

UNIVERSITIES ASLEEP AT THE SWITCH: A FRESH LOOK AT QUANTUM PHYSICS

DANIEL P. FITZPATRICK, JR.

Copyright 2006 by Daniel P. Fitzpatrick. All rights reserved. Copying of this file is prohibited!

Unlimited Publishing
Bloomington, Indiana

Amperefitz.com
Deer Lodge, Tennessee

Copyright © 2006 by Daniel P. Fitzpatrick, Jr.

All rights reserved under Title 17, U.S. Code, International and Pan-American Copyright Conventions. No part of this work may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, scanning, recording, broadcast or live performance, or duplication by any information storage or retrieval system without prior written permission from the publisher, except for the inclusion of brief quotations with attribution in a review or report. Requests for permissions may be sent via the publisher's Web site.

Unlimited Publishing LLC ("UP") works with authors and publishers worldwide, serving strictly as distributing publisher. Sole responsibility for the content of each work rests with the author(s) and/or co-publisher(s). Information or opinions expressed herein may not be interpreted as originating from or endorsed by UP, nor by any of its officers, members, contractors, agents or assigns.

This book is publicly offered contingent on the reader's prior agreement that financial, health, legal, political, scientific, or other professional advice of any kind should always be independently confirmed with other qualified sources. The author(s) and publisher(s) accept no responsibility of any kind for conclusions reached by readers of this book. If you do not agree with these terms in advance, you may return this book unread for a full refund.

First Edition

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CONTROL NUMBER:

Pending

ISBN:

978-1-58832-177-0 (Paperback)

978-1-58832-178-7 (Hardback)

Distributing Publisher:
Unlimited Publishing
Bloomington, Indiana

Contributing Publisher:
AmpereFitz.com
Deer Lodge, Tennessee

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: How Wrong Are These Universities?.....	1
Chapter 2: Trading All Our Present Science Laws for Ampere's Laws.....	23
Chapter 3: Isn't This an Expanding Universe?	33
Chapter 4: Surroundings.....	43
Chapter 5: Surroundings and Binding Energy	53
Chapter 6: Vector and Scalar Quantities.....	61
Chapter 7: In the Formula $E = mc^2$ What Does c^2 Imply?	69
Chapter 8: Motion	79
Chapter 9: Our Concept of Motion	85
Chapter 10: Mach's Principle versus an Expanding Universe	89
Chapter 11: Using the Right Rules <i>and</i> The Right Reference Frame	95
Chapter 12: The Picture You Should Look At.....	101
Chapter 13: Gravity, Inertial Mass and Hurricanes.....	107
Chapter 14: Generators, Motors and Transformers.....	115

Copyright © 2006 by Dennis P. Fitzpatrick. All rights reserved. Copying of this file is prohibited!

Chapter 15: Energy and Mass	123
Chapter 16: A Steady-State Universe.....	141
Chapter 17: Angle of Lock On: Why We Have the Hubble Limit and Why the Numbers of Quanta Fall Off with the Square of the Distance.....	149
Chapter 18: Light and Planck's Constant.....	155
Chapter 19: Einstein's Gravity Wave Prediction	163
Chapter 20: The Big Bang and More	169
Chapter 21: The Very End	177

Copyright 2006 by Daniel P. Fitzpatrick. All rights reserved. Copying of this file is prohibited!

*Dedicated to Fulbright Scholar Dr. Milo Wolff
who was the first to mathematically prove
Mach's principle by showing us that the electron
is a scalar, standing wave.*

Copyright 2006 by Daniel P. Fitzpatrick. All rights reserved. Copying of this file is prohibited!

“At every crossroad on the way that leads to the future, each progressive spirit is opposed by a thousand men appointed to guard the past.”

– Count Maeterlinck, 1911 Nobel Prize Winner – Literature

Copyright 2006 by Daniel P. Fitzpatrick. All rights reserved. Copying of this file is prohibited!

Chapter 1

How Wrong Are These Universities?

THIS IS the most incredible true story anyone has ever told. It will be talked about as long as humans are here. Others may tell this story better than I have. I merely lucked out and have been able to tell it first.

As this book is being first published, no one in these universities can tell you why we have centrifugal force, they can only give you the math for how strong it will be.

