

Albert Einstein, Stephen Hawking and other theoretical physicists looked for a **simplification** of all these various field theories with their numerous forces.

Well, **Here's the simplification!!!**

It changes 3 beliefs.

Issued: October 3rd 2018.

3beliefs in htm: - <http://rbduncan.com/3beliefs.htm>

Also 3beliefs in Word: - <http://rbduncan.com/3beliefs.doc>

And 3beliefs in Adobe pdf: - <http://rbduncan.com/3beliefs.pdf>



A new Look

(if this is really a frequency universe)

at the

scalar, spinning, standing wave

Continuum Hypothesis

Not only is there a **Continuum Hypothesis** in the mathematical world of infinities but there is also an infinity **Continuum Hypothesis** of even greater relevancy in the real world, that is, if Dr. Milo Wolff is right and we are in a scalar, spinning, standing wave, universe.

String theory showed us our universe was built of vibrating strings of a definite size wavelength, but this cannot be so in a universe of scalar, spinning, standing waves.

All radio transmitters waste power, producing standing waves that do act a bit like the vibrating strings in string theory.

But the power, creating these standing waves, in radio transmitters comes from only one direction or one point.

If the radiation power building our electrons comes from other electrons in our surroundings (*if it's scalar*) -- as Dr. Milo Wolff has shown for the electron -- it can not produce a vibrating string type wave: It can only produce a scalar, spinning, standing wave which we see as the electron.

Thus electrons, as well as stars, are constantly being re-built.

Not only that but these scalar, spinning, standing wave universe building blocks must be close enough to each other in spin frequency to act like a wave guide but not a close enough resonance to remove or emit energy to scalar, spinning, standing waves of other spin frequencies or else you will have something similar to our Big Bang.

Yes, the first ten thousandth of a second of George Gamow's Big Bang has to be changed: Where Gamow has neutrons being created in the first ten thousandth of a second, we know that an all neutron universe existed for a vast amount of time previous to our Big Bang.

Energy leakage either into or out of this all neutron universe made this all neutron universe suddenly unstable and it went into a beta decay only stabilizing again once half the original neutrons were locked safely inside newly created atoms.

The other half of the original neutrons became protons, electrons and neutrinos via beta decay.

While Gamow was wrong about the first ten thousandth of a second of his Big Bang, he was absolutely right about all the rest of it.

Just as Dirac's math showed us the anti particle, now does the **Continuum Hypothesis** math show us an unseen aspect of these standing wave building blocks that build our real universe.

It was Kurt Gödel who proved in 1940 that the mathematical infinity **Continuum Hypothesis** could not be **disproved** and it was Paul Cohen in 1963 who showed that it cannot be **proved**: So also can our scalar, spinning, standing wave infinity **Continuum Hypothesis** neither be **proved nor disproved**.

Thus: the **spin frequencies** of these scalar, spinning, standing waves -- *quarks, electrons, solar systems, galaxies, galactic clusters, super clusters, etc. (six spin frequencies we know about)* -- build only an infinitely tiny part of our universe.

It might even be better if we combine the electron spin with the higher close resonant spin frequency of the down quark and say there are **five orders** of spin frequencies that we know about.

There is an awful lot we don't know yet about all this but we do know that each **higher** frequency **order** of spin has a direct effect of modeling the next **lower order** of frequency spinning items: Just as you know quarks and electrons determine the nature of the atoms and molecules they build, so also do the spins of planets and stars determine the shape of galaxies they build.

Nature equates higher frequency with higher energy but we do something different:

Somehow we equate higher spin frequencies with being smaller and lower spin frequencies as being larger but I'm certain this frequency universe does not fall into that trap.

We see smaller things building larger things when it's really higher frequency (*higher energy*) things building lower frequency (*lower energy*) things.

You can only measure such concepts as space and time provided that you measure only inside your spin frequency gauge parameters. Everyone knows you cannot measure outside these gauge parameters in the microcosm. Now you know this is true in the macrocosm as well.

These different spin frequency gauges or orders of spin frequencies that we see in our macrocosm, are really different spacetime realm gauges having different spacetime intervals into which we should not be using the speed of light to measure: This wrong way of measuring, in the macrocosm, is the reason for our mistaken belief that we need all this illusive Dark Matter and Dark Energy: All this is covered later.

