


The **ANSWER** to the way this entire universe is built — is this one, simple **building principle!**

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>



A bit of light on

the Dark Matter "Attractive Force"

These important papers, by Fitzpatrick, brought to you **free** by R.M.F. founder of [MAGPUL Industries](#).

Here's a **simple model**
explanation for **how & why**
the **Dark Matter**
Attractive Force works.

This **simple model** answer, astoundingly, coincides with what [the new study by A. Cattaneo et al.](#) attempts to do. But it's far too simple for the present establishment to believe it.

About the time I was born, 84 years ago, Fritz Zwicky saw that more mass was needed to explain why the exterior galaxies in the Coma cluster were traveling so fast, around that cluster.

Since then, far more evidence of this missing mass has been found and labeled "**Dark Matter**".

I will give you the simple answer to this "**Dark Matter**" and it's an answer Einstein would have loved because he warned about field theory's continuous structures that the present establishment, even yet, firmly believes in.

Einstein, unfortunately, used the 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.*"

I've proven this universe is **not** built in a consistent enough way to use field theory in unifying the forces; I've proven

that in internet papers you can get free by clicking those links at the end of this internet paper: here's the **simple model** answer that works with this non-consistent universe!

Yes, you will see I'm right about this **simple model** answer to "**Dark Matter**", and Einstein turns out to be absolutely right about *the rest of modern physics* too.

True science laws should work ALL the time, but *until we achieve a unification of the forces, we will continue to remain in this fantasy land of present science where we are now*, using science laws that only work about half of the time.

HERE: read mathematician, Stephen Wolfram's best selling book "*A New Kind of Science*". It's free: [WolframsBook](#)

He's telling you, that for a complicated universe, you need a **simple model FIRST**. You do the math, after you see the **model**. Stephen Wolfram has proven, beyond any doubt, THE MATH HAS TO BE DONE LATER!

I'm giving you the **simple model**. What we need now is the "New Kind of Science" math to fit this new model.

After many decades of problem solving, of troubles on the various latest devices our scientists were turning out, I saw the discrepancy between what the universities told us to believe and what was really happening. Links to what I

found, and most of what I have written, is available to you all, free of charge, at the end of this internet paper.

OK, here's the way we must look at galactic attractions and repulsions; listen carefully to these following words that I've said before:

The

ULTIMATE SECRET

of this universe is not complex;

it's a *standing wave* universe where **all**

forces use only 2 simple phase rules:

The **CLOSEST SIDES** of these spinning entities must be seen as

LINKING TOGETHER

in-phase for attractions,

and

out-of-phase for repulsions.

This applies to **stars, galaxies and galactic superclusters** as well as to similar spinning items in the microcosm. It's this simple **linking** of the CLOSEST SIDES **IN-PHASE** between the **spins** of stars, galaxies and galactic clusters that gives us this **Dark Matter attractive force**, in addition to the gravitational force.

While it's apparent that it's the CLOSEST SIDES **linking IN-PHASE** causing the **attraction** in magnetism, **inertia** acts in conjunction with, but at a right angle to this force movement *also* in the macrocosm — precessing everything from stars to galactic super clusters — so that we will seldom see the CLOSEST SIDES of anything in the macrocosm **linking IN-PHASE**. However, because of present Hubble telescope observations, it will soon be apparent to all of us that, similar size, binary stars are always spin-up and spin-down and that their CLOSEST SIDES are always **linking IN-PHASE**.

Also, it's the **surroundings** inside of any galactic cluster — being far more **out-of-phase** than the interior — that gives an additional **BLACK HOLE** and **Dark Matter repulsive force** between themselves and the interior stars in the central portion of the galactic cluster.

It's this **repulsive force** of the **surroundings** inside any spinning entity — being far more out-of-phase than the interior — that gives the interior attractions far more attraction than if they were further away from that interior. **Astronomers know this**, but many in the establishment are still publishing that "gravity ALWAYS gives an attraction of 32 feet per second, per second." This is **not** a true statement, because if the Earth was moved closer to the center of our galaxy then the closer to the center it came then the more gravitational force it would have.