But ask them, "What causes centrifugal force?"

They can't give you the answer. It's hard to believe that they were closer to the correct answer eighty years ago than they are today.

You can get the answer, though, by reading this book.

By reading this you'll understand the principle behind why we have conservation of energy as well. Understanding this alone will put you far ahead of university "scholars."

Possibly as many as ten percent of visible stars are binary stars. If the premise put forth in this book is correct, all binary stars of the same mass should be spinning opposite from each other. If one star is spinning clockwise, its companion star should be spinning counter-clockwise. Nothing in our present science is able to tell us this. Astronomers do not know this yet. This is something that can and will be looked for as more astronomers read this book. It is in Chapter 6.

Remember: this was the first publication in which it was predicted.

There are many more important things, as well, that present science can shed no light upon, that can be predicted with this brand new kind of science. You will see herein the

reason why small clusters of two or three or four atoms have entirely different characteristics from larger assemblages of the same elements. You will find this in Chapter 4.

How wrong can the universities be, you ask?

About as wrong as one can be about our science laws – in fact dangerously wrong in this age of terrorism.

In this book, you will see the serious problems that are holding science back, while on the surface everything looks fine.

It will be hard to believe that all these science mishaps, on the road to wholesale ignorance, actually happened. However, they all did happen. Each one of them will be pointed out to you.

It's not one single factor that caused this naïveté, but many factors that all added up, which you will see as you read through this book.

I grew up loving radio as a kid and had an amateur radio station W2YDW up and running as I was entering high school. I learned about the importance of standing waves and impedance matching in radio circuitry at an early age and have finally found they both are extremely important to our entire universe as well.

These will be covered in detail. But first I'll repeat what I have said in many places before:

“We now have the answer Einstein was looking for, but this universe is far different from that presently described by most science laws. It is a scalar, standing wave universe and it resembles instead what we see in the quantum world but simply a lower frequency thereof with a slightly different symmetry.”

If enough universities remain asleep, while one nation puts sufficient time and resources into this brand new kind of science, then that nation will not only have cheap controllable fusion power with radioactive waste existing only for

microseconds instead of millions of years, it will also have enough sophisticated weaponry to keep the rest of the world as its virtual slaves, for many thousands of years.

While Joe Sixpack will have no interest in this book, fascist, terrorist states certainly will.

The information in this book could change the world as we know it. Concentrated in the wrong hands, it could change all of our lives permanently. Your world is at risk. It is up to you to understand the issues and help do something about it. If our universities remain asleep and if our government doesn't wake up and focus their energies in the right direction, some other nation will beat us to this holy grail of science, and they will then have the power to hold us hostage.

It was hard for me to believe that the radio shop at the Miami base of Pan American World Airways was putting correction cards on units that went to the instrument shop and there these "corrections" resulted in less accuracy rather than more. When I saw what was actually happening I went to both people involved in both shops and got the answer that nothing like that could happen with all the safeguards the engineering department "here at Pan Am" had in place. I then went to the person who headed both shops but that too brought no changes. Months went by and then I saw the radioman who made out the correction cards talking to the shop supervisor who got the units. They were talking about getting the most miles out of a set of tires. I stood there listening and then at an appropriate time, I asked the man in the radio shop, who had been a chief petty officer in the navy, "Chief, if the Gertz reads 359.9 instead of true north, what do you put on the correction card?" When he answered, Rufi Lopez, who headed that particular instrument shop, screamed at him, "No! That's an error not a correction! You're doing it backwards!" I silently walked away, now knowing that it would all be quietly corrected with no problems ever arising about the mishap.

I had another problem handed to me by the head of the vertical gyro department. He said, "This gyro keeps coming back every few weeks and they keep sending it out again. Something must be wrong with it that they are not discovering."

It turned out to be a puzzle that was hard to solve but one day, I and another man were in the instrument shop and he was ready to leave and he turned off a switch. Just then the gyro failed and started falling off. I turned the switch back on and the gyro went back to working correctly. Then when I switched it back off the gyro failed to hold. I asked him, "What is that switch for?" "It's for the vacuum pump," He answered.

