

The **ANSWER** Einstein looked for Issued: July 10th 2018.

ANSWER in htm: - <http://amperefitz.com/answer.htm>

Also ANSWER in Word: - <http://amperefitz.com/answer.doc>

And ANSWER in Adobe pdf: - <http://amperefitz.com/answer.pdf>

The

# **ULTIMATE SECRET**

of this universe is not complex;

it's a total frequency universe

that uses 2 simple phase rules:

**in-phase** for attractions,

**out-of-phase** for **repulsions**,

and an

# Impedance matching Energy rule

with tiny Quantum size pieces of spacetime.

But all this will remain completely unobserved  
for a long, long time yet.

Dr. Milo Wolff showed us that while ordinary standing waves can exist on wires and antennas, only SCALAR, spinning, standing waves can exist in free space.

He then gave us his beautiful mathematical proof that -- as long as energy in, equals energy out -- the electron has to be considered a SCALAR, spinning, standing wave; he gave us this even **before** the electron was found to be perfectly spherical.

But **if** this is a frequency universe, not only in the microcosm but all throughout, and we are tuned to a frequency, close to Planck's constant, then we would only view frequencies higher than us as frequencies; we could not view frequencies lower than our frequency as frequencies: those we would view as something else, perhaps solids, wouldn't we?

Also we would not view galaxies and galactic clusters as perfectly spherical and SCALAR because we would not be viewing them from a low enough frequency to witness their full spin and precession. To us they would simply seem *frozen in time* and we'd lose the bigger picture of what was actually happening: that is, if indeed this is **a total frequency universe all throughout both micro and macro worlds.**

**What could we expect to see if this really was a total frequency universe all throughout? *What if all these spinning entities in it, from small to large, are nothing but spinning, standing waves?***

Well, accepting that view, we'd be further advanced in science if the establishment had listened to the warnings of both Edwin Hubble and Albert Einstein; you'll see their exact warning words in ***bold blue italics in this.***

Better read those words of Einstein and Hubble carefully because if all these spinning entities, we see in both microcosm and macrocosm, are really spinning, standing waves then our present science is not going to give us the correct big picture of what is actually going on in this universe.

The religious high priests, who jealously guard **all** past science beliefs, are always more powerful than science innovators such as Hubble and Einstein.

You'll see I'm right about this if you take the thirty minutes, or so, to read this entire discourse of mine. People all over the world **are** reading it. I believe this is the best and possibly most important, thirty minute, science presentation I've ever written.

That the microcosm is a frequency universe, is an established fact. We see all this spinning and orbiting in **both** microcosm and macrocosm. But we don't see the macrocosm as a frequency world, do we?

The establishment is not even close to accepting the fact that this is a **total** frequency universe all throughout both microcosm and macrocosm.

Look at this again. Let's say we are tuned to a certain frequency (close to Planck's constant). Everything tuned to a higher frequency than us, we see as frequencies. Our frequency and frequencies lower than us, we see as solids. Even though this might be reality, it's not going to be accepted as reality for a long, long, time yet.

From our frequency realm the electron appears to be a perfect sphere and a scalar entity whereas galaxies do not. You will see herein that before you get the true picture, you must ask yourself if you are viewing things from a low enough frequency so as to ascertain the true SCALAR properties of the entity; this also meaning energy (mass) going in to the entity being EQUAL to the amount of energy

(mass) coming out of the same entity: this is Dr. Milo Wolff's additional condition for a true SCALAR entity.

For instance, you can't say a galaxy is not scalar unless you have taken into consideration its spin and particularly its precession movement which you don't know because these movements, in respect to you, are too slow and *frozen* in time.

However, presuming this is a frequency universe all throughout, we can finally build a SIMPLE *PHASE* MODEL that can explain this universe we find ourselves in.

Nothing in present science tells us **why** the two electrons allowed on any orbital must be spin up & spin down; this new concept does: these two electrons with opposite spins are ATTRACTED *because* their closest sides are IN-PHASE.

For the same (ATTRACTED *because* their closest sides are IN-PHASE reason), **binary stars of similar size must also have opposite spins**. (See the *unification of forces* factor in this?) And this is only E PLURIBUS UNUM, only **"one out of many"** new predictions coming from this.

Scientists agree that the microcosm is a frequency universe. All this spinning throughout both microcosm and macrocosm indicate a universal, relative motion, frequency law governs it all; you'll see, those two simple phase rules (above) do this.

Any viable "Theory of Everything" would have to incorporate all this *spin of everything* into the concept as a *major factor*, wouldn't it? Well, this concept does so.

With that statement, and earlier ones, I will have lost many readers, but wait; this is the first paper ever to explain exactly **why** gyroscopes hold to the distant stars: to learn that reason alone you will have to keep reading this.

Unless we move toward unification of the forces then we remain in a mystery world. I can remember taking my little girl into a department store and then going up the elevator to the second floor. When my wife and I and my little girl started to go back into the elevator again, my little girl said, "Is this room going to change too?" She was still living in a mystery world. She didn't know about elevators yet. **We live in a mystery world until we unify the forces.**

Let's backtrack to Einstein's "Special Relativity"; it has its faults: its math does not allow force in it. Nevertheless, in it Einstein does give us one supreme, everlasting right triangle picture where spacetime (a constant) is the triangle's hypotenuse. However, the other two sides of the triangle (space & time) are allowed to change *with a change in speed or mass*. And this is true because we've made many measurements proving it.

But what is this hypotenuse of the triangle, this thing

Einstein called "spacetime"?

In this paper you will see *exactly* what it is.

Einstein then went on to General Relativity where he could fully use field theory. This paper moves in the General Relativity direction too, and we also see spacetime as an unforeseen force, much as gravity can also be viewed as an acceleration (Einstein's "Principle of Equivalence"). This concept in front of you now **gives us the very first inkling ever of why we have Einstein's "Principle of Equivalence"**. NOTHING in our present science even comes close to that! This new frequency and phase concept is a blending of General Relativity with what I found working in electronics and with gyroscopes.

In this New "Phase Concept" you will find the essence of unification:

\***All** the forces have a common origin.

\***All** the forces have identical properties.

While **all the forces are truly unified in this "Phase Concept"**, this is not Einstein's "Unified Field Theory" nor is it any type of unified field theory.

Einstein's concept of "unification of the forces" was absolutely right; **it was his belief in his "unified field theory" that failed him:** you will see the reasons, if you keep reading, that **there can be no unified field theory** because, **as Einstein finally saw**, the concept of the field itself is a bad concept.

