



A bit of light on the

# 3 Distinct Changes coming to 3 Science Areas

This paper, by Daniel P. Fitzpatrick Jr., brought to you free by  
R.M.F. founder of  
[\*MAGPUL Industries.\*](#)

## ABSTRACT

This universe — of spinning entities — is far **simpler** than anyone has imagined.

I published in 1966 — using pictures to show — how Ampère's Law of 1825, said electrons on **parallel paths** going in the **same direction, attract** each other and those on **parallel paths** going in **opposite directions, repel** each other.

I showed in 1966 that this was far better, than using the concept of plus and minus charges and north and south poles because Ampère's law also explained magnetism perfectly as well, thus unifying what was considered then, electrical and

magnetic fields.

Since this was astounding, I knew, back then — and published back then in 1966 — that Ampère was the first to show us what was *really going on* in the electrical, electronic and magnetic realms.

Nevertheless Ampère's amazing, unifying concept of 1825 lost out to field theory that Einstein warned us about in 1954.

You will see, herein, exactly **why** field theory led us astray.

And you can read Einstein's exact warning words about field theory and modern science — which this paper now proves were correct.

André M. Ampère's long wire laws essentially showed us this: *electrons moving on parallel paths, in the **same direction attract** — — electrons moving on parallel paths, in **an opposite direction repel**.*

How the Britannica could screw up and get this completely backwards for over *five years now* — without even one scientist telling them — is beyond me.

Yes, mistakes are made by credible sources and myths are thereby created that last, *not only for five years*, but for decades: that's a good part of this paper.

A full page on 1-18-1967 in the **New York Times** is about

my publication, back in 1966. In that I showed Ampère's Law was the reality and *it beat thinking in terms of plus and minus charges and/or north and south poles.*

Now in 2018 I'm showing that *relative motion* or **phase** applies — *not only to electrons* — but to all these spinning entities in both microcosm and macrocosm.

Ampère's Law essentially **tells** you: entities that are **in-phase attract** and entities that are **out-of-phase repel** each other.

This is not only the rule — engineers use — in the electrical world, but it's the rule between **all these spinning entities** in our entire micro-macro universe as well.

**All forces** now have to be seen as being caused directly from that fundamental **phase** rule above — that both Einstein and Hawking looked for their entire lives — but never found.

Science now becomes a whole new ballgame, **simplified** by Ampère's Law.

\* end of Abstract \*

New discoveries, generally open up a Pandora's box of difficulties: this one greatly **simplifies** much of present science.

The following is going to be hard to believe by many who

read it, but it is all absolutely true.

Read this entire paper, and then at the very end you will be one of the few people who understands exactly what causes gravity.

*"Science is the key to life"* was written under my graduation picture in the 1950 Cynosure of Linden High School in Linden, New Jersey.

Science has, in fact, been **the key to my entire life**.

I can remember the first radio I ever fixed, as if it happened yesterday! It was either 1944 or 1945, and I was in the 6<sup>th</sup> or 7<sup>th</sup> grade and up at Lake Hopatcong where it was over a thousand feet above sea level and a lot cooler and far nicer than in Linden, New Jersey in summer. I was at our neighbor's house, and I found their beautiful big radio didn't work. I went back to our house and got my father's volt-ohm meter. At the radio, I put one meter lead to ground and the other to a grid cap on the top of one of the tubes, and as I tuned the dial I could see the meter fluctuating, so I knew the set was working OK. All the tubes checked out OK this way, so I went to the output transformer that matched the high impedance of the tube circuitry with the low loud-speaker impedance. I had, therefore, traced the sound fluctuations — through the tubes — and then I also saw fluctuating meter readings on both primary and secondary terminals of the

output transformer, going right to the loud-speaker — but why was there no sound??? Why didn't the radio work??? I had good eyes back then and spotted a broken loud-speaker coil wire — because sounds from the huge loud-speaker evidently vibrated, flexed and finally broke the loud-speaker coil to transformer wire. So, I went back home and got my soldering iron, came back and soldered the wire back again, possibly giving the radio another ten years of life. That neighbor woman couldn't believe it when the radio played just like it did when it was new — and she gave me two dollars.

That experience was worth its weight in gold because it showed me the path I was going to take for the rest of my life.

I'm retired now in one of the better retirement places just outside of Austin, Texas where I now have the time to write these science papers that are being read by thousands — every month in more than 50 countries — who wish to get a jump ahead of those in the universities, who are *always* a bit behind what is going on in the science world.