"Is that thing running all the time?" I asked. "Yes, as long as anybody's here," he answered. Well, I had already told the head of the instrument department that he had a worker who was improperly reading a dial indicator micrometer while measuring the end play on vertical gyro gimbal ball bearings. But nothing evidently ever came of it. Now I saw what was happening. With the wrong end play on the gimbal bearings, as long as the rotating gyro was perfectly centered, the gyro would work just fine on a piston powered airplane that was always vibrating but not on a jet that had no such steady vibration. Although the bearings were either too tight or too loose it was the vibration that was keeping it perfectly centered. In addition, since they were checking it on a bench that was continually vibrating, because of the vibrating vacuum pump, it always worked fine there. So the overhaul shop would put a green tag on it and send it out again. However, when it got on a jet airplane, that didn't vibrate, it fell off and wouldn't hold.

When I reported this to the head of the vertical gyro department he called engineering. I showed this to an engineer and told him, "This is probably why the poor record of Pan

Am's overhauled gyros are keeping them from flying the polar route. These gyros are an absolute necessity, close to the pole, where you can't use a magnetic compass."

Then came the Pan Am cutbacks and layoffs. I went to another department but later met that engineer to whom I had showed the gyro problem. "Hey, did they ever fix that gyro problem?" I asked. "No, I got pulled off that to get those movies running. They wanted those movies installed on all the airplanes," he replied.

Even with all this, our airlines are not as poorly run as our universities. There was not even one fatal commercial accident here in the U.S. of any scheduled airline carrier during the entire year of 2002. This was the year following 9-11 and that terrorist attack on the twin towers in New York.

Not having even one fatality in all those many millions of passenger miles flown, for that entire year, is one remarkable achievement. It can be done if everyone tries and that year following 9-11 everyone tried to be safer and they actually were able to do it and show those improved safety results. If you figure fatalities per passenger mile then you are about 50 or more times safer flying with a scheduled American commercial airline than you are driving your own car. This is a fact.

But, remember, that figure is fatalities per passenger mile, not hours. This does *not* mean you are 50 times safer for every hour you are in a commercial airliner than every hour you are in a car. An airliner racks up far more miles in an hour than a car does. You are indeed quite a bit safer per hour but not 50 times as safe, if you look at it that way.

Yes, these universities have graduated all these people who have given us these wonderful airliner toys. It's been neat cranking up a 40 million dollar toy and playing with it. Today an airliner costs even more than that.

What I'm trying to get across to you here, with those airline problems, is that people specialize. They cut themselves off from other specialties because there is simply too much info for a single brain to handle. Computers now keep coming out with more and more brain capacity. Unfortunately, we humans are still using that old first edition brain with low disk space so we have to specialize and not worry about what the others are doing.

This was one factor that has kept the universities asleep but there are more. Keeping simplicity in mind, I'm going to try to explain the present situation of science to you in an understandable manner and show you where these failures have occurred.

You must first understand that Max Planck realized something peculiar, one day, about the way energy worked and he gave a speech that very night talking about how energy must be sent out and received in packets. This was something Einstein immediately jumped on and with what Einstein termed a photon (a bullet-like packet of energy) the quantum theory took off running and hasn't stopped since.

Then Niels Bohr stole the show away from Einstein and Bohr's house in Copenhagen was cranking out future Nobel Prize winners almost as fast as Henry Ford, at the same time, was cranking out Model T Fords.

Bohr got the Nobel Prize, way back then, for showing us exactly how a quantum of light from a star is received by our eye.

Here's how Bohr said it works: On a distant star an electron drops to a lower orbit and an electron in your eye goes up to a higher orbit the same exact amount. This was termed "action at a distance."

If the electron only drops a short distance then it is a quantum of red light but if it drops a much longer distance (more energy) then it is a quantum of blue or (even more

energy) violet light. A quantum of violet light has about twice the energy as a quantum of red light.

These quanta packets can vary in size but the energy received always matches exactly the energy sent.

Do you discern an aspect of balancing in this? Please keep this aspect of balancing in mind. We'll cover it in detail.

The quantum theorists, after Bohr, did not keep it in mind because they wanted Bohr's Nobel Prize winning concept of the atom to be replaced with their new modern resonance picture, which happened to be void of any balancing aspect. I'm not saying it's a wrong picture but the elimination of the balancing aspect was bad. This eliminated a priceless tool and put us back almost eighty years.