Einstein, unfortunately, used this field concept all his life but then in 1954 about a year before he died, he said this: *"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."*

Here's a bit of Field history:

Even **before** the field, Ampere, in the 1820s, found that long parallel wires attracted if the current flowing through them was going in the same direction but these wires repelled if currents flowed in opposite directions in each wire: *No one, not even Ampere himself realized that he had discovered, what Einstein later searched for, the basic concept needed to UNIFY the FORCES!* If electronics was built upon Ampere's findings, then **the forces might have been unified** long ago. That didn't happen because right after Ampere's discovery, attention abruptly shifted from Ampere to two Englishmen who changed science forever; they gave England

its science years in the sun: in England, Faraday startled the world by inventing the first electric motor and then Maxwell provided the math for Faraday's field theory and field religion has never stopped growing since then.

The world then completely forgot about Ampere and built the electrical and later the electronics industry on the Faraday-Maxwell field theory, **an entirely different concept from Ampere's**, which Einstein later found out, was wrong. *I'll show you exactly **why** it's wrong.*

The originators of field theory didn't know **all** energy was always delivered in quantum sized pieces and each of these *always* came to your eye at the **same energy level** (color) by stars at **vastly different distances**. ***I'm afraid I could never understand the establishment's belief that field theory, where things had to get weaker and weaker with distance, could explain such a thing as that!***

**There is no way field theory can explain how those same size pieces of energy can go all those vastly different distances** without losing any energy whatsoever.

*I will show you, herein, what actually happens.*

I'm not here to change the establishment's improper scientific beliefs; that's impossible: this is written so my readers can profit in those few areas where the establishment's ignorance still exists.

Keep reading and **I'll show you even more reasons field theory is wrong!**

Half a century ago, I remember reading about "**Ampere's long wire laws**" in *Scientific American* but it's mostly been forgotten. "It was simple"; later I saw how important it was: he was really showing us **things moving in-phase attract and things moving out-of-phase repel.**

You don't need much more than this to unify the forces. *Keep reading: you'll see why.*

I had various radio licenses when I read that *Scientific American* article; I also knew Einstein worked to unify the forces, but failed. I distinctly remember coming back to the Library and reading that *Scientific American* article a second time and thinking that there is something basically simpler here than all this complicated stuff we have to try to remember to fix radios, TVs and electronic equipment.

In a short "Relative Motion Law" book that I published, I showed how important Ampere's findings were in unifying the forces. I gave several of these books to a friend who worked with Robert H. Dicke. Dicke said, "If gravity was caused by *relative motion* then we should see interference fringes." The Hubble telescope is now showing us Dicke's, gravitational interference fringes.

So, you better take a good look at all this.

I realized the "Relative Motion Laws" that Ampere actually discovered, were really "*phase rules*", about the time I saw Stephen Wolfram on TV, talking to Charlie Rose, saying "**Math can only explain simple things but a 'simple model' can explain a complicated universe**". I could hardly believe what I heard! **I knew that!** But, I thought, 'how does this mathematician know that unless he knows my simple "Phase rules"?' So I read Stephen Wolfram's thousand page book *A New Kind of Science* and saw that he discovered it an entirely different way from the way that I did.

I then saw, from Wolfram's book, that I did the one supremely important thing: **I began building with the correct foundation building blocks of in-phase and out-of-phase forces**. It was clear to me, as I read Wolfram's book, that if your foundation has the wrong building blocks, *to begin with such as field theory*, then you will actually **HIDE** reality and totally **BLIND** yourself and everyone else, from the TRUTH, by using those wrong building blocks.

After hearing Stephen Wolfram and Charlie Rose, I put in more than another decade of effort before seeing the "**Complete Big Picture**" of what was really happening to everything.

Now, we take this NEW route *proven* by mathematician Stephen Wolfram; I give you, herein, my very latest and "**Best Picture**" so far, of something I've been working on for

many decades: this is a '**simple model**', but *not the math*, because, as Wolfram showed and said in his best selling book *A New Kind of Science*, "**Math can only explain simple things but a 'simple model' can explain a complicated universe**".

**Think about this now:** for unification we need something besides spin that these things, building our universe, have in common. **All we have, besides spin, for unification, are spin frequencies and phase!**

While field theory math works part of the time, our mathematical calculations *will eventually* work 100% of the time as we convert everything to this new concept of spin frequencies and "Phase Symmetry".

Luck plays a part in everything we do; I've been lucky, and had to troubleshoot for decades, all the very latest things our science could create.

I used all those years to critically analyze the basic structure of present science; I saw a "few changes" were necessary: these changes are in areas Einstein saw change was needed.

It doesn't really matter if you dislike my "few new science changes"; you can make good use of what I show you to solve difficult science problems. I did this and it has made my life far better than my most optimistic dreams. Once you

know *more* than the establishment then you can make good money. If you solve more problems than others can, then the world is yours.

Even though you discover these truths, be low key in convincing people it really works this way because our present "field theory" is still too strong a religion to change. You cannot change the religion people believe in even though you tell them the truth.

**Einstein told them the truth about field theory and present science in 1954.**

**If the establishment wouldn't listen to Einstein, when he warned them about both *field theory* and *present science*, then they are not going to listen to me or even to Stephen Wolfram's advice about using a model instead of math.**

Yes, there are so many electrons that it looks like an electrical field and so many quarks that it looks like a gravitational field and these obey "field theory" rules *most* of the time but not **all** the time and that, my friends, is the big problem.

I'll show you, herein, exactly **why** field theory fails us, but now we go to Inertia:

**INERTIA** stems from an unknown **attraction** to the surrounding stars. I'll show you the reason for this

mysterious inertial **attracting force**, to the surrounding stars. *No one else seems to know the reason for this.*

I hope you have time because you'll have to read this entire page before you **see** the reason **the surrounding stars give us INERTIA.**

But I can't tell you **how** they do this unless I first prove to you they **are** doing this.

Pay attention to this **proof** that our Inertia stems from an attraction to the surrounding stars:

**Proof** of this inertial **attracting force** to the surrounding stars is the fact that gyroscopes, pendulums, vibrating elements and Helium-2 all have the same one complete rotation in one sidereal day, which is 23 hours 56 minutes and 4.0916 seconds. This rate of rotation is termed "Earth rate": this is the exact rate (or time) any stationary (relative to the "fixed stars") observer in space, would see this Earth make one complete rotation.

**You can actually SEE this "Earth rate" in a gyroscope.** Many times I've set the axis of a vertical gyro up at noon time with its axis pointing straight up at the sun. When I came back to it at 5 PM, its axis was tilted west still pointing to the sun that was setting in the west. It looked like it was following the sun but its rotation was a bit faster and really following the stars.