Here's something, the people who read my papers know.

It's really NASA scientist Dr. Milo Wolff's frequency universe — all throughout micro and macro worlds — in which the forces are produced via the **phase between** all these spin frequencies.

This frequency aspect of our universe all throughout — that Milo Wolff saw — is not that apparent, so we entirely missed it: this is the reason we missed the supreme importance of **phase** between all these spin frequencies being the **key** to what is really going on in this entire universe.

I stated in my 1966 publication that André Ampère gave us the **relative motion** law aspect of it that showed us what was really going on, "Things moving on **parallel paths** — in the same direction will attract and in opposite directions will repel".

I used the term **relative motion** and Ampère's law for decades, and even during Milo Wolff's healthier years, before using a different term **phase**, as I put more of the pieces of this science jigsaw puzzle together.

I'm certain that if I would have thought of it more as phase and used that term during Milo's good years then he would have published this before me.

It could be closer to Ampère's Laws than **phase**, but when trying to get folks to look at all these spins, I saw **phase** was the better word to use.

I had considerably slowed down on this puzzle until I heard mathematician Stephen Wolfram explaining to Charlie Rose on TV that mathematics could never help in finding the

*correct model* on which this universe was built. I immediately read Stephen Wolfram's book. It was then that I realized why Bohr and Einstein failed — neither had gotten to the bottom of things — and that I had the *correct model* — Ampère's law. Then I started really working harder, on not only putting *Phase Symmetry* together, but to convince people also.

Now — after getting the message out — it's becoming obvious to a great many that the only thing that spin frequencies have in common, that could cause force, would be **phase**.

Scientists use the word spacetime for a reason: space changes with a change in speed or mass, and so does time. We know when we look through the Hubble telescope through space, then we are also looking back through time. Space changes and time changes but the **spacetime interval** never changes: look it up!

Most enlightened scientists realize that spacetime is a single entity therefore we use that word. Einstein, more than anyone else gave us this realization of spacetime.

Our ancestors, however, didn't know about Einstein or spacetime and have given us two *different* building blocks of SPACE and TIME for our present science. Hence the chapter on COMPLEMENTARITY.

**This is an exceptionally simple universe** — once you understand what is really going on.

But we don't see it for the same reason that we see SPACE and TIME as two *different* things — when they are only ONE thing — as Einstein proved, the **spacetime interval**.

Why we discern both space and time is a riddle wrapped inside an enigma, and it may remain so for quite a while yet.

This paper may, in fact, be the very beginning of unwrapping that enigma.

It's a universe of Dr. Milo Wolff's **scalar** spinning *standing wave* entities all throughout microcosm and macrocosm, whose spins **all obey** Ampère's simple phase laws: **scalar** entities (solids) are created between attractive force, **in-phase** concentric binding of spin frequencies — or harmonics thereof.

And then we have the opposite of SCALAR.

Spacetime (Einstein's Cosmological Constant type **repulsive force** or space) which is produced between **out-of-phase** spin frequencies.

Einstein has to be given credit for being the first to see that all this space also had a **repulsive force** density to it. However, he missed the spacetime aspect of it all.



In fact, I did myself until recently. People will see that by reading some of my earlier papers.

I don't usually put out a paper unless I have something new to say, and in this paper it's the spacetime aspect of Einstein's Cosmological Constant, repulsive force density in both micro and macro realms: this, I'm trying to convey.

**Both our space and our time are produced by** Einstein's Cosmological Constant repulsive force density caused by all these spinning entities being out-of-phase with each other.

Welcome to Dr. Milo Wolff's frequency universe. Milo and I discussed science for decades. We both were into radio early and saw the rapid changes there. In his 80s, he drove me to John Wayne airport so I could return to Colorado. I do miss Milo Wolff. You are reading what he taught me.

It's a shame the establishment hasn't caught on to the utter **simplicity of this entire universe** that both Ampère and Dr. Milo Wolff have shown us.

Einstein's Cosmological Constant repulsive force density exists in both the microcosm and macrocosm, and even Einstein didn't realize its true value as also being spacetime that we somehow mistakenly divide into the two seemingly different concepts of space and time.

The establishment understands that we have all this neutron

***Binding Energy*** in mass. Really it is *quark harmonic binding of electrons*, making them molecular electrons.

Nevertheless when these numerous quark-electron bindings are severed — via either fission or fusion energy — then these many, severed items fly off, cork screwing through their realm producing vast amounts of out-of-phase forces or space as we see it, ending up with an element or elements closer to iron.

