3-3-(5)	Gallium	31	4-3-(5)	Indium	49
3-3-(4)	Germanium	32	4-3-(4)	Tin	50
3-3-(3)	Arsenic	33	4-3-(3)	Antimony	51
3-3-(2)	Selenium	34	4-3-(2)	Tellurium	52
3-3-(1)	Bromine	35	4-3-(1)	Iodine	53
4-3-1	Caesium	55	4-4-1	Francium	87
4-3-2	Barium	56	4-4-2	Radium	88
4-3-3	Lanthanum	57	4-4-3	Actinium	89
4-3-4	Cerium	58	4-4-4	Thorium	90
4-3-5	Praseodymium	59	4-4-5	Protactinium	91
4-3-6	Neodymium	60	4-4-6	Uranium	92
4-3-7	Promethium	61	4-4-7	Neptunium	93
4-3-8	Samarium	62	4-4-8	Plutonium	94
4-3-9	Europium	63	4-4-9	Americium	95
4-3-10	Gadolinium	64	4-4-10	Curium	96
4-3-11	Terbium	65	4-4-11	Berkelium	97
4-3-12	Dysprosium	66	4-4-12	Californium	98
4-3-13	Holmium	67	4-4-13	Einsteinium	99
4-3-14	Erbium	68	4-4-14	Fermium	100
4-3-15	Thulium	69	4-4-15	Mendelevium	101
4-3-16	Ytterbium	70	4-4-16	Nobelium	102
4-4-(16)	Ytterbium	70	5-4-(16)	Nobelium	102
4-4-(15)	Lutetium	71	5-4-(15)	Lawrencium	103
4-4-(14)	Hafnium	72	5-4-(14)	Rutherfordium	104
4-4-(13)	Tantalum	73	5-4-(13)	Hahnium	105
4-4-(12)	Tungsten	74	5-4-(12)	Seaborgium	106
4-4-(11)	Rhenium	75	5-4-(11)	Bohrium	107
4-4-(10)	Osmium	76	5-4-(10)	Hassium	108
4-4-(9)	Iridium	77	5-4-(9)	Meitnerium	109
4-4-(8)	Platinum	78	5-4-(8)	Ununnilium	110
4-4-(7)	Gold	79	5-4-(7)	Unununium	111
4-4-(6)	Mercury	80	5-4-(6)	Ununbium	112
4-4-(5)	Thallium	81	5-4-(5)		113
4-4-(4)	Lead	82	5-4-(4)		114
4-4-(3)	Bismuth	83	5-4-(3)		115
4-4-(2)	Polonium	84	5-4-(2)		116
4-4-(1)	Astatine	85	5-4-(1)	Larsonium	117
			5-4-0	Post-Larsonium	118

Lanthanoids (Rare Earths) 57-71
Actinoids 89-103

S))

ATOMIC NUMBER EQUATION BASED ON LARSON'S TRIPLETS (a,b,c,)

Where Z represents the Atomic Number, and (a,b,c) is the number triplet representing the atoms

$$1) \quad Z + 2 = \frac{(a-1)(a)(2a-1) + b(b+1)(2b+1)}{3} + c$$

If **a = b** then this reduces to

$$2) \quad Z + 2 = \frac{2b(2b^2 + 1)}{3} + c$$

If **a = b + 1** then it reduces to

$$3) \quad z + 2 = \frac{2b(b + 1)(2b + 1)}{3} + c$$

a=b		a = b+1		Range of c	Z	Range of Z
a	b	a	b			
		2	1	-1 to 4	c + 2	1 to 6
2	2			-4 to 4	c + 10	6 to 14
		3	2	-4 to 9	c + 18	14 to 27
3	3			-8 to 9	c + 36	28 to 45
		4	3	-8 to 16	c + 54	46 to 70
4	4			-15 to 16	c + 86	71 to 102
		5	4	-15 to -1	c + 118	103 to 117

Equation 1) is exactly representative of Dewey Larson's algorithm.

Equations 2) and 3) are just simplifications of eq.1) when a = b and a = b + 1 resp..

Some specific examples:-

Larsonium 5-4-(1) substituted into eq.3) gives Z = 117 as expected, however there is an interesting aside to consider, despite its counter-intuitive appearance and it requires some interpretation within RST too.