**It's important, considering what comes later, that you remember this absolute PROOF that our inertia is a connection to the surrounding stars.** So read this again if you didn't completely understand it.

**EXTREMELY IMPORTANT: One sidereal day, also known as "Earth Rate" or 23 hours 56 minutes and 4.0916 seconds, is the rate the stars make one complete rotation, as we see them going around us.**

In our industrial system I've talked to men, directly in charge of people working on highly sensitive gyroscopes, who didn't know this nor did they care about electron spin direction. I showed in 1966 that electron spin direction gives us an essential part of the big picture.

I had a good life solving gyro, radio and electrical problems; I saw many of these problems could not be solved using the field concept of present science, neither could they be solved without seeing that there was indeed a definite attraction to the surrounding stars. Every year that went by, as I worked, I added more of my own deductions about how things must actually be happening in this universe of ours. If you are blessed with spare time then you can read about what I found on the webpage links at the end of this paper. I'm 83 now; I'm not competing for money anymore, so I'm giving you, who can make use of this information, some important things to really help you, in this short paper.

All the evidence, for this simple phase concept is plainly there for everyone to look at. Stephen Wolfram proved to us a **simple model**, *not the math*, was needed. I must ask, why haven't others seen this **simple model** before me? I can only presume it was because *I listened to Einstein* and I persevered and was given the time to do it. And as I said before, I was lucky to have worked for decades on the right things. Also, this religion of present science and field theory is so predominant that I suspect **this** obscured the view of almost everyone.

I'm afraid all our scientists have acquired the Henry Ford syndrome of science. Henry Ford's Model-T was the best car produced for a good many years; present science and field theory *also* produced remarkable results over a good many years. Henry Ford resisted even **trying** to build a better car for years; not only did he resist for years, **but even for a short time after** Edsel Ford put together, a brand new design that was far more practical in many respects, a supremely better car, the Model-A.

I believe present day scientists have the Henry Ford syndrome; they are not even **trying** to find a better vehicle than present science **even many years after** Einstein's warning about **field theory** and **present science**.

What this particular Internet page is explaining to you, is the fact that frequency laws, especially these simple phase rules,

will give you a far better view of what is really going on in our universe *of various spacetime realms* than the field concept of present science ever can. In fact, present science ignores forces with the surroundings that we know and have proven exist.

Those who believe present science tells all, fail to see a full **50%** of the forces in this universe because **50%** of the forces in this universe are either **attractive** or **repulsive** forces **with the surroundings** and of these, present science hasn't even the foggiest answers for. But look, **"Phase"** gives us answers:

The faster two items spin together **"in-phase"** at the same frequency, **the stronger the attractive force is between them.** **Mass is also involved.** This is why two *massive* quarks, spinning (**completely in-phase**) together on the same spin axis *extremely* faster than electrons have an *immensely* stronger force attracting them than two electrons spinning (**completely in-phase**) together on the same spin axis.

What? You didn't know that the strongest attractive force between two electrons is when they are spinning (**completely in-phase**) together on the same spin axis? Well, it's true.

Stephen Wolfram showed me there is a good reason that you didn't know this: **field theory HID it from you and you were BLINDED from seeing reality by present science!**

Many times I have shown top engineers that the strongest attraction between two electrons is when they spin the same direction on the same spin axis and the weaker attractions between two electrons were when their closest sides were moving in the same direction.

**I could not convince them** that this was the reason for the attractions and not what they had learned in school. Then I gave up trying to show them reality because **it's difficult to change a person's science religion mainly because of three myths in present science that most believe in.**

**Einstein saw using field theory, in conjunction with the cosmological forces, was a myth** but there are two more myths that you must reject before you can *even begin* to see reality.

Present science, especially its field concept, was designed by people who only knew and believed in **50%** of the actual invisible forces, those forces **NOT in conjunction with the surroundings**. So I'm afraid present science is not my cup of tea when it gives us a myriad of different rules for quarks, electrons, stars and galaxies whereas there are only **"2 Phase Rules"** that cover all the forces given out by every spinning object no matter how big or how small it is.

Einstein saw all these things were similar in that they all had some sort of repulsive force around them keeping them a vast distance apart, Einstein called this repulsive force his

"Cosmological Constant"; it's essentially a **BALANCE** repulsive force, **BETWEEN** all these spinning entities, **equal and opposite** to the total attractive forces holding all these spinning entities together in each different spacetime realm of quarks, electrons, stars, galaxies and super clusters of galaxies. Dr. Milo Wolff taught us all these things, from quarks to galactic clusters are similar because they are "*spinning standing waves*".

I've been at this unification process since 1948 when I thought Einstein really had a good chance of unifying the forces. On my desk in front of me is a wide, double faced Aristo slide rule that I bought in Germany in 1952. I've used it almost every day of my life since then. It's practically obsolete now, but still gives approximate answers faster than a computer takes to come on.

However, you'll find no math in this because I learned a long time ago, that the amount of **readers, of whatever is written, is inversely proportional to the amount of math** included therein.

Thinking about the field and Einstein's warning about "*continuous structures*" I saw, about 1960, what I had to do mathematically was to prove any new individual force concept, that I came up with, would give identical results as the original field theory. This took several years but I finally found the answer. Not only that but this new concept was

exactly like Einstein's "Cosmological Constant" because it combined the SPACE we see, with the repulsive force holding everything vast distances apart. Also, I knew Einstein's warning about "*continuous structures*" was far more important than the establishment realized: **this is a universe built of individual forces**. The fact that Einstein tried everything but failed, and then in 1954 told us exactly **why** he failed, was positive proof, to me, that space (spacetime) is **not** a "*continuous structure*" even though our minds tell us otherwise.

Quantum Theory tells us energy, that one time was thought to be a "*continuous structure*" is not because we have absolute proof that energy is always delivered in these quantum CHUNKS. *I'm using that very unscientific term to get the correct idea across.* Energy is always delivered in these CHUNKS of energy that scientists refer to, in Latin, as quantum (singular chunk) and quanta (plural chunks): since we are speaking English here, then I'll keep the word chunk so those who do not know Latin can understand *exactly* what I mean.

In this new "*Phase*" concept, all energy (*mass*) quanta are *In-Phase (attractive force)* quantum chunks and spacetime (Einstein's Cosmological Constant) are *Out-of-Phase (repulsive force)*

quantum chunks.

That's all there is in this entire universe. That's essentially it!

But to understand this universe you must understand that these mass-energy attractive quantum chunks can only be formed with an **Impedance Matched Binding whose results give an overall better Balance.**

And these can only form by binding if no repulsive force spacetime quantum chunks are in the way of their binding. Keep reading to understand all this.