Neils Bohr had the electron traveling on certain orbits but now modern quantum theorists see the electron as being in a kind of mysterious resonance orbital.

What they did reminds me of the definition of a fanatic. "One who loses sight of his objectives but redoubles his efforts." They had good reason to do what they did but in doing so lost something priceless.

This you will see as you read on.

Anyway, when light comes to your eye from a distant star via these quanta, absolutely no energy is lost in any of these quanta over that long distance. This is so important that it's the foundation of quantum mechanics and it's the very basis of this brand new kind of science that I will try to explain to you.

Now, this isn't any fabrication of mine. This is the cornerstone of quantum theory. All the theorists there know this is true. If it wasn't, then Niels Bohr wouldn't have gotten the Nobel Prize for discovering it.

This is how energy is made. We also hear of binding energy along with atomic energy. When this binding changes then we gain or lose energy. All our science folks agree with that too, so try to keep that firmly in mind as well.

Now to the important question. Why does light diminish in energy with the square of the distance if no energy is lost in each quantum no matter the distance?

It is the *number* of these quanta (binding electron pairs) – electron on the star giving and electron in your eye receiving – that fall off with the square of the distance.

Only the *number* of electron binding pairs, falls off with the square of the distance. The strength of these bonds do not vary with distance but they do cease at the Hubble limit, which will be covered later.

Please remember this because it is so very important.

Just as things went wrong at Pan Am, they have gone wrong elsewhere. This is the story of how things have gone wrong in the universities just as they did at Pan Am and all the other Airlines that I've known.

Dr. Milo Wolff's brilliant mathematical proof that both the electron and its spin are scalar, standing waves with a finite portion (the Hubble limit) of their same frequency surroundings, has fallen on deaf ears. So has Saul Perlmutter's insistence that gravity's equal and opposite repulsive force (Einstein's cosmological constant) exists, holding all the stars and galaxies apart. Please visit my Web site:

<http://www.amperefitz.com>

...where you can simply click the links you find in this book for more information.

Dr. Milo Wolff's Web site is at this location:

<http://www.quantummatter.com>

Saul Perlmutter's Web location is:

<http://panisse.lbl.gov/public/sauldir/saulhome.html>

These two scientists have given us the final pieces of the master puzzle that show us this is indeed a simple universe. You can see approximately how it all works, and one does not have to be a math expert to see this either.

You simply can't overlook the evidence that these two scientists have put forth. Yet, universities have.

Scientists before them have given us other important pieces of the puzzle and they too have been mostly ignored by the universities.

Kurt Gödel proved that if we were confined to a subset realm – like here on earth – without being able to see out far enough then we might believe that our science laws were universal truths, when this would be far from the truth. This is exactly what has happened.

Berkeley, then Mach then Maxwell all told us surroundings were involved (Mach's principle). Since this did not mix well with present science and made the math too difficult, it was simply given lip service and largely bypassed and ignored by the universities. The university presses printed, "Inertia is implicit with the geodesic equation of motion." Now, thanks to my good friend Dr. Milo Wolff, we have actual proof inertia is *not* implicit with the geodesic equation of motion; it's same frequency surroundings that are involved. We have computers, coming on line in the future, that will do these calculations and will give even more proof of this than Milo gave.

Dirac predicted that one day we would be able to see an approximation of how it all worked and how true this becomes. The basic building blocks of this universe are simple standing waves whose spins and orbits produce vector forces, but this fact is totally obscured by all our subset, local science laws and the tons of garbage printed by the university presses.

They do print some diamonds as well but the problem is the same as in a diamond mine where you have to go through many tons of mud to get only one diamond.

The diamond that this book is showing you is that it is surroundings, surroundings, surroundings and spins, spins, spins. It's surroundings and either spin or orbital binding. These spins are spins that bind, giving us not only binding energy but gravity, inertia, light and all the invisible forces as well.

In fact, that's what this book will be explaining.

And that, essentially, is what you should be looking at to get the big picture of how our entire universe works.

Surroundings and spins are not a big part of present science but they are everything in this brand new kind of science.