This is **WHY** we have **BLACK HOLES** and **WHY** the **surroundings** matter, and **WHY** the **surroundings** must be taken into consideration when calculating ANY force.

Stephen Wolfram is right! **This simple phase model shows the EXACT BIG PICTURE of how this complicated universe works**, whereas none of the present science & math can, as yet.

What was it — **again** — that 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."*

Evidently the establishment never listened to Albert

Einstein, George Berkeley, Ernst Mach or present day astronomers either.

All these spinning entities **also** attract exactly like the electron attraction in magnetism where the **polar** attraction is the **strongest** attraction because then the entire mass, of both electrons, is spinning on the same axis, in the same direction, *in-phase* at the same exact frequency.

Spin-up & spin-down electrons also attract like spin-up & spin-down binary stars but this equatorial attraction is the weaker attraction also in magnetism because only that limited mass of the closest sides is in-phase then. I've shown why the equatorial attraction works out to be about half the polar attraction even though the mass ratio is far greater than that: read my other papers for that answer. It's a bit too involved to include here.

These Dark Matter forces *also* powerfully **centralize**, the same as gravity does to *produce a **BLACK HOLE** at the center of large galaxies*, but these larger entities spin at a much lower frequency than either the quark or the electron so they do not bend light like the **Black Hole** gravitational force caused by a very low percentage of quarks whose closest sides find themselves, momentarily, **PERFECTLY** in-phase.

The reason the strong quark attractive force creates the weaker gravitational attractive force is because of the limited amount of wormholes existing in the high quark density area,

through which these quarks need to link and bind, so as to give us this gravitational force.

The attractive and repulsive forces, *that build spacetime*, move **ONLY in the direction of linking** of the CLOSEST SIDES of these spinning entities. This is why all spacetime at any spin frequency is granular and will have wormholes. Not only energy but mass too is delivered, via spacetime, in chunks similar to energy's quantum units.

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.

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.

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, 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 only the macrocosm as solid?

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. 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.

Every spinning thing, including quarks, electrons, stars, galaxies and galactic clusters, *because of their spin*, **produce** more **in-phase attractive** forces locally and centrally in every spinning item 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, does eventually help the **balance** we see in this universe.

But before this **balance** point is achieved, INERTIA is acting at right angles to the strong polar attraction movement of every spinning entity, thus causing each to forever precess and therefore never able to form the strong polar attraction that each is striving to accomplish; this is why we have Einstein's Cosmological Constant, out-of-phase, repelling force (space) both in the microcosm and in the macrocosm: thus I say — like Einstein said in 1954 — "**Good-bye** to present science."

And it's **Hello** to an entirely *New Kind of PHASE Science*.

While this universe has the potential to **balance**, it never does perfectly. We wouldn't have molecules if it did. Fusion is atomic power balancing the lighter elements closer to iron and fission is atomic power balancing the heavier elements closer to iron.

No more atomic energy will be available after this universe is totally balanced out and all elements are converted to iron, or close to iron. Atomic energy isn't available from iron. **Iron is atomic energy's ash heap.**

What our field theory of present science is definitely **not showing you** is the fact that, in a spinning, standing wave universe, there is always a 50-50 chance of an **initial** linkage being either in-phase or out-of-phase, thus a **50%** chance that the invisible forces being put out by our universe are **out-of-phase spacetime forces** (*actually causing space [repulsion]*) with their surroundings: this is Einstein's "**Cosmological Constant**" — pointing us in the direction of unification of the forces — because all these IMMENSE spaces between everything from quarks to galactic clusters must be caused by **SIMILAR out-of-phase spacetime repulsive forces**.

If these "*spinning, standing waves*" fail to maintain an **approximate** 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 because of polar attraction and inertia that immediately acts 90 degrees to that polar attraction initial movement:** both electrons are forced to precess around the *closest other electron'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, equatorially, 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, wherein no one is even **trying** to find a better

science vehicle: they are like Henry Ford who for years kept saying, "No one needs anything better than a Model-T."