The iron molecule seems to be at some scalar, harmonic balance point — **why** is still a mystery.

These vast out-of-phase forces are what give us the atomic explosion — which ceases after creating the new element/elements, thereby removing all those temporary out-of-phase forces.

The microcosm — we all know — is a fairly well balanced realm, where the in-phase forces are balanced well enough against the out-of-phase forces for perfect stability.

It's a shame the establishment hasn't caught on to this either, because the macrocosm has all these identical spins too. Why does the establishment see it differently? And that's coming too, so read on.

There is an energy TRANSFER method that does not affect this in-phase to out-of-phase balance, but in that type of

energy creation and transfer method, impedance matching is necessary.

In fact, this necessary impedance matching — where each mass binding had to match an equal mass un-binding — gave us the concept that "*energy could neither be created nor destroyed*", this was, of course, before the atomic energy era that began with Einstein's proof that  $E=mc^2$ .

An example of this — impedance matching TRANSFER — is the light that comes to your eyes from a star.

If you can remember, in that first radio I fixed, there was an impedance matching transformer that matched the high impedance tubes with the low impedance speaker coil. Well, the universe doesn't have that, but stars have electrons of various impedances ready to emit light and your eyes have red, green and blue receptors to receive the various colored light — providing **among other things** — their impedance exactly matches the impedance of those light emitting star electrons. Also both star electron transmitting light and eye receptor electron must be a spin-up spin-down pair — **with their closest sides binding in-phase** — and their spin axes perfectly parallel.

**And this, my friends — with those other things — is the answer to Olbers' Paradox.**

Here's how light from a distant star acts somewhat like

alternating current but at a much, much, much higher frequency.

If you look at energy transfer this way, then you will see the relationship between binding with the surroundings (stars) and internal binding; the production of a **quantum of energy** is gained after an **in-phase binding first** with the surroundings (a star) and then that same electron switches a bond FROM the surroundings (star) to an internal **in-phase bond** in your eye: an example is green light from a star, at 5,000 Angstroms in wavelength (color mid-range), where electrons in our eye cones are cycling bonds between electrons on that star, and us, at the rate of 600 trillion times a second (600 THz).

Only **ONE** of those cycling **infinitesimally short period bonds** is a quantum of **green** light.

It takes only about eight or nine of these quanta cycling bonds before you can sense the slightest bit of **green** light.

This is the way it really works, but if you want to believe in photons go right ahead. However, I do believe that much of quantum theory — along with photons — is going down the drain once an all frequency universe is accepted. We know enough about frequency behavior now to replace much of quantum theory with the frequency aspect of what's really going on, as I've just shown you with starlight and **in-phase binding**.

Some features of quantum theory will remain because spacetime is not continuous — like field theory — as Einstein warned us. Spacetime comes in chunks and has holes.

Niels Bohr never realized that it was **out-of-phase** spacetime — not **in-phase** particles — that were coming from Planck's energy quanta.

Bohr had a 50 - 50 chance in getting it right and he got it wrong!

Georges Lemaître a Belgian Catholic priest had the same odds in guessing between two words AWAY and AROUND and he guessed wrong too on that one — even convincing Einstein — and gave us a myth that's believed just as strongly as quantum theory today.

I'll cover that myth later, and I'm glad I am writing this after Stephen Hawking died: much of his work relied on quantum theory, portions of which now has to be seriously looked into.

Even though the electron on a distant star giving you light, is separated from the one receiving that light in your eye — there is **no spacetime** whatsoever between their closest sides **binding in-phase**.

There is no spacetime — between those sides — because

**spacetime** itself is only created by the closest sides of entities spinning **out-of-phase**.

Our thinking of a continuous spacetime has to entirely change to pieces of spacetime.

Bohr and Einstein were both original thinkers, nevertheless, neither got to the bottom of what caused these **attractive** and **repulsive** forces in this universe.

Now we know!

All **attractive forces** are caused by things that are **in-phase**.

All **repulsive forces** — along with **spacetime** — are caused by things that are spinning **out-of-phase** with each other.

I've given you the correct building block model of how this universe is built.

That is my contribution — along with a lot of help from others that I learned from.

Mathematician Stephen Wolfram proved — in his *A New Kind of Science* — that all the math in the world isn't going to show how this universe works until you have the correct building block model.

