The Unity of the Universe
D. W. Sciama

I purchased this boot six months ago. It was published in 2009. After picking it up I perused the index to see if proper homage was paid to Charles Darwin as is the custom with modern physics books for the masses. There was no entry for the great man of physics. Would this be the second physics book for the masses in a row that I have read in which I would not know the author's religion or politics? On a closer look one finds that this publication is a reprint of the original published in 1959. That was before the discipline of physics expanded to embrace religion and politics. But what could one learn about the unity of the universe from fifty-year-old physics?

What more has been learned in fifty years is far surpassed by how much was known. I will not go into any detail about what was in the book. However, two areas stand out. I have heard of Mach's Principle but never really knew what it was except for it being strange. If fact it is as strange as relativity and quantum mechanics. Mach's Principle explains what inertia is and how it is related to the mass of the universe. I do not know what updates have been added to the Mach's idea in the fifty years since the book was written or if it is accepted at all. I will have to do further investigation to satisfy any curiosity.

The other area is the steady state versus the big bang universe. Steady state has mostly lost out, but not without a fight. The steady state universe was part of the structure of the religion of atheism. The universe having a beginning in time and space is indigestible for those of the atheist persuasion. The physics of the steady state could not be supported by the evidence. The steady state has been replaced with bounces and bubbles that are totally supported by the vapors of metaphysics. So all is well.

The book is a great read. What would surpass it is for someone to write a book paralleling "The Unity of the Universe" with what has been discovered and accepted since 1959. And also what is still in question.

Mathdrooler 17 Feb 2011