

# **The Essence of the Unified Universe Jacobs' Positively Charged Particles (PCPs) and Electrons in Mass (EM) Theory**

My correspondence with Henry Jacobs, inventor and theorist, began on 8 August 2016. He was adamant he had found a Theory of Everything and he felt it needed to reach out. Positively Charged Particles (PCPs) would come out from the fusion of our suns and permeate space, intersecting together and creating a grid in the universe like a semiconductor sheet, upon which particles can be created and replaced, travel and interact, justifying gravity.

To quote Hank: “[I realized] that there was a positively charged particle intersected at every 10 to the -8 cm in mass in space, accelerated by the nuclear fusion of our suns. This connection creates the Nucleus of our atom, the reason we have a positive and negative world. A negative grid that all electromagnetic energy rides on today”.

The Positively Charged Particles would be smaller than electrons, they create and replenish electrons constantly, keeping together the atoms and justifying nuclear bonds. He feels he has found the principle or mechanism behind what attracts matter together, which in Newton remained a complete mystery, with a significant issue of violation of the Law of Conservation of Energy. This unknown attracting force at a distance would require a significant and permanent amount of energy which has never been identified. Where would this energy come from, what attracts objects together which might emanate from matter itself?

Henry Jacobs' health is in rapid decline. I promised him that I would ensure his ideas are out there for anyone to review and find inspiration from. Of course, I am a die-hard proponent of Atomic Expansion Theory of Mark McCutcheon, and I developed my own Theory of Everything based on it. These theories are not compatible with Henry Jacobs' ideas.

However, I always keep an open-mind and feel every potential Theory of Everything out there merits consideration. Below is my correspondence with Henry, with links to an interview he has given. I only kept what was relevant to the theory itself, hence most of my side of the correspondence is not included below as it was only confusing the issues.

I have put together all the files he sent me into this one PDF/book at this URL, which should be read before you read this correspondence:

[http://www.themarginal.com/Jacobs\\_Positively\\_Charged\\_Particles\\_PCPs.pdf](http://www.themarginal.com/Jacobs_Positively_Charged_Particles_PCPs.pdf)

Hank used to call his positively charged particles gravitons, and also positrons, positronicks, posittronics or positronices. He asked me to change all these words back to positively charged particles or PCPs to avoid any confusion with the meaning of these words in Standard Physics. There are still some references to the old terms across the material.

There are several references to Mark McCutcheon and his book The Final Theory. It is because Mark's book is a great starting point to explain everything that is wrong or needs to be explained in our science today, and is quite a helpful tool for anyone who is searching for a new Theory of Everything, no matter if they believe in Atomic Expansion Theory or not.

**Roland Michel Tremblay**, November 2018

## **Henry (Hank) D. Jacobs' correspondence with Roland Michel Tremblay**

### **Comments on Facebook**

Henry Jacobs - From Grey Eagle, Minnesota

[https://www.facebook.com/TheFinalTheory/posts/1360428117303908?comment\\_id=1563340957012622](https://www.facebook.com/TheFinalTheory/posts/1360428117303908?comment_id=1563340957012622)

8 August 2016

Mark [McCutcheon], I can answer every question, and prove every answer using a simple principle that must be in play in order for our universe to exist and for the energy to react in the manner that it does. This includes why gravity is the attraction of mass, with light travels at 300,000 kilometers per second. Why life can begin any place in this universe any time. One other thing that I'll tell you is that there was no beginning to energy and that we have an energy bubble. I know that the scientific world will not even look at a possibility that there is one principle idea like you have presented [the single principle to explain gravity and everything else in physics according to Mark McCutcheon is the constant expansion of the electrons and atoms]. I'm in the process of writing a book I would like to review with you if we could have some kind of a joint venture. Whereas using your writing skills and my ideas we can put this together. See my intention are to look for free energy as a result of what I discovered. I can see it's just around the corner. Henry Jacobs [+1] 360 970 4900 [e-em-pcg@q.com](mailto:em-pcg@q.com).

Comments from Henry Jacobs added on 2 February 2017:

This is a complete revelation into what energy is. Original part of thesis already copyrighted. I need help in making this information available to mankind.

The Essence of a Unified Universe

This is a complete revelation into what energy is. This is complete work by only Henry Jacobs Original part of thesis already copyrighted. I made this post asking Mark if he would like to help published. Got response "Roland Michel Tremblay" [rm@themarginal.com](mailto:rm@themarginal.com).

Pathways to Paradise: Ep - 122 - New Review of Science Gravitism and Positronic's Part 1 - Apr 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2011. Click on this link to see interview:

[http://olelo.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view\\_id=30&clip\\_id=19693](http://olelo.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=30&clip_id=19693)

or

[http://archive-stream.granicus.com/OnDemand/\\_definst\\_/mp4:olelo/olelo\\_d4d5d979-f0b8-4e4e-9bf4-7f148886f15b.mp4/playlist.m3u8](http://archive-stream.granicus.com/OnDemand/_definst_/mp4:olelo/olelo_d4d5d979-f0b8-4e4e-9bf4-7f148886f15b.mp4/playlist.m3u8)

[There is no part 2 and no other past interviews found online. If the link ever goes offline, please contact me, as I have kept a copy. Roland]

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** HENRY JACOBS Owner <e-em-pcg@q.com>  
**Subject:** Re: Expansion Theory  
**Date:** 23 September 2016 at 19:46:17 BST  
**To:** Roland Michel Tremblay <rm@themarginal.com>

Dear Roland

This is a rough draft of the cover to my book.

I don't know why Einstein never addressed it, but all the planets roll in the opposite direction they would if they were rolling on Einstein's fabric, except the planet Venus, it turns one revolution for every 117 earth days in the opposite direction as all the rest. That's because it's the closest to earth, and earth's gravity causes its rotation and overpowers the sun's gravity to some degree.

Ps I have also reinvented the Electric Motor first time since Tesla in the 1880.

This whole thing, this is about getting free energy, the next step in my agenda.

Hank

[The cover page to my book.pdf]

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** HENRY JACOBS Owner <e-em-pcg@q.com>  
**Subject:** Energy a single principle entity  
**Date:** 23 September 2016 at 19:23:01 BST  
**To:** Roland Michel Tremblay <rm@themarginal.com>

Dear Roland Are you on skype?

I copyrighted the original materials in 1998, directly after realizing that there was a positively charged particle intersecting at every 10 to the -8 cm in mass in space, accelerated by the nuclear fusion of our suns. This connection creates the Nucleus of our atom, the reason we have a positive and negative world. A negative grid that all electromagnetic energy rides on today.

I will send you a couple of attachments, a link to old video on public TV to give some insight to what I'm talking about.

The scientific world treats me worse than Mark McCutcheon. I'm spending my time now writing this book, I have no literary skills, trying to make connections with people that do, such as ghost-writers.

Believing that there was a big bang 15 years ago that created our universe in less than 4 minutes and now it takes us 12,000,000,000 light years to get across it, is as dumb as believing in God or our earth is still flat. Einstein wanted to read God's mind, I will show you in this energy bubble we live in there is no energy for God.

I'm trusting you with the most important information on this planet so please don't use it without my permission and my understanding of how it's to be used.

I can answer every question that Mark McCutcheon says the scientific community cannot answer.

With my regards, Hank Jacobs

My skype name is gravitism at [e-em-pcg@q.com](mailto:e-em-pcg@q.com)

Why do we have the red shift?

Because all our Solar systems are moving counter clockwise like a large Ferris wheel in our universe, so everything is moving away from us and we are always moving away from everything else.

Interview:

[http://olelo.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view\\_id=30&clip\\_id=19693](http://olelo.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=30&clip_id=19693)

[Part of the original copyright.pdf]

[The Essence of a Unified Universe 1.pdf]

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** HENRY JACOBS Owner <[e-em-pcg@q.com](mailto:e-em-pcg@q.com)>

**Subject:** Re: Expansion Theory

**Date:** 24 September 2016 at 06:33:23 BST

**To:** Roland Michel Tremblay <[rm@themarginal.com](mailto:rm@themarginal.com)>

Roland

I really appreciate you looking into this, there is a couple other things I'd like you to understand.

- 1) First of all our planets, how can they become round without gravity in the center of each atom? I can put it there.
- 2) The dark matter science recognizes as my positively charged particles at work throughout the universe.
- 3) Antimatter is what we recognize as energy in our everyday life.

This is when the atoms in mass try to accelerate to 300,000 kilometers per second. This is if you light a match, shakeup a bottle of nitroglycerin, or write up to Robert Oppenheimer's Fission. Just how many atoms take off at the same time. It's in reverse of the old story, it isn't the fall that kills you, it's the sudden stop.

I can't imagine why mankind couldn't figure this out 1000 years earlier, we should be riding on crystal spaceship where the exterior skin is our driving component. All we have to avoid is a sudden start, we might have to make a new element so we can travel on the same grid that electromagnetic energy travel on, of course we gotta figure out one more thing and try not to go in every direction at the same time.

Einstein always wanted to travel on a light beam, can you imagine the flash of flame and the small explosion he would have made.

If I get this up and going I want to take a deep look at how to do this. There has to be a way that we can interact with the genetic component for most diseases.

Later, Hank

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** HENRY JACOBS Owner <[e-em-pcg@q.com](mailto:e-em-pcg@q.com)>  
**Subject:** : Energy a single principle entity  
**Date:** 24 September 2016 at 19:26:53 BST  
**To:** Roland Michel Tremblay <[rm@themarginal.com](mailto:rm@themarginal.com)>

Dear Roland

Just a few notes, the universe has to work on one principle idea such as Mark McCutcheon suggests, the scientific world does not want to accept or review his research, he's just asking simple questions they cannot answer.

