

[Back to page 1.](#)

Page 5. of fifteen pages

[Back to page 4. - - Page 6.](#)

Continued from page 4.

What present science fails to show us, and what these extremely simple "A" Laws show precisely, is that the electron is a spherical standing wave entity [Explanation](#) that behaves, in two ways, identically to the quark, which is also a spherical standing wave entity. [Explanation](#)

#1.. A "locked" in place electron will attract other electrons when the closest sides of each are going in the same direction (*magnetism and chemical bonding*). . The reason the polar attraction is stronger in magnetism is because the entire portions of both electrons are then constantly moving in the same geodesic path. . The quark behaves the same with other quarks but this quark to quark attraction is much stronger than any quantum of light because of the higher quark spin frequency. . **Neither vector binding force from individual electron spin nor from individual quark spin diminishes in intensity with distance.** . The number of these chance-binding connections is what falls off with the square of the distance.

#2.. Both electrons and quarks (*and ALL free spherical standing wave entities*) have a type of gyroscopic inertia where they precess 90 degrees to any applied force (*but in their space-time, not ours*)

This entire universe is built using nothing but those two aforementioned principles and the "A" Laws.

This universe uses none of our subset, present science rules at all.

The electron and the quark, of course, have different symmetries that come about because of their different construction but this construction is mandated by the different **surroundings** and our present science totally ignores the effects of these different **surroundings**. . We know that the gyroscope, Foucault's pendulum, Explanation vibrating elements and Helium 2 all hold to the "fixed stars" Explanation and our present science totally disregards the action of the **surroundings** in this as well. . Therefore we KNOW our present science is merely *a composite* of many subset theories, each separate theory being used in a different set of **surroundings**, such as quantum theory, Newton's laws and string theory. . Present science, therefore as a subset theory, becomes subject to Kurt Gödel's proof.

These "A" Laws are NOT subject to Gödel's proof because, unlike present science, they are universal laws that can be used in the microcosm as well as here.

These "A" Laws give you the big picture of what's really going on and they **PROVE** this universe uses exactly the same principle to build atoms as it does to build galaxies. . It seems unbelievable but we've totally missed it until now. . Our ancestors and then our scientists just didn't hand us the entire big picture of how "everything" really works. But now here's the answer, right in front of you.

Einstein tried to find this one simple principle.

Anyone who has ever worked with quantum theory Explanation knows this is a frequency universe. . Even Einstein correctly predicted gravity was a wave. Explanation The proof he was right is in these FREE e-books right here at this web site. But this type of a frequency universe presents a problem to those of us here on earth who must view things from only one reference

frame. . We will be forever condemned to viewing this one single principle---that Einstein tried to find---as various distinct, individual, invisible forces. . [Read the FREE e-book to see why.](#)

Why didn't anyone see this relatively simple answer to the unification of the invisible forces until now?

Why hasn't any scientist given us the actual reason that we have gravity and all these other invisible forces until now?

This e-book explains more than I ever thought was possible. It really does explain everything. And it must be right. After I read this TOE book by Fitzpatrick, I knew that I had to publicize it and more of his ideas, which are condensed in many of these unquoted paragraphs. . I've quoted his exact words. . He said, "Don't worry about plagiarizing me. Do it any way you can so they get the facts". . This long web page is my endeavor to do this.

Yes, I thought to myself, no university even provided the slightest concept of a phonograph before Edison produced one, and none from the university system have even come close to providing anything as brilliant as this astonishingly simple, brand new concept of unification. . [The math won't be simple though.](#) . This "new kind of science" is incredible and like Edison's phonograph, not that complicated. . It is truly one of the greatest discoveries in the entire history of mankind. . This, essentially, is what Einstein was trying to find.

General relativity uses complicated tensor math. [Explanation](#) This new concept greatly simplifies all this and even shows you why the tensor math of general relativity works. . It works because, unlike in special relativity, the **SURROUNDINGS** are taken into consideration.

Fitzpatrick---who has many degrees and licenses---facetiously claims he solved this problem mainly because he completely shed all the prejudices of his university training and moved quickly to gain hands on experience in the technical world, particularly in electronics, flying and in troubleshooting complicated jet airliners.

Fitzpatrick said, "While working for Pan Am, I saw that not all these shop specialists did well when transferred to line maintenance where one had to know how all these specialized systems intermeshed with each other. . With every black box or part they changed, they also changed their [idea](#) of what might be wrong. . I kept changing [ideas](#) too until I got all these subset present science laws rules to mesh and work together."

