



Shedding a bit of light on

Einstein versus Quantum Theory

while looking at the answers given to us via

Phase Symmetry

Daniel P. Fitzpatrick Jr.

&

Richard Mark Fitzpatrick

© February 2016

Why did Einstein argue with the quantum theorists for years when everyone knows quantum theory is right?

Einstein didn't say quantum theory was wrong: What he said was that quantum theory was not complete and the math

methods that quantum theorists were using were not going to make quantum theory any better.

Einstein was right, in his later years, about warning us about the **MMMs** (**M**ystical **M**athematical **M**ethods) involved in quantum theory.

Even though Einstein, himself, began quantum theory with his concept of the photon, he disliked the math route that it was taking via math methods such as this matrix math that gave, as my 1965 Encyclopaedia Britannica put it, "Answers that appear as if by magic."

Quantum theory did have some early success with these math methods.

Success breeds further success, and that was the beginning of the wondrous mathematical complexities that would later appear in quantum theory.

Math is a double edged sword and it will also cut you as well as help you: It must always be used within the parameters of a suitable, comprehensible science model.

This, Einstein could plainly see, was not being done in quantum theory.

I will again state herein — as I've done many times before — what mathematician Stephen Wolfram has so aptly stated, "Math can only explain simple things but a simple model can

explain a complicated universe."

And **Phase Symmetry** gives you a simple PHASE model that easily explains this ENTIRE universe.

Einstein knew you cannot keep throwing brand new MMMs at the problem and keep getting these "Answers that appear as if by magic." And then keep doing that again and again to build up and obtain the very latest quantum theory model:

This should never be done and this **simply cannot be done** if this is indeed a spinning, scalar, standing wave universe or you will get more errors than correct answers.

Since Einstein's death, quantum theory has continued to be built with building blocks containing both errors and truth. Too many errors and you can end up with something like the ancient Egyptian religion:

Quantum theory has myths that violate science like renormalization and asymptotic freedom that violates spin conservation.

Quantum theory does not even contain what Ernst Mach knew: **Surroundings cause inertial mass.**

Here's how surroundings cause mass. This is something quantum theory fails *entirely* to show you:

More than 99% of strong force *binding energy*, convertible to

mass, will be in energy quanta of 172.8 giga electron volts per energy quantum.

Remember, you saw it here first !!!

Well over 99% of our mass is *strong force mass*, produced by down quarks contained in our matter, spinning at the **square** of the electron spin frequency that are *momentarily* binding — and pulling similar down quarks, more than 10^{-15} meter away, from the tri-quark unit **of protons in the surrounding stars.**

We lose a **quantum of strong force energy** and gain its equivalent mass by a local down quark, in a proton here, pulling a down quark, in a surrounding star, more than 10^{-15} meter, toward the outside edge of a similar proton in that distant star — via **impedance matching** (Quantum Entanglement) with that other down quark in that surrounding star.

In the microcosm, **impedance matching**, Quantum Entanglement and binding energy transfer are essentially the same things. This is something quantum theorists haven't quite discovered yet.

The reason we have $E=mc^2$ is because the down quark spin frequency, *causing mass*, is the **square** of the electron's spin frequency.

When these same quarks here re-bind with local quarks, then mass — derived from binding with the surrounding stars — is turned into energy at the rate of $E=mc^2$. It's as simple as that.

This is a binding energy transfer to the stars and from the stars, both being approximately equal with the resulting net energy transfer about zero.

The up and down quarks that build matter are not *momentary*. They are permanent entities, but this is not so with *this energy flash quantum, that theorists call the top quark*. It is really a *momentary burst of binding energy*, that has no resemblance whatsoever to the quarks that build matter.

The so called top quark and Higg's boson both have a *momentary existence of a trillionth of a trillionth of a second*. Each has energy of over 100 giga electron volts and are things found in CERN's large hadron collider: They are undoubtedly, therefore, the *momentary energy results of locally binding quarks that had been previously bound with quarks in the surrounding stars*.

These *binding energy quanta of over 100 giga electron volts* — star binding returned to local binding — *are the binding energy methods by which inertial mass is turned into energy*:

The *so called* top quark — clearly not a quark — is evidently a quantum micro burst of *binding energy* of 172.8 giga electron volts (2013 Britannica) released by two down quarks.

Which quarks produce the Higgs boson quantum micro burst of *binding energy* of about 125 giga electron volts (2013 Britannica), we don't yet know.

CERN physicists seemed to know that the 125 giga electron volt burst had something to do with mass. But they missed the main little jewel that causes most of our mass. And on top of that, they called it a quark.

Why?

Because they were all true believers in "**strong force containment**" another highly illogical quantum theory belief that told them, '*the strong force was totally contained inside the nucleus*' therefore they could NEVER witness any strong force quanta:

This is why quantum theorists didn't see that BOTH of these micro bursts were of *binding energy*. They entirely lost out because they were "*true believers*" in these complex, Mystical, Mathematical, Methods they themselves had constructed.

