place them in coherent, understandable categories. A foundation philosophy is one that all other ideas and scientific models are built upon and filtered through. Everything starts with an idea—even the Universe. An idea can develop into a complete philosophy. In the fields of science, a philosophy will create a model that would be tested against known observable phenomena. Philosophers throughout history have dealt with the question of existence. What is existence? What is being? What is reality? Unfortunately, the people who have pondered these great questions were limited by their scope of knowledge and discoveries. The experiences and knowledge we have accumulated throughout a lifetime are the limiting factors that allow us to abstract, conceptualize, or analogize in this reality. These experiences are the tools that enable us to develop a foundation philosophy that will hopefully answer the three most difficult questions in the Universe, which I listed in the Preface. If your philosophy cannot answer these three ultimate questions you better face the obvious—you have nothing, and you better start from scratch. It is better to recognize the fact you do not know then to continue with a dead-end philosophy.

A philosophy is a collection of ideas, which is supposed to create a model to help you understand the Universe around you. If your model of the Universe is incorrect, you have a difficult time understanding the phenomena you see. I give you this analogy to help you to understand the problem. Imagine you have a 10,000 piece puzzle with random shapes and colors, but collectively they form a larger recognizable picture. To make matters more difficult, you do not have a finished picture of what the puzzle looks like when put together. The picture is analogous to a philosophy. If you do not have the finished picture or if you have the wrong picture, then it is much harder to know where the pieces fit together. Without the correct picture, you will need thousands of people working endless hours to piece the puzzle together. The Theory of Multidimensional Reality is a better more accurate picture of how the Universe really works. Some of the conclusions this theory is going to be ego

shattering for many of you so put your ego and your degrees aside and think hard about what is presented. The way our Universe was created there is a cyclical time limit for man to understand how the Universe really works, and we are running out of time.

Philosophies come in different forms. Some are religious philosophies, and some are science philosophies. Today these two philosophies are diametrically opposed to one another. The majority of scientists and academicians believe there is no God. The theologians believe God exists in spite of what they may or may not know about Roman history. One would assume that a science philosophy that could explain all known phenomena in the Universe would also prove the existence of God and explain His relationship to His creation. I contend the Theory of Multidimensional Reality accomplishes that.

Science Philosophy

Determinism is the predominant philosophy in current day science. This is the end result of a matter-oriented philosophy of the Universe. It is the pragmatic viewpoint of an engineer who needs to know the cause and effect of his environment so outcomes can be predicted, and products can be built with predictable results. The words science and physics are derived from the word physical that denotes the study of the matter world, the structure of matter and the Universe, including its measurement. The scientific process is about performing experiments and related fact-based theorizing that predicts things that can be verified and repeated. This approach is fine for producing products with consistent performance and results.

There is nothing wrong with this approach to science but it fails when you try to explain the subatomic world or explain the causes of magnetism, gravity, light and mass. What eventually happens is when a scientist discovers a phenomenon that cannot be explained, they just bypass it or come up with a workaround. Many times they just ignore it because its solution would represent too much of their time and money to find the correct answer. The worst situation for the academic status quo

6 Defining & Recognizing there is a the Problem

is the discovery of a phenomenon that cannot be explained using the “accepted theories,” and that to acknowledge such a phenomenon would mean the repudiation of “accepted theories.” It could also result in the possible tarnishing of a scientists’ reputation and/or the potential elimination of any future government grant money. Besides, the science philosophy they were taught in college gave a plausible answer to many phenomena even if they only worked within a narrow range of instances.

String theories of various approaches have made somewhat of a departure from the quantum mechanics approach to understanding gravity and light. So far experimental cooperation is nonexistent and unprovable. Dr. Jeffrey Harvey of the University of Chicago, who is a proponent of String theory, was reported saying “What am I doing spending my whole career on something that can’t be tested experimentally?” I will cover this subject in Chapter Three.

