

R B Duncan Press

Scientific Letter

A Forum for Independent Voices

October 12, 2007 Edition

([amperefitz.com](http://amperefitz.com) homepage)

Daniel P. Fitzpatrick Jr.  
says  
Itzhak Bars is correct, we do have 2 dimensions of time.

*(Reprinted with permission)*

Read what Itzhak bars says about us having 2 dimensions of time: [A Two-Time Universe? Physicist Explores How Second Dimension of Time Could Unify Physics Laws](#)

I have said the same thing in my latest book "[Universities Asleep at the Switch](#)"

Once you see that it is the spin frequency of the electron that is the cause of magnetism and both sigma and pi chemical bondings then you are lax if you do not also ask what we may have because of the spin frequency of the quarks.

The binding strong force of the quarks is caused by an important quark spin frequency that is a resonant square of the electron spin frequency.

Gravity and inertia are nothing but leakage of this strong force, in the quark time dimension, which is the square of the electron's time dimension and from which we get  $c^2$ .

This is why we have the *principle of equivalence* or why gravity acts as an acceleration.

It's been known for many years that electrons will attract each other when their closest sides are in phase.

The strongest attraction in magnetism happens when one magnet with a certain pole facing up is placed on top of a second magnet which also has that same pole facing up.

From this it is clear that the strongest attraction between two electrons happens when both electrons have the same spin direction and the same spin axis or when these entire electrons are in phase with one another.

I'm explaining this using the old Nobel Prize winning Bohr model rather than the modern complex quantum field model because I want readers to understand it.

This is also the same attraction that is present in pi bonding but pi bonding is the weaker of the two

chemical bonds because this is not a steady bonding like sigma bonding but it only happens for a short time during each orbital when the two electrons, that pass each other, are spinning the same way on the same axis.

But there is a weaker magnetic attraction when two electrons are spin up and spin down and they are both spinning in the same plane

You have this magnetic attraction when you put two magnets on a table with their poles reversed and you see that their sides attract.

This attraction is weaker because only the closest sides of the attracting electrons are in phase.

This is the attraction you have in sigma bonding and in light transfer between two electrons.

Both in light transfer and in sigma bonding there is an attraction between a spin up and a spin down electron.

This attraction does not decrease with distance and this is why a quantum of light from a far away star comes to your eye with no energy loss whatsoever.

It is only the number of these spin up--spin down electron pairs that decrease with the square of the distance.

But what does certainly decrease with distance is the relative width of the plane that both these electrons sense they are spinning in. This thins out so much at the Hubble limit that beyond this point no more attraction is possible.

Dr. Milo Wolff has mathematically proven this.

So this is a universe that has built itself in steps using the weak and strong attractions of electrons for each other.

And these are all nothing but simple in phase attractions.

All SINGLE spinning scalar wave resonances act as gyroscopes and fermions.

But a spin up and a spin down fermion can attract each other. . And with their opposite spins canceling this gyroscopic action, and also "locked" together, they can act as a boson.

Thus this universe is a quantum computer using nothing but scalar, standing wave resonances whose closest sides have different phase relationships with each other.

Once we can figure out all these phase relationships and use the electron exactly as the universe does, then we can build the first true quantum computer.

But please note what Stephen Wolfram tells us in the final chapter of his massive 1,000 page "*A New Kind of Science*".

"And indeed in the end the Principle of Computational Equivalence encapsulates both the ultimate power and the ultimate weakness of science. For it implies that all the wonders of our universe can in effect be captured by simple rules, yet it shows that there can be no way to know all the

consequences of these rules, except in effect just to watch and see how they unfold."

As Stephen Wolfram states, we can now see how this universe is built via simple phase rules

But as he also tells us, we can only know a bit of how the future will unfold.

We know that first our sun will enlarge to a red giant star with its flames scorching the earth.

Long, long after this we know that the stars will convert almost all the elements into iron and since neither fission nor fusion energy can be derived from iron then all the lights go out in this entire universe.

And then after many more hundreds of billions of years, if my theory is correct and the fine structure constant is slowly changing, then this cold, darkened, lifeless universe can expect another Big Bang with all our present molecules being totally replaced by something entirely different.

It seems Einstein was wrong and God does throw dice.

And Niels Bohr ends up being right in that it is all nothing but probabilities in the end.

Next read page 2. [It's a simple universe using simple rules.](#)

page 3. [We are tuned in to this universe like a radio or TV is tuned in to the transmitter.](#)

page 4. [Using the de Broglie wavelength.](#)

page 5. [Mathematical physicist Anthony Bermanseder's 1<sup>st</sup> post..](#)

page 6. [Mathematical physicist Anthony Bermanseder's 2<sup>nd</sup> post..](#)

["Universities Asleep at the Switch" - - 30 Pages FREE](#)

[Get "Universities Asleep at the Switch" NOW.](#)

[Return to amperefitz homepage](#)

© 2007 amperefitz

All rights reserved

Comments or complaints about anything on this site???

post to: [Daniel P. Fitzpatrick](#)

