

SEE, — **HOW** the complexities of **FIELD THEORIES** **HID** from us, the fact that **relative motion** (phase) between all these spinning entities, in the micro & macro universe, gives us **all** the **attractive and repulsive** **Fundamental Forces**.

Oct-29-2018.

Field Theories in html: <http://rbduncan.com/fieldtheory.html>

Also, **Field Theories** in Word: <http://rbduncan.com/fieldtheory.doc>


& **Field Theories** in Adobe pdf: <http://rbduncan.com/fieldtheory.pdf> Fitzpatrick's 1966 book showed the **relative motion** laws of **A. Ampère** unified the forces.

[Fitz's first book in 1966](#)

[Fitz's 1966 book in PDF](#)

EVERYTHING [on these links](#) herein are **FREE**, & **NO** pop up ads with these either.

This was the way the site --below-- looked many years ago. - - Dan Fitz.



Shedding a bit of light

on the cause of

Energy

while looking at the answers given to us via

Phase Symmetry

Daniel P. Fitzpatrick Jr.

&

Richard Mark Fitzpatrick

© January. 2017

If we are actually in an expanding universe then inertia should be getting weaker and weaker with time but it is not. Therefore we need to find a better concept of what is really going on here; thus this science discourse.

In this we have a prediction. *"Our prediction about the LIGO interferometer would be this: The speed of gravitational waves will, eventually as LIGO improves, be seen as both SLOWER & FASTER than the speed of light. The reason for this is that star/spin forces are SLOWER than the electron spin/orbit speed of light frequency range and quark/spin forces are FASTER."*

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. But here I must interject something else of importance that I have learned:

I studied German in my high school years. I spoke German then too with people in my neighborhood back then as well.

My brother and I still speak German when we are with German speaking people today. What I'll never forget, though, is what I learned when I went to Germany:

I spent 1951, 1952 and 1953 in Germany. Hitler's indoctrination program had been so profound and effective that almost every educated person in Germany, that I talked to, told me that *'Einstein never contributed anything to science'*:

And this belief was even stated by non Nazi party members because the U. S. Government never hired anyone who had ever been a Nazi party member (except rocket scientists).

From this I learned that *people would much rather believe what the universities publish than the truth.*

Please remember this; I always will. Now back to Einstein:

Einstein completed his general relativity with the tensor math that we still use today with perfect results even now. Einstein disliked the ever changing math methods that quantum theorists were using.

Einstein was right, in his later years, in his arguments about quantum theory. Quantum theory has an Achilles heel; this is their addiction to the complicated **MMMs** (**M**ystical **M**athematical **M**ethods) that are involved therein.

There are two distinctly different types of particles in

quantum theory: Nobel scientist **Richard Feynman gave this explanation of them**, "Fermi-Dirac particles, **with fractional spin**, tend to repel each other while Bose-Einstein particles, **with integral spin**, tend to clump together."

The Boson particle concept — *some called gluons evidently because they glue everything together* — relies on quantum theory's complicated mathematical structure. But this paper will show you that **the Boson cannot even be called a particle because** what is really going on is the very **antithesis of a particle in which space-time is removed similarly to when a positron unites with an electron**: In both cases two sets of standing wave frequencies producing space-time, that are 180 degrees out of phase with each other, **cancel each other out**.



It's the absence of space-time that gives the attraction and not a Boson particle:

But you must keep reading to understand exactly what space-time is *frequency-wise* before you can even comprehend the above statement.



And this is not the only defect in quantum theory this paper will be pointing out.

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 that gave, as my 1965 Encyclopaedia Britannica put it, "Answers that appear as if by magic."

Quantum theory did, in fact, 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.

There is no **freedom** in the tri quark assembly of hadrons: Quarks that move toward the outside edge of hadrons are being PULLED there by quarks with opposite spin. By calling it **freedom** they missed ENTIRELY the proof of the cause of gravitational and inertial mass.

Einstein claimed he based general relativity on "*Mach's Principle*". Therefore, Einstein knew this quantum theory, that entirely discarded "*Mach's Principle*", was a theory that

was headed down the wrong road.

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

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

* ** *

Both electrons and quarks, able to bind, **MUST** either bind locally or with similar entities in the surrounding stars. *This is why energy is conserved and why we have mass.* All quark bindings are the same strength whether locally or with quarks in the surrounding stars. 100% of our inertial mass comes from quarks in matter here binding with quarks in the surrounding stars.

Most recordable strong force *binding energy*, comes from down quarks in matter here, previously bound to down quarks in the surrounding stars (causing mass), now returning that binding to local quarks here, *thereby giving us energy.* Most of these down quark quanta will be 173.8 giga electron volts per energy quantum.

I'm afraid **strong force containment** is another myth or quantum theory fairy tale.

