

Ampere's 1825 Laws

Abstract

These relative motion laws greatly simplify all of science:

These laws are essentially Ampere's simple 1825 long wire laws with a frequency modification. . . These are universal laws that unify all the forces by seeing all forces as space-time creations similar to the way it's done in general relativity. . . These laws, though, visualize different space-time intervals being created at various frequencies.

Despite the fact that quantum theory does not see our type of spin causing angular momentum in the microcosm, these laws show it is there nevertheless but at a different space-time interval.

The "A" Laws

(The reason these A Laws work relates to the discovery by Caroline H. Thompson of Wales (a Cambridge graduate) that there will be no repulsive force with in phase waves but a repulsive force is always generated by out of phase waves.)

Remember, these are the laws for everything, from the smallest spinning particle to the largest spinning super cluster of galaxies where high relativistic speeds and mass are encountered.

* The **1st**. "A" Law shows us where all objects in relative motion produce the least space-time between themselves:

The space time interval is created the least between any two objects, the closest sides of which "see" themselves spinning or moving on parallel paths in the same direction at the same frequency (*like gears meshing*) or a close harmonic thereof. You can also say these two objects will attract each other.

* The **2nd**. "A" Law shows us where all objects in relative motion produce the most space-time between themselves:

Both space and time are created the most between any two objects, the closest sides of which "see" themselves spinning or moving on parallel paths in opposite directions at the same frequency (*like gears clashing*) or a close harmonic thereof. You can also say these two objects will repel each other.

I use the quoted word "see" to emphasize the world in which these entities actually find themselves.

Of great importance, in the two preceding laws, is that these laws are frequency laws and they work separately for each separate spin/orbit frequency level which means these individual wave-particles must "*see*" themselves doing these things from their viewpoint in their local gauge environment. It does not matter how some other spin/orbit frequency level views these things because space and time and indeed the average space time interval is entirely different for each different

spin/orbit [frequency](#) level.

These two laws look equal and opposite but they are not: The 1st "A" law "locks on" while its opposite 2nd sister law never does. This is because the total force is generally centralized and you can feel this 1st "A" law "lock on" when two magnets come together. These two laws result in limits of aggregation being established all throughout this universe: This is why there are limits to the size of atoms and limits to the size of stars as well.



The Aufbau or Ampere Corollary

The aforementioned forces, or space-time intervals, between two objects will vary proportionally with the cosine of the angle of their paths. And they will have a torque that will tend to make the paths parallel and to become oriented so that objects on both paths will be traveling in the same direction.

Or

All objects that "see" themselves traveling *in the same direction* on parallel paths at the same frequency will attract and/or space and time, at that frequency, between them is created the least.

All objects that "see" themselves traveling *in opposite directions* on parallel paths at the same frequency will repel and/or space and time between them, at that frequency, increases or is created the most.

And please don't forget this:

Why electrons, stars & galaxies repel each other

Remember, we have chucked all those invisible forces you are familiar with and all we have now are these two "A" Laws.

So in this new "big picture" of everything, there are no such things as plus and minus

charges.

Please pay particular attention to the following.

Electrons can exhibit either an attraction such as unlike charges when they are "locked" or a repulsive behavior such as with similar type charge or similar magnetic poles when they are "free". Our "A" Laws show us why this is so and in the **next 8 paragraphs** you have the best explanation of **why electrons and even stars & galaxies repel each other.**

Lets look at these free electrons first: They spin and hence they have inertial qualities and this includes gyroscopic inertia which always provides this force 90 degrees to any external force acting on such a spinning item.

Completely forget about charge now and only look at our new "A" Laws and what they say.

The 1st "A" Law tells us that there is a possibility that two free electrons can attract each other providing that any portion of their closest sides are spinning in the same direction at the same frequency. This means either their sides can be spinning in the same directions or they can be lined up so that both of their poles can be spinning in the same directions: Any such two electrons **will attract each other.**

Then we see that there is something else: This torque twisting force - on BOTH

free items - depends on the cosine of the angle of their respective spin planes.

As this force begins to act, it in turn causes this 90-degree gyroscopic torque to **twist** both of those totally free electrons **away from this initial attracting position**, doesn't it?