While we see the electron must be spherical, others -- such as galaxies -- are not.

Resonances, with the faster spinning items, play a big factor in these being spherical or even close to spherical. All of these universe building blocks, however, must be **scalar, spinning, standing waves**: These are the elements building our universe.

Frequencies, like numbers, can both increase or decrease forever:

So there may indeed be an infinite number of these scalar, spinning, standing wave frequency building blocks making up our entire universe that we don't know about. The **spins** of these resemble the keys of a piano whose keyboard is of such infinite length that the infinite number of these various **spin frequencies** becomes a **Continuum Hypothesis** that can neither be **proved nor disproved**.

An infinite number of higher and higher spin frequencies equates into an infinite amount of energy in our universe: While this is something our minds find hard to believe, it may indeed be so.

We knew our place in this universe was small but now Dr. Milo Wolff has shown us -- with his scalar, spinning, standing wave concept -- that our spot in this universe may even be exponentially much, much smaller than anyone had ever imagined!

Dr. Milo Wolff limits the distance that electrons surrounding us can deliver power to the electrons building us: Electrons beyond the Hubble limit cannot use their power to build our electrons.

We are in a frequency universe -- *all the quantum theorists know this* -- yet these frequencies that we cannot see, in the microcosm, are transformed -- via down quark and electron spin frequencies -- into a lower sub harmonic band of frequencies that we do see as our colors.

As Niels Bohr showed us, the higher the orbital drop the higher the color frequency. Thus the colors we can see are limited to the various orbital drops the electrons can make. So our visible frequency -- using Dr. Milo Wolff's scalar, standing wave, frequency universe -- exponentially reduces our frequency range of things we can see **compared** to the frequency range of things that are really here in our universe.

But this has nothing whatsoever to do with Dark Matter or Dark Energy. Keep reading and you will see why:

Pardon me for inserting a few things that I and my son Richard have said before.

These are also important:

In the following are things Kurt Gödel evidently tried to show in his famous proof: *Are our science laws really universal laws? They seem to be merely subset rules for subset areas inside of a larger universe whose real laws we have not quite yet acquired.*

What Kurt Gödel seems to be telling us is that as we view more and more of this universe -- *with for instance the Hubble telescope* -- then we are going to see more and more proofs that our highly valued scientific laws are nothing but subset rules for subset areas.

Copied from the 2013 Britannica DVD "*Mach, Ernst*

*... Mach also proposed the physical principle, known as **Mach's principle**, that inertia (the tendency of a body at rest to remain at rest and of a body in motion to continue in motion in the same direction) results from a relationship of that object with all the rest of the matter in the universe. Inertia, Mach argued, applies only as a function of the interaction between one body and other bodies in the universe, even at enormous distances. Mach's inertial theories also were cited by Einstein as one of the inspirations for his theories of relativity."*

Mach's principle, in other words, is saying that molecules here are binding with molecules in the surrounding stars to give us inertial mass. **This is important!** And I begin to show here, in this paper, how this happens and you can find in my other papers the full extent of exactly how this all happens.

Mach's principle is half of science. If you sweep **Mach's principle** under the rug, as this present science group has, then there is no way you can understand either gravity or inertia.

I got an e-mail from my friend Carl Scheider asking me what **Dark Matter** was.

My answer to him was that it was something this present science consortium had to originate because, scientists saw they needed far more gravity to hold galaxies together since they saw galaxies do not rotate like our solar system where the outer-most planets revolve slower. Galaxies spin more like an entire fixed, solid unit. They have what is called "flat rotation rates". Therefore the spiral arms of all these galaxies seem to be going far faster than their escape velocity and, as everyone knows, this is absolutely impossible.

All this was known long before the Hubble space telescope.

After the Hubble telescope came even more evidence of what was long called "missing matter" or "missing mass", but now is called **Dark Matter**: Seeing ABEL 2218 and ABEL 370, the arcs and galaxy brightness seen there -- *believing in gravitational lensing and micro lensing* -- would indicate that **ten times more mass** would have to exist there than could be accounted for from the mass of all the stars and gas situated there.