More people from China are reading this than any other country, while the American establishment is still 'Asleep at the Switch'. **How can 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 entirely different, polar and equatorial, strong and weak, attractive and repulsive forces; **this isn't a field: nor can it, 100% of the time, be mathematically represented as a field!** *What could be clearer than that!* It was 1954 before Einstein saw this, and more than a decade after that before I saw it.

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, 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 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!

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 780×10^{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 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.

They **failed to recognize** this because viewing it as various spin frequencies makes us see spacetime as time and **not** space. It's only after we **discard the spin frequencies view** of all these things that we can view this as space. This — **difference in viewing** — is EXACTLY why we see space and time as distinctly different entities even though they are both produced as spacetime via the same out-of-phase forces.

We still need to know **WHY**, in special relativity, is time related mathematically to one side of a right triangle, space to the other side and spacetime to the hypotenuse?

Not only does modern science need re-thinking, as Einstein foresaw, but also with this internet paper, these distinct entities that we think we see, called space and time also need now, to be considered in an entirely different light: Those two things are really only **one** thing — as all relativity mathematicians know — and that is **spacetime**.

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 spin things faster and faster, portions of the quark spins, in the thing you are moving faster and faster, are also going up **higher and higher in frequency**, thereby matching and linking to these higher and higher frequencies of portions of spinning quarks that are further out into space. Thus the **total** attractive force becomes greater and greater, because higher frequency means higher energy of attraction, thus **higher linking frequencies mean higher attractive forces**. There is a big difference between what frequencies *see* and what you see.

Centrifugal force is therefore determined via **higher linking frequencies and nothing more!**

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:

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 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.

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 **PROOF** 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.

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. 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, and you should too by now, *if you have paid attention to all of 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.**

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.**

It can be 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 quark density, the 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**, preventing the removal of a single quark away from the tri-quark proton or neutron.

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 gravity, inertia, and as you saw,

centrifugal force.

The establishment sees gravity and inertia as acting instantly; **that might be wrong**: they both act at a speed that we sense as c^2 , *pretty fast but not quite instantly if our bandspread extends a bit higher in frequency than the quark spin frequency*.

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.

Also, all electron forces travel at the speed of light but gravity travels instantly so it must be caused by quarks that spin far faster than electrons.

Now finally, we get back again to "**Dark Matter**". And you don't have to be a mathematician to see that in a galactic cluster, *besides gravity*, there are far more **in-phase attractions**, and *out-of-phase repulsions* with the surrounding galactic clusters **at the galactic cluster spin frequency speed** that the present science group is not taking even the slightest notice of seeing.

And this is it, in a nutshell.

Nothing could be simpler, *than these simple phase relationships*, to explain why we have "**Dark Matter**".

Not only that but you now know one of the speeds that one of these Dark Matter forces acts: galactic cluster spin force must act far, far, far slower than the speed of light, yet **more than** a million miles per hour because this is the speed of most galaxies on the outside edge of the clusters. This will be the average speed that spacetime is being created at the galactic cluster spin frequency as seen by us.

Dark Matter is also being created by stars and galaxies at even different speeds.

What the establishment fails to see is that spacetime forces are being created via the spin frequency of **ALL** its spinning, standing wave entities, this includes **quarks, electrons, stars, galaxies and galactic clusters**. This means there are far more forces out there than gravitational and electrical forces.

There are also far more spacetime realms out there than the quark and electron spacetime realm.

The reason there is so much space (**Einstein's Cosmological Constant**) between all these spinning entities, from quarks to galactic clusters, is that for an **attractive** force, the frequency must be **EXACTLY in-phase** to produce an **attractive force**, where this is not so for all the **many out-of-phase repulsive** forces.

All electron forces are emanated at the speed of light because this is the speed that the outside edge of the electron is moving.

Down quarks spin at ten times the electron's spin frequency (the tenth harmonic) and this is why gravity, inertia and centrifugal force acts instantly as seen by us.

And without this one particular quark, we wouldn't have the atomic and molecular world we now have. It is this down quark *via its tenth harmonic spin* that stops electrons from being free electrons.