Particle/Atom	a-b-c	`*Atomic Number'* Z
	0-0-(1)	-3
Electron	1-0-(1)	-3
Rotational base	1-0-0	-2
	0-0-0	-2
	0-0-1	-1
Positron	1-0-1	-1
Neutrino	1-1-(1)	-1
Neutron	1-1-0	0
Deuteron	1-1-0	0
Alpha Particle	1-1-0	0
Deuterium	1-1-1	1

APPENDIX

We have to consider the original `*oscillating space unit'* (photon or duplon) being rotated about its centre to `*form a disc-like laminar'*, and then this `*disc'* is further rotated about a diameter to form a `*sphere or ellipsoid'.*

One question that arises is whether to deem the mass to be located at the centre of the `*sphere or ellipsoid'*, (centre of gravity), or whether we consider the mass to be located at the surface as though it is a hollow shell, since the Moment of Inertia, (I), is grounded on one's definition of the particle, based on it having an apparent spherical (or ellipsoidal) shape:

MOMENT OF INERTIA (I)

1a) A sphere, about axis, coinciding with a diameter
1b) A spherical shell (hollow sphere, with surface of infinitesimal thickness) about axis, coinciding with a diameter

$$\mathbf{I_{sphere}} = \frac{2}{5}ma^2 \quad , \quad \mathbf{I_{spherical\ shell}} = \frac{2}{3}ma^2$$

2a) An ellipsoid, about axis, coinciding with semi-axis `c'.
2b) An ellipsoidal shell (hollow ellipsoid, with surface of infinitesimal thickness)

$$\mathbf{I_{ellipsoid}} = \frac{1}{5}m(a^2 + b^2) \quad , \quad \mathbf{I_{ellipsoidal\ shell}} = \frac{1}{3}m(a^2 + b^2)$$

It is certain that the atoms are all contained within a spherical boundary, but perhaps some subatoms may be elliptical.

(Yet to be determined)

The Angular Momentum about the centre of the sphere or ellipse is

$$\mathbf{Angular\ Momentum} = \mathbf{I}.\omega \quad \mathbf{where} \quad \omega = \frac{d\theta}{dt}$$

NEWTON'S LAWS

Newton's Laws of Motion, despite their applicability in linear motion in the local environment, have been shown to be deficient on

the large scale when calculating orbits of satellites etc., due to a limited range of applicability and that they relate exclusively to point masses and rigid bodies, neither of which are evident in physical interactions. Therefore they have had to be amended or replaced by Relativity equations, since no other competing paradigm emerged.

INTRACTANCE

In the case of rigid body circular motion, such as a spinning wheel or gyroscope, the Newtonian equations have been known to be deficient for many decades. Relativity does not seem to be adaptable to gyroscopes. There have been several proponents of a new approach, to put at least one more term in the usual equations, which term includes a quantity, called *"Intractance"*. This arises concomitantly when considering the rate of change of velocity direction, which produces the constant centripetal acceleration and hence the centripetal force for the gyroscope, when in fact there is another force, generated by the rate of change of direction of the centripetal acceleration/force. This finding led to a general investigation into intractance. Intractance can be regarded as *"the resistance of the system to a change of inertial field"*. Intractance may also be regarded as analogous to self-inductance representing the resistance of a coil to a change in magnetic field.

NEWTON'S EQUATIONS OF MOTION

Newton's Laws are based on a constant acceleration and are integrated from F = ma. Initial conditions are t = s = o, v = u.
In Newton's equations of motion, there are 5 pronumerals, (t,s,v,a,u), of which 2 are constants, (u,a).

$$\frac{d^2s}{dt^2} = a \quad , \quad \frac{ds}{dt} = v = u + at$$

$$s = ut + \tfrac{1}{2}at^2 = vt - \tfrac{1}{2}at^2 = \tfrac{1}{2}t(u + v)$$

$$v^2 = u^2 + 2as$$

TRADITIONAL DIMENSIONAL ANALYSIS (DA)

It has been common practice to analyse an equation to see that both sides of the equation agree when analysed dimensionally. The most common three symbols used in motion are for Mass, Length and Time (MLT). When there is a constant of proportionality, that correlates two quantities/qualities, involved in an equation, then there is usually a disagreement in the dimensional analysis, so the constant is accorded its own dimensions just to balance that analysis. What is mostly overlooked, is that, that very constant is itself a quality, that deserves more attention, and in many cases merits a name of its own.

