



Even Einstein didn't know how close he was to the answer of his Unified Field Theory when he wrote the following.

*"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."*

■ ■ *Albert Einstein*

Now in retrospect here's what we see.

Einstein was quite right when he wrote that *above* in 1954, about a year before he died.

Einstein's teacher, Hermann Minkowski, had already come up with the correct assessment of spacetime and the spacetime interval.

*When we look through the Hubble telescope through space, then we are also looking back through time, so it's really **spacetime**. And IMPORTANT — Einstein saw this **spacetime** was also a repulsive force.*

Einstein had seen that Minkowski's spacetime was also related to his (Einstein's) '*Cosmological Constant repulsive force*', that Einstein knew, and we now know hold all these 5 BASIC spinning things apart in both microcosm and macrocosm, i.e. quarks, electrons, stars, galaxies and superclusters of galaxies.

Einstein, saw modern physics was wrong, and should have seen that all he needed was a *simple phase law (relative motion law)*, because that is **ALL** that really exists in this totally spinning macrocosm.

That's really **ALL** that exists in this spinning microcosm too. What I didn't know at the time was that many others had put forth *relative motion theories* that were all promptly squelched by physicist Robert H. Dicke who claimed gravity could **not** be caused by **relative motion** because if it was, then *we would see evidence of gravitational interference fringes* in our largest telescopes. Since we do, in fact, NOW see these gravitational interference fringes in the Hubble telescope, then this, more than anything else tells us that **relative motion MUST** be the cause of all gravitational type attractive forces: *the very OPPOSITE of spacetime repulsive forces*.

More than half a century ago there was a good article, in *Scientific American* about Ampère's **1823** Long Wire Law that made me re-think — and suspect even more — everything I had learned in electronics.

In **1823**, André M. Ampère took two batteries and connected each to a long wire, with both wires parallel to

each other. When the current went the **same direction (in-phase)** through both wires, the wires **attracted**. When Ampère reversed one of the batteries and the current went through the wires in **opposite directions (out-of-phase)**, then the wires **repelled** each other.

The unit of electrical current, the Amp, was named after Ampère for this simple discovery in **1823** — relating the FORCE **directly** and **SIMPLY** to the **movement** (current) producing it.

This *fundamental basic simplicity* of Ampère's **1823** Law — using **NO** *plus or minus charges, or north and south magnetic poles* — is now totally obscured by the more complicated math and rules of the Faraday-Maxwell field theory, **coming half a century after Ampère**, that must use **imaginary** *plus and minus charges and north and south poles*.

We have electrons all spinning at the same EXACT frequency. They have two choices: They can either **spin or move** in-phase with each other or **spin or move** out-of-phase with each other. This is where Ampère lucked out. Ampère didn't know about their spin but **he made an 1823 law about their movements** showing PARALLEL MOVEMENTS (FLOWS), of electrons, IN THE SAME DIRECTION **(in-phase) ATTRACT** EACH OTHER.

—and—

PARALLEL FLOWS, of electrons. IN OPPOSITE DIRECTIONS (out-of-phase) REPEL EACH OTHER.

Ampère's 1823 Law.

Phase Symmetry attraction is simple:

Quantum coupling (binding energy) is a spin up & spin down electron with their closest sides in-phase, while orientation changes quanta sizes. These can be close (magnetism) or distant, thereby producing waves (light, radio etc.).

Superposition has far, far more binding energy because both electrons are spinning the same direction on the same spin axis, keeping BOTH ENTIRE electrons in-phase with each other. This type quantum binding has ONE size, and can be close (magnetism) or distant, but this type energy is not a general wave producer.

THINGS in-phase ATTRACT
—and—
THINGS out-of-phase REPEL.

This LAW replaces modern physics !!!

And the country that develops this Phase Symmetry framework first wins BIG.

And (**what Ampère didn't know**) electrons & every other spinning entity from quarks to galactic superclusters whose CLOSEST SIDES MOVE IN THE SAME DIRECTION (**in-phase**) will **ATTRACT** each other.

—and—

All spinning entities whose CLOSEST SIDES MOVE in OPPOSITE DIRECTIONS to each other (**out-of-phase**) will **REPEL** each other, also is **Ampère's 1823 Law**.

The Marie in **André-Marie** came from Ampère's mother's name: At that time in France it was a common practice to denote the mother in the child's name.

Ampère gave us this concept that things **in phase** always **attract** — *entanglement* — and things **out of phase** always **repel**.

