

Introduction to:

The "A" Laws

© 2003

"Do you think it will truly be possible to produce a theory of everything? A unified field theory that will explain all that exists in a simple equation which can be printed on a kid's t-shirt? How would that change man's place in the universe?" I asked Stephen Hawking for "*Times in Mykonos*" (after presenting him with a t-shirt containing Greek letters).

"I give it a fifty-fifty chance," Hawking answered. "I said so twenty years ago and I still have the same outlook. I think there's a fifty-fifty possibility that the unified field theory will be discovered within our lifetime." [Source](#)

I realize this concept will seem preposterous to the present generation of scientists but if this universe was built as described herein then we would have all the effects we have today in quantum mechanics and general relativity.

Quantum mechanics shows us that our microcosm has a different symmetry from our macrocosm in that we are able to determine different eigenstates in the orbitals of the electron around the nucleus.

But most important is the fact that quantum mechanics shows us that this is a frequency universe.

Milo Wolff [explanation](#) is showing us that all our present science laws are the end results of wave reactions.

In essence this means everything is really built from spherical standing waves or as **Milo Wolff** calls them, space

resonances.

The electron, **Milo Wolff** found, is actually reproducing itself, via scalar waves, from surrounding electrons.

This is telling us once more that things that reproduce remain here while those that don't, don't.

We may be getting closer to finding out what life itself is.

If **Milo Wolff** is right, which he most probably is, then when you are looking at things in the microcosm you may not be looking at things **smaller** but you are, in fact, looking at things tuned to a **higher frequency** than you are tuned to.

OR

As wavelength is the reciprocal of frequency, then:

Things that you see as **smaller** than you have a **shorter** wavelength than you and things that you see as **larger** than you have a **longer** wavelength than you do.

This leads us to some simple frequency laws called the "**A**" Laws.

The "**A**" Laws are laws for everything stable --- every free spherical entity --- existing in the microcosm or the macrocosm.

These free spherical entities orbit, precess and spin at various frequencies.

The "A" Laws give us a fair representation of the vector forces produced by all these orbits, precessions and spins.

Quantum scientists will tell you that the electron does not spin like the earth spins because quantum scientists see frequency as being the important component, of the electron's spin, and not our inertia.

They are correct - because this is a frequency universe - but they are not entirely correct because one cannot entirely dismiss the proof that the electron has inertial type qualities, which Niels Bohr won the Nobel Prize for explaining in 1922. [Explanation](#)

To completely understand what Bohr found, in this [new hypothesis](#) we picture the design of the universe the way it really is and we see - what quantum scientists should see - that inertia is an element of frequency.

Therefore, inertial rules or laws cannot be moved from one spin/orbit frequency reference frame (**gauge**) to another entirely different spin/orbit frequency reference frame (**gauge**).

So you cannot transfer our type of inertia to the electron.

But you can have various types of inertial qualities in each different type of spin/orbit reference frame (gauge).

By visualizing each spin/orbit frequency reference frame separately, these "A" Laws break down complicated multidimensional problems into an understandable 3-D reference frame.

Using this new frequency picture, we cannot expect the electron to have our type of inertia, nevertheless it does have inertial qualities - as Niels Bohr showed - in its own different space-time realm (gauge).

Most of the solar system's angular momentum is in the planets and not in the sun. explanation This is giving you a message: You can see the planets are acting like ball or roller bearings and their spin "fits in" with the action of the inner race (sun) and outer race (surroundings).

In certain orbitals the electron's spin "fits in" perfectly between the nucleus and surrounding electrons similar to the ball bearing analogy.

All these free spinning entities - *either in the micro or macro world* - "fit in" their spin this way. But it's same frequency surroundings that is of paramount importance here.

All these free spinning entities - *either in the micro or macro world* - bind with their same frequency surroundings in a

similar manner to the way an electron on a distant star binds with an electron in your eye, giving you a quantum of light that loses no energy no matter the distance.

All these free spinning entities - *either in the micro or macro world* - bind with their **same frequency surroundings** with individual quantum type exchanges that lose no strength with distance.

It is simply the number of these chance binding connections that falls off with the square of the distance making us think the strength of each is falling off with the distance squared.

Present science fails to see this.

The main premise of all of this is that WE must visualize each different spin/orbit frequency system of spherical standing wave entities as an entirely different gauge or as an entirely different space-time realm or as an entirely different Hilbert space [Explanation](#)

Einstein knew this entire universe was built on one simple set of laws and these "A" Laws are the closest things we have to describe this principle that this universe uses to build **both** the microcosm and macrocosm.

In other words, these gauge rules we are now using in quantum mechanics are **incorrect views** because we are receiving these views in our space-time realm and not in the space-time realm of the micro world in which they are actually occurring

We view the micro world **incorrectly** because it is in an entirely different

space-time realm (**gauge**) than we are in.