This became very much the case in gyroscopic motion in early 20th Century, (in particular), and then extended back into any non-linear motion, with the constant of proportionality, now named *"Intractance"*, and eventually deconstructed to subsume mass and *"Temporance"*.

(See below)

S))Q

NON-LINEAR MOTION & TEMPORANCE

One such derivation for Intractance starts with $F = MK = Ma + Q_1J$ where K is a constant, $Q_1 = MD$ is the intractance and J is da/dt and is the surge (jerk, rate-of-onset). D is the mass modifier, and it is the temporal aspect of the intractance, called the *"Temporance"*.

NEWTON'S EQUATIONS OF MOTION (EXTENDED)

In the equations for non-linear motion there are 8 pronumerals, (t,s,v,a,J,u,a_0,J_0), of which 3 are constants, (u,a_0,J_0). Initial conditions are $t = s = 0$, $J = J_0$, $a = a_0$, $v = u$

$$D.\frac{d^3s}{dt^3} + \frac{d^2s}{dt^2} = DJ + a = DJ_0 + a_0$$

$$s = D^2(a - a_0) + \tfrac{1}{2}t^2(DJ_0 + a_0) + t(u - D^2J_0)$$

$$s = D^2(a - a_0) - \tfrac{1}{2}t^2(DJ_\circ + a_0) + t[v + D(a - a_0) - D^2J_0]$$

$$s = \tfrac{1}{2}t[u + v - 2D^2J_0 + D(a - a_0)] + D^2(a - a_0)$$

$$v = u - D(a - a_0) + t(DJ_0 + a_0)$$

$$[v + D(a - a_0)]^2 = u^2 + 2(DJ_0 + a_0)[s - D^2(a - a_0)]$$

$$J = J_0.e^{\frac{-t}{D}} \quad , \quad a - a_0 = -D(J - J_0)$$

You can see from these equations, that they subsume Newton's equations, by looking at the limiting case where $J = 0$ and $a_0 = a$ thereby illustrating that Newton's original equations are only a rough approximation to describing motion. Also, we don't need to bring relativity into orbital calculations.

This extended look at Intractance and its higher forms led William Davis to propose:-

"Fourth Law of Motion.

The energy of a given system can only be changed in some finite length of time, depending on the system, and NEVER in zero time."

S))Q

GYROSCOPES

Angular Momentum for a sphere = $I\omega = 2M\omega r^2/5$ (ML^2T^{-1})
where $\omega^2 = a^2 + b^2 + c^2$, (in natural units), for an atom or subatom [a-b-c]. To evaluate the actual rate of spin in radians per second is presently beyond me, but I think that Ron Satz wrote such a paper some time back. This would enable us to know the actual kinetic energy of each atom in c.g.s, and therefore how much energy we need to disturb its spin-axis.

Similarly we could design experiments to evaluate the Lazer value of each atom and therefore the magnitude of the four restoring forces.

Rate of change of radial velocity = centripetal acceleration = a
$a = v\omega = r\omega^2 = v^2/r$, therefore centripetal force = $Ir\omega^2$
towards the centre of the circle of revolution

Additional Rotatory Force $F_2 = Q_1.J$ is the first adjustment to the force of a spherical gyroscope gives:-

$$\mathbf{F_1 = Iv\omega = Ir\omega^2}$$

$$\mathbf{F_2 = Q_1 J = IDv\omega^2 = IDr\omega^3}$$

$$\mathbf{F_3 = Q_2 . \frac{dJ}{dt} = ID^2 r\omega^4}$$

$$\mathbf{F_n = Q_{n-1} . r\omega^{n+1} = ID^{n-1} r\omega^{n+1}}$$

Even though we have these two orthogonal gyroscopic forces, we cannot use the triangle of forces since they are not additive in any way.

The centripetal force ($F_1 = Ia$) contributes to the gravitational force, that acts in the opposite direction to the S.S.E and the force ($F_2 = Q_1.J$) only manifests in the direction of the tangent to the pole when there is an attempt to rotate the axis of spin about its centre, and that is why all the atoms of the same element have their axes aligned parallel to each other.

Now, dJ/dt is the rate of change of surge, and its direction is in the radial direction of the centrifugal force, [outward from the centre of spin, (the direction of the normal)], the direction of F_3, while F_4 is in the direction back along the tangential path of v.