And how true that has been!

This paper gives the correct building block model

**foundation** — of this entire universe.

It's a foundation that scientists can finally build on to give all of us a better understanding of our universe and *hopefully*, a better world.

I believe I have given you a glimpse of what the future has in store for us.

And now I must correct Crichton — whose words you will read later in the **Complementarity** chapter: it was Niels Bohr who gave us photons, not Einstein.

Einstein claimed Bohr's Quantum Theory, that included photons, was not complete.

I passed the tests for the B and then the A amateur radio licenses and then the 2<sup>nd</sup> Class Commercial Radio License while in high school; from this I learned the importance of **standing waves** and impedance matching in energy transfers. I also had my pilot's license #1195823 too, before I graduated high school.

I got my 1<sup>st</sup> Class Radio license #P1-7-13647 after this.

In 1946 I could see, using alnico magnets, that a **relative motion or phase** concept of the electron spin gave correct answers for magnetism 100% of the time while the north and south pole concept didn't.

By 1947 I saw the same error margin using Benjamin Franklin's plus and minus charges that were worse at predicting, than the 100% correct *relative motion or phase* concept.

I published a book in 1966, about *seeing* this easy "unification of forces" and also *seeing* this amazing simplification of "*what the establishment believed*" was science. The New York Times had a full page about that 1966 book of mine in the Book Review Section, on Sunday June 18<sup>th</sup> 1967.

But then it took me several decades more — *while eliminating standing waves and working on the latest things our scientists were able to construct* — to put all the pieces of this complicated science jigsaw puzzle together and then to realize how simple this entire universe, of *spinning entities*, really was.

Using **phase** along with my good friend NASA scientist Dr. Milo Wolff's *standing wave* concept — I found **all** attractive and repulsive forces are merely a "*simple phase relationship*" between all these spinning entities in both microcosm and macrocosm.

What was hard for me to believe, was how hard it was to convince others — who did not have the knowledge of *standing waves*, and energy's impedance matching — to



believe in this new way to see what was really going on called *Phase Symmetry*. [phase symmetry](#)

Also in Adobe.pdf - [phase symmetry.pdf](#)

1. Speed of Gravity
2. The *Red*-Shift &
3. The Complementarity Principle

are the three Areas we'll look at.

Newton told us gravity acted instantly. But Newton was born in 1643, so NASA wanted a bit more confirmation, and the best NASA brains said gravity acted either instantly or at least 20 billion times the speed of light ( $2 \times 10^{10}c$ ) [Van Flandern](#).

But we must talk about the **red**-shift first because what we find out about that — pin points the speed of gravity even a bit better.

## 1. The **Red-Shift**

Once you know something that many others don't, then that puts you way ahead of that particular mob in troubleshooting. So, to stay ahead, in this game — and retire as well as I have — you must not only see what's going on but **you also must eliminate the "myths" that the mob — sometimes they're the majority — still believe in.**

Here, I *continue* with two of the establishment's myths:

**INERTIA** stems from an **attraction** to the surrounding stars. But you will soon see that this is the TRUTH; the myths come later.

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 VIEW this "Earth rate" using a gyroscope.**

Many times, after removing the dome shaped gyro's cover, I've set the axis of an aircraft 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.

Yes, remember, 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**.

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

This also explains why the stars seen at night, directly above, in winter are not the same stars seen, directly above, in summer nights: the **difference** between a 24 hour solar day and a sidereal day **add up**, after 182 days, to give the exact opposite stars overnight in summer as in winter.

**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 my 1966 book, that electron spin direction gives us an essential part of the big picture.

You saw that the **inertial gyro "Earth rate" precession of 23 hours 56 minutes and 4.0916 seconds** is proof that our inertia depends on the stars — — so 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 *Phase Symmetry* that I've explained in the previous links, because in *Phase Symmetry* there is an important "**CRITICAL BALANCE**" with no possible present expansion, but having said that, I fully see, and you should too by now — *if you have read Phase Symmetry and paid attention to this* — also see the reason the establishment thinks 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'm not calling these people liars but I do have a responsibility of pointing out to you, those who **don't tell us the truth.**

You just 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.**

Yes, those who believe in **WRONG** concepts will never arrive at **CORRECT** answers, even if they are in the vast majority.