A couple other things that one wants to consider, one is the earth must be powered as it goes around the sun in order to counteract the drag of the moon.

Imagine the foot pounds necessary to create the tides, this is a direct restriction on earth's rotation. Can you imagine these brilliant people that are telling us what the universe is about and don't address the direction the earth rotates or the power needed to produce the tides, anything they have to offer us would have the earth stopped rotating a longtime ago. Of course I can explain why a light will slow down going through water but immediately regain speed after, also why a magnet works or how the electrons are reproduced in our generators.

On some of the things I'm probably repeating myself, but what I'm trying to tell you is that any person even attempting to establish the beginning of energy should be in an insane asylum, or floating down a river with an erection hollering raise the drawbridge, raise the drawbridge.

PS when I first saw Mark McCutcheon's first edition of The Final Theory, I thought he had discovered it, not that he was just looking for it. I was excited to find out that he said maybe in 2050 a young physics student will figure it out, because I had it some 10 years earlier.

Hank

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** HENRY JACOBS Owner <[e-em-pcg@q.com](mailto:e-em-pcg@q.com)>

**Subject: Re: Expansion Theory**

**Date:** 28 September 2016 at 21:35:53 BST

**To:** Roland Michel Tremblay <rm@themarginal.com>

Dear Roland

There is only one answer to the single principle idea.

That is positively charged particles intersecting at approximately every 10 to the -8 cm in mass and space, connecting at every 9,192,631,770 times a second in every part of mass and space in our universe.

This Intersection puts gravity in the center of the atom and energy on the exterior where it belongs.

This revelation explains every question Mark McCutcheon asks, and a whole lot that he did not about our universe.

I heard that Mark McCutcheon was also an electrical engineer, I have reinvented the electrical motor, that if we can make connections I would like him to review, this engine first designed for electrical cars is so proficient that it might be able to run a generator producing excess energy. I'm sure Mark could make that calculation which does seem impracticable.

Hank

[McCutcheon\_Henry\_Jacobs\_New\_Single\_Principle.pdf]

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** HENRY JACOBS Owner <e-em-pcg@q.com>

**Subject: Re: Expansion Theory**

**Date:** 2 October 2016 at 23:22:58 BST

**To:** Roland Michel Tremblay <rm@themarginal.com>

Dear Roland

[...] Being an inventor, I'm always looking for something to patent or copyright, and I have some ideas that I will share with only people like you that I can trust in looking into this endeavor.

The scientific world will not even communicate with me, only because they've led mankind completely in the wrong direction, simply by not understanding the workings of gravity, believing in a nuclear binding force, and not understanding the connection of electromagnetic energy with mass that created our computers that are responsible for this beautiful technology we have today.

Thanks again Hank

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Roland Michel Tremblay <rm@themarginal.com>

**Subject: Re: Expansion Theory**

**Date:** 3 October 2016 at 02:46:18 BST

**To:** HENRY JACOBS Owner <e-em-pcg@q.com>

Dear Hank,

I have now read your two files, and I have watched the first part of the video. It says there is a second part. Do you have a link to it? [There is no second part.]

Your ideas are so far removed from Atomic Expansion Theory of Mark McCutcheon, I am not certain where to start to explain to you how different your ideas are. The only thing we can agree on, is that Einstein was wrong, however Atomic Expansion Theory also explains orbits through a natural orbit effect of the geometry of the expansion of matter. I cannot see however how there could be any kind of grid as Einstein had his sheet of rubber which was space, and that could be curved and pierced, etc.

Gravity for a start is simply due to the constant expansion of matter, this is why the distance between objects changes constantly as an acceleration. Newton is as dead as Einstein in Expansion Theory, there is no force acting at a distance, and the moon has no force emanating from it that could possibly influence the Earth's spin, or the tides. Tides are simply due to an internal wobble of the Earth which coincides with the passing of the moon. That is just the beginning, but I would need to write an entire essay to describe how your ideas are different from Atomic Expansion Theory, and of course, Mark and I are firm believers in this theory.

I would send you a copy of my book, but you strike me as the type that is more practical, and I am not sure you would read it. Here is the link just in case:

[New Age Physics by Roland Michel Tremblay](http://www.themarginal.com/NewAgePhysics.pdf)  
<http://www.themarginal.com/NewAgePhysics.pdf>

This said, on top of gravity itself, which is just reducing the distance between objects in their expansion, there is something else in what is called attracting and repelling forces as in electrostatics and Coulomb's Law. There are no more charged particles in Atomic Expansion Theory, everything is explained by the expansion of matter. The speed of light and electrons in electromagnetism is explained by simply the expansion rate of the electron. This is what gives it its speed, the expansion rate of matter.

On top of gravity there are what could be called attracting and repelling forces, between electrons and atoms. In my book I describe two types of gravity, one between atomic objects, the other between subatomic objects, and they are both attracting and repelling forces.

Vibrational frequency of matter is highly important, and this is something Mark McCutcheon has overlooked. I am still trying to figure it out myself, and I like some of your ideas.

I will need to read again what you sent me, and watch the video again, and see if I can truly understand what you are saying, and see if there is a great idea there. At the moment it

seems to me that possibly you are onto something, something I am actually working on right now, as you can see in my book. How in their orbits electrons can create these attracting and repelling forces simply by moving from where there is a surplus of electrons to where there is a depletion. And how these forces as described by Coulomb's Law can be used to produce energy.

Now, I am interested in the application of your idea. You said I believe that you have re-invented a motor, and some other inventions, that led you to your theory and idea. If I could understand exactly what it is that your invention and ideas for inventions do, I might be able to figure out or explain what you mean with your theory, and see how I can adapt it to my theory. I need to try to find a sensible way to explain how they can actually work. I can see that your sense is practical, you build things almost instinctively, and then try to explain why they work from the point of view of physics. So let's see if I can help you on that very issue.

Regards,

Roland

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** HENRY JACOBS Owner <e-em-pcg@q.com>  
**Subject: Re: Expansion Theory**  
**Date:** 3 October 2016 at 05:53:07 BST  
**To:** Roland Michel Tremblay <rm@themarginal.com>

Dear Roland

No we lost contact and there was not a second.

Let me ask you a few questions.

If there is no attraction between mass and mass and our universe, then what causes the planet Venus to turn in the opposite directions of the rest of the planets and our own solar system? Why is the Moon constantly moving further away, I'll bet you can prove it by simply GPS and monitoring it, and you will find that it moves further away only during the time that it is between the sun and the earth.

How can all our planets become round unless gravity is in the center of each atom?

If everything is constantly expanding, why don't energy simply escape into nothingness?

What makes the magnet work?

How can electrons be reproduced in the field coils of a generator? Don't tell me they are floating around all over and coming back in to the ground cable.

Why does light travel and all electromagnetic energy travel at 300,000 kilometers per second?

Why does light travel, slower through water, then retain the speed immediately after?

What is dark matter?

What is antimatter?

Last but not least, what is your reasoning for a positive and negative world?



Unless you have an explanation for the above you have nothing like science, I don't think you grasp my grid, energy must be something, a simple principle that controls everything. It's got to come from something, it doesn't have to have a beginning, but it has to be something that will cause a complete recycling of our universe as long as it will exist. The maximum energy in our universe is the nuclear fusion of our suns, the positively charged particles that I'm describing are so small that they cannot be detected. They are part of the reason that there is such a thing as nuclear fusion, for as they return into the suns to be accelerated once again, this action creates the nuclear fusion in our suns. I'm not very good at describing things, but imagine that you had a large bowl of very small marbles, they were so close to each other yet not touching, but they were traveling at 300,000 kilometers per second and constantly bumping into each other. These marbles are positive, every time they connect they make the negative. The reason they can't get out is because of the bowl. My positively charged particles are looking for the next large negative, another sun so they start heading back in, this is why energy does not escape. Maybe with a chalk board I could explain it easier. I'm sure once you get the picture, you will recognize there is no other way energy and our universe could exist. Of course unless you can fully understand I would not want you to participate in this endeavor. Your explanation of why we have the tides is only necessary if I can't prove to you that mass is attracted to mass. If you have Skype maybe that would help. There is one thing I'm sure of, there is only one final theory and I am 100% sure that I am right, but I'm maybe only 10 to 15 percent sure that I can convey this information to mankind, and that they are capable of understanding it. Simple enough, it could be taught in eighth grade science class. People don't understand how it could change their lives, we're only one step away from free energy once we know what we're looking for. This is as simple as we want to tap into the energy that creates nuclear fusion, this is the same energy that makes our atoms work. Anyway hope to talk to you soon, thanks for reading and listening. I'm so sorry that things are not done more professional. My life has always been solving problems, the kind that requires the capacity for abstract thought, I blame it on to the printed word, something I could not deal with. I'm dyslexic, hell I can't even spell the word. I think with pictures not words.

Hank

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** HENRY JACOBS Owner <[e-em-pcg@q.com](mailto:e-em-pcg@q.com)>  
**Subject:** Re: The Final Theory  
**Date:** 4 October 2016 at 06:12:44 BST  
**To:** Roland Michel Tremblay <[rm@themarginal.com](mailto:rm@themarginal.com)>

Dear Roland

[...] This is what my thesis is about, it is Newton's gravity (putting gravity in the center of the atom).

You know there's a big difference between seeing something that doesn't work and putting something together that does work, not just something different.