This is why our spinning, standing wave microcosm is so different from our spinning, standing wave macrocosm.

Back in 1950, while Einstein was still alive, I ground & polished, to a perfect parabola, a 6 inch telescope mirror for Linden High School and after I graduated, I gave them all my radio equipment that I had for my amateur radio station W2YDW. I knew, at that time, if our present science was absolutely right then we should be getting right answers **ALL** the time and not simply a fraction of the time.

In those days I listened attentively to everything Einstein said, but even then I saw if quantum theory was right then field theory had to be questioned. I couldn't understand why it was the reverse with Einstein, where he fully accepted field theory but claimed quantum theory was not complete. It

wasn't until 1954 that Einstein reversed course. I'll have to look back through my own papers to see when I finally saw the error of believing we could use the field concept to unify the forces.

Today, I consider myself very lucky indeed to have lived in those wonderful days and to have had over four score and 4 (84) years, of good health, and to have found out *exactly* why — using field theory — we haven't been getting **ALL** the right answers **ALL** the time.

And the reason for that is, we haven't been considering **ALL** the various, entirely different forces by using the field concept. **So let's forget the field concept and look at this extremely important concept of Ampere's, that the establishment seems to have entirely forgotten about:**

Ampere showed us that when an electrical current was put through two parallel wires in the same direction (**in-phase**) then those two wires would **attract**.

Ampere also showed us if electrical currents went through those parallel wires in opposite directions (**out-of-phase**) then those two wires would **repel**.

If these **laws Ampere gave us** are seen as **phase symmetry** laws then they explain magnetism, AC & DC electric motors and the entire microscopic particle world *including gluons* far, far better than Maxwell's field theory ever could. **Phase**

symmetry even explains, *believe it or not*, Gravity. And it explains precisely how *Quantum Entanglement* works as well. **Phase symmetry**, therefore, not only unifies the forces but *finally* also shows us exactly what (spacetime) really is.

Let's take a look at what Ampere showed us almost two hundred years ago:

Copied from Encyclopedia Britannica DVD 2013, "... Had Ampère died before 1820, his name and work would likely have been forgotten. In that year, however, Ampère's friend and eventual eulogist François Arago demonstrated before the members of the French Academy of Sciences the surprising discovery of Danish physicist Hans Christiaan Ørsted that a magnetic needle is deflected by an adjacent electric current. Ampère was well prepared to throw himself fully into this new line of research.

Ampère immediately set to work developing a mathematical and physical theory to understand the relationship between electricity and magnetism. Extending Ørsted's experimental work, **Ampère showed that two parallel wires carrying electric currents attract or repel each other, depending on whether the currents flow in the same or opposite directions, respectively.** ... " (My bold lettering.)

If you look up "Ampere's laws" on the internet today you will get electrical laws quite unknown to Ampere. Yes,

Ampere was the first to equate the forces associated with these laws you will find on Google but Ampere did his calculations with long wires; he didn't even know about electrons. There was no such thing as voltage or amperage back then. Current flow (amperage) is named after Ampere.

Just about half a century ago Scientific American published a good account of Ampere's long wire laws. I remember reading it like it was yesterday. Part of it went like the aforementioned Britannica statement or something like the following:

Ampere discovered that whatever was coming out of his batteries when put the same direction through two parallel long wires made those wires attract each other.

If this substance (later found to be electrons) was put through these long parallel wires in an opposite direction, in each wire, then these long wires repelled each other.

So basically what Ampere gave us was a simple relative motion law.

But you'd never know that — or even believe that — if you looked up "ampere's law" in a search engine. Try it. You'll see! And this is the big problem, getting the right facts today when EVERYTHING is now all confused with the Faraday-Maxwell field rules and field math.

You could also see Ampere's laws as "phase" laws: If the current through two parallel long wires is moving the same direction or "**in-phase**" then these wires will **attract**. If the current through these two parallel long wires is moving in opposite directions or "**out-of-phase**" then these two wires will **repel**.

If you see Ampere's laws this way then Ampere gave us the initial concept of **phase symmetry** which is exactly what Einstein looked for his entire life: This **simple model** called **phase symmetry** unifies all the invisible forces.