And when you understand this you will see exactly how this *entire* universe works. It's remarkably simple, really.

While it's been known for decades that **impedance matching** is necessary to transfer power in radio and electronics circuitry; this is the first paper to show not only **why** that is but also to show *exactly why* **all energy transfers are impedance matched balances.**

While this concept unifies the forces beautifully, it leaves me with the same problem Einstein could never figure out. You see, if these ***Out-of-Phase (repulsive force)*** quantum chunks are spacetime (Einstein's Cosmological Constant), then what are these other two sides of the triangle that we call space and time? I'm sorry folks; I can't answer that yet and neither did Einstein ever find the answer to it. So this concept tells

you exactly what spacetime is but not the individual units that we call space and time.

Relativistically, spacetime doesn't change while its individual components of space and time most certainly do; you will see later where this becomes a problem: it becomes a current major problem when we look at, what scientists call, an "expanding universe".

While this does leave me perplexed, it also shows me I'm further down the right road to the real answer as to what is authentic and what is not reality.

Even though this portrays a good simple picture of how this universe works, you will have to wait for someone else, down the road, to give you an exact picture of what space and time are as individual units, the way we sense them.

Nevertheless, this is the first scientific paper showing the world exactly what spacetime really is!

And this is important!

This is a lot to throw at you right now; so keep reading to see how this all fits together.

**Every spinning thing**, including quarks, electrons, stars, galaxies and galactic clusters *because of their spin* **produce** more **in-phase attractive** forces locally that help hold them together (tighter and away from their surroundings), plus

(some **in-phase** attractions) that pull them toward their surroundings (inertia). These two forces acting against each other help the **balance** we see in this universe.

What our field theory of present science is definitely **not showing you** is the fact that **50%** of the invisible forces being put out by our universe are ***out-of-phase repulsive forces*** (*actually causing space [repulsion]*) with their surroundings: this is Einstein's "Cosmological Constant".

**If these "*spinning standing waves*" fail to maintain an approximate **50%** attractive vs. repelling balance of forces level with their surroundings then they simply cannot remain stable.**

Even though theoretically all spinning entities **can** do all of the above; it's the makeup of the different frequency "*spinning standing waves*" and their surroundings whether they **do** do all of this.

Let's take a good look at one of these "*spinning standing waves*" the ELECTRON:

Electrons that can remain out-of-phase with other electrons will always repel each other; **they have to: both are forced to precess around the other's polar point of maximum attraction.** Stars and galaxies do exactly the same thing but since we can only see them in "ultra slow (*frozen*) motion" we entirely miss all this precession about their polar maximum attracting

points. Binary stars, however, attract each other with their closest sides in-phase because of their opposite spins. Yes electrons, like Binary stars whose closest sides spin in-phase with each other, will always attract each other; **like they do in magnetism: *all scientists realize this is true after considering it but why isn't this a well known fact taught in science classes?***

**We know which way electrons, causing magnetism, spin. In magnetism *alone*, (keeping in mind electron spin direction) the evidence of in-phase attraction and out-of-phase repulsion is overwhelming! *It's impossible to miss this if you look, which is easy to do now; there was no Internet when I had to hunt for spin direction of the electron.***

Quite a few have 'seen' this over the years but **NOT** yet the establishment, where no one is even **trying** to find a better science vehicle. **How can the top people not see it's in-phase attraction and out-of-phase repulsion when it's in absolutely, crystal clear, plain sight looking at the cause of simple magnetism?**

**Not only that but individual spinning entities are causing individual forces; this isn't a field! *What could be clearer than that!*** It was 1954 before Einstein saw this.

Edwin Hubble discovered the **red shift**. The further out we look at stars the more their color is shifted **lower** in frequency, or shall we say, toward the color red *which is the*

*lowest visible frequency*. Speed, *relative motion*, and special relativity are all involved here **before** we can see such a **red shift** lowering of that distant star light frequency. So here's where you really have to pay attention to what is going on.

Now I'm going to use Stephen Wolfram's simple model approach to explain a bit more about the **red shift**.

Frequencies respond to *relative motion*: Ampere showed us that. The electrons in your eyes that give you the sensation of light are spinning in a certain direction but the earth is spinning in another direction and the solar system in another and our galaxy in another and the super galactic cluster that we are in is spinning even in a different direction. Even though you are not **sensitive** to these spins in five different spin axes, the electrons in your eyes most certainly are.

While you *improperly* see yourself as stationary with the sky, the electrons in your eye respond *only to* all this spin induced *relative motion* that increases the **red shift** the further you look out into space. Because of the spin in these five different spin axes, *the further you look*, the **more** your eye electrons detect a faster and faster *relative motion* or **red shift**. It's as simple as that really.

All that *multiple spin axes* spinning exists! You are **not** stationary with the sky! The **red shift** is that *relative motion* detected between you and the various distant stars!

## Hubble got it right!

And you will see Hubble got it right if you keep reading.

The *relative motion* **red shift** aspect between you and the distant stars **is the same** whether they actually go around you or you spin in relation to them: **this is an important fact!**

The spin is there; therefore the *relative motion* is there and the further you look out into space, the faster the star's *relative motion* is around you, **and the establishment forgot all about this!**

You will get the **red shift two ways**: we see it if those distant stars are either going AROUND us or AWAY from us fast enough. The establishment picked AWAY from us, **wrong pick**, when they should have seen the *relative motion* AROUND us and between us and the distant stars was really fast enough where the role of special relativity kicks in!

Einstein's special relativity comes into play here because time slows down with a faster speed. The electrons in your eyes not only see this faster *relative motion* speed, of those stars going around you, but also the **time**, of those distant stars, *in relation to you* is **slowed down**, thus your eye gives you more and more **red shift** the further out into this

universe that you look.

In troubleshooting, never forget that the high spin frequencies of electrons and quarks both respond to *relative motion*! The establishment knows all that multiple spin *relative motion* is there but they forgot about it and didn't listen to **Edwin Hubble's warning** about prematurely giving the wrong answer to the **red shift**.

This is why, with centrifugal force, as you move things faster and faster, the quark spins, in the thing you are moving faster and faster, can match frequencies further and further out into space and the **total** attractive force (*not each individual force but the total*) becomes greater and greater. With energy it's important to match frequencies. There is a big difference between what frequencies *see* and what you see.

Once you know something like this, that the establishment doesn't, then that puts you way ahead of the mob in troubleshooting. So, to stay ahead, in this game, you must not only see what frequencies see but **you also must eliminate the "myths" that the other guys still believe in.**

Here, I begin with the establishment's myths: You saw that **inertial gyro "Earth rate" precession** is proof that our inertia depends on the stars. If we had an expanding universe then with the stars moving further and further away, *inertia would be getting less and less with time.*

**But it isn't!** It's the same EXACT amount it was a hundred years ago!

Since *Inertia isn't getting less and less with time* then an EXPANDING UNIVERSE is a myth!