[...] Once again there is only one final theory which explains why gravity works, how gravity is connected to electromagnetic energy, why the speed of light is connected to the cesium 133 atom, why a magnet works, why the field coils and a generator reproduce electrons, what dark matter is, what antimatter is, why life itself begins. Actually why lightning exists and how it works.

Simply why we have a positive and a negative world. Is not only the final theory, it is the theory of everything. [...]

This is about looking for the energy, finding a way to tap into the energy that creates nuclear fission and nuclear fusion.

[...] A little note, the Moon's gravitational forces are strong enough to disrupt this balance by accelerating the water towards the Moon.

This causes the water to 'bulge'. As the Moon orbits our planet and as the Earth rotates, the bulge also moves.

The areas of the Earth where the bulging occurs experience high tide, and the other areas are subject to a low tide.

This Force coming from the moon is against the earth's rotation. You have nothing unless you can explain what powers the earth turning to overcome this drag.

Hank

[...]

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** HENRY JACOBS Owner <e-em-pcg@q.com>

**Subject: Re: Understanding your theory**

**Date:** 5 October 2016 at 21:39:36 BST

**To:** Roland Michel Tremblay <rm@themarginal.com>

Dear Roland

[...]

There's a lot more to be an inventor and selling a product, getting it recognized, than you have any idea.

Something you should know something about, because you write about it, is a neutron. You write about this entity, have you ever seen one? Do you know why it exists?

Or does it exist maybe, it's just a figment of the scientist imagination. Ask yourself this question, what would happen to the nuclear binding force if there was no such thing as a neutron. Fact is Einstein called the nuclear binding force a quirky idea.

They want to call it the god particle, fact is that exactly what it is and it don't exist. Science recognizes that there were electrons in an atom.

Also knew there had to be a proton if there was an electron, but they could not understand

how these two entities could exist together. God must've told them, hey fellows just make a neutron to separate the 2, the proton from the electron, just like with God mankind will believe anything.

Once again tell me what you will do for me if I prove to you how an atom can exist and create electrons without a neutron.

Hank

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** HENRY JACOBS Owner <[e-em-pcg@q.com](mailto:e-em-pcg@q.com)>  
**Subject:** Re: Understanding your theory  
**Date:** 6 October 2016 at 02:51:37 BST  
**To:** Roland Michel Tremblay <[rm@themarginal.com](mailto:rm@themarginal.com)>

Dear Roland

The big difference between the three of us, is my theory is a revelation, and how to get free energy, free for transportation through the Cosmos, to tap into kinetic energy before it creates nuclear fusion.

I'm sure there are people looking for this once they realize what the key is, it might even answer the questions for them they needed. This is why I refused to publish so I can get a foothold on something that is patentable before in creating free energy. Already have an electrical motor that might be able to produce more energy than it uses. This is my business, I am not worried about timeline, I'm 80 years old, I worked out hard all my life. The most important thing to me is to save the species on this planet. I'm sure that if I do there will be somebody that will appreciate and maybe they'll have a better life for themselves. Remember Einstein himself knew he didn't have anything, that's why he spent the last 30 years looking for something I'm not.

There is not one doubt in my mind that the universe can work any differently than my one principle idea illustrates.

[...]

If I live long enough and I can get enough people understand, my thesis will cure this damn cancer too. Everybody does things for money, not for the enjoyment of understanding the problem and eliminating it.

This universe gives us everything, what do we give it in return, certainly not respect, the only thing it wants. [...]

Hank

---

**From:** "Roland Michel Tremblay" <[rm@themarginal.com](mailto:rm@themarginal.com)>  
**To:** "HENRY JACOBS Owner" <[e-em-pcg@q.com](mailto:e-em-pcg@q.com)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 6, 2016 5:28:10 PM  
**Subject:** Re: Understanding your theory

[...]

All theories are just models, and it is quite possible to develop several different models that all describe our reality and physics in an excellent manner. In the end it is the theory that describes the most stuff accurately that could be the truth. So it is possible that your theory is equivalent to Expansion Theory, that we can both reach the truth through these different models that describe the world accurately. In the end, we are only using a different vocabulary and interpretation to describe the very same phenomena.

Roland

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** HENRY JACOBS Owner <e-em-pcg@q.com>  
**Subject:** Re: Understanding your theory  
**Date:** 6 October 2016 at 21:46:38 BST  
**To:** Roland Michel Tremblay <rm@themarginal.com>

Dear Roland

Mark McCutcheon who has re-written General Relativity, and you are re-writing Einstein's Special Relativity, you guys aren't even close, there is only one final theory that encompasses everything, Theory of everything I don't care what you call it. My only problem is putting it to paper and being credited for that. The most important part about getting into paper is, the next step getting funding for the research, to look for free energy, this my real endeavor. I only read Mark's first book, this book was based on fact I was concerned with, it was about what science did not know. Whatever Einstein wrote about general or special relativity was fiction based on his imagination. And the only part of his imagination that work was the fact that he couldn't look for the answer he knew was fiction. It was well worth the read, only spend about 2 hours, maybe not that long. I'm probably one of the best speed readers and I never read for pleasure, only information. Now when he injects as imagination into what Einstein imagined, I would not find any interest in spending the time to look at it. I studied everything Einstein wrote, his life, trying to understand why he put so much energy into it. I believe he did it mostly, we recognized him as a scientist and for the Nobel prize which he got for his photon thing, it was just to giveth by the scientific community.

[...]

Regardless your Hank

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** HENRY JACOBS Owner <e-em-pcg@q.com>  
**Subject:** Re: Understanding your theory  
**Date:** 7 October 2016 at 07:20:48 BST  
**To:** Roland Michel Tremblay <rm@themarginal.com>

Dear Roland

I read his first book [of Mark McCutcheon, and he wrote only one book called The Final Theory], my interpretation is he was looking for a simple principle solution to a final theory. And gave no indication of what that might be [it is the constant expansion of all electrons and atoms explaining gravity]. I haven't replaced it. I do remember on the back some editor's note, a young physicist would discover this in something around 2050.

I have seen no answer. There are a few things in my view you must answer. Why do we have a positive and negative world? Must be the center piece.

Why gravity is in the center of each atom? Why does all electromagnetic energy travel at 300,000 kilometers per second, why we don't lose the energy in our universe? Imagine how a cell would survive if not for the energy encapsulated in it.

Why is the energy within an atom identified in the atom without a nuclear binding force? I could go on.

We judge each other by our own view finder and we cannot see beyond it, and most of us seem to talk to it.

I am saddened that you think my theory is equivalent to your expansion theory. I just have one question to ask you about your theory, what force causes the expansion?

This is without reading you, I can guarantee you, they are as different, and make up a substance, some form of fiction compared to a blueprint on how to build a skyscraper.

There is no phenomenon in my theory and it is based only on Standard Physics. That's the problem with science today, the reason they cannot answer questions they call phenomenon, they change physics or make their own physics, that produce black holes Warp space time. They have a program where they are researching how to put together a machine that will take us back in time. Program is being funded by private investor donation at the University of Washington.

[...]

Hank

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** HENRY JACOBS Owner <e-em-pcg@q.com>

**Subject:** Re: Skype

**Date:** 9 October 2016 at 04:23:09 BST

**To:** Roland Michel Tremblay <rm@themarginal.com>

Dear Roland

After talking to you, we will try to take it one step at a time. I was thinking about ways to describe my theory in the simplest of manner.

Number one, the only particles in the universe are my positively charged particles, this produces all the frequencies known to man. This connection is at every approximately 10 to the -8 cm in mass, representing the nucleus of our atom. The concept or idea of an atom is science driven by trying to find the smallest entity of mass, of an element, I don't think you can determine, because of the random of my positively charged particles connections.

The smallest part of the element probably is not recognizable simply because it is an impact area. Impact areas produce a negative response that is in fact a frequency, this is why life can begin in the smallest part of mass regardless of its composition. You have a constant positive and negative reoccurrence or impact at the rate of 9,192,631,770 (the spark of life), why new bacteria can be created each day if the right elements are available for the bacteria to begin life. By developing their own methods of using this constant spark of life.

If you have any questions of this first basic step into understanding my thesis.

Hank

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** HENRY JACOBS Owner <e-em-pcg@q.com>  
**Subject:** Re: Understanding your theory - first step  
**Date:** 9 October 2016 at 21:00:15 BST  
**To:** Roland Michel Tremblay <rm@themarginal.com>

Dear Roland

Thanks for a great compliment, visuals are often made up by one's feelings more than the actual pictures they see.

Establishing these particles was simply a matter of elimination, the only thing that will work, you see it is hard to explain the workings of my mind in any manner.

It was a given that there is something smaller than science could recognize. Science has made a big mistake in trying to explain what energy is or how Energy Works.

Starting with Einstein first trying to explain Newton's attraction theory, he creates his own physics by adding this fabric that don't work in the first place.

When I first started on this research I had to address the rotation of our planets and if the sun was getting up in the west and setting in the east, I would have been finished and would have believed he must be right, that would have been the end of my research. That didn't happen, what can possibly create mass to and be attracted to mass.

I can see this happening with simple magnets, so I know using physics I can see that happen in a larger scale. So the research begins.

Anyway to follow up on the second part of my explanation of my thesis. I don't know whatever this new age thing is again, that it's imagining energy that don't exist.

Second step of introduction, neutrinos are once again science's effort to create its own physics, knowing they have an electron and a proton in the same atom, just a figment of their imagination.