Our present science cannot give answers to the following:

Why is everything spinning in the microcosm as well as here? Notice all this separation (99.9999% *empty space*) both in the macrocosm *and* microcosm. Look how far we are from the sun. Light goes about 186,000 miles a second or 300 million meters a second and the sun is so far away that it takes light about 8 minutes to get from the sun to us here on earth. That's a lot of space there. Now if you make an electron as big as a pinhead then the closest electron to the nucleus would be as far from the nucleus as the fortieth floor of a tall building is from the road below. A lot of space is there, too.

Once you see all this evidence of spinning and orbiting, in the solar system, the microcosm and the macrocosm, and the *fact* that this massive amount of empty space in our world, the microcosm and the macrocosm *is exactly the same* then it doesn't take much of a brain to see there is *only ONE precept* behind it all. Therefore, all your science that gives entirely different reasons for us, the microcosm and the macrocosm must be very, very *wrong*.

You are about to see how wrong they are. You'll see the big picture of how it's really working. You'll see what Einstein tried to see.

This universe is built upon a foundation of scalar, standing waves that is extremely difficult not only to see but also to understand. Future super-computers will be needed to decipher all that. But today by using surroundings, spins and Ampere's Laws, an approximate big picture emerges as clear as crystal.

It turns out that Ampere gave us the first universal true laws in the 1820s, showing us how it all worked, and we should have listened to him but we listened to Faraday instead. Ampere described these invisible forces using relative motion laws while Faraday used fields. You must use relative motion to easily unify the forces because motion is the only common element. How do you easily unify sunny fields that all have wrong underlying concepts?

Millions of dollars, perhaps even billions, of taxpayer money has gone into trying to unify these invisible fields by various mathematicians with the results that only a resemblance of unification of the weak force with magnetism has ever been achieved. Nobel Scientist Richard Feynman, who understood it, humorously said about this particular unification that one could even see the glue that held it together.

It's ironic that Ampere, in the 1820s, gave us laws that can actually unify all these invisible forces today, right now, even without using any math at all. All you need is your common sense.

Math is an important science tool. There is no insinuation here that it is not. The above paragraph merely states that the reader, in this particular instance, will need no math expertise whatsoever to see the big picture of how magnetism, gravity, strong and weak forces are unified.

Stay reading and you'll see the best unification picture ever. You'll see a universe that finally makes sense as far as the unification of all these invisible forces is concerned.

True, universal, global science must be built upon a basis of logic. This logic foundation can only be laid *after* these invisible forces are unified.

You simply cannot have a logical foundation for your science until these fundamental invisible forces are unified.

Once you see how these invisible forces are unified then you will know what is going on. Until then, you won't.

If your science gives you a picture of these forces being one and the same – as Ampere's Laws do – then this is true, universal, global science.

If your science shows you different type forces – as present science does – for all these invisible forces then that science is merely local gauge theory and utterly worthless in seeing the big picture of how this entire universe works.

The Michelson Moreley experiment, over a hundred years ago, showed us something was radically wrong with our concept of motion. With this new approach, we now know a bit more about motion, in this universe of scalar, standing waves, and the parameters in which it can be safely used. Motion, along with the spacetime interval, in one frequency spin/orbit system spacetime realm is far different from motion and the spacetime interval in a different frequency spin/orbit system spacetime realm. Quantum scientists do understand a part of this, but only a part. That is why QED, Quantum Electrodynamics, (*the study of electrons*) uses different math and rules from QCD, Quantum Chromodynamics, (*the study of quarks*). They also understand that the strength of these individual binding energy forces does not vary with distance. It is merely the number of these individual bondings that decrease with the square of the distance.

Now that I've brought in the spacetime interval, I must tell you something about it. Mathematicians love it. It's like the hypotenuse of a right triangle with space being one side and time being the other side. If the hypotenuse (spacetime interval) stays the same and you reduce the time side then the space side must get longer and vice versa. This seems to be the way it really works in relativistic situations too. We get into these situations with different speeds of different reference frames where space changes and time changes but the spacetime interval stays the same.

Ampere's Laws immediately show you the unification of gravity, magnetic attractions and sigma and pi chemical bondings. And the standing wave action, which is the basis for these laws, shows us why we have motion, space and time and even life itself because things that reproduce stay here and things that don't, don't. Standing waves utilize the energy of their same frequency surroundings to reproduce themselves and stay here.