Using these simple "A" Laws you can see what is really going on in each gauge.

Using these simple "A" Laws you can actually visualize Einstein's unified field.

This [new concept](#), that I'm trying to put forth here, is that the various gauge rules used in quantum science are really only common, subset, inertial laws of **relative motion**, which are [incorrectly](#) seen by us. We see these [incorrectly](#) because we see things quite differently in our quite different frequency space-time, subset, inertial reference frame.

Einstein taught us that space and time changes with mass and acceleration. Now we are going to have to take one step further and see that space-time also changes in the microcosm as well.

What a good many quantum scientists fail to see is what I discovered and published in 1966:

I showed back then that the electron's magnetism and charge - that we see in our reference frame - are really nothing but laws of **relative motion** induced by the inertial qualities of the electron in the electron's entirely different frequency space-time inertial system.

This [new concept](#) - a continuation of my 1966 book idea -

states that all spherical standing wave entities (**electrons, stars, etc.**) will have spin and other motion induced by inertial qualities that are caused by the **relative motion** of similar surrounding spherical standing wave entities (**electrons, stars, etc.**).

Not long after my book was published with a full page write up in the N.Y. Times Book Review section in 1967, Robert H. Dicke [explanation](#) wrote that while there were many theories of gravity being caused by **relative motion** this was not the case because no interference fringes were being observed.

Dicke failed to realize two important things: 1. He had no way of seeing gravitational fringes because he didn't even know what frequency the gravitational frequency was. And 2. If **relative motion** was also responsible for the actual production of space-time then, indeed, we might see no interference fringes being produced.

Milo Wolff also informs us that we must take the surroundings into consideration (Mach's Principle) [Explanation](#). This, in essence, implies **relative motion**

The electron's composition and spin are caused by same frequency electrons in the surroundings just as the earth's spin is caused by all the same frequency mass in both the sun and the surroundings.

We are going to consider that since all particles are space

resonances then they are all behaving with simple inertial type forces and gyro torque but in their own space-time system (*gauge*). This information, however, gets distorted to us in our far different space-time system (*gauge*)

These "A" Laws will allow us to correctly look inside every different space-time system (*every different gauge*).

We are most certainly not doing this now.

Let's look at these invisible attractions:

Science teaches us that the tiny spinning electron acts exactly like a magnet.

Magnets are caused by millions of electrons spinning in the same direction.

Science also tells us that a gyroscope always holds its position to the fixed stars.

You know you are attracted to this earth so you are remiss in your acquisitiveness if you do not look for some common reason for all these invisible attractions.

Milo Wolff emphasizes the importance of what Berkeley, Mach, Foucault, Maxwell and many other distinguished scientists showed us: And this is that we must take the surroundings into consideration (Mach's Principle) [Explanation](#)

You must take same frequency surroundings into consideration when using these "A" Laws.

The first "A" Law (Ampere's Law) gives you this common relative motion reason for all these invisible attractions: Things that travel in the same direction on the same path or geodesic -- compared to the surroundings -- will attract.

It's hard to believe, but true, that all the scientists in all the universities have missed this important fact.

We are going to have to accept what Niels Bohr showed us, that we CAN utilize similar concepts of inertia, motion, spin and orbits much the same as we see in the macrocosm.

Because surroundings are different, then the symmetry of micro and macro worlds will indeed be different but nonetheless, the vestiges of inertia, motion, spin and orbits will remain in our entire universe no matter how large or how small humans are able to observe.

The "A" Law premise is that space-time is being constantly generated by entities moving in various geodesics.

Ampere's original long wire law and the Biot-Savart law *Explanation* are showing you not only how magnetic fields are produced from currents but these laws are also showing you how space-time is being created via relative motion.

Thus you get the **LEAST** space-time creation (attractive

binding force) between entities where their closest sides are traveling the **same direction** in parallel geodesics (paths) at the same frequency or a harmonic thereof.

This "A" Law premise is a simple premise but you must now look at force in much the same way as Einstein saw it and as it is seen in general relativity.

You must see force as a distortion of space-time.

For instance, a vacuum does not really cause a suction force. It is the air pressure surrounding everything that pushes into the vacuum and causes a **pressurized** force.

Use the same **pressure** analogy in dealing with these invisible forces too because force in both methods is obtained in almost exactly the same way

In this new concept, things on various different paths actually cause a creation of space-time and this we can visualize similarly to the aforementioned air **pressure**.

When a strong magnet aligns electrons in a piece of steel so all the spins are going in the **same direction**, each locked in place electron behaves like a tiny magnet.

I will eventually put the drawings in my 1966 book on this server because they show why translational motion is so important in all of this. But for now you must understand that ANY individual electrons that are locked on orbitals can act as tiny magnets. They can bind to other electrons not only with their poles but (like magnets) also with their sides when their **closest sides are going in the same direction** similar to δ (sigma) bonding in chemical binding.