My particles are either entering the impact area or are exciting the impact area.

(On the entering phase) they force out the electrons that encircles each impact area, this creates a different frequency in each element and binding it together by a negative exterior of each impact area.

Illustrated in the science periodical table. During the entering phase they also force out all electromagnetic energy or light that is introduced into this impact area by whatever means. Our cell phones are doing their thing because of this part of existing energy.

(On the exciting phase) they leave this positive entity or frequency we consider the proton in the atom, establishing gravity in the center of the atom.

Before the negative electron and positive proton can come together they are struck again by my positively charged particles, at the rate of 9,192,631,770 cycles a second.

So this means the interior of a mass has a positive frequency and the exterior of any mass like the exterior of every impact area is the negative.

Now when mass is attracted to mass the negative frequency of exterior trying to get to the positive or interior of the adjacent mass the more mass the attraction.

I will create diagrams making these illustrations. I will show you why the earth is actually somewhat like an Electric Motor and is powered in its orbit around the sun because of the sun overwhelming gravity.

Every ounce of energy you recognize in the universe is created by this action.

Hank

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** HENRY JACOBS Owner <e-em-pcg@q.com>  
**Subject:** Re: Understanding your theory  
**Date:** 11 October 2016 at 08:59:01 BST  
**To:** Roland Michel Tremblay <rm@themarginal.com>

Dear Roland

I've talked about this with you and others so much that I get a little lost. I think one way of proving my attraction theory is to have GPS monitor the moon during the time the Moon is between the sun and the earth, and reference it during the rest of the orbit, and you'll find that the only time it moves away from the earth is during the period it is between the sun and the earth. That should reject Einstein's fabric idea.

Well today let's talk about your neutron, I haven't clicked on your link, although I might at a later date if in some way I must argue against it.

This is the core of my thesis, there is no neutron, absolutely not necessary because there is no nuclear binding force.

Einstein thought this was a quirky idea, this nuclear binding, of course I'm not sure which came first,  $E = mc^2$  or the idea of a nuclear binding force. Of course, Einstein put energy in the center of an atom and connected the speed of light to it.

The 2 most consistent and recognizable entity we have is the speed of light and the cesium 133 atom, aluminum and magnesium are now more constant, but they all beat at 9,192,631,770 per sec, of course none of the things are coincidental or a phenomenon. They are caused simply by a connection of my positively charged particles which eliminates the need for a neutron. {There is no phenomenon in my thesis---none.}

I'm sure I said this in the video but I'm saying it once again, science created something that didn't exist, they created their own physics trying to explain energy in mass that they simply recognized early on by running a magnet through a coil of wire (OUT POP an ELECTRON), the

explosion of nitrogen now called gunpowder.

Energy is expressed on the exterior of an atom. This is recognizable in the fact that electricity does not travel in the wire, but around the outside of such wire.

I'm sure you never recognize or read anything about mass instantaneously accelerating at 300,000 kilometers per second that creates all explosions known to man right up to Robert Oppenheimer nuclear fission. Nuclear fusion is something just a little different.

You must have nuclear fission before you can have fusion, this is why it's so difficult to attain this, it is what happens in the center of our suns.

When this is happening there, it is actually the acceleration of my positively charged particles, because they are coming back into an area where fission is occurring.

Well I'll send this off, I'll let you think about it all, see if I can find time to answer each question that you sent me tomorrow.

With all my trust, Hank

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** HENRY JACOBS Owner <e-em-pcg@q.com>

**Subject:** Trying to explain my theory

**Date:** 13 October 2016 at 07:40:01 BST

**To:** Roland Michel Tremblay <rm@themarginal.com>

Dear Roland

I've answered all your questions I hope to your satisfaction.

I'll send you a few of my old diagrams that might help take a look at these attachments.

And we'll get back together. Hank

[The\_Essence\_of\_Unified\_Universe\_2.pdf]

[From docx file attached to above email, called "first step to Roland.docx":]

Dear Roland

After talking to you I was thinking about ways to describe my theory in the simplest of manner.

Number one the only particles in the universe are my positively charged particles, this produces all the frequencies known to man. This connection is at

every approximately 10 to the -8 cm in mass representing the nucleus of our atom. The concept or idea of an atom is science driven by trying to find the smallest entity of mass, of element. I don't think you can determine this because science establishes this idea from their idea of energy being inside the atom, a false premise. The randomness of my positively charged particles connections indicates only one thing. The smallest part of any element is simply the smallest measurement science can make of mass, of any element.

My Impact areas produce a positive entity in the center surrounded by a negative response on the outside as indicated by sciences. These negatives exteriors of the impact area, which



are adjacent to each other in mass, is what keeps them connected by the same frequency, separates them from each other's positives, being connected to the negative of the next one.

This frequency is why life can begin in the smallest part of mass regardless of its composition, you have a constant positive and negative reoccurrence or impact at the rate of 9,192,631,770 (the spark of life), why new bacteria can be created each day if the right elements are available for the bacteria to begin life. By developing their own methods of using this constant spark of life.

These particles were simply a matter of elimination, the only thing that will work, you see it is hard to explain the workings of my mind in any manner.

It was a given that there is something smaller than science could recognize. Science has made a big mistake in trying to explain what energy is or how Energy Works, by trying to create a new energy.

Starting with Einstein, first in trying to explain Newton's attraction theory, he creates his own physics by adding this fabric that don't work in the first place.

When I first started on this research I had to address the rotation of our planets and if the sun was getting up in the west and setting in the east, I would have been finished, I would have believed he must be right, that would have been the end of my research. That didn't happen so I had to find out what would work and possibly create mass to be attracted to mass.

I can see this happening with a simple magnet. I have to find out what the difference is in the attraction between mass in a magnet attracting another magnet, and our earth and sun attracting each other. Using the physics we have, I can see that it does happen at a larger scale. Question, what is the one simple entity that could make them both work. In order to do this, you first have to eliminate the myth that energy is created in every atom and every atom produces its own energy. Of course I know that there is an energy causing my cell phone to work, it cannot be seen and this energy can send a message any place at the speed of light around our world and far beyond through buildings or whatever.

I know this energy is there and science is looking for it in a number of different ways, I know that it is not the battery in the cellphone that is capable of doing this. My mind understands you can only test assumption with the physics you have and you should not create a new energy source, and knew physics to answer old question. This is the capability of using abstract thought and applying logic and reason to the physics that exist.

Second step of introduction.

Neutrinos are once again science's effort to create its own physics. Knowing they have an electron and a proton in the same atom, is simply creating it to keep the positive and negative apart.

What's really happening is my particles are either entering the impact area or are exciting the impact area at all times.

(On the entering phase) they force out the electrons that encircles each impact area, this creates a different frequency in each element and binding it together by a negative exterior of each impact area.

Illustrated in the science periodical table. During the entering phase they also force out all electromagnetic energy or light that is introduced into this impact area by whatever means. Our cell phones are doing their thing because of this part of existing energy.

(On the exciting phase) they leave this positive entity or frequency we consider the proton in the atom, establishing gravity in the center of each atom or impact area.

Before the negative electron and positive proton can come together, they are struck again by my positively charged particles, at the rate of 9,192,631,770 times a second.

By this mean the interior of a mass has a positive frequency and the exterior of any mass, like the exterior of every impact area, is the negative.

Now when mass is attracted to mass, the negative frequency of the exterior is trying to get to the positive, or interior of the adjacent mass, the more mass the attraction. This makes Newton, he's worked out all the math, and science uses this math today to answer questions about visible gravity energy when launching a spaceship or whatever.

I will create diagrams making these illustrations. I will show you why the earth is actually somewhat like an Electric Motor and is powered in its orbit around the sun because the sun has an overwhelming gravity, and this nuclear fusion is accelerating my positively charged particles. Every ounce of energy you recognize in the universe is created by this action and the rest of the suns in the universe.

I think one way of proving my attraction theory is to have GPS monitor the moon, during the time the Moon is between the sun and the earth, and then reference it during the rest of the orbit, and you'll find that the only time it moves away from the earth is during the period it is between the sun and the earth. That should reject Einstein's fabric idea.

The neutron, which is a figment of science's imagination, I have eliminated it. Fact is I never considered it at any time of my investigation into gravity. It created the nuclear binding force, this is the core of my thesis, there is no neutron, absolutely not necessary because there is no nuclear binding force.

Einstein thought that a nuclear binding was a quirky idea. James Chadwick created this idea in 1932. Einstein liked the part that energy was in in the center of an atom and connected his  $E$  equals  $Mc$  squared to it.

The 2 most consistent and recognizable entity we have is the speed of light and the cesium 133 atom, aluminum and magnesium are now more constant, they all beat at 9,192,631,770 per sec, of course none of the things are coincidental or a phenomenon. They are caused simply by a connection of my positively charged particles, which eliminates the need for a neutron. {There is no phenomenon in my thesis---none}, a phenomenon should never be an excuse for the answer, it is an expression of ignorance.

I'm sure I said this in the video but I'm saying it once again, science created something that didn't exist, they created their own physics trying to explain energy in mass that they simply recognized early on by running a magnet through a coil of wire (OUT POP an ELECTRON) the explosive of nitrogen now called gunpowder. Energy is also expressed on the exterior of an atom. This is recognizable in the fact that electricity does not travel in the wire, but around the outside of such wire.

I'm sure you never recognized or read anything about mass instantaneously accelerating at 300,000 kilometers per second, that creates all explosions known to man, right up to Robert Oppenheimer nuclear fission, nuclear fusion is something just a little different.