An unwarranted belief in the three items of **renormalization**,

asymptotic freedom and **strong force containment** not only ended any hope of quantum theory ever being complete but it prevented quantum theorists seeing what was really going on.

Even though the original basic concept of quantum theory is above reproach, Einstein knew, as you yourself can now see, that many of these Mystical Mathematical Methods, used in quantum theory should have been replaced, a long time ago, by more scientific discovery methods that would have made quantum theory more complete.

In my world of radio and electronics, standing waves and **impedance matching** are of paramount importance. I was surprised and even shocked to find out they are also of supreme importance in the microcosm and macrocosm as well:

You've seen a bit of this already and you will see more of this as you read on.

The percentage of empty space in the microcosm is similar to the percentage of empty space in the macrocosm:

For instance if you enlarge an electron to the size of a pin hole then the distance the closest electron is to the nucleus would be about the same distance the fortieth floor of a tall building is to the street below. There is a vast amount of empty space in the microcosm. But we see none of it.

Space-time is another thing difficult for us humans to comprehend. We humans have split it up into space and time but this universe, it seems, likes it to remain together in one piece as a space-time ensemble: For instance, when you look at distant stars you are also looking back in time.

Even at the time I'm writing this, **Phase Symmetry**, that clearly shows you exactly what space-time is frequency wise, still fails to show us exactly what space or what time is as individual components. I am certain the answer is there but I, as yet, haven't found it.

We probably need a better frequency math before a resolution of space from time can be accomplished. This is the problem I'm working on now.

I started this project after a Eureka moment *seeing that Ampère not Maxwell showed us what was really happening* while solving an avionics problem at Pan American Airlines in 1966: I saw the forces could indeed be unified adopting Ampère's concepts. Later I saw that Einstein was right in 1954 warning us about field theory. While fields have helped us considerably, they totally obscure the foundation principle of what is really going on.

I've been plugging away at this a few hours daily most days since then. Luckily, I've had plenty of days since 1966 to put practically all the pieces of this puzzle together. I don't

consider myself a science fanatic. I've enjoyed life and I didn't really put a big portion of my life into this. I simply solved these problems like I did at the airlines. I enjoy working, especially when I get the right answers like I did here and back then. But I do certainly believe we are also here to smell the roses in life as well. For me this project is something that has always been sort of simmering on the back burner:

However, I may not live long enough to finish my present goal and see space separated from time frequency wise.

In fact, humans give themselves immense problems when they attempt to separate space from time. For instance, examine the following:

Let's do something Einstein said he did; let's use '*Einstein's thought picture*' and ride on a light wave and examine this space-time ensemble: But instead of riding a light wave in space, could we ride a light wave at the speed of light through time?

Yes, I think we can. Possibly this is what we are presently doing as we remain here on this Earth as it travels through space-time.

We know that the speed of light is a constant regardless of the speed of the source or of the speed of the observer: This might mean that the speed of light is the speed of time (in our

local space-time realm) regardless of any additional speeds of anything.

This could still be true even though Einstein's relativity shows us time for an object slows down as the speed of that object increases. Relativity (Einstein's train example) also shows us that one person can observe two events as simultaneous but another observer, moving a much faster speed, will see the same events happening at different times.

So beware of separating space from time and don't confuse your local time from time elsewhere. But that doesn't stop us from examining other effects of space-time distortions.

Let's consider ourselves moving through time at the speed of light.

Moving at the speed of light through time, therefore, may **in our local space-time realm** make this vast empty space between all these electrons vanish; with vanishing space between all the electrons, we would see things more as solids, wouldn't we?

All this vast empty space between all these electrons DOES vanish for us at the electron's spin frequency. Why? Because at that frequency, and a bit lower, we see things as solids. Could this be because we ARE actually riding at the speed of light in time on a light wave where that vast empty space (at the electron's spin frequency)

vanishes?

You need no exotic math to look at all these things including general relativity: Simply use *'Einstein's thought pictures'*. And when you do take time to examine things this way then you end up with a whole new concept of what is making this universe really work.

Our space-time, or speed through time at the speed of light is produced by the spin frequency of the electron. The quark, however, has a far different space-time interval from us. The quark is producing space-time at the square of the speed the electron is producing it. This gives you the answer to Einstein's 'Principle of Equivalence' or as to why gravity **being produced by down quarks** acts like an acceleration.

Knowing this, we can settle one **big science argument** between Einstein and Newton. Newton said gravity acts instantly. Einstein said gravity acts at the speed of light. Well, both lose this argument. But gravity, as all astronomers know and all astronomical colleges teach, must be acting far, far faster than the speed of light for this universe to be stable. We know inertial mass is equal to gravitational mass. NOW we know quarks cause mass so they must cause gravity too, so the astronomers are absolutely right and Newton was closer to the truth than Einstein who clearly lost this one.