Sir Karl R. Poppers’ philosophy on scientific theories was that they can never be proven, only falsified. Therefore, they should be used as calculation tools and not as religious dogma. Admitting something is wrong or “I don’t know” is the beginning of a discovery and the end of wasting time and money on a dead-end theory.

There have been over 40 philosophers since the time of the Hebrews and the classical Greeks to the modern age, that have debated the importance between mind and matter. Was mind the dominant force in the Universe or was there nothing more than matter? It appears the atomists had won out. Maybe because we are so attached to our physical bodies we find it difficult to believe there could be anything else in the Universe.

Before I present the thoughts of some past scientist philosophers, I want to give my observation as to whom I would describe as a philosopher-scholar. I have observed that out of 100 rabbis, ministers, physicists, scientists, etc. only about one to two percent are what I would call a real scholar. Most are just practitioners or technicians of their field but do not delve into the “why” and “how” of the most difficult questions. In

the modern era there have been a few very notable physicist-philosophers who hinted that the Universe was something other than what they were taught and that there was something more than the traditional four dimensions (length, width, depth and time). Some of these famous scientists knew there was something wrong with the accepted philosophies and wrote about their doubts to friends and in lectures. With that said, the following are without question philosopher-scholars in their fields even though I may not agree with everything they have written and thought.

Sir Arthur Eddington, the outstanding scientist of Great Britain in the Twentieth Century (*The Nature of the Physical World*) stated:

“Not in the dim past but continuously by conscious mind is the miracle of creation wrought. The idea of a universal Mind or Logos would be, I think, a fairly plausible inference from the present state of science theory. ... To put the conclusions crudely, the stuff of the world is mind-stuff... consciousness is not sharply defined but fades into sub-consciousness and beyond that we must postulate something indefinite but yet continuous with our mental nature ... it is difficult for the matter of fact physicist to accept the view that the substratum of everything is of mental character.”

Albert Einstein wrote:

“You will hardly find one among the profoundly scientific minds without a peculiar religious feeling of his own . . . his religious feelings takes the form of a rapturous amazement at the harmony of natural law, which reveals an intelligence of such superiority that, compared with it, all the systematic thinking and acting of human beings is an utter insignificant reflection.”

The English Scientist, Sir James Jeans, from Cambridge

University, wrote:

“The Universe begins to look more like a great thought than like a great machine. Mind no longer appears as an accidental intruder into the realm of matter; we are beginning to suspect that we ought rather to hail it as the creator and governor of the realm of matter.”

“we suspect it [the Universe] is all waves and nothing but waves.”

“The old dualism of mind and matter, which was mainly responsible for the supposed hostility, seems likely to disappear, not through matter becoming in any way more shadowy or insubstantial than heretofore, or through minds becoming resolved into a function of the working of matter, but through substantial matter resolving itself into a creation and a manifestation of mind.”

Richard Feynman commenting on the state of affairs in quantum mechanics during his November 1964 Cornell Lectures entitled the Character of Physical Law stated:

“It always bothers me that, according to the laws as we understand them today, it takes a computing machine an infinite number of logical operations to figure out what goes on in no matter how tiny a region of space, and no matter how tiny a region of time. How can all that be going on in that tiny space? Why should it take an infinite amount of logic to figure out what one tiny piece of space/time is going to do? So I have often made the hypothesis that ultimately physics will not require a mathematical statement, that in the end the machinery will be revealed, and the laws will turn out to be simple, like the checker board with all its apparent complexities.”

The only scientist-mathematician-cyberneticist that came close to hinting that the Universe was the product of information

was David Foster in his 1975 book *The Intelligent Universe*. He saw the similarity between the DNA and the principles of computer cybernetic control of systems or processes. The important principle he established was the controlling computer that exercises the cybernetic control over something must operate at a much faster processing speed than the process it is controlling. In other words, whatever is controlling our Universe must be operating at processing speeds faster than what it is controlling.