Not only does "Earth rate" prove it's a myth but so does this "Phase concept", because in this concept there is an important BALANCE with no possible present expansion, but having said that, I fully see **the reason** they think it is an expanding universe: so in this game you must understand the other person's mistaken religious beliefs! And, in this way, you come out way ahead!

I don't call people liars but I do have a responsibility of pointing out to you those who **don't tell us the truth**.

I recently heard a well known cosmologist on TV saying, "Hubble discovered the expanding universe." **That simply isn't so.** Edwin Hubble discovered the "Red Shift", yes. But Hubble himself warned us that **the Red Shift may NOT indicate an expanding universe** with these words: *"The possibility that the red shift may be due to some other cause, connected with the long time or distance involved in the passage of light from the nebula to observer, should not be prematurely neglected"*.

**Earlier you saw the absolute PROOF that Inertial "Earth rate" gyroscopic precession** shows inertia is a connection to

the surrounding stars and since inertia **isn't changing**, then an Expanding Universe **is a myth**.

Not everything can be tested this easily.

But, as you saw for yourself, an expanding universe **can** be tested.

**And it failed the test!**

You can see from my PROOF that these people telling you about an expanding universe have a **mistaken pseudo-scientific religious belief**, that they know more about space than Einstein.

Einstein proved mathematically, that we are LIMITED in measuring expansion, to cases where *relativistic* space doesn't change. You are vastly exceeding that LIMIT when you say this entire universe is expanding, so let's simply say those people telling us about an expanding universe just aren't telling us the truth. And there is an awful lot more about present science where this truth is lacking too, but I don't have room for all that in this.

Next is the **myth of "strong force containment"**. By not looking for *the cause* of gravity and inertia, **they got that one wrong too**.

I showed this was wrong years ago when I wrote, "*Because of the extreme density, the three quarks will not even*

*recognize that they are spinning at the same frequency unless they are separated from each other by about the diameter of a proton or neutron. You will have frequency dispersion here as well. This is what causes the asymptotic freedom of the quarks inside a proton or neutron."* After I published the book with that statement, I realized that **two quarks of different masses that had different spins in that high spacetime tri-quark density, could very well "appear" with one quark in that lower spacetime density (the distance of a proton or neutron's diameter), by both to be "same frequency spins": thus there is a strong in-phase attraction there.**

Anyway, **not knowing what caused asymptotic freedom, and not investigating why we had gravity and inertia, the establishment came up with the myth of strong force containment.**

The strong force (between two quarks) is not contained! This is the force that gives us both gravity and inertia!

The only spinning standing wave entities that could give us gravity and inertia are electrons or quarks; since we know 100% of the forces given off by the electron and none give us those forces: then it has to be the quark giving us both gravity and inertia.

While present science tells us nothing about what causes gravity and inertia, this new phase concept certainly does.

*Inertia* is composed of TWO types of quark **attractive** pulls from quarks in the surrounding stars: it's *both* a quark to quark stronger **attractive** pull where a very limited number of quarks here, *spin the same way*, and are on the 'same spin axis' (**completely in-phase**) with quarks in the stars. The second type pull is a weaker quark to quark attraction where only the **closest sides of the distant quarks are in-phase**.

OK, here's where you have to stop and think. Everything from quarks to super clusters of galaxies are vast, vast distances apart. **Why?** Because of "Einstein's Cosmological Constant"! Since all these spinning, standing wave entities -- *from ultra microscopic to ultra gigantic* -- are behaving the same way, staying vast distances apart, then it is safe to assume that we will find other similarities of force as well **providing we find the correct unification concept**. And we do. This **"Phase"** concept shows us ALL of these entities will have SIMILAR FORCES. This means we are going to have quarks with similar forces as the electron: the sole difference being the quark being more massive and spinning faster tells us these similar forces to the electron will be vastly stronger than electron forces. So let's look at the quark's forces, in the following, **"Phase wise"** similarly to the way we look at the electron's forces.

And remember this (below)?

We have the 2nd important FORCES UNIFICATION

corollary, that the establishment forgot when guessing we had strong force containment.

\* All the forces have identical properties.

This is not only telling you there is **no** strong force containment but it is also showing you the quark forces must resemble the electron's forces.

Since the electron has both a strong and weak force the quark must also have a weak force; there is a weaker quark to quark attractive force (already mentioned) where **only** the **closest sides of both quarks are in-phase**.

**Stability** indicates there is also an opposite balancing **repulsive force** from the surrounding stars.

So about half of this invisible force with the surroundings are attractions **to** the stars and an equal amount of this force are repulsions (space) **from** the stars.

But beware, even though the total amount of force is fairly well balanced, the number of *individual* attractive forces is much smaller than the number of *individual* repulsive forces and this is because of the immense **attractive** strength of **impedance matching** of this tremendous attractive pull where the mass of **both** entities **is equal** (**impedance of both is matched**) both are *equally* involved in this extremely

strong attraction; in this, *both spin the same direction on the same spin axis*: there is nothing comparable to this strength in any of the repulsive forces. Repulsive forces are **all** weak forces. Some attractions, like gravity and inertia, are **both** strong and weak forces. Some attractive forces (causing color) are only weak forces.

The ultimate secret, of this universe, is that attractions happen when *"like masses" move in-phase*; this is **impedance matching**. Please remember that you learned about this first, **here**.

The **impedance matching** found in radio circuitry necessary to transfer power is very much "akin" to all attractive forces in this universe. "Akin" might be the wrong word because all these phenomena are the same things but at different frequencies; however, few see this.

I honestly believe that if Einstein would have known about the supreme importance of **impedance matching** in radio circuitry, then he might have unified the forces. In my first year of high school I learned about its importance the hard way, getting my first radio license, building a transmitter and matching it to the antenna.

A prediction: it will first appear that in harmonic transfers of energy impedance doesn't match, **but it does**. We can easily see electron motion where we can't easily see the motion of quarks. The biggest science advancement will come when we

use the harmonic linkage between electrons and quarks and **impedance matching** (equal masses moving in-phase) with those quarks, to more thoroughly understand quarks.

Repulsive forces are not like the **impedance matching** attracting forces at all. Repulsive forces are spacetime creations (Einstein's Cosmological Constant): this is the big surprise to all of us who clearly understand that *field theory* is not compatible with a universe so constructed.