So because of this gyro torque, two free electrons can never remain in a full attracting position and they will therefore be forced to stay more in a **repelling** position. Therefore free electrons will always end up repelling each other and this repelling is not explained by using this thing called charge: it is explained only by simply using **global** inertial qualities and our new global "A" Laws.

The above 8 paragraphs explain not only why electrons repel each other but they also explain why any two perfectly free similar spinning objects of the *same size* must repel each other. So now you know why both electrons and galaxies stay well away from each other.

This is Einstein's cosmological constant.

This same type attraction disrupting itself is also very apparent with binding energy (pi bonding).

Please note the following **quotes** from the **1997 Britannica CD**. (my emphasis)

" A simple single bond, known as a sigma bond results from head-to-head overlap and is **symmetrical about the line** between the two bonded atoms. A second type of bond, known as the pi bond, results from sideways overlap."

"A pair of atoms may be connected by one or by two pi bonds **only if** a sigma bond also exists between them;"

", , , but reactions do occur that break the pi bonds to form stronger sigma bonds."

". . . a pi bond will draw to itself atoms or atomic groupings that are electron-deficient, thereby initiating a process of bond-breaking that can lead to rupture of the pi bond"

What is plain to see from the above quotes is that there is enough rigidity in the system to allow the sigma bond to be maintained once it is aligned because the sigma bond pull is a direct, in line, attraction but since the pi bond attraction is off center it disrupts and destroys its own alignment.

This is why you can have a lone sigma bond but never a lone pi bond.

Once the stronger sigma bond attraction is maintained then other weaker pi bonds can also attract without upsetting the apple cart.

Something somewhere has to be **"locked"** in place and synchronized in frequency with the electron's spin or a close subharmonic of the spin to get any kind of attracting force:

Yes, the proton attracts an electron. When two up quarks combine with one down quark to form a proton then the two up quarks are able to synchronize in with the electron's spin frequency and **"lock"** two electrons thereby preventing these electrons from precessing or wobbling and therefore the up quarks can attract the electrons.

This is why aggregations come together (**gravity**) and larger aggregations come together and accumulate because as these things grow in size there are more things **"locked"** in place strengthening the attractive force of the 1st **"A"** Law.

Once we knew about quarks then we should have realized how those two 'up quarks' in the proton are set up spin up-spin down (The 'up quark' does not signify orientation). Those two spin up-spin down 'up quarks' are spinning - in the same equatorial plane - at a higher frequency but all 'up quarks' spin at a harmonic of the electron's spin frequency allowing a spin up and spin down electron to be attracted to them in the same equatorial plane. We will soon know even more about the **attractive** quark **strong force** binding functions. Attraction is **always** a **synchronized frequency attraction** and it is **not** simply the old idea of plus and minus charges.

All attractions in this theory must be synchronized frequency attractions.

Both light and inertial mass are caused by these synchronized frequency attractions.

As quantum theory shows us, the orbital of an electron on a distant star goes down a certain amount while the orbital of the electron receiving this quantum of energy---in your eye---goes up the exact same amount. But what quantum mechanics does not tell you is that these two energy-exchanging orbitals must be in the same exact plane. Not only that but each orbital must be a mirror image of the other with the electrons in each rotating and revolving in the exact opposite directions so that at the time the energy exchange takes place the closest sides of both electrons are going in the same direction. You can see from this that this energy change is merely a **MOMENTARY DIRECT PULL** from the electron, on the star, to the electron in your eye. These electrons will make many revolutions, rotations and wobbling oscillations during each change of those orbitals giving you the light that you see.

If two distant quarks are lined up so that their closest sides are in the same directions as the two aforementioned electrons then they too will momentarily bind with each other---even from a vast distance---and cause what we see as inertial mass. But since the quarks in the proton and neutron tri-quark entities do not oscillate and wobble quite like the electron then this pull of the two quarks is a steady momentary binding pull where **BOTH** quarks are pulled away from the other two quarks but **NO PERMANENT Energy CHANGE** is made in either tri-quark entity (neutron or proton).

When you spin a flywheel and notice the gyroscopic inertia, you should also notice that the gyroscopic torque that is always 90 degrees to the axis of rotation **can also be seen** as a linkage with the rim of the rapidly spinning flywheel to a path projected in the sky (macrocosm surroundings). The rim tries to stay in this path. This is showing you that you do have an absolute reference frame, which is Mach's principle. Billions of quarks in **BOTH** the flywheel and in the macrocosm are both being momentarily extended more than normal thus giving you this added gyroscopic inertia.