You must have nuclear fission before you can have fusion, this is why it's so difficult to attain this, it is what happens in the center of our suns.

When this is happening there is actually acceleration of my positively charged particles, because they are coming back into an area where fission is occurring.

[END OF DOCX FILE]

[Docx file called Explanation of the theses.docx, where Hank answers my questions:]

Dear Hank,

“It is quite possible that you are right, although I have great difficulties understanding and visualising your ideas. [...] You say you are dyslexic [...]. In fact, I think Einstein was dyslexic, and that is why he took things slowly and was able to describe everything in detail.”

Answer from Hank: Einstein being dyslexic or not, he did not use good reasoning and logic in his attempt to solve Newton’s problem with the attraction with mass to mass.

Right away he tries to invoke a different energy and science seized on it, so now we wind up with warped time and space, black holes that suck all mass and light into the nothingness.

Once again producing a none existing energy to solve no problem.

I just don’t understand, well maybe I do, rather than answering the question using proven physics, it is much simpler to create another energy.

“1. For a start, has your theory got a name?”

Answer: The Essence of a Unified Universe

“I must point out that since you are excellent at inventing things, you should concentrate on inventing things that work, and then people will have to pay great attention to you.”

Answer: To judge my work as an inventor is of course laughable. My answer to this question is when one’s work is judged, always consider the source.

“You need to understand that your ideas might be compatible with a world where matter expands constantly. I think I had ideas along the lines of yours, although I am not sure, since I am not sure I understand your ideas. But my ideas work very well within Expansion Theory, but maybe you will convince me otherwise.”

Answer: Again you are in no position to judge what I must understand. To answer this question, I am not interested in blending the expansion theory into my theory at all. Because my theory can answer all questions of our universe, and one of them is that it is not expanding to any noticeable degree, although as a result of the constant recycling in our universe, over 1,000,000,000,000,000, without a beginning, I do believe it is growing ever so slight.

“Mark wrote only one book, is not planning another, and I can assure you he is not making any money out of it. Just like you, everyone is ignoring him. Also, please do not judge him or his theory before you read his book. If he is incorrect, another theory of everything will need to be convincing indeed, and will need to explain the entire physics, every single phenomenon, several you already mentioned in previous emails.”

Answer: My judgement of Mark was always favorable because of what I understood he was in disagreement with science. I noticed nothing in his first edition that represented a description of what was happening in the universe. Only the fact that it must be a one principle idea. The so-called best mind in the universe, Einstein spent the last 30 years of his life looking for exactly this.

The difference between my idea and his, I can produce that one principle idea that connects everything and there can't be two different energies doing the same thing. I have a 1998 copyright that illustrates the one principle.

I have his second book which I understand now is just a second edition of the same book. I hate to read, and never read for pleasure, only for information, so why would I read it? The reason I got the second edition and the first edition was to give my ghost writers information on what science did not know.

[...]

“2. If I understand correctly, you found the reason for Newton's attracting force at a distance. The very mechanism by which Newton's force acting at a distance actually works. Is that correct?”

Answer: Yes this is exactly true, it is very simple, my positively charged particles on the way in and it, just before connection, force out a negative response which science calls electrons, these electrons winds up on the exterior of the impact area or atom and adjacent to the negative exterior or electrons of the next atom. On their way out and on their way to the next connection, they leave a positive or a proton to the impact area.

As a result, the exterior of all mass is negative, and a composition of positive and negative in the interior, but mostly positive inside. Our sun is all negative on the outside, positive inside the earth, all negative on the outside, all positive in the inside like every piece of mass in the universe. So simply the attraction force is the negative of the sun, it is trying to get to the positive on the earth and vice versa, and the earth doesn't go crashing into the sun because there's a large repelling negative entity between the 2 of them. Because earth is all negative on the outside, the attraction force coming from the exterior powers the earth to rotate in a direction. This is the reason, has not stopped on the drag of the moon's gravitational pull that creates the tides.

“As a result, you reject Einstein's Theory of General Relativity in order to explain gravity, where gravity is instead justified by the geometry (distortions) of space-time, as if space-time was a sheet of rubber or a cover on a bed. However, you kept some sort of grid permeating space, a bit like what Einstein describes as space-time. And you also, I believe, kept the idea of Einstein concerning mass-energy.”

Answer: I completely reject all aspects of Einstein's space-time. What's the difference if you warp or bend something, if you bend white light in our skies today, you get a rainbow. The Jacobs Positively Charged Particles Grid is simply showing that there is energy in all of our universe that operates gravity of mass in the manner mentioned above. Energy has only 2 components, very small Positively Charged Particles and the suns using their nuclear fusion to accelerate these particles. Because the positive of course, they're always heading for a negative, the next negative is of course another sun, as a result of

them turning back in to this next sun, they create the end of energy and this great energy bubble we live in.

“3. So, maybe you are also re-interpreting Einstein, while still keeping several of his ideas. That space, time, energy and mass are all interlinked together in some sort of grid permeating space, upon which everything lays on. Is that correct?”

“4. Of course, there is also apparently that the entire universe might be permeated with neutrinos, especially where there are suns. They may be neutral particles, with a small mass, by they could perhaps be the grid you are mentioning, upon which the positively charged particles and energy might travel? Is that correct?”

Answer: Absolutely not, there are no such things as neutron, neutrinos or neutral particles.

“5. Possibly instead you are talking about the field that the Higgs Boson is supposed to create and which permeates the universe, and which is said to be the 17th particle in particle physics, and composes the very field that explains why every other particle has mass (I am not sure exactly how they justify this, but it is similar to a magnetic field). Is this correct?”

Answer: No, once again Higgs Boson is simply, once again, using his imagination to create a none existing energy.


“6. (Important question:) Basically, if the answers to questions 3, 4 and 5 are incorrect, then please explain to me what your grid is made of, and how it works exactly. Your grid must be made of something, some particles, and they must be smaller than electrons? So possibly neutrinos? And we must explain how it moves particles.”

Answer: My grid is simply the connection of Positively Charged Particles that intersect at approximately every 10<sup>-8</sup> cm in mass and in space. In space they force out a negative response, in mass they create the negative electron.

“You say that all energy is kinetic, this is something Mark McCutcheon agrees with, he says the only type of energy that is truly energy in the universe is kinetic energy. So that point agrees with expansion theory.”

Answer: Nothing agrees with your expansion theory. My theory explains why all energy is kinetic. I even explain why the acceleration of mass at 300,000 kilometers per sec is an explosion.

“Now, I believe that the way you explain that energy is kinetic, and the way you explain that mechanism behind Newton’s force of gravity, is that atoms within molecules (of cesium for example) are vibrating or pulsating at something around 9 billion times a second. This is an atom of cesium below, it has 55 protons, 55 electrons, 78 neutrons. The fact that it has 55 protons and 55 electrons means it is neutrally charged:”



Answer: This is science's observation of what's happening and believing that energy is in the atom and not kinetic, I can only describe it in this manner.  
Science knows because of the manner of their detection, that it is exactly 9,192,631,770 per second, of course this consistency is the reason that this was the first atomic clock.  
Now they have discovered that both aluminum and magnesium beat at the same rate, but even more constant. That would tell you something, that the speed of light is the only thing that is constant.

[...] (The remaining questions were not answered.)

(END OF DOCX FILE)

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** HENRY JACOBS Owner <e-em-pcg@q.com>  
**Subject:** Re: Trying to explain my theory  
**Date:** 17 October 2016 at 02:40:33 BST  
**To:** Roland Michel Tremblay <rm@themarginal.com>

Dear Roland

[...] About my thesis.

First of all I started with not the idea of wanting to change anything, I just knew there wasn't anything in the world I shouldn't be able to understand.

I fully expected, because of the notoriety Einstein got, that he was the man.

After discovering how all energy is connected and what entities must exist to create energy, I'm afraid I'm the only one that can take this there.

The main thing that my thesis does is give us a lead in how to attain free energy.

Let's take the atom. Science believe that the atom Stores Energy and every time a new atom is created, it automatically attains this energy.

In order to keep this energy and this atom, there must be a neutron that separates the electron and the proton, that even a \$12,000,000,000 accelerator still can't find. It is simply

because they created from nothing to separate the electron and the proton. This Energy created in the atom must in some way cause electromagnetic energy to travel at 300,000 kilometers per sec. (Farfetched.)

The explosive nature of nitrogen can be stored in the atoms and suddenly released. In other words, you can create atoms with the energy in them so we can create energy.

My Positively Charged Particles create the condition that nitrogen does not have, or create new energy in reproducing every new nitrogen atom.

The only thing nitrogen has is the ability to be encapsulated in a condition that accelerates it at 300,000 kilometers per second, simply because mass cannot accelerate at that speed, we have an explosion.

I must write this book then put a Well animated film together so everyone can get a visual of exactly what energy is.

The people that are involved with me in doing this will be fully compensated when this migrates into the search for free energy.

Hope you're one.

Hank

**From:** "HENRY JACOBS Owner" <[e-em-pcg@q.com](mailto:e-em-pcg@q.com)>

**To:** [e-em-pcg@q.com](mailto:e-em-pcg@q.com)

**Sent:** Friday, October 21, 2016 5:51:41 PM

**Subject:** Re: Trying to explain my theory

Dear Roland

Hope everything is improving: for you.

Just watched a movie evidently published in 2008, it was about Eddington and Einstein collaborating on getting Einstein's theory of relativity together.

It showed just exactly what was lacking in their assumption that there was another reason, that reflected the gravity force other than the attraction of mass.