Regardless of what the majority believe, we must accept truth.

Present science's inadequate laws distinguish between magnetism and chemical bonding but they really are the same. In both

magnetism and chemical bonding electrons are attracting other electrons either with their poles or sides just like magnets do.

Since sunshine is the best disinfectant, let's shine some light on what's really going on:

Certain electrons, "locked" in place on certain orbitals, are *flip-able* electrons: These can suddenly flip and change their spins from spin-up to spin-down with a change of a nearby magnetic field. Flip-able electrons are found locked in place in the *d* or *f* shells of the iron atom. These cause iron to become a magnet.

Flip-able electrons act exactly like tiny magnets, in fact, they are the smallest magnetic entities. These *flip-able* electrons that can easily flip over and spin the other way are not the furthest from the nucleus though.

Electrons furthest out are called *free* electrons or valence electrons or sometimes they are called conduction electrons.

We are now going to forget our present science laws and forget lines of force emanating from the north and south poles and say both this magnetic attraction and chemical bonding are both being caused because the **closest sides** of these electrons are all going in the **same direction**.

The polar attraction, similar to π (pi) bonding will be *greatest* - in magnets - because all electrons aligned on the same spin axis will see the *entire portions* of the others as moving in the **same geodesic path** at the same frequency. Therefore less space-time will be generated between them giving this vacuum or attraction effect mentioned earlier.

But, this happens only when these electrons are "locked" in place, spin up or spin down, on orbitals.

The polar bond **in magnetism** is the strongest.

In **chemical bonding**, however, the polar bonding - π (pi) bonding - is the weakest bond because the polar bond is a repetitious, short duration bond.

In chemical binding the side to side electron attraction - δ (sigma) bonding - is the

strongest because these spin up-spin down electrons that attract each other with their closest sides moving in the same direction are always in the same orbital planes. Therefore the closest sides of these electrons are continuously attracting each other. This is quite unlike the momentary polar attractions of π (pi) bonding.

What if every spinning entity, from electrons to galaxies, behaves the same as the electron?

They actually do.

Niels Bohr showed us much of this. Only the symmetries will be different with different type entities because of the different frequency surroundings.

Once you realize that all these FREE spinning entities are gyroscopes and will precess 90 degrees to any applied force then you see why all of these FREE spinning entities we see in the microcosm or macrocosm, no matter how small or large, will repel each other similar to electrons.

If a FREE electron would happen to attract another FREE electron when either its poles or closest sides were going in the same direction (**magnetism**) then **both of these electrons would be forced to precess and twist 90 degrees AWAY from this applied attractive force.**

Therefore they would be forced to remain in a position to their nearest neighbor where more repulsion than attraction was taking place.

Thus you have, between FREE electrons, what present science sees as charge but which is really nothing more than a microcosm form of Einstein's **cosmological constant** which Einstein said was a repulsive force between everything in the universe.

As you read further you will see electrons are using only inertial qualities and gyro type torque. They are behaving exactly like all the other spinning entities we see in the macrocosm but our present science view that restricts us to this one space-time reference frame (*gauge*) can't discern this because we are in an entirely different space-time system.

So I guess Einstein was right about his **cosmological constant** all the time and Saul Perlmutter is right about his proof of Einstein's **cosmological constant** today.

These "A" Laws are laws that work in any surroundings. **These are also laws that depend on the surroundings to work.** None of our other science laws seem to be based on anything like this and therein lies the problem in developing the math for these new "A" Laws.

George Berkeley, Ernst Mach, James Clerk Maxwell and a host of others all **claimed that our surroundings caused our inertia.** Einstein was also of this opinion when he first published general relativity and he saw the importance of the surroundings not being changed. He, in fact, emphasized that our surroundings were evenly spread out all around us with a consistent density. Since taking these surroundings into consideration would make the science math far more complicated, mathematicians rationalized and felt no reason to consider the surroundings. They completely forgot about what these important people said and what Foucault showed us. We fitted our scientific theory to the math we already had and that seemed to work well enough for everyone. We forgot about the warnings of these great men.

Kurt Gödel gave us another extremely important warning we were completely deaf to. Kurt Gödel proved, beyond a shadow of a doubt, that when you view from a subset single reference frame, such as we do from here on this earth, then you may **THINK** all your science laws are true laws when they are not true laws for the **ENTIRE** universe. And this is exactly what has happened.

When you see you cannot take your science laws into the microcosm then this is Kurt Gödel's message to you that something with your precious science laws is awry.

Even Einstein gave us the proof that Newton was wrong. Einstein gave us the corrections for Newtonian mechanics but Einstein failed to find the correct "big picture" of how it really all worked.

But I **can** give you the "big picture" of how it all works but I cannot do the math for it. Can you? If you can then a splendid place in history awaits you.