You might have to read the long TOE at <http://www.rbduncan.com/TOEbyFitzpatrick.htm> to get the full picture of what happens when you crank up a gyroscope or a flywheel or ride a bicycle and produce gyroscopic inertia. It's similar to the reason you need cyclic pitch on a helicopter. When a helicopter moves forward then the blades on one side travel through the air faster than the blades on the other side and this tries to tip the helicopter over. (Igor Sikorsky had to invent cyclic pitch to

prevent this).

The same thing happens to certain quarks whose rims line up with the rim of the gyroscope, flywheel or bicycle wheels. The speed that these items are turning---in respect to the macrocosm---now adds to portions of the quark rim speed which before was close to the speed of light and now gets even closer to the speed of light. So you are moving up an asymptotic curve close to the unsurpassable speed of light. And this---even with a miniscule number of quarks involved---gives us this gyroscopic inertia. It does this because the mass of these few quarks increase tremendously as portions of their rim speed approach the speed of light. As Einstein has shown us, mass increases with speed and especially increases when on that asymptotic portion of the curve.

Of available electrons, only the smallest fraction link with others a distance away to transfer light and heat. The same with the spinning quark that causes gyroscopic inertia. All spinning quarks link to cause inertial mass. All these binding linkages are momentary with the electron's oscillations causing a permanent transfer of energy and the various momentary quark bindings causing inertial mass. This could be seen---in gyroscopic inertia---as only a temporary transfer of inertial mass. But if you could increase our surroundings---as will be the case when our Milky Way galaxy finally collides with the Andromeda galaxy---then anyone here on earth will find both inertial mass, gyroscopic inertia and centrifugal force have all become stronger with the more crowded surroundings.

Now let's go to the stars and you will see the same "A" Laws apply there as well and, as you can see, these too will always have to remain in a repelling position with each other.

Close stars, especially close binary stars, will NEVER be spinning so that their closest sides are moving in the same direction at the same frequency.

Recently Perlmutter discovered this acceleration and showed we must have Einstein's **cosmological constant**---a repulsive force---between all the stars and galaxies.

If you think Perlmutter is wrong then why do we have Einstein's Principle of Equivalence?

Why is the earth's gravity the same as an acceleration?

Present science doesn't answer that but the only possible answer, my friend, is that space-time is being created MORE in the surroundings than it is between you and the earth thereby pushing you toward the earth.

And if gravity can not be discerned from an accelerating contraction (Principle of Equivalence) then that repulsive force in all the surroundings can not be discerned from an accelerating expansion either.

Scientists have been recently wracking their brains to figure out why we have Perlmutter's acceleration because nothing in our present science has even predicted such a thing.

But read those preceding blue sentences again! Now I hope you can finally see that our "A" Laws tell you exactly why we have Einstein's "cosmological constant" not only in the sky but in the microcosm as well. And they tell you why we have gravity too. Your present science doesn't even do this.

The reason these "A" Laws work is that this universe is built on an extraordinarily simple principle via an endless chain of vector waves producing lower frequency spherical standing wave, scalar wave resonances that, in turn, produce space-time by spinning, orbiting and precessing.

A minimum of space-time is produced between vector waves that are in phase.

This leads, in turn, to production of the most important vector forces between the closest sides of such spinning spherical resonances and in the direction of the axis of each spin. There are also vector forces via orbits and spin and orbital precessions.

This universe equalizes the energy vector force input to vector force output of these scalar wave resonances by balancing them on specific spin and orbital geodesics.

These vector forces, in turn, combine to produce lower frequency, hence lower energy, scalar resonances, which in turn, spin, precess and orbit producing still

lower frequency space-time and its related vector forces and this goes on and on:

Thus is our universe built from the microcosm to the macrocosm and may continue indefinitely because higher frequency waves would always be producing lower frequency, lower energy scalar wave resonances and they, in turn, would be producing even lower energy, lower frequency resonances.

This seems to be an infinite frequency universe with each spin/orbit frequency having inertial and gyroscopic qualities but yet with each spin/orbit frequency having its own distinct symmetry.

Daniel P. Fitzpatrick Jr.

zeusrdx@yahoo.com

[web page](#)