As you can see, some of the most famous mathematician and physicists intuitively knew something was wrong with their matter oriented, scientific theories. I should also include Schrödinger, who also hinted that he did not believe the concept of matter as fundamental. All of these scientists had given up the deterministic mechanical theories of the Universe. Unfortunately, none of them ever took it to the next step by asking themselves “What if the Universe was the product of information? How would we explain what magnetism, gravity, matter, and light are?” I cannot find any evidence where they tried to create any philosophical models that would tackle these weighty questions. They collectively continued to beat this matter theory of existence into the ground.

Today we are faced with the problem of explaining what mass is. For that reason we have two philosophical camps to describe matter and gravity. On one side are the physicists that prescribe to the Standard Model in quantum mechanics and the other camp defend and promote the various String theories, the latest being M-theory. I will later cover these different philosophies, not with the intention of torturing the reader with long explanations, but merely to show that both sides have built a house of cards on talcum power. Both are partially right and partially wrong. I should also note for the reader that both camps had been and are currently dominated by armchair mathematician.

The results of what we know or do not know about our Universe are:

1. Space is curved by large massive celestial bodies.
2. There was a beginning of the Universe we call the Big Bang. We do not know where it came from before the Big Bang, but something cannot come from nothing; there has to be a source.
3. We do not know what gravity is. Einstein analogized it as a form of acceleration in four-dimensional time and space. His formulas are workable but not the complete answer. He did not explain what causes gravity. You cannot know what gravity is unless you know what is mass.
4. Objects get smaller in gravitational fields and time slows down.
5. Whatever matter is, it is made up of waveforms.
6. Planck's constant is the ultimate building block of the energy of the Universe, but no one knows why. It represents one electrical wave.
7. We do not know why the natural log e exists in our Universe.
8. Mass and energy are the same, but we do not know why.
9. We do not know what mass is, which is what causes gravity. Without knowing what mass is, it is premature stating what causes gravity.
10. What is electricity, the electron? Is it a black hole?
11. What is light? Is it a particle or a waveform?
12. What is magnetism?
13. What is time?
14. What is consciousness and life?

You would think that after several hundred years since the birth of the scientific process, someone would have asked the basic question: Something is wrong with our foundation philosophy. Maybe matter is not the dominant 'thing' in the Universe, and there is something else? Only after the last eight years have some physicists come to the conclusion that our reality is a hologram. The traditional theories are

currently workable only within a narrow framework. Many scientists have found that their disciplines break down at the limits. Then another scientist comes along to try to expand our understanding based on the earlier work. However, no one has been able to explain the total picture or even to define the most basic definitions of their discipline. We should all try to use a logical approach in science, but the logical approach can only be used where our underlying principles are firmly understood and are correct. Unfortunately, many of the phenomena in our Universe, or reality, are not understood at all. Much of the thought processes and assumptions we employ fail at the limits of our reality.

The following quote mirrors what I am conveying. It comes from the late Imre Lakatos who had a Ph.D. in Philosophy of Mathematics and Science from the University of Cambridge. He stated from his book *Science and Pseudo-Science*:

“Scientists have thick skins. They do not abandon a theory merely because facts contradict it. They normally either invent some rescue hypothesis to explain what they then call a mere anomaly or, if they cannot explain the anomaly, they ignore it and direct their attention to other problems. Note that scientists talk about anomalies, recalcitrant instances, not refutations. History of science, of course, is full of accounts of how crucial experiments allegedly killed theories. But such accounts are fabricated long after the theory had been abandoned. What really counts are dramatic, unexpected, stunning predictions: a few of them are enough to tilt the balance; where theory lags behind the facts, we are dealing with miserable degenerating research programs. Now, how do scientific revolutions come about? If we have two rival research programs, and one is progressing while the other is degenerating, scientists tend to join the progressive program. This is the rationale of scientific revolutions... Criticism is not a Popperian

quick kill, by refutation. Important criticism is always constructive: there is no refutation without a better theory. Kuhn is wrong in thinking that scientific revolutions are sudden, irrational changes in vision. The history of science refutes both Popper and Kuhn: on close inspection both Popperian crucial experiments and Kuhnian revolutions turn out to be myths: what normally happens is that progressive research programs replace degenerating ones.” [Imre Lakatos, *Science and Pseudo-Science*, Pages 96-102 of Godfrey Vesey (editor), *Philosophy in the Open*, Open University Press, Milton Keynes, 1974.]