Problem began because Newton did not identify the cause of the force, and he said this force was God's work.

Now Einstein wanted to only read God's mind, and after nine years of work doing this, comes up with this ridiculous fabric concept.

Part of the movie showed Eddington trying to put on a demonstration to his family. He has 2 people hold the tablecloth at both ends.

He then puts a large loaf of bread in the center, saying this is the sun, then he takes an apple and rolls it around the loaf of bread. Guess what, that apple still turns in the wrong direction than the earth turns on its axis today. That only goes to prove how actually little effort was made to reason out Einstein's proposal.

Of course Eddington went to Northern Africa for the taking of pictures with the cameras, they had in them days of the stars to prove Einstein's Theory.

I don't know if anyone has attempted the picture taking again during an eclipse of the sun.

I can simply show you, if you don't understand by now, why Newton's theory was right then and still is now. Do you imagine the dark road we took creating black holes.

Warped time and space all because of such a lack of reasoning, and deciding Einstein was

right instead of Newton.  
Get back to me when you fill you have time. Hank

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** HENRY JACOBS Owner <e-em-pcg@q.com>  
**Subject: Re: Expansion Theory**  
**Date:** 29 October 2016 at 05:55:53 BST  
**To:** Roland Michel Tremblay <rm@themarginal.com>

Hi Roland  
I would like to know how to expose the Einstein Eddington connection at Cambridge, you can't be too far from there.  
I watched the 2008 supposedly documentary on this episode, I believe Newton was completely sold down the river by Cambridge on this matter.  
I can prove Newton was absolutely correct in this matter.  
Hank

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** HENRY JACOBS Owner <e-em-pcg@q.com>  
**Subject: Re: Expansion Theory**  
**Date:** 4 November 2016 at 22:08:43 GMT  
**To:** Roland Michel Tremblay <rm@themarginal.com>

Dear Roland  
My single principle idea of energy is not only very simple, but it is the only way all other energies can exist.  
1) First it supplants the need for the neutron in the atom. Science created this entity in order to keep the positive and negative apart, in a nuclear binding force idea. Science has an all out search for this none existing entity, to the degree to even create a \$12,000,000,000 accelerator.  
2) Second my single principle idea replaces the neutron in the center of the atom with gravity. Gravity is the leftover positive entity in the center of my impact area or the atom, as the positively charged particles are leaving the impact area.  
A2) The above all takes place because of my positively charged particles, which are accelerated by the nuclear fusion of our suns, and that intersect at every 10 to the -8 cm in mass and space. In mass we recognize this energy in the atom creating an explosion, because mass cannot accelerate at 300,000 kilometers per second when placed on this grid. This type of an explosion is actually what science describes as anti-matter.  
B2) In space all electromagnetic negative energy is repel on this grid of positively charged



particles. These positively charged particles, or what science is now trying to identify as the dark matter of our universe.

This is absolutely the simplest I can illustrate what we have been talking about. A 5 minute simple animation would make everything explicitly clear, which I will put together after publishing the book.

Please respond as soon as you're available. Hank

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** HENRY JACOBS Owner <e-em-pcg@q.com>  
**Subject: Re: Time**  
**Date:** 13 November 2016 at 18:57:23 GMT  
**To:** Roland Michel Tremblay <rm@themarginal.com>

ROLAND

I can understand you've been busy, but I hope you realize there can only be one final theory and that is mine.

The universe can only have one principle that creates all energy and gravity that is very simple, and I've identified that principle. [...]

Hank

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** HENRY JACOBS Owner <e-em-pcg@q.com>  
**Subject: Re: Time**  
**Date:** 12 December 2016 at 22:39:54 GMT  
**To:** Roland Michel Tremblay <rm@themarginal.com>

Dear Roland

I don't know if you understand or not, but what my thesis involves is a complete renovation of science and the understanding of energy.

The idea is to create an electron separator of some sort, to be directly involved with energy before it creates fission and or fusion.

[...]

Your friend, Hank Jacobs

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** HENRY JACOBS Owner <e-em-pcg@q.com>  
**Subject: Re: Expansion Theory**

**Date:** 21 February 2017 at 03:05:41 GMT

**To:** Roland Michel Tremblay <rm@themarginal.com>

Dear Roland

I'm really sorry that we cannot get on the same page. I scanned through the second edition of Mark McCutcheon's Final Theory.

I had purchased the first edition years earlier, and the second edition I purchased the hard copy about a year before I talk to you, and got the download, which I have deleted. I am amazed at the literary capability of some people, the idea of energy being created because of an expansion that some way controls mass, is without a doubt the capacity of an amazing literary capability, but I'm afraid no better than what Einstein produced. Making Expansion an initiating force is pure fantasy, sorry I know of no other way to explain it.

To reason there is any kind of expansion that is not produced by a contributing energy such as my positively charged particles is to be blind to any observation, no better as to what science believes it to be, from a 10 to the -23 cm atom big bang 15,000,000,000 years ago. Absolute ignorance. It is just too bad that man cannot understand that energy can exist without a beginning, otherwise we will not have an explanation for how it works. If science could prove this, there would be no lack of understanding everything else in our universe. If we believe Einstein's version or the Expansion Theory, we will never be able to tap into the true entity of energy itself. Completely overlooking the way Nicklaus Tesla recognized energy in our universe.

How does your expansion theory explain the aspect of different bacterial life being created in our environment each and every day?

Or how you can extract the nitrate from pig shit, create nitroglycerin and make the mistake of shaking up a small bottle and blowing yourself apart and your friends that are watching this **action**? This is the force science recognizes as anti-matter although they don't have an explanation of it.

Anti-matter is what all explosive energy is, this action is caused by the atom of mass being forced to accelerate in all directions at the speed of light. No matter if you light a match, fire cracker, a stick of dynamite, Robert Oppenheimer fission. The size of the explosion is simply related to the number of atoms that accelerate at the same time. Nuclear fusion is a larger explosion, and this is simplified in the scientific world that relates to the fact that you got to have fission before you can have fusion.

Please simply read this and be so kind as to explain to me how I'm wrong, and where your expansion theory derives its energy from to create living bacteria, or produce an energy in a magnet, or reproduce electrons into filled coil?

[...]

I suspect that electromagnetic energy traveling west costs more than when it travels east.

[...]

Hank

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** HENRY JACOBS Owner <e-em-pcg@q.com>

**Subject: Re: Expansion Theory**

**Date:** 4 July 2018 at 01:05:05 BST

**To:** Roland Michel Tremblay <rm@themarginal.com>

Dear Roland just couple of questions, how can the planets become round, without gravity in the center of each atom? Why does electromagnetism travel at 300,000 km per second? What is the proof there was a beginning to energy? Without the beginning of energy there would be no expansion theory. To me the beginning of energy, is the most illogical and conception of logic.

Hank always your friend.

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** HENRY JACOBS Owner <e-em-pcg@q.com>

**Subject: Re: Expansion Theory**

**Date:** 21 July 2018 at 07:34:07 BST

**To:** Roland Michel Tremblay <rm@themarginal.com>

Dear Roland,

[...] The main thing that separates me from the rest of the people is that I have directions and how to take this to the next step in finding free energy.

[...] In putting this together I will get somebody to try to help me with sketches or drawings depicting this action and describing the bubble we live in and how it works. Completely recycling everything that's in it, not showing any details of a beginning.

Thanks again for taking another look. [...]

THANKS ROLAND

ALLWAYS YOUR FRIEND HANK

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** HENRY JACOBS Owner <e-em-pcg@q.com>

**Subject: Re: Three more pictures**

**Date:** 30 July 2018 at 00:04:47 BST

**To:** Roland Michel Tremblay <rm@themarginal.com>

Dear Roland

I'm trying to get somebody to make some simple drawings for me. But anyway we must start from here and how all Energy Works and why it's all kinetic.

The Essence of a Unified Universe

Our universe is a large energy bubble. The simple reason that energy does not escape our universe is as follow.

This large energy bubble is composed entirely of kinetic energy created by positively charged particles. These positively charged particles are accelerated by the nuclear fusion of our suns. They travel out away from our suns looking for another negative, being that the exterior of our suns are negative, they travel back through the suns, actually creating the nuclear fusion of our suns. They contact each other in mass and space at approximately every  $1 \times 10^{-8}$  cm. This connection both in space and mass creates a repelling negative response. They are so small that no matter how dense mass is, they travel directly through it. Scientists, looking for dark matter detected traces of my particles in deep mines. They are actually what science is looking for as far as dark matter is concerned, they are both dark matter and antimatter. An explosion of mass, is what happens when the atoms of mass are forced to accelerate at 300,000 km per second. Because they make a connection with my positively charged particles, so now mass must also be repelled like electrical magnetic energy at 300,000 km per second. This is the same reason we have lightning. When hydrogen and oxygen are bonding to make water, they come across that same problem. Can you please respond to see if I've lost you already.  
Your friend Hank

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** HENRY JACOBS Owner <e-em-pcg@q.com>  
**Subject:** Re: Expansion Theory  
**Date:** 31 July 2018 at 02:31:59 BST  
**To:** Roland Michel Tremblay <rm@themarginal.com>

Dear Roland

Just a couple of words on where I started. I was making calls from my cell phone, there were four walls surrounding me.

I realized that the information I was sending, with the only energy in the cell phone of a small battery that would not shine a light halfway down the hallway, yet this information was going clear around the world. It made me think that there had to be something else going through those walls that my information was riding on.