Not only that but another mystery element called **Dark Energy** is now needed to give this accelerating, expanding universe even more of a repelling or repulsive force. For what's really going on see:

<http://www.amperefitz.com/acceleratingexpandinguniverse.htm>

We **do** have Einstein's cosmological constant which is a repulsive force equal but opposite to gravity. But this is only part of a larger **Dark Energy** repulsive force.

I would rather call it a dark force rather than dark energy because energy **must** come in quantum units.

I'm with a group that feels the Big Bang wasn't started with any mystery energy. We believe a stable neutron universe was already here for eons <http://www.rbduncan.com/page7.html> & <http://www.rbduncan.com/BB.htm> and the Big Bang occurred because slow energy leakage caused the *fine structure* to change enough that this all neutron universe eventually lost stability and had a sudden beta decay. **So, for us, the Big Bang began with quantum energy we understand.**

*(That a free neutron remains stable now for about twenty minutes, proves that the slow energy leakage is still here and the **fine structure** is not quite the perfect constant most think it is.)*

Copied from the 2013 Britannica DVD "Interference fringe:

a bright or dark band caused by beams of light that are in phase or out of phase with one another. Light waves and similar wave propagation, when superimposed, will add their crests if they meet in the same phase (the waves are both increasing or both decreasing); or the troughs will cancel the crests if they are out of phase; these phenomena are called constructive and destructive interference.

Robert Dicke claimed that if gravity was caused via phase or relative motion then we would see *interference fringes*. He turned out to be right because now with the advent of the Hubble space telescope we are actually seeing Dicke's *interference fringes* and their cause is being seen as gravitational lensing caused by Einstein's curved space. This assumption makes **Dark Matter** seem necessary to our present science group.

Copied from the 2013 Britannica DVD: "*Robert Henry Dicke*

born May 6, 1916, St. Louis, Mo., U.S.

died March 4, 1997, Princeton, N.J.

American physicist noted for his theoretical work in cosmology and investigations centering on the general theory of relativity. He also made a number of significant contributions to radar technology and to the field of atomic physics. . . . By the 1960s Dicke had become actively interested in gravitation."

Einstein knew and said gravity was a frequency (*wave*). But it is not in the electromagnetic range of frequencies. **Black holes are invisible to the light perception frequency but not to the gravitational perception frequency:** The speed of stars rotating around the center of the Sombrero galaxy indicate a black hole of a billion solar masses while the black hole in the center of our own Milky Way galaxy approximates a mass of four million stars like our sun.

Over the years I've shown several reliable indications, that light and gravity are caused by **far different** frequencies.

Gravity stems from frequencies both above and below the electromagnetic frequency band. **It occurs from spin frequencies both above and below the electron's spin frequency.**

We will never see Dicke's *interference fringes* from any of the higher gravitational frequencies because these frequencies are far too high to see but we can see these *interference fringes* from the lower galactic spin gravitational frequencies (*read my other papers*) especially now that the Hubble space telescope is revealing far, far distant galaxies more in this lower gravitational frequency range.

Why does this so called gravitational lensing only occur from this extreme far distant space now revealed, for the first time, by the Hubble space telescope?

Why doesn't it also occur for these much closer galaxies to us that have the same mass as those distant galaxies?

Delving into the above two questions actually gives me one answer: the amount of **extra** gravitational attraction (*Dark Matter*) caused by galactic spin, relative to the surroundings, is probably far **more** of Dicke's *interference fringes* and far **less** of this gravitational lensing.

If gravity -- *and all the other forces, for that matter* -- are seen as phase or relative motion, and if Dicke was correct, then we can account for all the **Dark Matter** needed to explain all the *interference fringe* effects now being seen by the Hubble space telescope.

The Hubble telescope is, by the way, a remarkable instrument: The galactic count in one **outstanding** Ultra Deep Field **268 hour** time exposure, made in 2004, at an aperture of about .85% of a degree, shows us that there are **130 billion galaxies** -- *all around us in the sky* -- at this furthest Hubble distance.

It's certainly a shame, that with no more space shuttle flights, there will be no more battery changes nor repairs to that magnificent telescope.