Therefore we can see that there is an infinite series of quantities, each differentiated with respect to t from the previous one's vector, (viz. radius vector, velocity, acceleration, surge ....), each fourth one being in the same direction and each one's magnitude being multiplied successively by the Lazer value. Each one from surge onwards has a concomitant constant of proportion, ($Q_1, Q_2, Q_3, ...Q_n$), analogous to mass accompanying acceleration.

Each of these four orthogonal forces are mutually independent from each other and are non-additive. They are restoring forces, only coming into operation when there is a disturbance, so they qualify for the description of being *"potential forces"*. They preserve the atom's stable equilibrium under normal conditions. This allows for extra-normal conditions to override this stability by bringing them into play and thus allowing for the loss of the equilibrium state and consequent breakdown of the very atom. (c.f. Chaos Theory)

So, in the *`ideal state'*, the gyroscope spins without precession until some applied force tilts it, whereupon it starts to precess, upon which the restoring forces come into play and have the ability to return the gyroscope to the non-precessing state.

Notwithstanding the equation of spin for each atomic number, this does not differentiate between the isotopes. They are specified by the value of the gravitational charge in the equation for atomic mass.

IONISATION

It is stated in the texts how to calculate atomic mass from atomic number $\mathbf{A_L = 2.Z + G}$ where **G** represents gravitational charge and can be represented by

$$G = \frac{9I_z(Z + k)^2}{1408}$$ where 30 of the atomic numbers agree with k = 0

13,17,21,26,27,29,30,41,45,47,59,61,63,69,71,
73,74,75,77,78,79,80,81,82,83,88,90,91,92,93.

and where 41 of the atomic numbers agree with k = 2
9,11,22,23,24,25,31,32,33,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,42,43,44,46,48,
49,50,51,52,53,54,55,56,57,58,60,62,64,65,66,67,68,70,72,76

So the value for I_z is the ultimate determinant for the particular isotope. This ionisation level subsumes the temporance as a result of which, in the case of the radioactive elements, their instability is because of the extra value of the temporance.

LAZER VALUE

Each atom of the periodic table has a unique spin, therefore an individual rotational speed, (ω), and therefore a unique product rotational speed x temporance, (ωD), this product is a constant, called the Lazer value, (L_z).

If the Lazer value were > 1 we would have a divergent series, so then it must always be < 1 and then the force magnitude converges.
Each atom has its unique spin and its unique temporance, but what is unknown at this stage of the investigation, is whether:-

1 Each atom has a unique Lazer value, or
2 All atoms have the same Lazer value, or
3 The atoms fall into groups according to their common Lazer values, in which case how many groups are there and what are the common properties of these groups? Do they have any connection with the periodic classification, or is this an entirely independent type of taxonomy?

GYROSCOPIC FORCES

My guess is that atoms have Lazer values that are very close to unity and as a consequence very large potential restoring forces. These four forces are all but equal in magnitude due to their ratios differing by a multiple of the Lazer value, which is so close to unity that any difference would be imperceptible.

These forces, while potential, cannot be considered to be connected with any finite energy source, but when they are manifested, they draw their energy for action from the physical universe, which can be regarded as limitless.

This manifestation of energy from outside the local system may be well-worth further consideration. Perhaps an experiment can be designed in a high energy physics laboratory, which does not hinge on radioactivity to release more energy than is supplied by the experimenter.

So the ultimate case for the forces, that are produced by any gyroscope or atom, depends on, from what direction it is being disturbed.

$$F_1 = Ia = Ir\omega^2$$

$$F_2 = Q_1 J = IDJ = IrD\omega^3$$

$$F_3 = IrD^2\omega^4$$

$$F_4 = IrD^3\omega^5$$

$$F_n = IrD^{n-1}\omega^{n+1} = Ir\omega^2 L_z^{n-1} \quad \text{where} \quad L_z = D\omega \quad \& \quad 0 < L_z < 1$$

$$F_1 + F_5 + F_9 + F_{13} + ,,,,, + F_{4n-3} = \frac{Ir\omega^2}{1 - L_z^4} \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty$$

$$F_2 + F_6 + F_{10} + F_{14} + ,,,,, + F_{4n-2} = \frac{Ir\omega^2 L_z}{1 - L_z^4} \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty$$

$$F_3 + F_7 + F_{11} + F_{15} + ,,,,, + F_{4n-1} = \frac{Ir\omega^2 L_z^2}{1 - L_z^4} \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty$$

$$F_4 + F_8 + F_{12} + F_{16} + ,,,,, + F_{4n} = \frac{Ir\omega^2 L_z^3}{1 - L_z^4} \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty$$