Another fairy tale is the force strength goes as the '*inverse distance squared ratio*'. I'm sorry, but **distance has no effect**

on electron or quark binding strength; only the NUMBER OF BINDINGS decrease inversely proportional to the square of the distance

Remember, you saw *for the very first time* here on this page, **what a quantum of strong force energy really is !!! (2nd blue paragraph above)**

Most 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 hadrons in the surrounding stars.****

Binding is not simple: In order for electrons or quarks to bind, their spin planes must be an EXACT match. Less than EXACT will not work. Both binding point masses must exactly match: This means there must be PERFECT impedance matching as well or there will be no binding.

The number of quarks able to bind are limited indeed because quark spin must also match quark spin and this is difficult to obtain because quark spin frequency changes as the quark moves closer or further from the massive tri-quark entity where time is tremendously slowed down: It's important that you know this fact because this is the main reason the strong force produces the weak force of gravity.

Quantum theorists forgot about the massiveness of the tri-quark entity appreciatively slowing down time enough to change quark spin frequency: It does this enough so that a quark pulled away from the other two, becomes more and more in resonance with the other two quarks the further it is pulled away from them. **This is what is happening:** Not knowing this Quantum theorists gave us the ridiculous ideas of **asymptotic freedom** and **strong force containment**.

This is Quantum Theory approaching ancient Egyptian mythology with the blind leading the blind.

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 hadron 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.

Their worst mistake was equating binding energy shifts with Boson particles and this you will see, if you keep reading, was absolutely wrong.

The reason we have $E=mc^2$ is because the down quark spin frequency, *causing mass*, is the **Tenth Harmonic** 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 quantum of energy flash*, 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 a, nearly instant, quantum burst of *binding energy* of 173.8 giga electron volts (2013 Britannica) released by two down quarks.

Which quarks produce the Higgs (*boson?*) which is a, nearly instant, quantum 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 (main mass/energy shift) that clearly points out most of our mass shift. 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 infinitesimal 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.

That important interval of a trillionth of a trillionth of a second (5×10^{-25} second) was overlooked by quantum theorists but not by us: You know the down quark has to spin two rotations or 720 degrees to produce that quantum of binding energy. You know the electron is spinning at the square root of this frequency: Do the simple math and you, like us, become the first on Earth to know the down quark's spin frequency is around 10^{26} Hertz and the electron's spin frequency is about 10^{13} Hertz. Scientists should have seen this but didn't.

But quantum theorists made an even worse mistake:

This really bad mistake was in seeing Bosons as particles. Bosons are not particles. Bosons are binding energy quanta. "*Fermi-Dirac particles, with fractional spin, tend*

to repel each other while Bose-Einstein particles, with integral spin, tend to clump together." **As we said earlier, this was Feynman's explanation of it:**

However, **Quantum theorists**, including Feynman, **failed to see that what they called Bosons were actually momentary binding energy shifts, that look exactly like particles in CERN's large hadron collider. But they are NOT really particles.** The photon is a binding energy shift, **NOT a particle.** Our sun and the stars shoot off all kinds of particles, many of which simply get completely lost in space and go nowhere in particular. According to quantum theory, stars do this with photons too. **WRONG, WRONG, WRONG,** because if they did that then energy would not be conserved.

Minkowski knew this: That's why we have his light cone that severely limits the exchange to only one definite point in space and in time (space-time). We know energy cannot be created or destroyed: It can't simply be left in space either. **Energy IS conserved !!!** So this belief of equating a photon with a Boson particle is **ABSOLUTELY WRONG !!!**



ALL attractions, whether in the micro or macro world — you will see as you read on — are IN PHASE BINDING ENERGY attractions and nothing else. To get a better idea of binding energy — or indeed what energy really is — we

need the *Fitzpatrick Model* because quantum theory is totally devoid of any such model: Take a look at the gears at the beginning of the *Fitzpatrick Model* in the "e-mail to Carl Scheider" that comes later on in this paper.

Forget the expressions *top quark* and *Higgs Boson* and tell it like it is as 'two infinitesimal energy bursts' **one of 173.8 Gev and the Higgs infinitesimal burst of 125 Gev both of which are gravity/energy or mass/energy shifts, where either gravitational mass or inertial mass is shifted to energy via a quark star/local binding shift !!!**

Even though the original basic concept of quantum theory is above reproach, Einstein saw, early in the game, which way quantum theory was headed. As you yourself can now see, 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.

If you type "*Minkowski's light cone*" into Google then you will get one explanation of this but the next paragraph gives the best answer as to what is really happening.

Phase Symmetry shows us exactly why this is: A spin up electron in your eye bonds with a spin down electron on a distant star **only when** the OUT OF PHASE frequencies, *producing a space-time wave* from the electron in your eye EXACTLY match the OUT OF PHASE frequencies, *producing a space-time wave* from the electron in the star. Since these electrons are spinning 180 degrees out of phase then their frequencies producing the *space-time in an ultra*

thin line (wormhole) between them are also exactly 180 degrees out of phase to each other and **MUST CANCEL EACH OTHER OUT** (similar to a positron and electron). So even though you and the star are far apart, **there is NO space or time** between the in phase binding points of **the electron in your eye and the one on that star** sending you a quantum of starlight.

This is **WHY** spin up-spin down binding energy bonds do **not** vary in strength with distance: Only the **NUMBER** of bindings vary.