So whatever that was that was going through my walls, was going through me and everything in my room. And through everything else in the world, and was traveling at 300,000 km per second. Now, what if I light a stick dynamite and that action puts that dynamite on that same electromagnetic grid, and the atoms in that dynamite try to take off at 300,000 km per second? I believe you got one hell of an explosion, what do you think????  
Your friend Hank

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** HENRY JACOBS Owner <e-em-pcg@q.com>  
**Subject:** Re: Expansion Theory  
**Date:** 31 July 2018 at 20:22:19 BST

To: Roland Michel Tremblay <rm@themarginal.com>

Dear Roland

One more thing, the frequency sent out by my cell phone attaches itself to the electromagnetic grid created after and because of my positively charged particles connection, that created the particles of the atom. Hope this is helping you understand. During the time we were not talking, I talked to an old friend of mine, a retired Atty. He's had some dealings with and was always interested in theoretical physics. I sent him the same material I sent you, he is a wordsmith he said he understood it, but didn't want to write something so against the scientific community.  
Talk to your later. Your friend Hank

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** HENRY JACOBS Owner <e-em-pcg@q.com>  
**Subject:** Re: Expansion Theory  
**Date:** 31 July 2018 at 22:04:59 BST  
**To:** Roland Michel Tremblay <rm@themarginal.com>

Dear Roland

[...]

...we will rejuvenate Sir Isaac Newton importance in the scientific world.  
Your friend Hank

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** HENRY JACOBS Owner <e-em-pcg@q.com>  
**Subject:** Re: Chemotherapy  
**Date:** 19 August 2018 at 03:22:53 BST  
**To:** Roland Michel Tremblay <rm@themarginal.com>

Dear Roland

[...] I wondered if you were thinking about what I discussed last with you on my positively charged particles and if you could understand what I was trying to get at.

I do think we should do that interview that you talked about because the old ones that I did are out of date and there were some small mistakes made.

I also wanted to talk to you about positronicks and positrons, my creation, I was just naming positively charged particles and the action they created, that might be a distraction. [...]

Your friend Hank

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** HENRY JACOBS Owner <e-em-pcg@q.com>  
**Subject: Re: Chemotherapy**  
**Date:** 20 August 2018 at 22:55:38 BST  
**To:** Roland Michel Tremblay <rm@themarginal.com>

Dear Roland

[...] I have never changed my mind on anything since I made my first copyright in 1998. I'd just misspoke in some instances on earlier interview. But I have confirmed a lot of it by discovering such things as the cesium 133, magnesium and aluminum atoms all beating at the same rate. 9,192,631,770 cycles in one sec.

Make up 3 completely different molecule structures, three different atoms that should tell anybody that there's an outside influence causing this action.

I'm awaiting your contact. Your friend Hank

On 31 Aug 2018, at 23:50, HENRY JACOBS Owner <[e-em-pcg@q.com](mailto:e-em-pcg@q.com)> wrote:

Dear Roland

I haven't talk to you lately reckon your back teaching or about to start. Anyway here is a copy of my first intended book. Your friend Hank

[First\_edition\_copyrighted\_1997.pdf]

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** HENRY JACOBS Owner <e-em-pcg@q.com>  
**Subject: Re: Chemotherapy**  
**Date:** 1 September 2018 at 00:53:16 BST  
**To:** Roland Michel Tremblay <rm@themarginal.com>

Dear Roland

Just a couple of tidbits, in what science can know about the universe or what we can see from our position.

The earth travels at 67,000 miles an hour around our sun.

Our sun travels at 514,000 miles per hour around the milky way galaxy.

It takes us 250,000,000 years to make one rotation around the galaxy.

The milky way galaxy is traveling at 1.34 million miles per hour in the direction of the constellation Hydra.

This could only leave one to believe, because of our changing position, that science is getting a different view of the universe, and all times, and they don't have any idea of what part of the universe they are viewing.

Also that the constellation Hydra has to be traveling at equal speed away from us, or we would have run into each other a long time ago.

Your friend Hank

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

From: "e-em-pcg" <e-em-pcg@q.com>

To: "e-em-pcg" <e-em-pcg@q.com>

Sent: Wednesday, September 12, 2018 7:40:15 PM

Subject: Re: Update

Dear Roland

Just an update on my thoughts in regards to the book [...].

First of all I will start it out as I started the first one, mentioning the great discoveries of mankind before me. Then move from there to where we are in the universe as follows.

This is what science knows about the universe or what we can see from our position.

The earth travels at 67,000 miles an hour around our sun.

Our sun travels at 514,000 miles per hour around the milky way galaxy.

It takes us 250,000,000 years to make one rotation around the galaxy.

The milky way galaxy is traveling at 1.34 million miles per hour in the direction of the constellation Hydra.

This could only leave one to believe, because of our changing position, that science is getting a different view of the universe at all times, but because of such a large scale that we're working on, they recognize the changing position, and they don't have any idea of what part of the universe they are viewing.

Also that the constellation Hydra has to be traveling at equal speed away from us, or we would have run into each other a long time ago.

Then I will move into the idea of what Einstein did with his efforts to read God's mind.

Which begins with a big bang around 13 billion years ago, so we've only travel

26 or 27 times around the milky way galaxy since the big bang. But the big bang put us in the position we are in the universe in less than 4 1/2 minutes.

I have no idea when science decided to give up on logic. This is what happens when you get a cart before the horse, describing what energy is before you, understanding it.

Trying to establish a beginning to something, believing that energy is inside atoms.

give me some feedback, your friend Hank

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Roland Michel Tremblay <rm@themarginal.com>

**Subject: Notes and questions about first edition copyrighted 1997 2**

**Date:** 20 September 2018 at 16:37:21 BST

**To:** <e-em-pcg@q.com>

Notes and questions about first edition copyrighted 1997 2

Dear Hank,

What do you think for this title of your webpage on my website, let me know if you would change it:

**The Essence of the Unified Universe  
Jacobs' Positively Charged Particles (PCPs) and  
Electrons in Mass (EM) Theory**

I have finally read the 31 pages of the file first edition copyrighted 1997 2, and these are my notes and questions about it.

It appears that you have postulated the existence of a new theoretical particle that is very small, so small that we will never potentially be able to see it or identify it. You have called this particle positively charged particles, or PCPs, and I believe you state these particles are produced and emanate from the fusion in the Sun. Is this correct?

This new particle you have theorised, from what I can gather, would be smaller than an electron. It is hard to tell how small an electron is, we have never seen one before, and it is all guess work. But it seems your  $10^{-18}$ cm for size, puts your PCP into the category of as small or smaller than an electron. Do you agree? Which is it?

Your theoretical PCP is pulsating at  $2 \times 10^{18}$  per second. What do you mean by pulsating? It just expands and contracts rhythmically constantly, like a heartbeat? It vibrates on and by itself constantly? Or, is it moving from one place to another, between two points perhaps very close to each other, at that rate?

Is there a cause for that pulsation, or is it just in the nature of that particle to simply pulse by itself? Or possibly it is never by itself, and the interaction between the positively charged particles causes this pulsation somehow? Like in gravitational waves?

You have imagined positively charged particles that are constantly moving in space, affecting the negative particles called electrons. These positive particles basically move the electrons within the atoms and between atoms, creating chemical reactions when electrons are moved and interact with electrons of other atoms; fission reaction when electrons interact with electrons within a same atom, exiting the atom; and fusion reaction when electrons interact within the nucleus of the same atom, entering the atom.



When you say that the positively charged particles are the prime essence of the universe, do you mean that it is the only particle in existence and everything is made up of these positively charged particles?

These positively charged particles move at the speed of light, always, 300,000 km per second, although you state that they are accelerated to that speed within the Sun. Does this mean that originally they were not moving at that speed? Or I think you said they always move at half the speed of light, and their interaction between two of them creates that speed of light?

These positively charged particles are in size hypothetically  $10^{-100}$  cm you state, but earlier in your document you said it was  $10^{-18}$  cm. Which is it? Where does this number come from? Is this about the same size as an electron, in your opinion, or smaller?

What is the power source for these positively charged particles, to be moving as they do in space non-stop, and why are they all and always moving at the speed of light, or 300,000 km per second?

When you state that these positively charged particles meet at  $2 \times 10^{-18}$  per second in space and mass, creating an intersection at every  $10^{-18}$  cm, which produces your grid, where do these numbers come from, what are they based on? Is it derived from the speed of light?

The positively charged particles are intersecting with what? With themselves? Or with mass that is already everywhere?

And these intersections, where the positively charged particles meet, become the nucleus of atoms? What is that initial mass made of? And you say that this mass becomes the protons of the nuclei of atoms? How?

I have a hard time understanding what is an intersection exactly, how it is produced by these positively charged particles intersecting together, and how all these intersections could form a grid. And I have difficulties understanding how these intersections would produce the nuclei of atoms and electrons out of thin air.

How do these intersecting positively charged particles create electrons at every intersection of positively charged particles? Where do these electrons come from? Are they positively charged particles that simply switch from a positive to a negative charge? Because then, your positively charged particles are simply positrons, positively charged electrons?

For that matter, are the protons also made up of positively charged particles? Or are they just mass around in the universe, and the positively charged particles ensure their structure and behaviour?

I have difficulties figuring out how those positively charged particles create the nuclei of atoms at intersections of positively charged particles, essentially creating atoms out of thin air, and how they can also create an infinite supply of electrons as soon as they escape from the atoms. And all from positively charged particles produced and escaping from the Sun?

