SEE, — **HOW** the complexities of **FIELD THEORIES HID** from us, the fact that **relative motion** (phase) between all these spinning entities, in the micro & macro universe, gives us **all** the attractive and repulsive **Fundamental Forces**.

Oct-29-2018.

Field Theories in html: *http://rbduncan.com/fieldtheory.html*

Also, **Field Theories** in Word: *http://rbduncan.com/fieldtheory.doc*

& **Field Theories** in Adobe pdf: *http://rbduncan.com/fieldtheory.pdf*

Fitzpatrick's 1966 book showed the **relative motion** laws of **A. Ampère** unified the forces.
Fitz's first book in 1966

Fitz's 1966 book in PDF

This was the way the site --below-- looked many years ago. - - Dan Fitz.

Spin and iso-spin

I agree with Jim Whitescarver, text below, that we have a real problem understanding iso-spin in the micro world.

It has the angular momentum similar to what we know as spin, but this iso-spin in the microcosm is a riddle wrapped inside an enigma.

The only explanation that I can see, that makes sense of it all, is that this is indeed a wave only universe with every spherical entity that we notice really being a scalar, standing wave entity as *Dr. Milo Wolff* has mathematically proven the electron to be.

What must be happening is that these scalar, standing wave entities **appear** to us to have what we describe as spin and **motion**. Also this spin and motion will **appear** to obey Newton's laws and fit into a Euclidean framework providing this **motion** does not exceed .01% of the available speeds or in our realm if it does not exceed .01% of the speed of light.

If this is true then Dr. Milo Wolff is absolutely right in adamantly demanding we see everything as waves and not as particles.

In the future we will have the super computers to give us what *Stephen Wolfram* calls "A New Kind of Science".

And they will undoubtedly work entirely with these scalar resonance entities and vector type quantum resonance exchanges that build our entire universe.

But we don't have these future super computers yet so we are forced to use this simplified *Occam's razor* approach that our minds understand using particles, spin and **motion**.

Remember, seeing things in the microcosm as particles having spin and **motion** will be essentially wrong for 99.99% of the available speeds and only right for .01% of the available speeds if the microcosm follows the same pattern as we see here.

But even though wrong for 99.99% of available speeds look how much we still continue to use Newton's laws of **motion** in a Euclidean framework.

I've found the same approach can be used in the microcosm using *Ampere's Laws*.

These relative **motion** laws absolutely do work.

Look at how much Feynman emphasizes **motion** in his famous *QED*.

DPFJr

In TheoryOfEverything@yahoogroups.com, Jim Whitescarver <jim@x>> wrote:

Yes. I understand half spin as a result of the limited dimensionality
of flux twists orthogonally 4 times to point in the original direction.
each "querk" points one way defining only half of a dimension that goes
both ways.

Or, there are two 180 turn arounds in each of two dimensions for one
complete turn around of 360 in each independent dimension for a total of
720. Note that there is no meaning of turns at angles of other than 180
degrees in this quantum view. This also represent a Moebian twist in
the orthogonal twists.

For me, understanding spin is just about the most challenging aspect of
understanding the quantum. I tend to value any proposed model of the

quantum based on how well it suggests the nature of quantum spin.

Further the key to handedness of spin as that which distinguishes the degrees of freedom of plus and minus charge separates, in my mind, arbitrary models, from models actually mirroring the kinetics of quantum flux propagations.

While this seems very clear to me with respect to electrodynamics, I still get rather baffled understanding spin in neutrino interactions. I am still missing something...

And, further the cooperative or participatory nature of the quantum must be accounted for in any correct model of the quantum.

Jim