Most in these universities came to this "*needing more gravity*" solution because they failed to listen to what Wheeler and Feynman said and they had not heeded **Gödel's proof** nor had they realized that "*you can not quantize without fixing the gauge*" is as valid in the macrocosm as it is in the microcosm.

They also, unfortunately, do not understand what space really is and you can form no logical picture of things unless you know exactly what both space and time really are where quarks are involved and phase is involved. See: [*LOGIC doesn't exist unless you know EXACTLY what Space and Time really are. 3-22-2013*](#)

LOGIC doesn't exist unless you know EXACTLY what Space and Time really are. 3-22-2013" [also](#) in Adobe.pdf - [spacetime logic.pdf](#)

Remember, **Gödel's proof** warns us that it seems we only have a group of **subset** rules working in **subset** areas. We have **no** supreme universal law showing us exactly how our entire universe really works.

Kurt **Gödel** was absolutely correct because in **Gauge** Theory, quantum scientists know, that to predict quantities correctly, they must fix (*specify*) the exact **gauge (rules and math)** and a certain **subset section of the microcosm** where those rules apply). See: <http://www.amperefitz.com/quantize.htm> (You cannot quantize without fixing the **gauge**.)

Kurt **Gödel** essentially told us: Since we can't see this entire universe, we have no universal laws for this entire universe; instead we only have **subset** rules that we are forced to use in subset areas thus, **we are forced to always specify, and not exceed, the parameters inside of which these rules and math apply.**

Wheeler and Feynman warned us that we can never correctly measure things outside of our spacetime realm. But since we know the speed of light in a vacuum, we use that as our measuring stick all throughout the macrocosm.

The story of how we developed the method we use today to measure the distance to distant stars begins with Henrieta Sven Leavit and continues with a host of great astronomical advances and it is one of the truly great astronomical stories and astronomical accomplishments.

I do not wish to cast the slightest doubt on those who have discovered, what they have that allows us to presently measure distances to the distant stars. But I do wonder if perhaps the astronomers of today -- *by measuring space that is not being produced by the electron* -- have mistakenly used the electron, that has a **different spin frequency** to determine all that, non electron produced, astronomical space.

We would certainly need far, far less **Dark Matter** if that space was presently being vastly overestimated.

By measuring across galaxies, and even across further clusters of galaxies, we are not measuring in a true vacuum are we?

It seems to me that by using the speed of light to measure out across that extended realm of all those **130 billion galaxies** -- *without considering that the mass of all those galaxies is going to appreciably slow down that light* -- means that each yardstick that we are placing end to end to measure, will measure worse and worse the farther we go in measuring this universe.

The proof that this is what is happening is that neither our galaxy nor any of the galaxies in our immediate cluster show any signs of expansion whatsoever. The only signs of expansion come from far distant galaxies.

Even though the speed of light is the best measuring stick we have, it reveals **an expanding space** to us as we look too far out and then, just beyond the Hubble Ultra Deep Field range, the measuring must stop entirely because we are measuring -- *also in time* -- to the very beginnings of this universe. The exact opposite **of this** is measuring to a Black Hole where the same speed of light measuring stick must also stop measuring because, as it reaches the Black Hole, space gets so **small** it completely vanishes, revealing to us a **contracting space**.

Again, Kurt Gödel evidently tried to **warn** us in his famous proof: *Space is not really a universal concept. It seems to be merely a*

subset concept in a subset area inside of a larger **frequency** universe whose real laws we have not quite yet acquired.

We gave ourselves a concept of space **before** we **fixed the gauge** on the parameters of that concept!

We exceeded the parameters of our measuring ability!

Not only that but if gravity affects spacetime then wouldn't gravity's equal but opposite repulsive force **also** affect spacetime?

Am I the first person to notice these measuring errors?

It seems to me everyone can see this. Why hasn't anyone written about these things?

Not only that but Ernst Mach told us **surroundings** are part of it.

The solar system has far different **surroundings** from the galaxy.

Besides, once you see that galaxies **do not rotate like our solar system**, and you also know both space and time are phase relationships, then heed Wheeler and Feynman:

We cannot take solar system measurements -- *where the components have one phase relationship* -- and use these measurements in a galaxy environment where the components thereof have an entirely different phase relationship.

