

# It's about chemistry, Ron

Ron Massarik, much has happened since you graduated from Linden high school in 1949 and I in 1950. Peter Wojtowicz, who thought a lot of you, told me some years ago that he had a diamond retirement. As for myself, I've traveled all over this world and I, like you, also am in good health.

But that's not what this paper is about, Ron. It's about chemistry. I need to talk to you about what I've found. I guess because of your vote and Ralph Eikamp's and Peter's votes, I followed you as president of the chemistry club at Linden high.

I went a far different route than you did Ron, but I may have found out an aspect of chemistry you entirely missed.

I lived across the street from your good friend Peter Wojtowicz. Peter and I used to play chess together. But my interests were more toward the radio end of it and Harry Kantrowitz, Berni Elowitz—both in your graduating class—and I and biology teacher Lester Barr all got our amateur radio licenses together. I had my station set up and used to talk to Berni Elowitz on the 40 meter band. Peter never seemed to listen or even care much about radio theory and it surprised me that later he "*made a splash*"—*his own words*—in solving a problem that gave us better TV pictures.

I tried to convince Peter about the supreme importance of GQdel's proof but he never really understood what I felt was its great significance to the understanding of science.

I learned about standing waves first from Lester Barr (head of the Radio Club). They are of immense importance in radio. They have to constantly be engineered out of radio circuitry because they not only tend to proliferate but they eat up energy and they will not transfer power, which is what a radio transmitter must do. I learned later that this universe, however, uses nothing but standing waves to build itself. All your chemistry—believe it or not—functions around this fact.

But I loved airplanes most of all, Ron, and got enough money for my pilot's license—that I had before I graduated—by working in a soda fountain during vacation time. I've owned many airplanes over the years and was at my best troubleshooting for the airlines. While trying to solve a RADAR indicator problem, at Pan Am, I realized that Ampere's long wire law was also showing me why I was being attracted to the earth. I'll never forget that day!

But Ampere's long wire law is also a relative motion law. So I put out a small book showing how gravity and the electrical laws both can be simply explained by relative motion. I still have a congratulating letter from Lincoln Barnett about the concept but I got blasted by Robert Dicke who said if gravity was being caused by relative motion then we would see interference fringes. Well, with the Hubble space telescope, we most certainly are finally seeing Dicke's fringes now.

Feynman tried to prove the electron was a standing wave but failed. I always knew that the electron had to be a standing wave, but it took Dr. Milo Wolff to mathematically prove it was a scalar, standing wave. Milo and I have been good friends since 1997 and we send each other our books as we write them. Another good friend, who is gone now, was Tom Van Flandern. He showed me half the scientific community—the astronomers—all believe gravity travels far, far faster than the speed of light. They all know this universe simply cannot be stable if gravity travels as slow as the speed of light. From Van Flandern I learned that quarks must also bind together via an equatorial sigma type bond the same as certain spin up-spin down electrons bind together.

We have aircraft gyros now that hold their positions to the stars so accurately that we can actually see that this earth rotates once—in relation to the stars—every 23 hours, 56 minutes and 4 seconds or one sidereal day.

Do you know why pendulums, gyros and vibrating elements hold to the stars?

Did you ever think that this might be a sigma bond?

Do you know why you cannot have a pi bond unless you also have a sigma bond?

Did you know that the strength of these sigma bonds do not vary with distance but as Dr. Milo Wolff discovered, this bonding falls off completely at the Hubble limit?

Even Einstein realized in 1954 that the field concept was wrong. Do you know that what we used to think of as a gravitational field that varied as the square of the distance is really nothing more than these sigma bonding pairs?

It's not the strength but only the number of these bonding pairs that vary as the square of the distance. This should be the new *inverse squared* concept.

All energy turns out to be binding energy. Mass turns out to be binding too but wherever you have mass this mass is caused via a binding with the distant stars.

The smallest unit of mass is a sigma type bond somewhere to a far distant star.

Thus mass being converted into energy is understandable because it's merely a binding change—of the same strength—from far to close.

In fact this is quantum theory because a quantum of energy—a binding shift—gives your eye a quantum of energy—with no energy lost—from a far distant star.

Instead of viewing it as relative motion you can also view it as *phase*. This I found out later.

**Ed Weiss would have loved this concept, Ron.** Dec. 24, 2010

To read more about *PHASE* click the following links:  
<http://www.amperefitz.com/phase.htm>

and <http://www.amperefitz.com/aphaseuniverse.htm>

[Daniel P. Fitzpatrick Jr.](#)

Thank you,

Have a good day & visit my site at goodreads:

<http://www.goodreads.com/user/show/276352>

**Click ANY of these [links](#) to get what you want**

You can buy my book "*Universities Asleep at the Switch*" at Amazon.com

Or even better yet:

Read my book FREE by clicking links below:

[http://www.amperefitz.com/ua\\_20071020\\_ck\\_ds\\_jm\\_ds.pdf](http://www.amperefitz.com/ua_20071020_ck_ds_jm_ds.pdf) (This is the book in Adobe)

or

<http://www.amperefitz.com/unvasleep.htm> (This book [link](#) opens faster if you have dial up.)

& super popular now

<http://www.amperefitz.com/top.spot.htm>

<http://www.amperefitz.com/principle-of-equivalence.htm>

<http://www.amperefitz.com/acceleratingexpandinguniverse.htm>

<http://www.amperefitz.com/einsteins.cos.c.htm>

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

[Over 4 Decades of Daniel P. Fitzpatrick's Books, Papers and Thoughts](#)

Over 4 Decades of Fitzpatrick's Books, Papers & Thoughts

<http://www.amperefitz.com/4.decades.htm>