In radio, we constantly look for ways to eliminate all the standing waves we can but in this universe, it's just the opposite and this universe uses them as its master building blocks.

Not only is all of this true but there is a lot more for you to know about – mostly mistakes – that the universities have made and you will also see why they fell into the trap that they did.

All large organizations are prone to do this.

The Catholic Church in Galileo's time was the great repository of knowledge back then and they refused to even look through the new telescope that Galileo built. Galileo was put under house arrest for merely stating the earth moved. Giordano Bruno who not only stated that the earth moved but that the sun was a star just like all the other stars was burned at

the stake by that great repository of knowledge for merely expressing what he knew was a fact.

Things haven't changed much since then.

When President Eisenhower retired, he warned about the power in the military-industrial complex. The university system that we have today is nothing more than a servant to that military-industrial complex.

The universities are simply reiterating what was told in the past just the same as the Catholic Church did in Galileo's time and that simply was not good enough back then and it is not good enough today either.

Today it's surroundings, surroundings, surroundings, and spins, spins, spins. It's surroundings and either spin or orbital binding.

I know that the quantum purists will challenge me at this point telling me "The electron doesn't spin like a top." I know that. I know it is resonances and not motion, in fact that is exactly what you will be learning all about in this book.

What you will be seeing all through this book, is that the foundation stones are indeed resonances and not motion. This is exactly what quantum theorists imply. Because this is far too complicated for our minds, at this present time, then simply use the Occam's razor approach and simplify it by seeing it as motion.

That's what Niels Bohr did, and it worked.

That's all I ask you to do now and it too will work.

Many quantum scientists dislike seeing this as motion in the world of the electron but we do have good and sufficient spectrographic evidence of angular momentum orbit changes and spin changes the same as when orbits and spins change here. Niels Bohr won the Nobel Prize for showing us the orbit changes and some years later Dirac showed us the fine structure evidence of spin changes. So there is sufficient evidence the electron does orbit and spin. The reason that we

see it as resonances is that we are not inside the electron's spin/orbit spacetime realm. We are in an entirely different spacetime realm and from where we are looking out here, to inside of the microcosm, we will see it all as resonances. What the quantum theorists fail to realize is that you will not see things as resonances in your own spacetime realm. There you will see them as solid entities, spinning and orbiting, the same way we see the planets and stars and the very way that the electrons must "*see*" themselves.

The word "*see*" has been used very loosely in that above paragraph. That's why it is in quotes. This, seemingly, is the best way to explain it.

This adamant refusal, on the part of the universities, to understand this motion concept in the microcosm not only cost Goudsmit and Uhlenbeck the Nobel Prize but it has set us back dearly in our understanding of this universe. So just hang in there all you quantum experts. I'm sure you too will finally be satisfied with the *entire* explanation where there is more on this very subject and a caveat on motion and the parameters in which it can be safely used. But as for right now, let us go back to about 1920 where Neils Bohr described it as electrons spinning like the planets and orbiting around the nucleus (*we now know it's a quark nucleus*) like planets do in the solar system.

The reason that we have to go back to the way Niels Bohr described electrons eighty years ago is that our minds simply cannot understand what is going on if we see it as it really is, a universe of resonances within their same frequency surroundings.

Quantum mechanics fell into a "Catch 22." They found the right answer before they received the computers, programming and entire theory that could utilize that correct answer.

Stephen Wolfram, mentioned later, got it right. The correct answer is far too complicated, right now, for our minds to even begin to deal with it. We will need future super-computers for that.

Quantum theorists do not like to see orbits because there are problems with orbits. Different surroundings will make them change, making the Hartree approximations necessary, but that is no different from us having to use general relativity corrections out here when the surroundings get too massive.

Presently you will see a method whereby our minds can deal with it today, right now. You will get an approximate big picture of how it all works. Dirac even predicted this approximation would arrive. It did. It's here now in this book.

See it as Niels Bohr saw it. Give the electron, and the quark, a spin and orbit and visualize the electron, possibly even, as an oblate spheroid the same as the earth but naturally much, much, much smaller.

