

**Qualified Applause for Frank Tipler's Work on *Physics Of Christianity* BUT  
Respectful Dissent from Tipler's Speculations Based Upon the Copenhagen Interpretation of Quantum  
Mechanics and the Minkowskian/CurvedSpacetime Interpretation of Relativity**

by

**Robert W. Bass**

Frank Tipler is a brilliant, extraordinarily creative and almost unbelievably diligent theoretical physicist.

Certainly, in virtually every subject upon which he has written, it is evident from his literature citations, and exhaustively thorough discussions, that he has delved into the subject far more deeply than have I, and so it is painful for me to have to qualify my enthusiastic recommendation of his *magnum opus Physics of Christianity*, Doubleday 2007, with some very specific caveats, which I shall now send to Professor Tipler on the grounds that it is unethical to criticize someone's work behind his back.

I have attempted to promote the sale of Prof. Tipler's book by posting upon my website <http://www.innoventek.com>, as Article 21 of its Philosophy sub-site <http://www.innoventek.com/philosophy.html>, the Covers & back-cover Blurbs and Table of Contents of his **utterly unique** and **pricelessly invaluable book**, which contains information of **epochal importance** for the future of humanity that has not appeared anywhere else in readily-accessible form, to the best of my current knowledge:

<http://www.innoventek.com/TiplerPhysicsOfChristianityContentsAndExcerpts.pdf>

Suppose that someone was offering at a Public Auction an unopened Treasure Chest, to whose contents you had been privileged to have a preliminary peek, and you knew that it was jam-packed with priceless diamonds & pearls & rubies & sapphires of unprecedented size & quality -- but also contained a few rusty knives and broken sabers that could be easily discarded without affecting the value of the hoard of jewels. Would you discourage your friends from bidding on it, or just keep quiet and then advise the lucky winner of the auction to discard the irrelevant junk and place the true gems in the place of honor in a public museum?

In my opinion this is a fair analogy to Dr. Tipler's book.

If only I could persuade him to exercise the same thoroughness, that he has on so many subjects, upon my posted dissents from "mainstream interpretations of basic physics" and perceive that the remedies which I advocate in numerous articles on my Science sub-site <http://www.innoventek.com/science.html> are not only viable but mandatory, and that then he would agree that the evidence is overwhelming that Quantum Mechanics (QM) and Quantum Electrodynamics (QED) need to be replaced by the Fenjes/Nelson Stochastic Mechanics (SM) and the Boyer/de la Pena-Cetto/Sakharov-Haisch-Rueda-Puthoff Stochastic Electrodynamics (SED), and that the Minkowski interpretation of Einstein's Special Relativity (SR) needs to be replaced by the Lorentz-Fitzgerald-Larmor-Ives interpretation while, the "curved space-time" interpretation of General Relativity (GR) needs to be replaced by the H.A. Wilson derivation of Einstein's gravitational field equations from Maxwell's equations of electromagnetism!

In short, "modern physics" needs to be replaced by a **neo-classical physics** which would NOT seem weird or bizarre to Euclid or Newton or Maxwell, but is consistent with the views that I have expressed in my essay claiming that "Three And One-Half of the Five Great Problems of Physics Have ALEADY Been Solved!," by qualified authors in reputable archival journals, and have never been refuted, but simply ignored! <http://www.innoventek.com/ThreeAndOneHalfOfTheFiveGreatProblemsOfPhysicsHaveAlreadyBeenSolved.pdf>

*Inter alia*, Prof. Tipler believes in the reality of **Black Holes** and in the QM-required **Multiverse**.

But if he will take note of Einstein's insistence that GR is incomplete without Mach's Principle, and then consult the hundreds of pages of rigorous calculations in my doing just that (and finding consistency with the two-dozen then available measurements of the Eddington-Robertson Parameter, showing that Dicke had got the wrong sign on the Dicke Coupling Constant used to include Mach's Principle via the Brans-Dicke theory), which are available on the Science sub-site of my website, presenting the Bass Gravitational Mach's Principle, and if he will then take note of my papers on an Electrostatic Mach's Principle, and the de la Pena/Cetto Electromagnetic Mach's Principle, hopefully he will agree with me that "**Three Mach's and You're Out!**" regarding the **alleged** weirdness of "modern physics."

I am going to post this on my website adjacent to my favorable advertisement of his invaluable book, and if he deigns to send a reasoned reply to my "Three Mach's" argument I'll post it also!