# The Importance of Tiny Quantum Size Pieces of Spacetime

Einstein **warned us** about our belief in these "*continuous structures*", one of which happens to be space. Spacetime is **not** a "continuous structure". It is built up of "out-of-phase", repulsive force "Tiny Quantum Size Pieces of Spacetime"; none of which are **on that spin axis** directly between two distant quarks that are spinning the same direction *on the same spin axis at the time of attraction*: This means,

although we see two quarks being light years apart, any two quarks binding have no actual "Tiny Quantum Size Pieces of Spacetime" directly between themselves. Therefore the *INDIVIDUAL* quark stronger, strong force *will not vary with distance*, although the **NUMBER** of these forces will vary inversely with the square of the distance. It's vitally important that you remember this as we proceed.

The establishment tells us that it's a field varying inversely proportional to the square of the distance: well, *before you finish reading this colorful document of mine, you will see that "Earth rate" for gyros is only possible with what the paragraph above tells you* and it is not possible with field theory. You will plainly see then, the above paragraph is right, and that the establishment made a rather **BAD GUESS** and you will know then that **this was another one they got wrong!**

Once it is seen that energy is always delivered in quantum sized chunks then it should also be seen that using field theory, in looking at this universe, is impractical. This is where field theory should have ended abruptly, but it didn't for the establishment. **A quantum size chunk of red light energy delivered to your eye from stars of different distances means having a force of energy delivery that does not vary in strength with those different distances.** After working many years on this problem, I finally saw it would all work out fine if we considered that energy was only

delivered by attractive in-phase INDIVIDUAL forces, whose strength did not vary with distance, that **also** reset the balance of things in this universe *to a better balance*: **That is the energy keystone!**

How does the electron affect this keystone of balance? Because it has *only* **one** stronger force strength when totally in-phase with another electron and multiple strengths when only its closest sides are in-phase with other electrons. Since colors are various strengths we know light stems from the weak electron attractions. The strong force of the electron can upset the balance two ways by making it better or worse but the weak forces, in light transmission, can only upset things by delivering oscillating energy that maintains a similar balance.

**REMEMBER:** *once you know same size quantum chunks of energy are being delivered various distances then you also know that same strength attractive forces are delivering these quantum units, thus no individual force can decrease in strength with distance; there is a distance limit: it's the Hubble limit for the electron and a different limit, we'll call it the Wolff limit, for the quark.*

So, once you know that **same size** quantum chunks of energy are being delivered *various distances* then you also know that **FIELD THEORY IS WRONG** when used for these cosmological forces!

Let's return to the tri-quark entity (proton or neutron) again. **Remember now:** (if you've read about quarks) the force of **attraction** kept getting stronger and stronger the further that quark was pulled away from the *spacetime environment* of the other two quarks. **This is vitally important** because it is telling you the answer as to **exactly why** gyroscopes, pendulums, vibrating elements and Helium-2 all have inertial qualities: **by moving the quarks in these items faster or in the case of Helium-2, positioning those quarks where they can be considered as moving faster, you are changing the spacetime environment so that *more ultra-long-range inertial binding frequency matches* are being made to those quarks in the far distant stars! **And the faster the speed, the more of those frequency matches that are being made. This is the real answer as to why we have centrifugal force!****

Both vertical and directional (horizontal) gyros are a necessity in aircraft and space vehicles and we've learned much about them. Nevertheless, I have to suspect much in present science because **no** scientists yet -- *with the exception of this paper* -- have shown **exactly why** these gyros hold to the very distant stars instead of the much closer Earth or much closer and massive sun.

Remember, *you will have to read right to the end of this* to see that!

See, present science is good at giving you the **amount** of

centrifugal force or gravitational force or even inertial force but it cannot tell you **why** we have all these forces, especially those forces with the surroundings. **This new phase concept does;** but it doesn't yet give the *amounts* like present science does: so, *after eliminating present science myths*, you use both concepts to solve difficult science problems. It helped me, and it will help you too.

It takes years for *each* human mind to program itself and make sense out of this particular spacetime realm in which it exists. Thus, it's extremely difficult for humans to make sense of the far different spacetime realms of electrons and quarks.

Quarks give us gravity via the quark to quark weak and stronger attractive forces. The amount of this gravitational force is somewhat balanced "AGAINST" an attractive INERTIAL pull to the surroundings via both the weak forces of quarks having only their (**closest sides in-phase**) and the stronger force of quarks spinning the same direction on the same spin axis (**completely in-phase**) with quarks in the stars.

This is a frequency universe in which we see out-of-phase frequencies as space. We don't seem to see them as the repulsive forces that they are because we have devised nothing yet to measure a few quark generated forces as well as we can measure a few electron generated forces.

We do a better job in understanding that these in-phase attractive forces exist (gravity).

For instance, even though all quarks have movement here on Earth, they are more in-phase with each other **here** than they are with the quarks in the rest of the universe that have substantially more relative motion: this -- *being more in-phase locally* -- **adds** to our gravitational attraction.

This -- *being more in-phase locally* -- 'adds' to the reason quarks, electrons, stars, galaxies & superclusters bind together.

Standing wave SPIN FREQUENCY balance is very important! Different spin frequency setups have different balance points; the spin frequency balance point for atomic spin frequencies is iron: this universe is still balancing things after the Big Bang. Fusion is building up and converting the smaller atoms to iron or closer to iron. Fission is splitting the larger atoms so they become iron or closer to iron. There will be no more atomic energy someday: atomic energy is nothing but energy given off as conversion balances things toward iron. The lights will go out all over the universe when the atomic world is finally balanced out and **all** converted to iron.

Balance is important, but people won't see this cosmological balance as long as all these empty headed preachers keep preaching this *present* universe is expanding, which has been

proven absolutely wrong for decades now!

The *proper spin frequency* of all these entities is giving them the **attraction** that's holding them together. Spinning faster than this, they would come apart (centrifugal force).