Mathematician Stephen Wolfram said, "Math can only explain simple things but a **simple model** can explain a complicated universe."

Phase symmetry gives us the "phase" **simple model** answer to a Theory of Everything: [Ampere's Laws - that apply to SSSWRs](#)

What is absolutely astounding is that **phase symmetry** not only simplifies but clarifies this entire complicated universe in both the microcosm and the macrocosm. It's utterly amazing!

To learn exactly **WHY** we have all these things, you will have to learn what it's taken me many years to learn:

Even though this firm belief in fields have given us some

spectacular insights, such as Einstein's general relativity, **phase symmetry** makes it crystal clear that field theory has prevented us from seeing the big picture of what is really going on.

Phase symmetry ends up with the inverse square rule, the same as field theory, but obtains it a different way with **impedance matched, resonant quantum bound pairs** and the Milo Wolff limit (*Hubble limit for the electron*).

The Milo Wolff limit is needed with all these **impedance matched, resonant bonding pairs** because these bonds **do not lose any of their strength with distance**:

This is why your eye receives full quantum packets of energy no matter how far a star is in the distance.

This fact alone should make you wonder about field theory.

Back to these quantum bonding pairs; these pair bonds of their **CLOSEST SIDES** can be effected in **TWO WAYS**: The first way is the **STRONG** force way when both entities spin the same direction, at the same **EXACT** frequency on the same **EXACT** spin axis. The second way is the **WEAK** force way where both attracting entities spin in opposite directions giving the strongest of the weak forces when both spin in the same plane, with only their **CLOSEST SIDES** going in the same direction (light energy transfer method).

However, the number of bonding pairs drops off inversely with the square of the distance: Thus, phase symmetry ends up with the inverse square rule the same as fields do.

And this is because the NUMBER of direct paths or holes where this binding linkage, can take place also falls off ***inversely with the square of the distance.***

This is why we were tricked into believing in field theory.

We have also been tricked into believing that this is only a frequency universe in the microcosm. I'm afraid it is a frequency universe all throughout and that's why we need these phase symmetry "phase" rules instead of field theory.

Too few seem to realize that Dr. Milo Wolff has proven the electron is a spinning, scalar, standing wave: Once scientists see that the quark is too, then a brand new look at our macrocosm is needed because elements there indicate it too is obeying these spinning, scalar, standing wave phase symmetry phase rules exactly as in the microcosm: **And this is truly a revelation.**

What we see as tiny, are higher frequencies than we are tuned to. What we see as solid, is the frequency we are tuned to. The macrocosm, that we see as larger, is a lower frequency than we are tuned to.

ALL of these spinning entities, quarks, electrons, stars,

galaxies, galaxy clusters, super clusters, etc. obey identical **phase symmetry** "phase rules" via their spin frequencies. And the higher the spin frequency the higher the energy. The quark has the strongest force and the fastest spin frequency.

Once you **know** your smaller building blocks are spinning, standing waves and you see the larger building blocks — galaxies, galaxy clusters, super clusters — also spinning then you **know** what your larger building blocks really are. (If it walks like a duck and quacks like a duck then it's a duck.)

We sense that we are built of quarks and electrons. This works in a standing wave universe as well, where the higher frequency standing waves build the lower standing wave structure: The reason for this is that higher frequencies have higher energy than the lower frequencies. We can count six of these spin frequencies going from quark to super cluster but how many this universe contains, no one knows.

Where field theory sweeps the quark strong force under the rug, (*strong force containment*) **phase symmetry** doesn't have to because it is this quark spin along with impedance matched, resonant momentary bindings that give us not only gravity but all the inertial forces as well.

The quark obeys the **same phase symmetry** "phase" rules that electrons, stars, galaxies, galaxy clusters, super clusters, etc. use.

We know the maximum star rotation period to be 30 days and our galactic rotation period to be 240 million years: These are several billion cycles apart.

But the separation between the star spin frequency and the electron spin frequency must be more than that or else we could detect the electron's spin frequency: It's above our detecting range.