All of this tells you our solar system is in an **entirely different** spacetime realm from our galaxy. (Remember, galaxies rotate more as a solid unit than our solar system where the outer planets go much slower.)

Wheeler and Feynman's measurement warning is certainly correct in this instance.

Our present science group doesn't even know half the story. They are not taking surroundings into consideration (*Mach's principle*) and they are not using **logic** because they do not even know what space and time are frequency wise and this indeed is a frequency universe in its entirety from microcosm to macrocosm.

This is a frequency universe all throughout:

You simply cannot put yourself into the center of things and say everything smaller than me is a frequency universe but everything larger than me is **not**. Yet this is exactly what is being done today.

All present subset science rules **must** be translated into frequency laws before we have real answers to anything in this universe.

Logic, about all this, will only arrive to you after you discover what **space** and **time** really are. Einstein almost had it but then he backtracked away from his cosmological constant, which is **gravity's equal but opposite force**.

This universe is built on **equal but opposite forces** at different spin frequencies: *This is it, in a nutshell.*

The electron spin frequency gives us the magnetic forces. The quark spin gives us not only the strong force but gravitational and inertial forces as well.

General Relativity tells you that force can be equated into more or less (*curved*) space.

This is what is really happening.

There **is** a definite problem in our measuring.

However, this entire universe is following Ampere's Relative Motion law: <http://www.rbduncan.com/relMlaw>

If you do a bit of reading, by clicking those links below, you will see that all the attractive forces in our universe are basically *in phase* attractions that have equal but opposite *out of phase* repulsions.

Space, you will see if you do enough reading, is merely the **average** *out of phase* amount in this frequency universe of ours. But you'll have to do a lot more reading to fully understand that.

These new mysterious things (Dark Matter & Dark Energy) show us that our old long believed science model needs drastic changes.

But just as the Catholic church did not allow Galileo to destroy their science model, neither can the present university system allow anyone to destroy their present science model even though it no longer works.

I wish to thank all those who have helped me see the correct **model** of "what's really going on" -- *their names are on many of my papers* -- and I want to thank my son Richard who has probably helped me the most.

But if I have failed to show the public, through my various papers and books, that this **far superior science model** -- *is better than the subset concepts these universities are presently portraying* -- then it's entirely my fault.

Mathematician Stephen Wolfram told us in his best seller 'A New Kind of Science' that "Math can only explain simple things but a simple **model** can explain a complicated universe."

More about this at <http://www.amperefitz.com/phase.symmetry.htm> and <http://www.amperefitz.com/phase.symmetry.pdf>

You can also get the general gist of this **far superior kind of science model** – *being put together now* – by reading various articles at

<http://www.rbduncan.com>. & <http://www.amperefitz.com>

And a bit more of something you may have already seen:

I did a lot of analyzing gyroscope precession before I wrote **my first book** in 1966. I came to the conclusion that the way this 90 degree gyro precession was happening was an additional proof of Mach's principle: that gyroscopic inertia was caused by the gyroscope's molecules binding – *in some way* – with the molecules in the surrounding stars. I imagine Ernst Mach saw this as well.

In 1966, while working for Pan American Airlines, I published **my first book**:

There was a **full** page in the New York Times about [Fitzpatrick's First Book](#) on June 18th 1967.

"Fitzpatrick's First Book" also in Adobe.pdf - [pge1.pdf](#)

Click above links to read that first book of mine free.

A good many scientists fail to realize that a simple model can explain a complicated universe. I knew this in 1966, maybe indeed before Stephen Wolfram did. That was essentially what my first book was about.

Even to this day I cannot understand why my peers do not recognize the importance of Mach's principle and that this is a standing wave universe as Dr. Milo Wolf has shown. **It's so obvious!** Eventually this **far superior kind of science model** will prevail but I'm glad, in a way, it hasn't caught on strong yet because, in this way, it's allowing me – *even though I'm slow and in my 80s* – to remain out here, way ahead of the mob, and actually be one of the people able to begin to see into and work with this **far superior kind of science model**.