The Weakness of Mathematics

For the last 130 years, mathematicians have dominated the field of physics. As stated earlier, we still do not know what magnetism, gravity, light and mass/matter are beside the other phenomena listed previously.

Math is an invaluable tool to explain abstract ideas, but it can be misused. In fact, many people who know the power of mathematical description have misused it. However, the real power of math is not in its descriptive application but in our ability to use it to evolve to abstract concepts. This is math’s real forté. When you work with numbers long enough they can make anything fit your conceptual view of a problem. This is where the weakness of the “tool” is most pronounced. The final formula is the least important to the math process. The thought process is the most important. If the logic is wrong, the math will not show it. In fact, math can “prove” faulty logic is correct.

The problem with the heavy reliance on mathematical modeling to explain these phenomena is that the mathematician seems not to appreciate fully the fact that higher math is only a tool. The philosophy has to come first. I will explain with this simple analogy. Let us take a building contractor. His tools are saws, hammers, drills, planers, glue, paint brushes, etc. He uses these tools to build a structure based on an architect’s plans, but if the architects’ plans are flawed the builder will construct

a building that may fall or rot away in a few years. The point being that the tools and their correct application cannot show a faulty plan incorrect.

Math is similar. Math is just a tool that can express almost any type of reality the skilled mathematician chooses to use. That is the weakness of the tool. It cannot prove faulty logic incorrect because it can describe almost any kind of reality. An example of this is in General Relativity that concludes the existence of black holes with infinite gravity. The first question that should have been asked is: can black holes even exist in our reality? Another example is with String theory. It is entirely created out of a very complicated long math construct and not from observed facts. With ten or more dimensions and unobtainable experiments to prove it one way or another, it borders on faith, not science. In science, unobserved speculations do not disprove observed facts. An example of such faulty logic is from Dirac, "It is more important to have beauty in one's equations, than to have them fit experiment."² The problem with his kind of thinking is that he forgot that the math is merely a tool to understand the experimental results not that the math is the end result.

Where Did the Error Start

The matter oriented theory of the existence is very old in origin. They were first expressed by the Greek atomists, Leucippus (440 B.C.E.) and Democritus (420 B.C.E.). They taught that nothing exists, except atoms and the great void. Plato's book, *The Sophist*, says,

Some of them [the atomists] drag down everything from heaven and the invisible to earth, actually grasping rocks and trees with their hands; for they lay their hands on all such things and maintain stoutly that that alone exists which can be touched and handled; for they define existence and body, or matter, as identical, and if anyone says that anything else, which has no body, exists, they despise him utterly, and will not listen to any other theory than their own.³

14 Defining & Recognizing there is a the Problem

This sounds exactly like what goes on in academia today. Non-matter oriented theories of existence existed at the time of Plato and long before him. The Jewish concept of the Universe I would conclude is correct, which is “As long as God thinks the Universe, it exists.” Implying the Universe is the product of a thought form, which is correct. The problem the Jews had at that time was that it was difficult finding analogies to help describe their philosophy. Plato used a cave analogy to try to explain existence and the Universe:

‘And now, I said, let me show in a figure how far our nature is enlightened or unenlightened: — Behold! Human beings living in an underground den, which has a mouth open toward the light and reaching all along the den; here they have been from their childhood and have their legs and necks chained so that they cannot move, and can only see before them, being prevented by the chains from turning round their heads. Above and behind them a fire is blazing at a distance, and between the fire and the prisoners there is a raised way, and you will see, if you look, a low wall built along the way, like the screen which marionette players have in front of them, over which they show the puppets.’