On the other hand, if they spin too slowly -- *remember, with centrifugal force you are changing quark spin frequencies* -- (if their atomic spin frequency gets too far from the iron atom's spin frequency) *they won't have enough attraction to hold together*, and they also come apart: **this gives a definite 50 - 50 (in-phase to out-of-phase) CHANCE** that the closest sides of spinning standing waves attract or repel: so it's a **50 - 50 move**, to either a higher or a lower frequency direction, from the iron atom's spin frequency, and the present establishment only sees the centrifugal force direction. *They only observed half the forces and only got half the answers.*

*There is only one perfect balance spin frequency for each spinning standing wave from quarks to galactic clusters! You must keep that in mind.*

Not only is this the first scientific paper showing why gyroscopes hold to the stars but it's the very first enlightenment anywhere of precisely what energy really is: **energy is ONLY produced via a more precise attempt at causing in-phase to out-of-phase standing wave balancing.** My good friend Dr. Milo Wolff was the first to see that all these spinning items from quarks, to electrons, to atoms,

even to super clusters of galaxies, because of spin, precession and this **balance**, might effectively be **SCALAR "Standing Waves"** as he proved the electron to be: this is telling you in no uncertain terms that they all have great similarities. Out-of-phase repulsive forces (Einstein's Cosmological Constant) or what we see as space are keeping them all apart. Not only that but *all spinning standing wave forces ARE SIMILAR and similarly balanced.*

THINK: we see the electron as a perfect sphere; inside, however, it may really be built like a galaxy but its ultra fast spin and precession make it *appear* to us as a perfect scalar spheroid. *Yet, we are forced to view galaxies in ultra slow (frozen) motion thereby missing forces that their spin and precession cause.*

So, even though we see these galaxies as non-scalar; considering their spin and precession, the energy going out from them has to equal the energy coming in to them, just as Milo Wolff mathematically proved happens to each electron.

This is why the spin frequencies of everything in this universe are so important!

Thus all these spinning entities in the microcosm and macrocosm **BALANCE**: *the reason for this balance is that the closest sides of spinning standing waves have a 50 - 50 chance of having either an in-phase attraction or an out-of-phase repulsion.* A stronger force where both entities,

being completely in-phase with each other, by *spinning the same direction on the same spin axis* can either help the balance like the in-phase forces of inertia and gravity or they can add to the unbalance; even more upsetting to this balance is the spinning quark. By curbing the electron's ability to repel 100% of electrons and allowing them to attract some electrons, is **a quark that spins at the tenth harmonic of the electron spin frequency**, allowing things to be, and even stay for some time, a bit out of balance: this is what gives us all the elements and molecules we see in our atomic world, *and allowed life to start on Earth about four billion years ago.*

This temporary unbalancing is also why we have supernovas.

Let's look at electrons:

Only absolutely FREE electrons will always repel other absolutely FREE electrons. It's the inertia of both electrons, plus excess system energy, that keep them precessing *around* their position of maximum attraction (*BOTH having the same spin direction on the same spin axis*): so two FREE electrons can NEVER attract each other. I saw this well before I got my First Class Radio License. **An electron has to be quark attracted harmonically, losing some of its inertial freedom (*precession*), before it can then attract other electrons such as in magnetism.**

The quark that harmonically attracts an electron spins exactly at the tenth harmonic of the electron's spin frequency which we see **INSTEAD** as **the square** of the electron spin frequency giving us the reason for  $E=mc^2$ : which makes perfect sense because, mathematically, you can't square a speed.

**Gravity bends light because this quark to electron harmonic attachment exists.**

Our minds have been designed to separate spacetime into space and time, which may not exist (quite as our minds perceive it) in this frequency universe. **This universe, of possibly an infinite number of frequencies, understands spacetime.** We who only perceive a tiny portion of this bandspread **THINK** we see space and time. Einstein was the first to show us our mistake in doing this.

Einstein proved that **spacetime (triangle's hypotenuse) is the truth** but sometimes space and time (triangle's other two sides) have to change their respective sizes, *with changes in speed or mass*, to give us the truth. See, we don't seem to be comprehending what is really going on. Einstein gave us the mathematical proof that something is wrong about the way we discern both space and time but he died before he could tell us exactly what it was that our minds had wrong about space and time.

We need to see that inertia (like gravitational attraction) is also caused by in-phase quark to quark attractive forces. Inertia, like gravity, is obtained by *both* the **stronger** quark to quark attractive force with a few quarks **here**, spinning the **same way, on the same exact spin axis** (**completely in-phase**) with quarks in the surrounding stars and the weaker quark to quark attraction where only their (**closest sides are in-phase**). The **individual in-phase attractive force strength** (quark to quark or electron to electron) is **not, even a slight amount, affected by distance.**

We improperly use the term "strong force" for both strong and weak quark to quark forces: the weaker quark force is far stronger than any electron force.

Again: the stronger **attractive** force is exerted when both quarks *spin the same way* (**completely in-phase**) *on the same spin axis*. The establishment doesn't seem to be aware of this yet; neither are they aware of the quark to quark weak force of "**varying**" intensities, where quarks spin in opposite directions with their "closest sides "in-phase". **Weak force** strength varies because the **angle**, of the closest sides in-phase, *varies in all weak attractions*. **The most intense weak attraction** (of not only quarks but **all** spinning entities) is with "opposite spins" and **THEIR SPIN AXES PARALLEL**: knowing this, allowed me to solve quite a few problems. **Belief in field theory ends when enough people know this.**

Quarks behave exactly the same way, as electrons, giving us space when they repel other FREE quarks. They give us inertia while strongly attracting a few **in-phase spinning** quarks, in distant stars, using their **attracting** strong force.

AGAIN: quarks here, give us inertia by spinning (**completely in-phase**) *the same way*, on the *exact same spin axis*, with some quarks in the distant stars and inertia also stems from the weaker quark to quark attraction where only their **closest sides are in-phase**.

A stable existence means these attractive and repulsive forces are balancing out in the neighborhood of approximately **50%** **attracting internally and to the surroundings**. Moreover, close to **50%** are repelling internally and to the surroundings.

In present science, we see this balancing out while examining orbits: we miss the attractive and repulsive forces with the surroundings by doing so. However, the important element of force diminishing with **distance** plays a dominant role in maintaining this balancing of forces as we look at our surroundings.

But what we imagine as a force field falling off with the **square of the distance** in our spacetime realm is not what is happening in the spacetime realm of the quarks in a spinning gyro. If it was, then with a gyro completely attracted to the Earth, we would witness **no** "Earth rate" at all: however, a

gyro that is completely attracted to the sun would have a complete turn, of its axis, in 24 hours instead of 23 hours 56 minutes and 4.0916 seconds. What is happening instead is that the **number** of quark attractions, to the stars, is falling off inversely with the *square of the distance*: nevertheless, "each" quark to quark attraction -- *even to the most distant telescopically visible stars, not only* -- **doesn't** decrease, even the slightest with distance and the two quarks strongly "**lock together**"! This plus one more *very important thing* you'll see, my friends if you keep reading, is what gives us the "Earth rate" we see, for gyros, pendulums, vibrating elements and Helium-2.

I saw, early in the game, that there would be no unification of the fields because the field concept itself was wrong and fields, as our present scientists see them, simply **can not be used** to unify the forces. Keep reading to see more of **why**.