It took me a while to understand orbits according to your theory. It seems to me that you justify orbits and gravity through simple magnetic fields made up of electrons, like the Electric Universe Theory of Everything. Our Moon, Mars and Venus, may not have any magnetic fields, so I am not sure how this would work for them.

And gravity is much more than just orbits. What happens when an object falls to Earth? How are the magnetic fields justifying this force of gravity?

I think you may also, or instead, justify gravity through this exchange of electrons between objects, which are transported and created through the movement of positively charged particles. Is this correct?

Graviton particles is a theory in standard physics to justify gravity. I am not familiar with what they say exactly, I have only read the entry on Wikipedia. How is your theory different from theirs?

[...]

Regards,

Roland Michel Tremblay

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** HENRY JACOBS Owner <e-em-pcg@q.com>

**Subject:** Re: Notes and questions about first edition copyrighted 1997 2

**Date:** 22 September 2018 at 00:32:02 BST

**To:** Roland Michel Tremblay <rm@themarginal.com>

Dear Roland

[...]

The fusion of our suns accelerates my positively charged particles, I got a little carried away calling them gravitons in the beginning.

These positively charged particles exist throughout the universe creating the bubble that the universe is. The nuclear fusion of our suns simply accelerates them. This relates to what science knows as energy. I do not believe that there can be a beginning to energy, at least not one that man can understand.

These positively charged particles are bouncing off from each other and making a connection creating the nucleus of our atom. This is the pulsating of their connection to each other, this happens at 9,192,631,770 times in a second. This connection is also why gravity is in the center of each atom.

Maybe you would respond just to this, and we kinda take one piece at a time.

Always your friend Hank

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

From: "e-em-pcg" <e-em-pcg@q.com>

To: "e-em-pcg" <e-em-pcg@q.com>

Sent: Sunday, September 23, 2018 3:24:32 PM

Subject: Re: Update

Dear Roland

[...] Because I've learned so much since 1997, I wanna to be prepared in the second edition publication to encode and clarify my thesis. Your friend Hank. [...]

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** HENRY JACOBS Owner <e-em-pcg@q.com>

**Subject: Re: My first book**

**Date:** 3 October 2018 at 05:10:33 BST

**To:** Roland Michel Tremblay <rm@themarginal.com>

Dear Roland

I haven't heard from you lately, since I ask why we couldn't talk on skype?

Anyway there's a couple of things I wanted to clear up. One I no longer want to mention such things as Gravitons, positrons or positronicks. These words just create confusion. You ask me a couple of questions in one of your emails but I can't seem to find it.

It seems to me that one of them was about magnetism and a planet's field of gravity, believe me these are two different things.

Magnetism is the reaction within certain materials to my positively charged particles that create a current flow in this material, exit out the north side goes around and enters in the south.

Gravity is created by the connections of my positively charged particles in mass that leave a negative exterior on the outside of all impact areas or atoms.

This creates the surface of all mass regardless of how thin he is to be negative. The internal part of these atoms where the connection is made as positive in all mass, the atom reacting in this way is why gravity is in the center of the atom. So a total exterior of our earth is negative, the interior is positive.

The sun is the same way, all negative on the exterior and positive in the interior. The rest is simple, the negative of our sun is trying to get to the positive of our earth.

The negative on the exterior of our earth is trying to get to the interior positive of the sun. This is what causes the earth to rotate in the direction it does.

Opposite of what Einstein would do.

Your friend Hank

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** HENRY JACOBS Owner <e-em-pcg@q.com>  
**Subject: Re: My first book**  
**Date:** 8 October 2018 at 04:40:05 BST  
**To:** Roland Michel Tremblay <rm@themarginal.com>

Dear Roland

[...]

What I was hoping for, people would read it, and someone would realize that understanding the essence of a unified universe is the very first step in getting free energy, so they would make contact with me, realizing that I'm probably the only person that has the insight to make this happen. [...]

Your friend Hank

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** HENRY JACOBS Owner <e-em-pcg@q.com>  
**Subject: Re: Update website**  
**Date:** 2 November 2018 at 00:06:05 GMT  
**To:** Roland Michel Tremblay <rm@themarginal.com>

Dear Roland

I have received your last e-mail, I want to clarify that I want no mention in anything published about positively charged gravitons. Gravitons is my word, but what I discovered, and the proper identification is positively charged particles. I believe this word would just lead to confusion so I want no mention of it, especially in the start of my communication with the public. I know this might be a little difficult for you and the connection you have to the expansion theory. What I'd like to do is write and publish a simple explanation to what I discovered, trying to write something that will leave my readers on the right track right from the beginning.

[...]

Thanks Roland always your friend Hank

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** HENRY JACOBS Owner <e-em-pcg@q.com>  
**Subject: Re: Update**  
**Date:** 22 November 2018 at 03:51:23 GMT  
**To:** Roland Michel Tremblay <rm@themarginal.com>

Dear Roland

[...]

You mention the neutron from time to time. Let me ask you this, where did it come from, is it not true that the nuclear binding force would simply not work without it, what else would it take to keep the proton and the electron apart. I won't look too good but I can talk and visualize very clearly.

Hope to talk to you on Skype soon, your friend Hank

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** HENRY JACOBS Owner <e-em-pcg@q.com>  
**Subject:** Re: Update  
**Date:** 23 November 2018 at 00:30:20 GMT  
**To:** Roland Michel Tremblay <rm@themarginal.com>

Dear Roland

I'm sorry I don't feel that way about Einstein, the only thing I agree with him on, was the idea of a nuclear a binding force was a quirky idea.

Can you imagine a genius telling you he wants to read gods mind. He was a genius with paper and pencil and a bunch of numbers, putting together an imaginary base on his calculation over an eight year time span.

He only wanted that Nobel prize not because he discovered something new but so he could settle with his wife and marry his cousin. It was simply swept up by his scientific community looking for something different than the bare facts when the apple falls to the ground after the tree can't hold onto it anymore, that's gravity baby.

Much too simple for the scientific community at this time. Couple more things, first show the aluminum atom and magnesium atom with the same internal beat 9,192,631,770 as the cesium 133, not funny but fact, that is kinetic energy at work baby.

I am absolutely positive if I had time I could make the necessary breakthrough that Nicklaus Tesla was talking about.

That's why we got to get on Skype and have a real conversation because if you're serious about writing this book for me I want to make sure that you will be compensated in the way that it should be treated. I know this seems impossible that the scientific world could understand that the university cannot exist any other way than I view it [...] I have drawings of an electrical magnetic engine that I would like Mark McCutcheon to make an analysis of.

I do really appreciate knowing you and feel sorry that your expansion theory does not work for me. I absolutely cannot work from any type of an assumption, the largest of these assumptions to me is the big bang [...] I read some of your history, the same to have a very interesting and outstanding childhood, a job well done.

Always your friend Hank

---

**From:** "e-em-pcg" <e-em-pcg@q.com>  
**To:** "e-em-pcg" <e-em-pcg@q.com>

**Sent:** Friday, November 23, 2018 7:11:24 PM

**Subject:** Re: Update

Dear Roland

I know I did a little research into the idea of a big bang, although I never believed in it from the beginning, just didn't make sense to me, of course neither did the nuclear binding force. I know there's quite a bit of controversy over it, one wouldn't work without either. Now they rely on the Doppler system before it was the background noise.

The Doppler system is flawed as far as I'm concerned, first of all we would have to prove when measuring something from our solar system that it is not our solar system that is moving. This was our beginning, why I explained how the red shift would not work in a fair well type universe, where all the galaxies are going around the core of the universe. So we're going away from one behind us, as equally as the one ahead is going away from us. Of course this is part of my thesis, I sent you pictures of my concept.

I'll talk with you later, the sooner by Skype the better.

Always your friend Hank

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** HENRY JACOBS Owner <e-em-pcg@q.com>

**Subject:** Re: Skype 8.0

**Date:** 25 November 2018 at 23:31:57 GMT

**To:** Roland Michel Tremblay <rm@themarginal.com>

Dear Roland

[...]

One little thing more about my positively charged particles, they only operate within the matter at hand, of creating a nucleus of another atom, another atom, another atom.

They are the only thing that travels at half the speed of light in our universe. Create a positive and negative world for us to live in and put gravity in the center of each atom, and make the universe understandable for all of us.

I think this is what has made it difficult for you to understand the atom as I see it. Nice to meet your family once again and to see you on skype.

Your friend always Hank

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** HENRY JACOBS Owner <e-em-pcg@q.com>

**Subject:** Re: Skype 8.0

**Date:** 30 November 2018 at 06:35:20 GMT

To: Roland Michel Tremblay <rm@themarginal.com>

Dear Roland

I sure appreciate everything you're doing for me Roland I just hope that there will be some way I can repay you. [...] I would never ask if I wasn't 100% sure of my thesis.

I think our last conversation we uncovered a short lack of understanding that I was trying to relay.

That is positively charged particles, after making a connection in mass or space, are never heard of again other than making more connection.

The reaction in the atom or mass is pretty much the same with a binding force other than we have no need for a neutron.

I believe that each atom within our body or in all mass is beating at that same beat, but cannot be detected in these other atoms at this time.

Thanks again Hank your friend

\*\*\*

Read the book in PDF format:

**The Essence of the Unified Universe  
Jacobs' Positively Charged Particles (PCPs) and  
Electrons in Mass (EM) Theory**

[http://www.themarginal.com/Jacobs\\_Positively\\_Charged\\_Particles\\_PCPs.pdf](http://www.themarginal.com/Jacobs_Positively_Charged_Particles_PCPs.pdf)