‘I see.’

‘And do you see, I said, men passing along the wall carrying all sorts of vessels, and statues and figures of animals made of wood and stone and various materials, which appear over the wall? Some of them are talking, others silent.

You have shown me a strange image, and they are strange prisoners.

Like ourselves, I replied; and they see only their own shadows, or the shadows of one another, which the fire throws on the opposite wall of the cave.’²⁴

Plato is saying that what we perceive in this reality is analogous to the shadows projected on the wall of the cave.

Man thinks reality is what he sees, but it is really something else.

The philosophies and attitudes of the atomists most closely resemble the philosophies and behavior of modern-day scientists and academia. Solon, Plato, and the Jews fought this kind of philosophy for hundreds of years. Today nobody in academia even questions it. The atomists had won two thousand years ago.

How Our Science Philosophy Was Changed.

I feel it is important people understand why the science was changed after the second century and who did it. Only a very few scholars in Roman history know this information but it is time everyone know why and who.

The Catholic Church taught the philosophies of Aristotle from the second to the eighteenth century. His works were almost elevated to the status of holy. The writings attributed to Aristotle are the origin for the current day matter oriented theory of existence. The academic narrative for the history of Aristotle was that he was a philosophy student of Plato and that he took over Plato's school after his death. In all of Plato's writings Aristotle is not mentioned once. His name is only inserted by footnote by the translators usually stating that Aristotle wrote also this. There was an Aristotle mentioned by other Greek writers but as an admiral in Alexander the Great's navy. The Roman writer/geographer Strabo (his full name is better known as Julius Creaser, Strabo was his family name) also mentions an Aristotle but only as a geographer, most likely the hobby of the Admiral while he was invading other countries with Alexander. Another Roman writer who mentions Aristotle was Plutarch, which was one of the pseudonyms of a very powerful Roman aristocrat. Plutarch repeats the same story written by Strabo. Neither writer mention Aristotle as a philosopher. At this point real scholars of Roman history know exactly who to blame.

The Essence of the Problem

The essence of the problem we face is transitioning from the finite to the infinite. For our finite minds to approach the

infinite, we have to use all of our resources. We have been taught that infinity cannot be understood by the finite mind. We have been taught that some concepts are beyond the minds of men. I am going to show you why this is not true, that the perceived complexity of the Universe results from an inaccurate picture of reality. To understand infinity is to understand only what the basic systems are. You cannot understand the basic systems unless you have an understanding of the systems underlying principle.

The best way to conclude this section is a quote from Dr. Lee Smolin, research physicist at the Perimeter Institute in Waterloo, Canada.

A successful unification of quantum theory and relativity would necessarily be a theory of the Universe as a whole. It would tell us, as Aristotle and Newton did before, what space and time are, what the cosmos is, what things are made of, and what kind of laws those things obey. Such a theory will bring about a radical shift—a revolution—in our understanding of what nature is. It must also have wide repercussions, and will likely bring about, or contribute to, a shift in our understanding of ourselves and our relationship to the rest of the Universe.⁵

I sincerely believe that the Theory of Multidimensional Reality has fulfilled Dr. Smolin's requirements and that it shows that the Universe is the product of information.

Endnotes

1 New York Times article of December 7, 2004. *String Theory, at 20, Explains It All (or Not)* by Dennis Overbye.

2 Dirac, 'The Evolution of the Physicist's Picture of Nature', *Scientific American*, May 1963, 208, 47.

3 Plato, *The Sophist*, Vol. 7, pp. 371, Loeb Classical Library, Harvard University Press, 1967.

4 Plato, the Republic, Book VII. Loeb Classical Library, Harvard University Press.

5 Quote attributed to Dr. Smolin in 1977 and listed on the Open-Site Web page: http://open-site.org/Science/Physics/Modern/Theory_of_Everything.