Thus the spin frequency **norm** between each of these entities might be more than **many trillion cycles**.

All attractions (that we know about) come only via **in-phase** impedance matched, resonant bonds.

This means, "the **in-phase mass of the binding pair has to match** at the very instant that the bond is made and energy is exchanged."

Phase symmetry eliminates fields and all the force carrying particles of those fields: The bubble chamber evidence of force carrying particles now have to be seen as evidence of an entirely different spacetime distortion from a particle.

If an electron on a distant star is spinning clockwise in the same exact plane as a counter-clockwise electron in your eye then a tiny portion of their closest sides are **in-phase** and the mass of that tiny portion **in-phase** is the quantum of light energy that comes into your eye: But both of those tiny

portions must have the **exact same mass** or there will be no "Quantum Entanglement" bonding or energy being transferred.

That quantum of light energy came, that long distance, to your eye with no energy loss whatsoever; **the reason for this is that Einstein was right and spacetime is NOT continuous: it is built of quantum chunks. It has holes.**

There are vast distances between all these spinning entities in both the microcosm and macrocosm enabling these lengthy wormholes.

There is no such thing as energy loss when electrons transfer energy (*bind together*) through these **spacetime** holes!

Once more: there is no energy loss through spacetime holes!

How can field theory be justified if there is no energy loss through these spacetime holes?

PROOF of the above is that **ALL energy exchanging bonds have the same strength regardless of the distance!** It's only the **number of bonding pairs** that decrease inversely proportional to the distance squared.

There are electrons in your eye that are set up to quickly shift binding between binding with electrons on that star and then shift back to closer binding with other electrons in your eye giving you a quantum of light energy, every shift. At the

instant of transfer as the electron on the star transfers this quantum of energy — *the star in the higher energy level instantly replaces it* — and few today realize all energy transfers work exactly this way.

Every time your eye electron binds with an electron in the star, via "Quantum Entanglement", it gains a quantum of inertial mass (*equal to a quantum of energy*). When it shifts back to closer binding with your senses, you receive this quantum of light energy. There are many of these electrons in your eye first gaining mass by binding with the stars then shifting that energy to your senses by binding back locally with your senses — *and doing that over and over again* — many thousands of times per second.

Einstein showed you space could be distorted. I'm showing you that space exists because of out-of-phase forces. And it's not simply space; it's spacetime because as we look through the Hubble telescope into space, we also are looking back into time.

Space (space-time) is not uniform nor is it empty: It's built of quantum chunks similar to energy. Except each space-time quantum chunk is an out-of-phase repelling pair, the exact opposite of an **in-phase** binding energy pair. Electrons and quarks that bind find a "wormhole" through those quantum, repelling pair, chunks of space.

There is a 50% chance these spinning, standing wave entities

can be either in-phase or out-of-phase together. This give the *possibility* of the **total energy** of all the IN-PHASE *attractive force* binding quanta in this universe equaling the **total energy** of all this OUT-OF-PHASE, *repulsive force*, spacetime structure of this universe.

Here, and in my other internet papers, I've given a fairly good picture of all these IN-PHASE forces, how they work, and why field theory cannot be used to unify them.

I've also shown how all these out-of-phase entities give us spacetime (space), but it is this OUT-OF-PHASE spacetime structure, containing Dr. Milo Wolff's spinning, standing waves, that still eludes us in perfectly explaining the cause of what we see as space and time.

Even though we now have the big picture, the exact linkage model of these out-of-phase **repulsive forces**, along with these spinning, standing waves, is somewhat yet an enigma. I've shown why we see this entire spacetime assembly as the individual components of space and time, unwrapping some of this mystery wrapped inside an enigma, but more needs to be done. All scientists should be working on this mystery/enigma now: few are.

Now, thanks also to Dr. Milo Wolff and Stephen Wolfram, this is the best model 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: July 7th 2017 [DPFJr](#)

Also this page in Word: - [darkmtr.doc](#)

And also the page in Adobe pdf: - [darkmtr.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.

July 7, 2017

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 Caves Road

West Lake Hills, TX 78746

Send me your e-mail.