So, the big deviation from field theory is what is actually happening. There is **NO DECREASE OF FORCE WITH DISTANCE** in each individual attraction where like objects spin the same direction **in-phase** on the same spin axis. **Doing this they LOCK together and strongly bind**, probably not for very long, but the locking effect is there **nonetheless**. *This is not field behavior*; a paragraph toward the end gives you the **most important** reason we see gyroscopic "Earth rate". Again: It's only the **NUMBER** of these individual **binding and locking** forces that decrease

with distance.

We know with electrons: the **strongest attraction** is when both are spinning the same direction, on parallel paths, **in-phase**, at the same frequency, *on the same spin axis*. **It has to be exactly the same with quarks but immensely stronger**. There are **some other weaker type attractions**, between two electrons, when their *closest sides are in-phase*. **This too must be exactly the same with quarks!** We know that the electrons are spinning in different directions attracting other electrons with varying strengths.

**ALL spinning standing wave ENTITIES have this one strong attraction positioning setup and many weak varying attraction positioning setups, similar to the electron: this is not field behavior!**

**ALL this is caused *only* by in-phase quantum size attractions and *out-of-phase* quantum size repulsions, which are also the building blocks of spacetime.**

Numerous entities, in ***every spin direction***, have made scientists THINK there are more positions enabling force than this but **THERE ARE - LIMITED - ATTRACTIVE FORCE** positions available FROM **spinning standing wave ENTITIES**.

Again: **All spinning standing wave** entities (from quarks to galactic clusters) have similar, **LIMITED positioning setups**

to similar items spinning at the same frequency.

**All these are similar because all these are standing waves but spinning at different spin frequencies.**

The electron -- that we see as very different -- is really no different from all the other spinning items we see in our universe. *See what this tells us about what we currently believe in?* I saw this early in the game: this told me it was *not a force FIELD*, however, only the **number** of each of these individual forces involved that fell off with the square of the distance. So this concept of a constant field -- where this strong to weak force setup **is so different from a field** -- is a very poor concept indeed.

For each individual strong force attraction there are multiple varied strength weak force individual attractions; the reason for that is, in an individual strong attraction, spin axes must be in line with each other; so there are few positions where this happens compared to opposite spinning electrons whose **CLOSEST SIDES ARE IN-PHASE** and that have far, far more positions to give weaker side to side attractive forces **of various strengths**.

This is another reason there will be no "unified field theory"; this hardly noticeable truth also invalidates a good part of present science.

Nevertheless, it's a far different story for frequencies and

phases. Using these, we have a model that works!

This phase relationship -- *and these **attractive individual strong and weak forces produced by electrons*** -- must be exactly the same with spinning quarks (**disposing of that myth of "strong force containment"**) and that even though the distant stars are light years away, there is no such thing as a decrease in attraction between two quarks that are spinning the same direction, (**completely in-phase**) on parallel paths, at the same frequency (on the same spin axis): this will also be where the strong force is at its **stronger attraction** to each.

In unification of the forces, *it's (happily) good-by to our ultra reliance on present science and field theory forever.* **Field theory.** very useful in many areas, is extremely misleading when used to investigate cosmological forces: the **number** of these forces decrease with distance but **each individual force does not, even to the far distant stars, *each of these attractive bonds has the same strong force.*** And this is one little detail you had better not forget, especially in the following paragraphs.

I loved writing this particular paper and especially the next following paragraphs; they are the clinchers!

These oncoming paragraphs, especially the big **colorful** paragraph, are **extremely important**: keep reading these following paragraphs 'till you understand **why** gyros hold to

the stars, even the far, far distant stars.

Dr. Milo Wolff gave us a magnificent mathematical proof that the scalar energy of the electron determines the distance of the "Hubble Limit"; this fact, Milo himself showed me, was another proof, that this **"Phase"** concept of mine was mathematically feasible. Milo liked it because it fit in so beautifully with his scalar energy approach to the electron.

But even more important is the fact that the quark, having a far higher scalar magnitude of energy could have a much larger sphere of energy transfer than the electron; hence the Wolff limit for the quark could be a much further distance than the Hubble limit for the electron: therefore **this strong quark to quark inertial force could extend to stars much further than we could telescopically see**. This further distanced Wolff limit, for the quark, could make this paragraph as important or more than the **next big colorful** paragraph.

We know this gyro attraction is to the stars because the gyro's axis makes a full turn in 23 hours 56 minutes and 4.0916 seconds. We also know this attraction is between two quarks that are spinning the same direction (**completely in-phase**), on parallel paths (**exactly** on the same spin axis) at the same frequency or having opposite spins with their **closest sides in-phase**. **We know the reason these quark attractions are to the stars: it's because the sun (from Earth)**

subtends an angle of **ONLY half a degree** and would eliminate over 99.9% of attractions where both **must** have the *same exact spin axis* or *their closest sides in-phase*. But the surrounding universe is in all directions and allows a **100% line up** of quark to quark spin axes, or *closest sides in-phase*, of quarks, here on earth, to a virtual **solid hollow sphere of available quarks** in that virtual **solid spherical wall** of *possibly* even MORE THAN 70 billion, trillion ( $7 \times 10^{22}$ ) **surrounding stars**.

I have to insert this on October 15, 2016. Yes, even more than 70 billion, trillion; in fact even **TEN TIMES MORE**: click links below.

Observable Universe contains ten times more galaxies than previously thought

Hubble Space Telescope at ESA - 2 days ago

There Are Ten Times as Many Galaxies as Previously Thought

Smithsonian - 17 hours ago

**If you know of any other arrangement that would produce this "Earth rate", for gyros, of 23 hours 56 minutes and 4.0916 seconds then please tell me because I know of no other**

## possible cause.

That's about the extent of it.

And believe it or not, what you've read here today is only the very beginning of what science has in store for us a long, long time from now in the far distant future.

It's amazing what we've learned so far, however, what will be truly amazing is what the coming, new younger generations will find; that is, of course, providing the world's industrialists don't kill off these oncoming new generations.

Here's one on June 12th 2018 telling about a Britannica mistake, but half way through is a most interesting dissertation on how our eyes see **COLORS**.

Britannica in html:

<http://rbduncan.com/britannica.html>

Britannica in Word:<http://rbduncan.com/britannica.doc>

Britannica in Adobe pdf:<http://rbduncan.com/britannica.pdf>

Click: <http://www.amperefitz.com>

or <http://www.rbduncan.com> which was really the very first web page showing us what was actually going on in our universe.

And of course

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

And for the earlier version of this page with its superfluous longer ending. <http://www.rbduncan.com/toprule1.htm>

*Anyone may copy and paste this to their webpage if it is copied and pasted in its entirety.*

*Daniel P. Fitzpatrick Jr.*

*August 18, 2016*