Niels Bohr looked at the electron correctly. He saw these electrons as they saw themselves in their own microcosm world. This is the way it has to be done using today's slim resources.

You must look at them from within *their* reference frame, not from within ours.

If this is done then all these entities will appear as solid spinning entities similar to what we see in our macrocosm.

Nevertheless, the fact is today that this is not being done. Quantum theorists are looking at them from within *our* reference frame and seeing them as resonances. I'll go into this reference frame concept more in detail as we proceed.

This new science tells us the quantum theorists are right about seeing these resonances. Not only these resonances, but all repetitive geodesic spins and orbits, are equivalent to scalar, standing waves. Matter that is made up of these spins and orbitals must also be considered equivalent to scalar,

standing waves. Therefore, electrons, stars and galaxies are all constructed basically the same and being repelled, from each other, exactly for the same reason. And we'll get to that in this chapter and Chapter 2.

Ampere's Laws, plus the gyro precession that this brand new kind of science shows us all spinning scalar wave entities have, tell us why all these spinning entities repel each other when they are free.

Quantum theorists did get the resonances right but they didn't see the importance of Ampere's Laws in showing them far more about their beloved resonances than they now know about them themselves.

By far the most important thing about these resonances is the fact they are either in phase or out of phase with another resonance. There is nothing more important than Ampere's Laws that can tell quantum theorists about that.

The spin frequencies of everything are the key in this brand new kind of science.

This new science shows us all spinning, scalar wave entities must have a form of gyro precession to same frequency neighbor similar entities in their surroundings. This means *their* same frequency surroundings and not necessarily what you will see as gyro precession in your spacetime realm. Whereas our realm is homogeneous and isotropic, (*no privileged spot and surroundings evenly spread out*) the realm of the electron is definitely not.

When will you have these spin binding *attractions* in this universe?

You will get a spin binding *attraction* whenever the spins, of two scalar wave entities, are in the same *equatorial* plane or parallel *axial* spin planes (on the same spin axis) with the closest sides, between this pair, going in the *same* direction (*like gears meshing and not clashing*).

Electrons and other scalar wave entities REPEL each other when they are spinning in the same *equatorial* plane or parallel *axial* planes (on the same spin axis), with the closest sides between this pair, going in OPPOSITE directions (*like gears clashing*).

You will see, as you read on, that all these spinning scalar wave entities have a gyroscopic force that will act 90 degrees to Ampere's force. You will only get attractions, in this universe, when the entity is "locked" thereby preventing the gyroscopic force from reacting. Where spinning scalar wave entities are free and both forces are free to act then the spinning scalar wave entities must *repel* each other. This is why stars and galaxies *repel* as well. This brand new kind of science also will be showing you the scalar wave phase rules that are the foundation for Ampere's Laws working as well as they do.

To have an attraction, according to this brand new kind of science, something must not be free but it must be "locked" into position some way.

Totally free spinning items such as electrons, stars or galaxies will never attract each other.

But once they get "locked," into orbitals such as electrons do or on the same path, like we are on the same path with the earth, then these things certainly can attract one another and Ampere's 1st law shows us how.

Our Galaxy is "locked" into the spin of the Andromeda galaxy and is being attracted to it via Ampere's Laws.

Ampere's Laws show us why magnetism works.

A good example of the old rubbish still being taught is that in magnetism opposites attract.

This may have been good enough before we knew the electron had spin but this should have been changed after we knew the electron's spin caused magnetism.

An electron will attract another electron when their closest sides are going on parallel paths in the same direction relative to the surroundings if they are locked some way as in orbital shells. Sometimes they will even get locked in an unbalanced spin position such as the *d* and *f* shells in iron that cause magnetism.

Magnetism is caused by these *d* and *f* shells in iron having more electrons spinning one way than they do any other way. Electron spins are generally balanced elsewhere.

Scientists agree that the smallest entity in magnetism is the spinning electron.

Scientists also agree that we will get such a MAGNETIC spin binding *attraction* whenever the spins of the electrons are in the same *equatorial* plane or parallel *axial* spin planes (on the same spin axis) with the closest sides, between this pair, going in the *same* direction (*like gears meshing and not clashing*). THIS, IN FACT, IS AMPERE'S LAW.