Over 4 Decades of Fitzpatrick's Books, Papers & Thoughts

<http://www.amperefitz.com/4.decades.htm> and here's this page duplicated in Adobe.pdf:

<http://www.amperefitz.com/4.decades.pdf>

Fitzpatrick's website is at <http://www.amperefitz.com>

Another older website carrying Fitzpatrick's works FREE is:

<http://www.rbduncan.com>

Thank you, [World Scientist Database - - Daniel P. Fitzpatrick Jr.](#)

Have a good day & visit my site at **goodreads**:

<http://www.goodreads.com/user/show/276352>

Click ANY of these [links](#) to get what you want

Read my **latest** book FREE: (these two [links](#) below)

http://www.amperefitz.com/ua_20071020_ck_ds_jm_ds.pdf (This is the book in Adobe)

or

<http://www.amperefitz.com/unvasleep.htm> (This book [link](#) opens faster if you have dial up.)

While all the links on this page are OK and presently working, unfortunately only about two thirds (2/3) of the links I gave, years ago, as proof (click & see: <http://www.amperefitz.com/presskit.html>) for statements in this latest book, published in the year **MMVI**, are now still working **BUT** your search engine will probably take you to a similar area where you should be able to read similar proof material.

& super popular now:

[QED - Feynman's Strange Theory of Light and Matter](#) "Feynman's Strange Theory of Light and Matter"

<http://amperefitz.com/einsteins.cos.c.htm> Einstein's Cosmological Constant.

<http://www.amperefitz.com/two.magnets.htm> Two magnets will show you more than thousands of books.

<http://amperefitz.com/exeshorttoe.html> Extra short Theory of Everything.

<http://www.amperefitz.com/45years.htm> 45 Years of Putting this Jigsaw Puzzle together - of unifying Gravity with all the other forces.

<http://www.amperefitz.com/question.htm> "Ampere's Long Wire Law is a fact!"

<http://www.amperefitz.com/why.general.relativity.htm> Why we have General Relativity or why mass increases with speed."

<http://amperefitz.com/answers.to.mendel.htm> "Dan Fitzpatrick comments on Theoretical Physicist Mendel Sachs' Beliefs."

<http://amperefitz.com/quarkmspin.htm> "While the electron spin causes magnetism, GRAVITY & INERTIA are caused by the QUARK SPIN."

<http://amperefitz.com/abstract.htm> "ABSTRACT of scalar, standing wave concept."

<http://amperefitz.com/lawrm.htm> "It all begins with this all important science law."

<http://amperefitz.com/energy.htm> "All energy is a form of binding energy." (science) e-letter by Fitzpatrick.

<http://amperefitz.com/dark.m.e> Why NASA tells us we have 72% Dark Energy, 23% Dark Matter and 4.6% Atoms.

<http://amperefitz.com/gold1.htm> More wave and scalar wave questions answered by Fitzpatrick.

<http://amperefitz.com/fermbos.htm> ELECTRONS are fermions but not when paired spin up - spin down."

<http://amperefitz.com/bond.strengths.htm> "Sigma Bond strengths in the microcosm."

<http://www.amperefitz.com/acceleratingexpandinguniverse.htm> "Accelerating, expanding universe."

<http://amperefitz.com/not.quite.everything.for.a.theory.of.everything.htm> "Not Quite Everything for a Theory of Everything."

[Schrödinger's Universe](#) **Schrodinger's Universe**

<http://rbduncan.com/why.we.have.gravity.htm> "Why we have GRAVITY and why we have Centrifugal Force."

<http://amperefitz.com/einsteins.blunder.htm> "Einstein's Biggest Blunder -- Wasn't?"

<http://amperefitz.com/plawrm.htm> "Electrons normally repel BUT . . ." says Dan Fitzpatrick Jr.

http://www.rbduncan.com/letter_june2004.htm "And Hubble warned us this was NOT an expanding universe."

<http://www.rbduncan.com/binary.htm> Binary Stars act exactly like Electrons.

<http://rbduncan.com/TOEbyFitzpatrick.htm> A "Theory of Everything" by Daniel P. Fitzpatrick Jr.

<http://rbduncan.com/boson+.htm> Bosons?

http://www.rbduncan.com/letter_june2004.htm Newton and Einstein only gave us HALF the story.