This has to be the final answer to unification because not only does it unify the 4 fundamental forces *Explanation* using an easily understood concept but it unifies ALL the invisible forces including centrifugal force as well. And the most incredible thing about this radically new idea is that you don't need to utilize math to comprehend it. . This makes sense too because the universe doesn't seem to be using any math but the universe does seem to be using one, easy to see, essential principle---throughout---in both the microcosm and the macrocosm. . You do need to know a bit of science to understand Fitzpatrick's book but you do not need to be a math expert: That's what makes this book and this "new kind of science" so fascinating.

"Andre Ampere was a child prodigy who knew all the math of his era by the time he was 12 years old. . He later went on to formulate the first electrical laws but he could not produce the math for his own laws so these "A" Laws were eclipsed by Michael Faraday's laws that Maxwell *Explanation* provided the math for and which Heinrich Hertz greatly clarified. . Is it possible that our present math is only good in our singular reference frame? . Could it be that we had no math, *until recently*, for a universal law that would encompass everything? . Did Ampere give us the one simple set of universal laws that---*until Milo Wolff's math*---we failed to develop any math for? . This seems to be the answer once you completely understand the full significance of Gödel's proof; Ampere's ("A") laws; frequencies and the surroundings."

"Jean Foucault *Explanation* was the first to show us what modern gyroscopes show us and what George Berkeley, Ernst Mach, Maxwell, J.A.Wheeler, and R.Feynman claimed, that **our inertia must stem from our surroundings**. . But this, along with Lorentzian Relativity and what Harress and Sagnac *Explanation* showed, implies an absolute, preferred reference frame. . In opposition, the Galileo-Einstein concept (*incorporated in special relativity*) indicates that you cannot have an absolute, preferred reference frame and this is backed up by the speed of light being a constant, independent of the velocity of the source or the observer. . Any unified field theory, worth its salt, must be able to resolve this disparity. . The one you are about to look at does so admirably."

Once more so you don't forget it:

The disparity is that the gyroscope is showing you that there is an absolute preferred reference frame and special relativity is telling you that there is **no** preferred reference frame.

"So do we have to visualize **BOTH** an absolute reference frame and a relative world? . Not only does the new "A" Law concept resolve this but this is done in general relativity as well. . The crew of modern airliners must visualize even more than two different reference frames. They have to see their airliners flying at 4 different speeds, . Indicated airspeed (IAS) for take off & landings; . Mach for flying the corridor; . True airspeed (TAS); . and finally ground speed read out when selecting an Omni station."

"The flight crew fully realizes that there is no such thing as one paramount type of speed that can be suitably used for all occasions."

"Why do we have all this trouble with speed and all these simple concepts our ancestors gave us?"

"Because this is really a frequency universe that does not recognize these simple concepts of present science."

"Your mind was developed within this single reference frame mode so you can never quite eliminate the way science views things today. . But you also must be like the flight crew and not let this---single reference frame---present science view completely overwhelm the way you know things must be actually happening---in OTHER reference frames---all throughout this entire universe."

" The belief that our science laws work the same in every other reference frame is only true providing the **surroundings** remain essentially the same. . If the spin/orbit frequency or the surroundings change then it's an entirely different TYPE of reference frame (*different gauge*). . We know the microcosm uses far different laws. And our science laws do not seem to be true outside of our galaxy because we can see that galaxies are rotating so swiftly that portions of them are moving much faster than their escape velocity. . Since these galaxies are not coming apart then you know these galaxies are being held together by a far greater force than the gravitational force that holds you to this earth. . So present gravitational laws do not seem to be working properly as we take in a larger view of the universe including portions outside of our galaxy. . Hidden, invisible, dark matter that must be 95% Explanation of the mass of each galaxy??? Explanation I'm not against studying black holes and these singularities that are further inside these black holes. . Black holes do indeed exist but this popular belief of such a vast, extensive amount of dark matter existence causing this galactic behavior is **wrong**.

This wrong belief is forced upon all those who believe gravity is the same strength throughout the entire universe.

Gravity is not being understood correctly by our present science group that sees gravity remaining a constant strength all throughout this entire universe."

"Gravity does not remain a constant strength throughout this entire universe."

"The Hubble, and other space telescopes, will eventually provide evidence that the above is true. . How can there be a dark matter substance, Explanation which must be 95% of the mass of all the galaxies, that we can look right through and not even know that it's there? Explanation This makes no sense at all using the view present science gives us but we can see exactly what is going on if we switch to this new concept. . We've been heading entirely in the wrong direction for over three-quarters of a century. . Perlmutter's findings are telling us that we must return to Einstein's original concept of a universe obeying Mach's principle. Explanation After the necessary improvements are made to the tensor math of general relativity, giving the proper effect to different type surroundings---as one looks further out---then this popular fictitious religion of dark matter will vanish much like the once highly popular ancient Egyptian religion of Amun."