SCALAR INERTIAL QUANTITIES/QUALITIES/PROPERTIES					
LINEAR			ROTATIONAL & GYROSCOPIC		
	EQUATION	D.A.		EQUATION	D.A.
MASS	M	M	MOMENT OF INERTIA	$I = MN$	ML^2
			INERTIAL MASS MODIFIER	N	L^2
DISPLACEMENT (LENGTH)	s	L	DISPLACEMENT (ANGLE)	θ	Nil
SPEED	$v = \frac{ds}{dt}$	LT^{-1}	TANGENTIAL SPEED	$v = r\omega$	LT^{-1}
			ANGULAR SPEED	ω	T^{-1}
ACCELERATION	$a = \frac{dv}{dt}$	LT^{-2}	ACCELERATION	$a=\omega v=r\omega^2 =v^2r^{-1}$	LT^{-2}
FORCE	F = Ma	MLT^{-2}	CENTRIPETAL FORCE	$F_1 = Ia=Ir\omega^2$	ML^3T^{-2}
			TANGENTIAL FORCE	$F_2=QJ=IDJ$ $=IDr\omega^3$	ML^3T^{-2}
			TORQUE	$T_q = I\omega\Omega = Ir\omega^2$	ML^3T^{-2}
SURGE/JERK	J	LT^{-3}	SURGE/JERK	$r\omega^3$	LT^{-3}
MOMENTUM	Mv	MLT^{-1}	PRECESSIONAL MOMENTUM	$m = I\Omega$	ML^3T^{-1}
IMPULSE	Ft	MLT^{-1}	ANGULAR MOMENTUM	$m = I\omega$	ML^2T^{-1}
			PRECESSION	$\Omega = r\omega$	LT^{-1}
INTRACTANCE	Q = MD	MT	INTRACTANCE	Q = ID	ML^2T
TEMPORANCE	D	T	TEMPORANCE	D	T
			LAZER VALUE	$L_z = \omega D$	Nil
POTENTIAL ENERGY	Mgh	ML^2T^{-2}			
KINETIC ENERGY	$\frac{1}{2}Mv^2$	ML^2T^{-2}	KINETIC ENERGY	$\frac{1}{2}I\Omega^2$	ML^4T^{-2}
WORK	W = Fs	ML^2T^{-2}			
			GRAVITATIONAL CHARGE	G	M
			IONISATION LEVEL	$I_z=(T/D)^n$	Nil

CONJECTURE

STEREO-ISOMERS, [(allo-isomers) e.g. geometrical-isomers, optical-isomers are dependent on their chirality.]

With respect to chemical interaction of molecules, the actual physical shape can be a determining factor in many chemical reactions. e.g. Dextrose (glucose) and laevulose are prime examples where they demonstrate markedly different properties and metabolic pathways within the human body.

Pharmacodynamic drugs are often dependent upon steric hindrance and stereo-isomers for their bio-availability and efficacy.

At a more basic microscopic level, it may well be that the reactions between atoms, (and also between ions), is geometrically dependent in some measure on their spins and the inclinations of their axes of spin.

e.g. It's not hard to imagine that if they were to *`meet'* head on (/\) they may not combine chemically, whereas if they were similarly inclined, such as parallel or nearly parallel (//) they may be *`more inclined'* to react, (pun intended). One atom may act as a type of receptor for another.

So, summarily, RST may have something valuable to contribute to the understanding of chemical reactions, (over and above other published contributions), based on these axes of spin.

Whether this is a pivotal idea is up to the readers to assess.

All were it so!

S))

POST SCRIPT

As I understand it, the motivation for using the cellular automata and PAs method of investigating RST is to account for all the early findings, (in particular), especially the assorted motions for the subatoms and atoms, taking into account the scalar motion concept. I believe that some cognitive dissonances may have arisen, since my approach has revealed some. It would be an interesting exercise to compare these results. I shall list a couple of them below:-

To date we don't seem to have a deduction directly from the postulates that accounts for the spin, when first introduced for the rotation of the vibrating space unit. We presume that its is an allowable concept due to it not conflicting with the postulates, and therefore *"mandatory"*, according to Larsonian philosophy.