He gave us this concept using relative motion rather than phase but it's the same thing really if you analyze it. Use relative motion in your own spacetime realm or lower frequency realms and use phase in higher frequency spacetime realms.

Simply use whichever method makes it clearer to you.

We've shown, in the prelude and in Chapter 7, that even Albert Einstein — *a year before he died* — considered the concept of fields to be a **bad concept**.

Yet most items on the internet will show magnetic **fields** being associated with what Ampère discovered. **Forget FIELDS: Ampère's 1823 long wire discovery** had nothing in it about magnetic fields. **Forget** his later laws incorporating magnetism in 1827.

Field theory was mainly England's great gift to us. Today's enhanced **field concept** came from Faraday and Maxwell, and as Einstein shows us, it turned out to be a **bad mistake**.

Field theory may explain repulsive force space, but it blinds us to the TRUE attractive forces **that are always in-phase, quantum entanglements**. One example is Newton's gravitational **field** concept that blinds us and prevents us from seeing the TRUE cause of Dark Matter.

Ampère didn't know about electrons but he did know something in his wires were moving so he gave us a system of laws that have **nothing to do with MAGNETIC fields**.

This below essentially is what Ampère said about long parallel wires in **1823**:

1. Long parallel wires having things in them moving the same direction caused the wires to attract.
2. But if things in one wire moved one way and in the other parallel wire they moved the opposite way then this caused the wires to repel.

Then he gave us a bit of math for various angles if the wires — *in which these things above were moving* — were not exactly parallel.

And this gives us by far our best observance at how those things inside the wires — *electrons* — are behaving in relation to one another. This tells us essentially the idea of plus and minus **charge is wrong** because these electrons do not **always repel** each other. Regularly, like in Ampere's long wires, they attract each other.

In **all** cases, *phase* is a better concept to use than **charge** (positive ions and negative electrons).

Absolutely correct in **all** cases, Ampère's *phase* concept also shows you which way the electron spins. When you see the much more highly complicated Faraday-Maxwell concept doesn't, then it's simple to know which concept to use.

Ampere didn't know these things as electrons but now we think we know a bit more about them.

These are essentially Ampère's Relative Motion Laws: [Ampere's Laws](http://www.rbduncan.com/AmpereLaws) [http://www.rbduncan.com/Ampere](http://www.rbduncan.com/AmpereLaws)

OR [Aufbau Laws](http://www.rbduncan.com/aufbaulaws.htm) <http://www.rbduncan.com/aufbaulaws.htm>

OR <http://www.rbduncan.com/theALaws.htm> <http://www.rbduncan.com/theALaws.htm>

OR [Relative Motion Law](http://www.amperefitz.com/lawrm.htm) <http://www.amperefitz.com/lawrm.htm>

OR [Gold Universal particle relative motion law](http://www.amperefitz.com/plawrm.htm) <http://www.amperefitz.com/plawrm.htm>

These are also **phase laws** with which all the forces can be unified: <http://www.amperefitz.com/aphaseuniverse.htm>.

Why only a few of us see this today, is something that I still can't figure out!

I began to see this *simple relative motion law* in the early 1940s when my father bought, and let me use his 20,000 ohms per volt, volt-ohmmeter, and this *relative motion* concept really grew more intense, in my mind, in the mid 1940s when my father and I went halves in buying a war surplus Sherman Tank radio transmitter-receiver, for \$79.95 from Gimbals Department Store in New York, and got it working by using two car batteries to give us 12 volts to drive the units' power supply generators. These two batteries we charged with a rectified & filtered 2 amps, using a war surplus 12 volt '*rectifier*', which supplied enough current to recharge the batteries but had not quite enough current capacity to run the transmitter-receivers' power supply generators directly by itself.

I had assembled a pretty good picture of how a *simple relative motion law* was working in the microcosm by 1965, while working for Pan American Airlines, in the Radio Department, using my U.S. 1st Class Radio License with RADAR Endorsement #P1-7-4087.

This meant reverting back to Ampère's *simple ORIGINAL relative motion law* of 1823, and disregarding ALL later laws using fields & charges, which even includes Ampère's later laws.

It was **crystal clear** to me then, that there was only ONE *simple relative motion rule* for **ALL** these forces in our universe. In fact, I was solving more radio problems using that one rule than using all the garbage beliefs of charge, magnetism and field theory, that I knew by then could not

possibly exist. In fact, they obscure us in seeing the actual attractive and repulsive forces.