Explanation

"Yes, much, much more invisible matter does indeed exist but it exists in a different type gauge. . It exists in a higher energy form---a higher spin/orbit frequency form---than we here can discern as matter. . But this is not what is causing this strong galactic internal attractive force. . Einstein showed that the total attractive force within the galaxies is equal in strength to the total repulsive force between the galaxies. . Today's scientists don't believe that one though."

"Berkeley, Foucault, Mach, Maxwell, Wheeler, Feynman and many other distinguished scientists have presented ample reasoning that our surroundings are causing our inertia and our gravity. . Even general relativity implies this. . This new idea says---what is perfectly obvious---that mass is nothing more than a steady binding with the distant macrocosm surroundings.

. When an electron and a proton both lose mass Explanation to form a hydrogen atom, the additional binding they gain with each other is binding that was lost to the surroundings far away in the macrocosm. . It's hard to believe that, in this year of 2002, most scientists don't see this simple fact yet. . . Another obvious fact put forth by this new idea is that energy is merely any binding CHANGE with the macrocosm surroundings. . This shows why we can have both fission and fusion energy. Explanation

Thus---considering surroundings---you can actually visualize Einstein's mass-energy equivalent and present science fails to acknowledge this."

"**MASS DEFECT** *Explanation* is the term scientists use to describe this loss of mass that is associated with both atomic fission and atomic fusion energy. . It's clear to see that this mass defect is merely the end result of a binding **LOSS** with the macrocosm."

"You have to be mentally blind not to see that all those aforementioned scientists are right and present science is wrong for disregarding the important role surroundings play in all of this. . Gravity and inertial mass are produced by the surroundings. . The change of mass *Explanation* in atomic energy is proof of this. . Gravity and inertia are both a bell curve of waves whose frequencies actually change with the viewing area and the item being viewed, therefore gravity is NOT a constant force throughout this entire universe. . It's the far different Supercluster *Explanation* surroundings outside our galaxy that cause a much greater galactic attractive force and this stronger force is what holds the galaxies together."

"AGAIN !"

"Why does **BOTH** fission & fusion create energy???"

"Why does a gyro hold to the fixed stars
???"

"Why do we have inertia and gyroscopic
inertia ???"

"Why is binding energy equivalent to mass
???"

Present science offers no answers to those questions. . But all those questions can be immediately answered. . You have to be blind as a bat not to see the following reasoning:

"There must be some reason for inertial mass and there must be some reason why mass is equivalent to energy ($E = MC^2$). . Tiny packets of strong, invisible, binding linkages to the surroundings are the only possible

explanation. . Once you comprehend this inertial mass attractive linkage to the macrocosm then you clearly see a **CHANGE** of this linkage is energy. . When you finally understand the role surroundings play in giving us both mass and energy then you completely understand Einstein's mass-energy equivalent."

"For instance, an electron and a proton both lose some of their original mass to bind together to form a hydrogen atom. . The mass they lost was nothing more than some binding to the "fixed stars" now transferred as an increased binding with each other."

"Even chemical energy is derived via greater or lessened binding with the fixed star surroundings. . Energy produced by the nuclei of elements solely to the left of iron, on the energy curve, produce energy by **ending up more tightly internally bound** or decreasing their binding with the macrocosm. . This is atomic fusion energy. . Energy produced by the nuclei of the heavier elements that are exclusively to the right of iron, on the energy curve, produce energy also by **ending up more tightly internally bound as well** and decreasing some of their binding to the fixed star macrocosm surroundings. . This is atomic fission energy. . One can actually look at chemical compounds, as well and see this overwhelming evidence that surroundings play a part in this."

"Knowing this, it is easier to understand why light must be considered both a wave and a particle because it really is !"

"Even though all this is crystal clear, it has never been acknowledged by even one university. . All the universities, in this year of 2002, presently preach the current, highly popular religion that surroundings do **NOT** enter into the picture at all. . Since 1966 I've been saying and publishing that surroundings **DO**. . From the response I'm finally getting, I now see that this internet, along with enough people who are **not** like H. L. Mencken's Homo Boobus and

who do think for themselves, will most certainly bring about a drastic change to what is presently being accepted as real science."

"This new concept will eventually be accepted, not because of any mathematical proof *unless we perfect Milo Wolff's math first*, but on the preponderance of the evidence much like Darwin's "Origin of the Species" was accepted. . Kurt Gödel has proven and shown to you that any present math designed for this present subset, affenstall science will not enlighten you to any universal laws at all."

* * * continued on page 6. * * *

CONTINUED on Page 6.

Click above for Page 6.

* ~ ~ ~ * * ~ ~ ~ * * ~ ~ ~ * * ~ ~ ~ * * ~ ~ ~ * * ~ ~ ~ *