

Caroline T., Bill Arnold, Milo Wolff and the rest to whom it may concern:

All of us have hit this problem from different angles.

And all of us can learn from talking with others, to find out how the other person sees the problem.

In 1966, I was at Pan Am and working on a radar indicator overhaul problem. I realized that this cathode ray tube electron beam was being drawn to the top of the square, rotating coil for the same reason that I was being attracted to the earth. It depended on Ampere's Long Wire Law and relative motion that incorporated the surroundings. I will never forget that day as long as I live.

So I published a book that I see is selling now for \$8 used on the internet. Got an approving reply from Lincoln Barnett, who was a friend of Einstein and who wrote many general relativity articles for the Britannica encyclopedia. But the concept was flatly turned down by Robert Dicke who said relative motion could not be the cause of gravity or we would see interference fringes.

After the book was published I realized I should have incorporated frequency into my law of relative motion but it was Dicke's argument that troubled me.

But I always kept the idea simmering in the back of my mind that I had unified those two fields and if I could overcome Dicke's argument then I had the answer as to how this universe was constructed no matter how improbable that answer might seem.

Britannica wanted \$1,000 for their 1996 CD. Their price went down to \$300+ then to \$200+ and when they offered me their 1997 CD, that would work on Mac or PC for \$100+, I sent them the money. From that I learned about Kurt Gödel.

Kurt Gödel warned us that with math proofs of subset rules, you might be proving that these things were universally WRONG - not right.

You can have math proofs of frequencies like Bill Arnold is doing and those will be universal proofs.

Or you can remain solely in one spin/orbit frequency range where the space-time interval remains the same like Milo Wolff did and the math proof remains a universal proof.

But our present science is mostly nothing more than BLINDLY matching math to various subset rules that do NOT even agree with each other.

So you had better not disregard Kurt Gödel's proof or you may be proving things WRONG universally, not right universally.

I saw that if this was an infinite frequency universe, then we would have these spherical standing wave creations at intervals like piano keys on a keyboard of infinite length and they would all have a form of gyro torque like I showed the electron had in my 1966 book. Incidentally transformer action makes a lot more sense using gyro torque action than using the Faraday-Maxwell concept.

Now came the big surprise: I saw that each of these piano key resonances was creating space-time at each spin/orbit frequency (you can plainly see this with the spinning electron causing magnetism). This then would not only give us the universe we have but it would also show Dicke was wrong to argue about the interference fringes.

All of these resonances creating this space-time soup is the medium that Bill Arnold is looking for as well.

I couldn't figure what was balancing everything and I needed a wave definition of space and another one for time. Milo Wolff solved those problems and provided a math method that super computers will someday use to figure this all out.

So this is why I gave Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's statement to Caroline.

Once you unify the four fundamental forces then the answer you get, however improbable, has to be the truth.

fitz

[web page](#)

This site is a member of WebRing.
To browse visit [Here](#).