Also, it is claimed that such a rotation cannot be as though it were rolling in the direction of the outward expansion, because such a scenario would cause a greater linear speed than the unit speed of one space unit per time unit. So far so good. This means that we do not have to find a mathematical explanation of that rotation; it just is a basic fact, a given, as is the very outward expansion itself.

Not quite so simple to accept are the following two alleged deductions:-

1. That one rotation backwards is deemed to be as though it was not only rolling against the outward expansion but also is equivalent to one linear displacement of a single space unit.

What bothers me is the blind acceptance of this, as though it is a valid conclusion. It is not subsumed by the postulates and it does not conflict with the postulates, **seemingly**. However, the postulates lay claim to acceptance of *"ordinary mathematics"*, and that means we must acknowledge the transcendental number π as being necessary to express the rolling circumference in terms of its radius. This equivalence of the circumference to a space unit *`flies in the face'* of ordinary mathematics. I have no suggestion for this paradox.

2. *`Rotational Vibration'*. This is an intriguing concept, but it is not subsumed by the postulates. Is it compatible with ordinary mathematics? Maybe, but it cannot be deduced from the outward linear motion. Certainly, the linear oscillation is accountable, but the same logic cannot reverse a rotation, I believe.

I have my doubts, but cannot be authoritative about it. Perhaps, it is also **"mandatory"**.

S))Q

POETIC LICENTIOUSNESS-10

THE PHILOSOPHY OF PSILOLOGY OR THE SYMBOLOGY OF MISOSOPHY

(Later or sooner, we update Spooner)

If you understood the preceding,
Without the grey matter receding,
Your chances of bettering,
From woe on,
T'others in Greek lettering
And so on,
Are imaginary or real,
Dependent on zeal.

S))Q

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Larson, D.B. *`Structure of the Physical Universe'*
Page 9 re direction reversal:-

"The latter being traversed repeatedly in opposite directions."

It is very clear and decidedly unambiguous, that Larson was deducing from the postulates the type of oscillatory motion, that was described on the same page *"One unit of space per unit of time continues just as if there were no reversals".*

In no way is this to be interpreted as Simple Harmonic Motion, despite Larson saying so on another page. This was the mathematical equivalent of a *`Freudian'* type of slip, due to a mental default harking back to Dewey's pre RST days of handling mathematics of vibrations as any engineer would have done. Also Satz accepted the SHM as far back as his paper *"Further Mathematics of the Reciprocal System"* in Reciprocity Vol X No.3 1980 Page 2. where he stated *"$y = A.\sin(\omega t)$"* in the section on the Mathematics of Radiation, subsection Simple Harmonic Oscillation.

A is the amplitude, which is half a natural space unit, which he then divided by the Interregional ratio 1408/9 to show its

manifestation to an observer in the time-space region resulting in 1.457 Angstrom units.

I agree with Satz completely re the amplitude; it is the SHM equation that is not in accordance with the postulates, and must be replaced with a Fourier series. Once we all recognise this cognitive dissonance we can accept the Fourier series and then we can go on with our work with the high hope that further derivations will be made with greater facility.

All the images of the projections of the space curves of the subatoms and atoms are divided into the chemical groups of the periodic classification, and are in papers named for those groups, as well as the duplon and triplon images.

S))

Davis, William O. `*The Fourth Law of Motion*' 1962

Halprin, David `*Space Odyssey*' 1973

Halprin, David `*Ionisation*' 1980

Halprin, David `*Che Sara Sara*' 1988

Halprin, David `*Simple Vibratory Motion*' 1988

Halprin, David `*The Constitution of the United States of America and the Constitution of the Unified States of the Physical Universe*' 1988

Halprin, David `*Notions of Motions*' 1991

Halprin, David `*Particle*' 1991

Halprin, David `*Ultimate Analysis*' 1992

Laithwaite, Eric `*All Things are Possible*' 1976

Laithwaite, Eric `*Engineer through the Looking-Glass*' 1980

Larson, Dewey `*A Rejoinder to KVK Nehru*'
Reciprocity Volume XII, No.3 1983

Nehru, K.V.K. `*On the Nature of Rotation and Birotation*'
Reciprocity, Vol XX No.1 1991

Satz, R.W. `*Further Mathematics of the Reciprocal System*'
Reciprocity Vol X No.3 1980

Wolfram, Stephen `*A New Kind of Science*'

S))Q

David Halprin davrin@net2000.com.au