I wrote a 64 page book about this **simple relative motion law** in 1966. [Fitzpatrick's First Book \(Click Link\)](#) There was a **full page** about it on page 29 of the June 18, 1967 Sunday, New York Times Book Review section.

In my 87th year on this earth, I've managed to convince quite a few people, around the world, that this is what is really happening, but **it's hard to change established religious beliefs**, and that's exactly what today's modern physics is. Even Einstein saw that in 1954.

While we cannot obtain a Unified Field Theory, we can obtain a **working relative motion law** by substituting speed for voltage and mass for current in Ampère's Law. We now have the computing capacity to give ourselves a **working relative motion law**. This may sound impossible but this actually can be done today. I've done all I could putting many of its foundation stones in place. See

<http://www.rbduncan.com> **and also read 4 decades of my papers FREE by clicking**

[45 Years of Putting this Jigsaw Puzzle together - of unifying Gravity with all the other forces](#)

Science will make one huge quantum leap once this is done.

Here's how it's done:

When you are measuring amps, **you are really measuring the quantity** of electrons passing your measuring point. In

the macrocosm you use the same **amount** of energy, passing your measuring point, with its force falling off at the 'square of the distance' just the same as in Ampère's original 1823 Law.

The problem comes with voltage. **We see it as pressure**. However, we can't measure **pressure** in the macrocosm, but I've realized for years that we are not measuring the **pressure** of electrons. We are measuring the SPEED of those electrons and calling it voltage.

SPEED is something we certainly can measure in the macrocosm.

So, what does this tell you?

It tells you the answer Einstein was trying to find with his Unified Field Theory — and with SIMPLER MATH too.

What we are unifying are ALL the FORCES. We are unifying **ALL** the attractive and repulsive forces in this universe using *Ampère's simple ORIGINAL relative motion law of 1823*.

What can't be unified are the spacetime realms produced by the **different frequency** spins of spinning quarks, electrons, stars, galaxies and galactic super-clusters: **their spins are all at a different frequency**. **THEY ARE ALL DIFFERENT**, the same as radio frequencies (radio stations) are all different.

Our very concepts of LARGE & *small* are derived from a frequency, resonance world we know nothing about.

The quark spins at a resonance of AT LEAST 20 billion times FASTER than the electron, yet this super-high resonance attracts the electron & builds molecules AND gives us our concepts of LARGE & *small*.

We see these faster spinning things (higher spin frequencies) as *small*, and the slower spinning things (lower spin frequencies) as LARGE.

Even though this seems incomprehensible, it's a fact! And you will have UNIFICATION now because as you start using Ampère's Law for all this, then you will understand EXACTLY WHAT CAUSES SPACE & TIME (spacetime).

This is something you don't know now.

We have many spacetime realms but 5 BASIC spin frequency spacetime realms: quark, electron, star, galaxy and galactic super-cluster.

The electron is the only one of those above 5 spinning entities that has the same EXACT spin frequency for all electrons, making the *same EXACT spacetime realm* for all electrons.

Each of the above 5 BASIC spinning entities — *spinning in all directions, mostly out-of-phase with each other* — are producing — *repulsive force, — holding themselves far, far apart*, and producing different spacetime realms (different space and time) at different spin frequencies.

These are the only 5 BASIC spinning entities we know about, but **MODERN PHYSICS**, unfortunately, allows

infinitely larger accumulations than galactic super-clusters and infinitely smaller building blocks than quarks.

*Einstein had put **most** of this picture of our universe together when he warned us about modern physics in 1954.*

WE ARE IN A FREQUENCY UNIVERSE — not only in the microcosm — BUT ALL THROUGHOUT — hard even to imagine!

Make no mistake about that!

We have limits in our spacetime realm. But does this spin frequency universe have a limit in spin frequencies either higher or lower? Does this universe have a limit of these spinning entities being too small or too large?

Ampère's simple relative motion law of 1823 solves that problem as well: IT GIVES US A LIMITED UNIVERSE! WHY?

Because it shows us conclusively that this is a universe that is FOLDED BACK ON ITSELF!

Because gravity, *and inertia*, acting **at least** 20 billion times FASTER than the speed of light shows us the vast distance that the quark spin is effective.

Then how much more effective is a smaller, **even higher frequency**, FASTER SPINNING building block particle of the quark going to be? It's effective distance will extend even further than the quark's spin frequency!