Will the establishment look at this proof that we are really in a steady-state universe? **Absolutely not!**

We have spinning items in both the microcosm and macrocosm, and *Phase Symmetry* explains ALL the attractive and repulsive forces in both, via *PHASE* — giving us

steady-state realms with **no possible expansion** — now — in both micro and macro worlds.

Einstein said in 1954 *"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."*

Yes, Einstein's Unified Field Theory was a failure because of several reasons — all being the failure of field theory — that I have already pointed out in earlier papers available to all now free.

Here's one major reason right now: while in-phase attractive forces balance out-of-phase repulsive forces in the macrocosm — quark harmonic capture of molecular electrons gives the microcosm MORE in-phase attractive forces than out-of-phase repulsive forces — making field theory inoperable in unification because of the balance difference between micro and macro worlds.

It gets even worse — for field theory — once you see exactly how and why energy gets transferred. It's nothing like the establishment now believes. They don't even have the foggiest concept of how that needs **impedance matching** to work.

Nor do they realize that while there can only be ONE size

quantum of energy for a polar in-phase bond of two electrons with the same spin on the same spin axis — there can be **MULTIPLE** size quanta with spin-up spin-down electrons binding attractively with their closest sides in-phase (different light colors).

Field theory fails because of this too. Einstein was **RIGHT** about using field theory to see the big picture! You can only use field theory where its use has been proven!

**Evidently the establishment never listened to Albert Einstein, George Berkeley, Ernst Mach or present day astronomers either.**

Use what you learn here to profit by it. That's what I've done, and it helped me solve many science problems. It's worthless to try to convince the establishment that this is true, because if they wouldn't listen to Einstein then they are not going to listen to you or me.

Einstein was right; structures we thought continuous, are not: it's a whole new ballgame **in which you can't use field theory to see a model of the big picture.** Modern science, *just as Einstein predicted*, goes out the window when enough people see this.

To see this better, you will have to understand *standing waves* and you will have to know **why** Einstein warned us about **field theory** and **modern science** in 1954.

Also, to see this better we'll discuss another **big, serious myth** that, along with field theory, obscures our correct reasoning.

Dr. Milo Wolff — *one of those scientists that helped get us to the moon* — showed us that while ordinary standing waves can exist on wires and antennas, only spinning, standing waves can exist in free space.

And they will appear **scalar** with only their spins and orbitals transferring energy.

He then gave us his beautiful mathematical proof that 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 — as Dr. Milo Wolff considered it — 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?

**So isn't this why we see the macrocosm as such?**

**Things that we see as larger are merely lower in frequency!**

Well, accepting that view or not, we'd be further advanced in



science if the establishment had listened to the warnings of both Edwin Hubble and Albert Einstein. I gave you Einstein's warning and the *blue words* below are what Hubble said.

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"*.

Did the establishment listen to Hubble or Einstein?

**NO!**

So keep reading to see how this all fits together.

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*: Ampère 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 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 eyes 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 your eye electrons and the various distant stars!

Hubble got it right, with his warning!

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

***This next paragraph is of supreme importance. Read it several times.***

The *relative motion* **red shift** aspect between your eye electrons and the distant stars **is the same** whether they actually go around your eye electrons or your eye electrons 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 your eye electrons, **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 our eye electrons and between us and the distant stars was really fast enough where the role of special relativity kicks in!

The electron spin frequency remains the same for all the colors, but ONLY violet light is produced when the spin planes of both transmitting and receiving — *impedance matched* — electrons (spin up - spin down) are in the same EXACT spin plane. All other colors are produced via PARALLEL spin planes with parallel spin axes.

Now here's the *piece de resistance*: The frequency of violet light is  $780 \times 10^{12}$  times a second. So the electrons in our eyes must be spinning at a close harmonic of this 780 THz

frequency.

**EACH SECOND** those electrons in your eyes rotate *at some harmonic of 780 trillion times a second*.

NOW all you mathematicians can measure the distance to the various red-shifted stars and multiply each of these distances by 3.1416 (*pi*) and then multiply this by — various lower harmonics of 780,000,000,000,000 cycles per second, to eventually get the correct frequency the electron spins at — which will be the **ACTUAL** speed of the Doppler effect red-shift of those distant stars *relative motion* **AROUND** the electrons receiving the light from those stars.

Someone will eventually do that simple math and get 100% of the red-shift seen for each star, whatever its distance.

No Expanding universe needed!

In fact, when this math is done by enough mathematicians for enough stars, then we will get the final **PROOF** of not only the **RED-SHIFT**, but also of the correct *spin to frequency ratio* of the electron.

