



Einstein and his cosmological constant repulsive force

Einstein gave us his **cosmological constant**, which he considered a repulsive force equal but opposite to gravity.

The majority of scientists today believe this **cosmological constant** (*350,000 spots on Google*) repulsive force does indeed exist between all the stars and galaxies holding them apart.

I think one cannot discern an accelerating, expanding universe from a steady-state universe with this **cosmological constant** repulsive force between all the stars and galaxies holding them apart.

Nobel laureate Richard Feynman showed how important motion was for unification in his famous [*Feynman's QED*](#)

I showed in [*my first book*](#) in 1966 how gravity could be unified with quantum theory by using [*Ampere's Relative Motion Laws*](#).

Since then I've recognized Ampere's Laws are showing me this is a frequency universe that is really obeying simple

phase laws: *Out of phase* elements produce space and repulsive forces while elements more *in phase*, than average, produce **attractive** forces. Because most of the in phase items are already congealed together, then space is the average out of phase condition between all these spinning, orbiting entities we see in our universe.

It's well known that magnetic force is caused by the electron spin frequency and the strong force by the quark spin frequency. What is not as well known is that inertia is caused via a quark spin frequency and gravity is caused by the same *in phase* quark spin frequency. Another gravitational force, not directly measurable to us here on earth, is also caused by the *in phase* spin frequencies of stars and galaxies -- as compared to the surroundings (*Mach's principle*).

Only an infinitesimal portion of the electron is involved in certain impedance matched *in phase* electron to electron bindings. The actual binding elements would have to be some sort of boson type vortice set up where the spins of the vortices of both electrons are in phase -- *spinning at the square of the electron spin frequency* -- on the surface of the electron, much like Jupiter's red spot on Jupiter. These vortices must continually exist on the closest equatorial sides of a spin up--spin down electron pair. They must also exist in sigma chemical bond pairs. Such electron vortices that are spinning at the quark spin frequency -- *square of the electron spin frequency* -- will give us, what we see, more redshift

happening with more light years of time and light that will bend with gravitational force.

Not only do certain quark *in phase* spin frequency bindings with distant quarks in the surroundings give us inertia (*Mach's principle*), but each of these electron to distant electron vortice bindings give us a photon of energy as this binding takes place. All these bindings must impedance match as well! These spin up--spin down electron pair vortice bindings -- *giving us energy quanta* -- are the same strength all the way to the Hubble limit where they cease entirely. Only the number of these electron to electron binding pairs vary as the square of the distance. When these same electrons unbind they give us a dark line in the spectrum.

Things are tuned to specific spacetime realms -- much like a superheterodyne radio tunes into a certain bandspread -- in this frequency universe. We are able to see planets, stars and galaxies, which are in our bandspread but electrons and quarks are at too high a frequency for us to see. So we cannot see into the microcosm. As Wheeler and Feynman taught us, we cannot directly measure anything outside of our spacetime realm but we most certainly may detect it.

Motion, that we can measure directly, only exists in our limited frequency bandspread (*spacetime realm*). We can not see nor measure any motion in the microcosm, which is

outside our spacetime realm. We can only detect the changes of spin or orbital shifts in the microcosm. All we can measure in our spacetime realm are the effects of these microcosm spin or orbital changes. I'm of the opinion that future scientists have a lot to revise in present scientific thinking, such as thinking the spin of an electron is different from the spin of a star. The electron spin or orbit is merely in a different realm from us where we cannot directly measure these but only detect a spin or orbit change. It looks like Niels Bohr was right on the mark about the electron actually orbiting. It's not spinning and orbiting, however, in our bandsread (*spacetime realm*).

I've shown that Ampere's Laws work in both the microcosm and macrocosm. Yes, both have entirely different symmetries the same as Lego blocks and Tinker toys have entirely different symmetries but both micro and macro entities are also snapped together and held tightly in place via numerous, impedance matched *in phase* bindings. The major difference is that the microcosm is at a higher frequency from the macrocosm. Spins, precessions and orbiting are **caused** in both micro and macro worlds because *in phase* amounts must exactly equal *out of phase* amounts. This gives us a perfectly balanced system in both worlds. Even the percentage of empty space is almost exactly the same in the microcosm as in the macrocosm. It's incredulous to think there is much difference, besides frequency, between micro

and macro worlds. It's crystal clear that [Dr. Milo Wolff](#) is right and this is a scalar, standing wave, frequency universe.

The important thing learned from this frequency model is that this has to be a **perfectly balanced** universe -- exactly like the microcosm -- because the in phase items must exactly equal the out of phase items. So Einstein was right about his **cosmological constant** being exactly equal, in force, to gravity but opposite in that it was a repulsive force. He was also right about gravity being a frequency, in fact, gravity has the widest frequency bandsread of all the forces.

Einstein showed us, with his man on a train, that instantly to one observer may not be instantly to another. A man standing next to a super-fast moving train sees two lightning strikes instantly as a passenger inside the train passes him. One of these lightning strikes is in front of the train and the other to the rear of the train. Einstein tells us, the passenger must see the front lightning strike happening **before** the rear one.

Dr. Milo Wolff has proven that the electron and its spin are both separate, scalar, standing wave frequencies. The light and dark spectrum lines are redshifted not because of an expanding universe but because these vortices -- *created by the spin frequencies of an electron on the sun and the electron in your eye* -- see their quantum transfer as happening **instantly*** but the main scalar frequencies of the electrons and you see a full 8 minutes happening between the

transfer. The more *time* that exists between the star and the observer, then the more the spectrum is redshifted.

We can therefore extend Einstein's principle of equivalence to this opposite repulsive force of gravity and say, "You cannot discern an accelerating, expanding universe from a steady-state universe with this **cosmological constant** repulsive force in it holding all the stars and galaxies apart."

* **instantly** meaning a speed of at least 6×10^{15} kilometers per second or as much as Van Flandern's latest speed of 9×10^{10} kilometers per second, whereas the speed of light is only 3×10^5 kilometers per second.

For more about all this see: [From where do we get this quantity c squared?](#)

Also read this: <http://www.amperefitz.com/einstein.hoyle.htm>

Be sure to read: <http://www.amperefitz.com/acceleratingexpandinguniverse.htm>

See this short, clear picture:

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

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

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

There's a lot more too.

And this you can find out by buying my latest book **Universities Asleep at the Switch** at Amazon.com or by reading it FREE simply by clicking the following links:

<http://www.amperefitz.com/unvasleep.htm> (This link is faster if you have dial up.)

http://www.amperefitz.com/ua_20071020_ck_ds_jm_ds.pdf (This is the book FREE in Adobe.)

Web pages are at: <http://www.amperefitz.com> & <http://www.rbduncan.com>

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

Thanks for reading this. Let me know what YOU think. e-mail is Th1nker@indiainfo.com

This page can be copied and published by anyone as long as it is copied and

published in its entirety.

April 13, 2010

[Daniel P. Fitzpatrick Jr.](#)