This is how this UNIVERSE GETS FOLDED BACK ON ITSELF!

This answers one of our biggest science/physics problems: it gets FOLDED BACK because the higher quark and **faster**, SMALLER, *shorter* spin frequencies can penetrate the LARGE amount of space produced by the **slower** spinning galaxies & galactic super-clusters whose slow spin frequencies produce LARGER, *longer* waves that, in turn, PRODUCE — *less time* — but SO MUCH more SPACE!

This universe has ONE CERTAIN SIZE because the same EXACT amount of SPACETIME exists between spinning electrons as it does between spinning galaxies: it's simply the RATIO of space to time in each that is DIFFERENT!

There is more TIME than SPACE between electrons than there is between galaxies, but the amount of SPACETIME between each is EXACTLY THE SAME, giving this ENTIRE UNIVERSE a certain LIMITED *spacetime* SIZE.

1. Now we must ask ourselves an important question: If we are, indeed, in such a frequency universe as this, then could our concepts of **large** and **small** be WAVELENGTH concepts? Faster spinning, higher frequency (smaller WAVELENGTH) spinning entities seem to be smaller, and slower spinning, lower frequency (larger WAVELENGTH) spinning entities seem to be larger.

2. Could our two concepts of **space** and **time** be erroneous concepts? Relativity scientists see this

repulsive force as **ONE** thing, i. e. (Einstein's Cosmological Constant), or Minkowski's spacetime.

I've been asking myself those two questions (in the above paragraphs **1.** and **2.**) for a good many years now.

I've made considerable progress in answering these two questions in paragraphs **1.** and **2.** in the following links below.

Last, but not least, **we solve even more of Niels Bohr's Complementarity Problem**, because we see how an electron, *from the quark's spacetime realm view*, might look somewhat like our galaxy.

Precession, with each revolution — **over a long period of time** — results in a perfectly round PARTICLE or Dr. Milo Wolff's spinning, SCALAR, standing wave.

Therefore, a **tremendously longer period of time (spacetime)** must exist between quarks, electrons, stars, galaxies & super-clusters of galaxies for this universe to be stable.

We only know the binding speed of two of these: electrons bind together at the speed of light, and quarks bind together at, *or more than*, 20 billion times the speed of light ($2 \times 10^{10}c$). [*vanFlandern*](#)

Now you have some TRUE facts and the **WHY** for the Big Bang.

Thanks for reading this.

Electricians and radio people understand the importance of PHASE in regard to FORCE. I guess it was beneath the dignity of all the theoretical physicists, so far, to even consider the PHASE aspect of any unified force theory.

And many sought to unify spacetime realms that simply can't be unified. Einstein was so close! If he had worked in early radio, instead of the Swiss Patent Office, would he have gotten it? It's an incredible story: Einstein completed 99% of what was needed but missed unification by a hair.

Daniel P. Fitzpatrick Jr.

*I cannot teach anybody anything.
I can only make them think.*

(Click a **Scalar** [link](#) below for # 1. Answer.

Scalar in htm: - <http://amperefitz.com/scalar.htm>

Also, **Scalar** in Word: - <http://amperefitz.com/scalar.doc>

And **Scalar** in Adobe pdf: - <http://amperefitz.com/scalar.pdf>

Without this new knowledge of **Ampère's simple relative motion law of 1823**, modern physics has become so dysfunctional that **it cannot tell us what causes Dark**

Matter. Fixing that dysfunction is the challenge at hand. Change begins with understanding, and I wrote **WIMPs** to provide some. It also partially answers the question in paragraph **2.**, giving you a good idea of what's really going on.

(Click a **WIMPs** *link* below.)

WIMPs in html: - <http://rbduncan.com/WIMPs.html>

Also, **WIMPs** in Word: - <http://rbduncan.com/WIMPs.doc>

And **WIMPs** in Adobe pdf: - <http://rbduncan.com/WIMPs.pdf>

February 11, 2020

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

Daniel P. Fitzpatrick Apt. 329

Belmont Village

4310 Bee Cave Road

West Lake Hills, TX 78746

Send me your e-mail.

THIS PAGE in htm: - <http://rbduncan.com/EinsteinsUnFld.htm>

Also, THIS PAGE in Word: - <http://rbduncan.com/EinsteinsUnFld.doc>

And THIS PAGE in Adobe pdf: -<http://rbduncan.com/EinsteinsUnFld.pdf>