And Minkowski — *Einstein's teacher* — might have published this himself if he hadn't died so early in life.

Now we see Einstein's distorted space even better than Einstein saw it and we see exactly what a wormhole in space really is.

Space-time is built of frequencies the same as particles:

But *frequency-wise* space-time (which also can be considered a repulsive force) is the average or mean amount that the closest sides of all these spinning particles are out-of-phase with one another.

We now know a bit more about space-time than even Einstein knew but we have a lot more yet to learn about space-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 *why we see* space and time 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's long wire PHASE laws, not Maxwell's field rules 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, one by one, 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:

The electron spin, for instance, is nothing but one frequency but we humans have separated it into so much space covered in so much time (speed) but it is also the speed limit for our space-time realm. This is also the speed of all electron binding energy.

The spin frequency of down quarks is the square of the electron spin frequency and quark to quark binding (giving us gravity and inertia) occurs at a speed that we see as almost instantly. Both gravity and inertia happen at a speed too fast for our electron space-time realm. Why do we humans see these simple spin frequencies of both electrons and quarks as both space and time? This is the ultimate mystery wrapped inside an enigma.

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:

One of these distortions is that this vast empty space between all these electrons vanishes for us at the electron's spin frequency. Why? Because at that frequency, and a bit lower, we see things as solids.

Our space-time, or speed through time at the speed of light is produced by the spin frequency of the electron. It is **not** produced by quarks spinning at the **square** of the electron's spin frequency, giving us a speed of gravity that is very close to *instantly* and far faster than the speed of light: This is a speed most astronomers now can accept.

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.

Even though we are in the realm produced by the electron's spin, this does not mean that the electron is in our space-time realm. **It is not.** So finding out about the electron itself is a challenge. Our math and space-time is only good in our local space-time realm.

The electron can be considered having real spin in its space-time realm but for all intents and purposes **we are limited in calculating what we'd like to know about the electron from our space-time realm.**

Knowing about different space-time realms, 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 seems to have lost this one.

But the spins of stars and galactic clusters and super clusters at a much lower spin frequency than the quark are involved in gravitational force in some way that we can't seem to measure. Will LIGO tell us something about these lower gravitational frequencies? As I've said and published before, gravity has the widest bandspread of all the forces and it's on BOTH sides of the electron frequency bandspread.

Our prediction about the LIGO interferometer would be this: The speed of gravitational waves will, eventually as LIGO improves, be seen as both SLOWER & FASTER than the speed of light. The reason for this is that star/spin forces are SLOWER than the electron spin/orbit **speed of light** frequency range and quark/spin forces are FASTER.

Yes, electron mass/energy travels at the speed of light but that's the only mass/energy that travels at that speed. **Most** of gravitational mass/energy travels FASTER than the speed of light.

So looking at the lower frequency spins, Einstein may not

have missed it that much and 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 when I realized that if we received energy in quantum sized pieces then these binding forces did NOT diminish, even one iota, with distance but only the **NUMBER of binding pairs** diminished with the square of the distance. I saw 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. **If you keep any of these things then you can NEVER unify the forces. Get rid of them**

and then you can see what is really going on. Start entirely from scratch using only PHASE rules.

Here's the *Fitzpatrick Model*. Unfortunately present science has no energy model that can show you *the mass/energy conversion* as this one easily does.

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.

Those gears above show you the spin layout for two similar electrons (with their closest sides in phase) that together produce a sigma chemical bond or a spin up-spin down Cooper pair of electrons held together with the same in phase bond. Those gears also represent the layout of two (spin up-spin down) binary stars attracted to each other with their closest sides in phase. And those gears also represent the way your mass is created by your down quarks having an in phase attraction to opposite spin down quarks in the surrounding stars.

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

If ALL these spinning entities have FULL 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).

End of e-mail to Carl Scheider

Even though Einstein was worried about his field theory of general relativity, people will continue to use it because it

works as long as it's held within its parameters of millions of quanta:

But forget fields entirely when examining the individual quantum of energy. In this respect we all have to be gauge theorists in certain ways while examining our universe. Don't exceed the local gauge (parameters) with your math or rules.

Math and rules are only to be believed in one, spin/orbit frequency, space-time realm.

The only real universal rules are PHASE rules.

And remember what we learned at the beginning of this paper, *people would much rather believe what the universities publish than the truth.*

Fitz

For more click links below:

[*The TOP Science rule in our Universe.htm 8-18-2016*](#)

Best kept SECRET is the TOP SCIENCE RULE.

In Word: [*The TOP Science rule in our Universe.doc 8-18-2016*](#)

TOP Science Rule is: 8-18-2016 also in Adobe.pdf - [*TOP Science Rule is: 8-18-2016.pdf*](#)

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

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

or

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

[*4 Decades of writings of Daniel P. Fitzpatrick Jr.*](#)

Daniel P. Fitzpatrick Jr. & Richard Mark Fitzpatrick

Revamped Sunday, January, 29, 2017 — Scheider e-mail portion Thursday, April, 30, 2015.