In other words, two electrons will attract magnetically when they are spinning in the same *equatorial* plane or parallel *axial* planes (on the same spin axis) and their CLOSEST SIDES are moving in the *same* direction (*like gears meshing and not clashing*). THIS IS ALSO THE WAY SIGMA AND PI CHEMICAL BONDING WORKS.

Scientists likewise agree that these magnetic attraction and repulsion forces will have an *equatorial* vector and an *axial* vector component.

Therefore there will be two positions (*equatorial* and *axial*) in which two electrons will magnetically attract each other.

Einstein made mind pictures to see what was going on. Please do the same with these next two paragraphs. Look at these electrons as spherical, spinning entities.

The weakest (*equatorial*) position of attraction in magnetism will be between a spin up and a spin down electron

where their spins are in the same *equatorial* plane and their spin axes are parallel. Their CLOSEST SIDES will be moving in the *same* direction and acting *like gears meshing and not clashing*. You get this type of magnetic attraction when you put two pole-reversed magnets side by side and you also get this type attraction in sigma bonding. Light is derived via a sigma type, side-to-side, binding that I'll give you all the details about in Chapter #18.

The strongest (*axial*) attraction in magnetism will be between two electrons, spinning the same way, in parallel planes on the same spin axis or *axial* because then not only the CLOSEST SIDES but also both entire electrons are spinning on parallel paths (*like gears meshing and not clashing*) in the *same* direction. You get this type attraction with magnets that are not reversed, but have same poles pointing in the same direction and placed pole to pole. This is the way it works in pi bonding. But pi bonding is the weaker of the two chemical bonds because it is only a short duration, repetitive binding and not a steady bond such as in a sigma type bond where the orbitals of both electrons remain in the same plane.

So in truth we have magnetic attraction when geodesic paths are SIMILAR.

So opposites don't really attract do they?

However, this is what is being taught in the universities today and it is absolutely wrong.

And not only is it wrong, but it is the exact opposite of what is right.

Refusing to see Bohr's motion in the microcosm, by adamant quantum purists, blinded them to seeing the correct solution. Moreover, this kept a very bad WRONG religion of opposites attracting alive to fog the minds of students who would be trying to find the correct answers.

Stephen Wolfram was right: This is extremely complicated, exactly as he states in his *New Kind of Science*

and as he predicted we will be asking future super-computers for the answers. Now, something that Stephen Wolfram doesn't tell you is that these super-computers will be programmed with a new type of frequency math that we are only now learning and a new frequency structure that we are now also learning about for the first time. Everything will have to be translated from this wave world in which these super-computers work to the world of present science that our ancestors thought they understood and that most of us still believe is correct because this is the type thinking we have always relied upon.

I'm not advocating doing completely away with our science laws. They will be with us as long as humans remain here simply because they give us accurate answers to 99.9% of the science problems. Besides, they are simple in theory and math.

What you cannot do is mix present science with this brand new type science. It won't work! Entirely forget present science rules when using this brand new kind of science.

Use either present science or this new kind of science but never both at the same time.

In some things already, our science laws have to be corrected with either special or general relativity corrections for us to get accurate answers. For instance, your GPS Global Positioning System uses built in general relativity corrections to give you accurate latitude and longitude readings.

Moreover, in the future even these relativity corrections won't be quite good enough. Super-computers will have to be using a frequency-based math related to the actual standing wave resonances that are really building our universe. Only then will we get controllable fusion power.

Don't take this as it may sound. I'm not one of those birds saying general relativity is wrong. It isn't. What I'm saying is that future super-computers programmed to this brand new

Daniel P. Fitzpatrick Jr.

kind of science (the standing wave world) will do a better job of it than adding relativity corrections to our present science the way it is being done now. And this can be used in the microcosm as well where general relativity cannot.

Copyright 2006 by Daniel P. Fitzpatrick. All rights reserved. Copying of this file is prohibited!

Copyright 2006 by Daniel P. Fitzpatrick. All rights reserved. Copying of this file is prohibited!

For free, ongoing updates and extensive additional resources,
please visit:

www.amperefitz.com

Copyright 2006 by Daniel P. Fitzpatrick. All rights reserved. Copying of this file is prohibited!