**AWAY** from us, the **wrong pick**, would mean an Expanding universe, but the correct assessment of **AROUND** us means **we live in a Steady-State universe**.

Those who believe in **WRONG** concepts will never arrive at **CORRECT** answers, even if they are in the vast majority.

And this **WRONG** pick of the stars going **AWAY** from us prevented the establishment from seeing that it's this **spin** that gives us this spacetime, which the establishment **failed to recognize** as spacetime.

*They saw the time involved but missed the space involved so they invented new fictitious expanding universe space.*

Once an expanding universe is accepted, by the establishment, then any balanced, steady-state universe concept will be seen as simply radical! **And indeed, this is what has happened!**

## **2. The Complementarity Principle**

The Complementarity Principle states, "that a complete knowledge of phenomena on atomic dimensions requires a description of both wave and particle properties. The principle was announced in 1928 by the Danish physicist Niels Bohr. Depending on the experimental arrangement, the behavior of such phenomena as light and electrons is sometimes wavelike and sometimes particle-like; i.e., such things have a wave-particle duality (q.v.). It is impossible to observe both the wave and particle aspects simultaneously. Together, however, they present a fuller description than either of the two taken alone." *from Britannica 2013 DVD*

Michael Crichton really hits the **Complementarity** nail on the head — in his book ***DISCLOSURE***.

In this book he points to our biggest unsolved "**Science Problem**".

It's the wave-particle problem argued about, for years, between Albert Einstein and Niels Bohr.

Herein, I quote from Michael Crichton's book *Disclosure*.

But first Crichton shows us a pictorial where light from one narrow slit additionally goes through a pair of narrow slits, making a long series of light and dark bars.

But then if the light, from that first slit, is shined through four slits, instead of two, there are half as many light bars as before, because where frequencies are alligned **in-phase**, the light energy is **increased**, and in those spots where the waves are more **out-of-phase**, with each other, the light energy is **decreased**, and those areas appear darker.

Crichton then explains this phenomenon (**Complementarity**) a bit differently in **this color** below (... are my omissions):

"The usual explanation is what I've drawn — the light passing through the slits acts like two waves that overlap. In some places they add to each other, and in other places they cancel each other out. And that makes a pattern of alternating light and dark on the wall. We say the waves interfere with each other, and this is an interference pattern."

... "So what's wrong with all that?"

"What's wrong," ... "is that I just gave you a nineteenth century explanation. It was perfectly acceptable when everybody believed that light was a wave. But since Einstein, we know light consists of particles called photons. How do you explain a bunch of photons making this pattern?"

This, quote above, about **COMPLEMENTARITY** from Crichton's book *DISCLOSURE*, *clearly explains* our **largest science problem even today!**

Wave Theory explains much of what we know, and quantum (particle) theory explains other things, but neither theory explains much about each other.

Also, neither theory, nor both, can explain everything.

In the future we may be told that Saul Perlmutter, Adam Riess and Brian Schmidt won the Nobel Prize in 2011 for finding the wave-particle problem that Crichton told us about which exists in our universe as a **Complementarity** problem that changes somewhat like those light and dark bars Crichton commented on. This gives us a non uniform universe throughout, but it made those three Noble scientists think the redshift change was not from that — but **MISTAKENLY** from an accelerating, expanding universe.

This expanding universe is nothing more than a myth that has endured for decades, exactly like the Phlogiston myth of earlier decades.

As Crichton has shown us — these three Nobel scientists have merely discovered the **Complementarity** aspect of this universe and not the acceleration they thought they had discovered.

### 3. Speed of Gravitational Attraction

As previously stated, our present science establishment sees gravity acting either instantly or at least 20 billion times the speed of light ( $2 \times 10^{10}c$ ).

At first glance, 20 billion times the speed of light seems pretty close to an infinite speed — and this range of speeds is good enough today for NASA as long as astronauts don't venture too far beyond this area of our galaxy.

*Phase Symmetry* shows us that with future astronaut travel — **the speed of gravity and the speed of Dark Matter attraction are both going to be of vital importance.**

Since astronauts won't be venturing far from our galactic area any time soon, then there is no rush to obtain a more accurate speed of gravity.

Remember these 3 earlier paragraphs?



Someone will eventually do that simple math and get 100% of the red-shift seen for each star, whatever its distance.

No Expanding universe needed!