<http://www.rbduncan.com/mybook.htm> "A New Science Tool" (science) e-book by Fitzpatrick

<http://rbduncan.com/Gspeed.htm> "Speed of Gravity is 9×10^{16} meters per second."

<http://rbduncan.com/phase.coherence.htm> Phase Coherence and the Inverse Square law.

<http://amperefitz.com/lisiimp.htm> "Why Garrett Lisi's Model is so important."

<http://amperefitz.com/ffacts.htm> "Little Known Facts about Well known science Terms" (science) e-book by Fitzpatrick.

[Mach's principle](#)

[Stephen Wolfram](#)

Adobe [pdf links](#) below give you **more important** actual science about what is really going on in our universe.

QUICK version of Ampere's Laws.

<http://amperefitz.com/qamp.pdf>

Two magnets will show you more than thousands of books.

<http://amperefitz.com/two-magnets.pdf>

Sigma bond strengths in the microcosm

<http://www.amperefitz.com/bond.strengths.pdf>

"An important Quark message no one is heeding!"

<http://amperefitz.com/quarkspin.pdf>

45 Years of Putting this Jigsaw Puzzle together - of unifying Gravity with all the other forces."

<http://www.amperefitz.com/45years.pdf>

"Ampere's Long Wire Law is a fact!"

<http://amperefitz.com/question.pdf>

"Affenstall Science Christmas Message"

<http://amperefitz.com/affenstall.pdf>

"Dan Fitzpatrick comments on Theoretical Physicist Mendel Sachs' Beliefs."

<http://amperefitz.com/answers.to.mendel.pdf>

"Why we have general relativity or why mass increases with speed."

<http://amperefitz.com/why.general.relativity.pdf>

"Fitz answers some Scalar Wave questions."

<http://amperefitz.com/26nov2006.pdf>

"And Hubble warned us this was NOT an expanding universe."

<http://amperefitz.com/lj2004.pdf>

"Ampere really gave us this Relative Motion Law in 1825 for things he knew were moving in the wire (electrons)."

<http://amperefitz.com/reIMlaw.pdf>

"Fitz talks about some basic problems in physics." - by Fitzpatrick.

<http://amperefitz.com/3dec2006.pdf>

"Little Known Facts about Well known science Terms" (science) e-book by Fitzpatrick:

<http://amperefitz.com/ffacts.pdf>

"Lisi's E8 model seems to show us why we get space & time!"

<http://amperefitz.com/e8.pdf>

"Why Garrett Lisi's Model is so important."

<http://amperefitz.com/lisi-important.pdf>

"What Dr. Milo Wolff says connects with what A. G. Lisi is showing."

<http://amperefitz.com/a.g.lisi.pdf>

A radioman sees us all as radios tuned in to this universe.

<http://amperefitz.com/noaether.pdf>

WHEN DID YOU PUBLISH "Out-of-phase waves give us space and repulsive force."

<http://amperefitz.com/4apr04caroline.pdf>

But then Caroline - from Cambridge - repudiated what she had discovered: one of the most important scientific discoveries EVER MADE! Incredible! Simply Incredible!

<http://amperefitz.com/Carolines.pdf>

"Why we have GRAVITY."

<http://amperefitz.com/why.we.have.gravity.pdf>

"Speed of Gravity is 9×10^{16} meters per second."

<http://amperefitz.com/Gspeed.pdf>

"Einstein's Principle of Equivalence or why gravity acts like acceleration."

<http://amperefitz.com/principle.of.equivalence.pdf>

Is Saul Perlmutter explaining the reason for us having the principle of equivalence?

<http://amperefitz.com/saultony.pdf>

"It's understanding the Binding Energy Curve" says Dan Fitzpatrick Jr.

<http://amperefitz.com/b.e.curve.pdf>

"All energy is a form of binding energy." (science) e-letter by Fitzpatrick.

<http://amperefitz.com/energy.pdf>

"Shedding light on Energy Quanta."

http://amperefitz.com/letter_july2003.pdf

Monday - September 29, 2014 - This can be copied and distributed by anyone as long as it is copied and distributed in its entirety.

Daniel P. Fitzpatrick, Jr.