But Einstein didn't know about quarks, did he?

It was a few years after Einstein died that the quark particle idea started to be formulated.

I still had a firm religious belief in fields more than a decade after Einstein died as well.

Another Eureka moment came to me in the early 1980s when I suddenly realized that if these binding forces did NOT diminish, even one iota, with distance but if only the NUMBER of binding pairs diminished with the square of the distance then THIS was the way forces had to be seen and NOT as fields. I saw then that Einstein was absolutely right in 1954 when he said, *"I consider it quite possible that physics cannot be based on the field concept, i.e., on continuous structures. In that case, nothing remains of my entire castle in the air, gravitation theory included, [and of] the rest of modern physics."*

See, by reading my papers you can learn something new every paper. I've enjoyed writing every one of them too.

Let's take a good look at **Phase Symmetry** because, when you do, you will find out far more about what's really going on than present science will show you:

To see a crystal clear picture of all this, **free**, click this link and read: <http://www.rbduncan.com>

(e-mail to Carl Scheider)

Yes, "Quantum Entanglement" in Wikipedia tells about the spin up-spin down bonding that I've been harping about with Phase Symmetry.

Dr. Milo Wolff is right and this is a scalar, spinning, standing wave universe. All these spinning entities are scalar, standing waves -- the smallest to the largest -- all throughout this universe even though we don't see it that way. You must visualize them merely having different spins at different spin/orbit frequencies: And using frequencies you can use phase.

Decades in avionics taught me to trust Ampère rather than Maxwell: So wipe the mind slate clean of fields and all that they imply like monopole gravity, plus and minus charges, north and south poles, etc. Start entirely from scratch **using only PHASE rules.**

Start out by thinking of two identical gears with meshing teeth. One gear can be considered spinning clockwise and the other counter-clockwise (spin up-spin down) and the gear teeth will be meshing **IN PHASE.**

Even though both spins are 180 degrees out of phase, if both spins are in the same **EXACT** plane then a portion of their

closest sides are IN PHASE and **impedance matched** (mass of both tiny portions matching). Therefore this tiny portion IN PHASE locks those two spinning entities together in "Quantum Entanglement" whether these entities are quarks, electrons, stars, galaxies, clusters or super clusters.

This TINY PORTION, **impedance matched**, is the quantum of, electron to electron, energy that comes into your eye from a distant star.

Since ALL these have gyroscopic precession, NO TWO can ever attract each other because once their IN PHASE sides begin to attract then precession precesses them well beyond the attraction points.

THEREFORE: Totally FREE quarks, electrons, stars, galaxies, etc. MUST end up not only repelling each other but NEVER will have ANY portions of themselves IN PHASE, as long as they can FULLY precess.

BUT once precession, say in an electron is halted, via a STRONGER down quark spinning at a higher but at a harmonically IN PHASE frequency, then these two units are Quantum Entangled or **impedance matched**. The entangled electron, that can no longer FULLY precess, now CAN attract other FREE electrons via their IN PHASE sides.

Two binary stars (spin up-spin down) attract each other with their closest sides IN PHASE.

Sigma and pi chemical bonding and magnetism are ALL instances of electrons attracting other similar electrons via IN PHASE bonds where FULL precession of at least one of the electrons, of the pair, has been lost.

In this universe of spinning, scalar, standing waves the OUT-OF-PHASE repulsive forces, creating also space-time, do not need any impedance matching yet they MUST equal the IN-PHASE attractive forces: Einstein foresaw this giving us his cosmological constant repulsive force that was equal to the gravitational attractive force.

So Phase Symmetry is the ONLY thing that shows you exactly why all this vast preponderance of EMPTY SPACE exists both in the microcosm and macrocosm.

Plus it shows you why we have **impedance matched** "Quantum Entanglement".

This is a frequency universe all throughout, however, we only see it as solid at ONE of those frequencies. But all these spinning, scalar, standing wave entities from quark to super cluster of galaxies have spin, have inertia and obey the SAME Phase Symmetry laws. They have entirely different

space-time intervals though. So space-time in each is different: A main reason we think we need dark energy and dark matter is that the speed of light is NOT a proper measuring stick throughout the macrocosm's different spin frequencies.

The speed of light can only be used as a measuring stick through FREE SPACE: That may look like FREE SPACE throughout the macrocosm but it definitely is not because you are measuring through a material (the macrocosm).

fitz

Read about "***PHASE SYMMETRY***" FREE: (these two [links](#) below)

<http://www.amperefitz.com/phase.symmetry.htm>

or

<http://www.amperefitz.com/phase.symmetry.pdf>

Daniel P. Fitzpatrick Jr. & Richard Mark Fitzpatrick

Saturday, February, 9, 2016 — Scheider e-mail portion Thursday, April, 30, 2015.