In fact, when this math is done by enough mathematicians for enough stars, then we will get the final PROOF of not only the RED-SHIFT, but also of the correct *spin to frequency ratio* of the electron.

Yes, when that math is done, then we will be able to pin point the speed of gravity a lot closer.

But what about the speed of Dark Matter? We will have to know that too.

*Phase Symmetry* gives us a **real surprise** here.

It tells us that Dark Matter is caused by the spins of all the stars, galaxies and galactic super clusters.

*Phase Symmetry* tells us that the spin frequency of the electron determines the speed of light and the much faster spinning down quark gives us the much faster speed of gravity and the much more massive — but slower spinning — stars, galaxies and galactic super clusters are giving us Dark Matter — made up of various attractive forces — traveling at various **slow** speeds compared to the forces we've dealt with up to now.

NASA must deal with these much, much, much slower than gravity speeds too.

We will — eventually — be able to get the degrees of rotation versus energy quantum from these spins too.

*Phase Symmetry* also shows us that Strong Force Containment is nearly correct and it is 99.9999% right. It is the .0001% balance of down quarks that are not contained that give us both gravity and inertia. Since that balance here on this Earth remains exactly the same continuously, then this is the reason that Earth's gravitational force exactly equals the Earth's inertial force.

Why do we have gravitational force?

Go back to the beginning of this paper.

ABSTRACT: Things in-phase attract and things out-of-phase repel. This is not only the rule in the electrical world but for all these spinning things in our entire universe as well.

We have gravity because all these things close to the earth are more in-phase with the earth than they are with our out-of-phase surrounding stars, galaxies and galactic superclusters.

Gravitational force is a combination of those surroundings repelling and Earth attracting.

Today's scientists totally missed the repulsive part our surroundings play in giving us gravity.

See, gravity is not a universal force. It depends on the surroundings.

NASA's computers are not programmed for anything quite like this, so when astronauts start traveling in different parts our galaxy — or to other galaxies — then they will be in for a rude awakening.

Welcome to Dr. Milo Wolff's frequency universe, existing all throughout this universe of ours, that, unfortunately, the majority of scientists in our present science establishment don't quite believe in yet.

Not to worry scientists: your paychecks will continue until, of course, too many people find out all of present science has to be changed a bit.

I gave you, herein, Einstein's correct prediction about modern science.

He was right.

I really loved writing this paper.

Now, thanks to Dr. Milo Wolff — *who taught me much* — and also to Stephen Wolfram, who made me work harder, this is the best model or **BIG PICTURE** of our universe that

anyone has so far published.

You saw, part of the picture, herein that [phase symmetry](#) tells us what General Relativity tells us. But by reading my other books and papers, you'll see even more: [phase symmetry](#) shows us why mass can be converted into energy and why energy can only be delivered in quantum sized amounts. Also [phase symmetry](#) shows us what inertial mass really is and how Ernst Mach was right: surroundings are very much involved. [Phase symmetry](#) shows us why we have centrifugal force. It shows us why we have gyroscopic action and it does a much better job of explaining all these things than present science does.

This PAGE DATE: October 3, 2018..

THIS PAGE in htm: - <http://amperefitz.com/3beliefs.htm>

Also THIS PAGE in Word: - <http://amperefitz.com/3beliefs.doc>

And THIS PAGE in Adobe pdf: - <http://amperefitz.com/3beliefs.pdf>

Also see [DPFJr](#)

An Important Matter seen by Crichton in htm: - [crichton.htm](#)

Also Crichton in Word: - [crichton.doc](#)

And also Crichton in Adobe pdf: - [crichton.pdf](#)

P.S.

To keep this page short I had to leave out many more interesting things, but you will have to click on the following links and spend a lot more time reading to see those.

*See: [Phase symmetry makes quantum theory more complete. 12-02-2013](#)*

Phase symmetry makes quantum theory more complete.  
12-02-2013 also in Adobe.pdf - [phase.symmetry.pdf](#)

**For the LATEST 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 - click this following link:*

<http://www.rbduncan.com/toprule1.htm>

AND 4 Decades of Fitz's papers:

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

*Anyone may copy and paste this complete presentation to their web page providing they paste it in its entirety.*

Daniel P. Fitzpatrick Jr.

October 3, 2018

If any of your work seems to correlate to my findings then please write to me at:

Daniel P. Fitzpatrick Apt. 314

Belmont Village

4310 Bee Cave Road

West Lake Hills, TX 78746

*Send me your e-mail.*