Now, I'm going to change the scientific theory a bit and put surroundings back in. The problem then will be to find new math to fit this new theory that includes these important surroundings. But it's a much better theory than anything we've got now because **it actually gives you a "big crystal clear picture" of unification.**

Remember, surroundings are the key here: And here's the Aufbau Law Theory - or - Construction Law Theory of our entire universe.

Einstein wanted a simple answer and this is really simple but it's different from what your peer group is handing out presently.

Look! You can see that you live in a universe that does have quantum theory and that does have general relativity and this is also a universe in which the speed of light remains a constant. When you see all this then you must see something is drastically wrong with the ideas handed to you by your ancestors.

Change your thinking to this new concept. Then you will immediately see exactly why you will have quantum theory and general relativity.

We are going to add to what Berkeley, Mach, Foucault and Maxwell pointed out. We are going to say that not only is inertia created by our surroundings but, in this new Aufbau Law Theory, **that space and time are also generated by the surroundings**, especially generated by all this motion in these surroundings.

Another important item is that we are going to say space-time is frequency conscious.

But the main thing you must realize is that all your various invisible forces are nothing more than various space-time creations. You must remember that space-time can be generated at various frequencies. **But the space-time that you see is only the space-time generated at this quark-electron subharmonic frequency,**

These "A" laws agree with what we find is happening in the world of general relativity and the quantum world.

Now, consider the **surroundings** in all of this and these "A" Laws will show you the whys & wherefores **of space-time creation**, which can also be seen as all those **invisible forces we know so well but that we've eliminated now for this special viewing.**

Some quantum purists will resent the concept of physical spin being brought into the microcosm. I fully understand their concern but as Niels Bohr showed, a form

of inertia is present in the microcosm and the word spin does approximate what is really going on. I would also remind the quantum purists that Dirac predicted the human mind would eventually find an "approximation" of how this all worked. The following laws are such an "approximation" of how it all works.

Finally, here they are:

The "A" Laws

Remember these are the laws for everything, from the smallest spinning particle to the largest spinning super cluster of galaxies.

* The **1st** "A" Law shows us where all objects in relative motion produce the least space-time between themselves:

The space time interval is created the least between any two objects, the closest sides of which "see" themselves spinning or moving on parallel paths in the same direction at the same frequency (*like gears meshing*) or a close harmonic thereof. You can also say these two objects will attract each other.

* The **2nd** "A" Law shows us where all objects in relative motion produce the most space-time between themselves:

Both space and time are created the most between any two objects, the closest sides of which "see" themselves spinning or moving on parallel paths in opposite directions at the same frequency (*like gears clashing*) or a close harmonic thereof. You can also say these two objects will repel each other.

I use the quoted word "see" to emphasize the world in which these entities actually find themselves.

^

Of great importance, in the two preceding laws, is that these laws are frequency laws and they work separately for each separate spin/orbit frequency level which means these individual wave-particles must "*see*" themselves doing these things from their viewpoint in their local gauge environment. It does not matter how some other spin/orbit frequency level views these things because space and time and indeed the average space time interval is entirely different for each different spin/orbit frequency level.

These two laws look equal and opposite but they are not: The 1st "A" law "locks on" while its opposite 2nd sister law never does. This is because the total force is generally centralized and you can feel this 1st "A" law "lock on" when two magnets come together. These two laws result in limits of aggregation being established all throughout this universe: This is why there are limits to the size of atoms and limits to the size of stars as well.



The Aufbau or Ampere Corollary

The aforementioned forces, or space-time intervals, between two objects will vary proportionally with the cosine of the angle of their paths. And they will have a torque that will tend to make the paths parallel and to become oriented so that objects on both paths will be traveling in the same direction.

Or

All objects that "see" themselves traveling *in the same direction* on parallel paths at the same frequency will attract and/or space and time, at that frequency, between them is created the least.

All objects that "see" themselves traveling *in opposite directions* on parallel paths at the same frequency will repel and/or space and time between them, at that frequency, increases or is created the most.

And please don't forget this:

Why electrons, stars & galaxies repel each other

Remember, we have chucked all those invisible forces you are familiar with and all we have now are these two "A" Laws.

So in this new "big picture" of everything, there are no such things as plus and minus charges.

Please pay particular attention to the following.

Electrons can exhibit either an attraction such as unlike charges when they are "locked" or a repulsive behavior such as with similar type charge or similar magnetic poles when they are "free". Our "A" Laws show us why this is so and in the **next 8 paragraphs** you have the best explanation of **why electrons and even stars &**

galaxies repel each other.

Lets look at these free electrons first: They spin and hence they have inertial qualities and this includes gyroscopic inertia which always provides this force 90 degrees to any external force acting on such a spinning item.

Completely forget about charge now and only look at our new "A" Laws and what they say.

The 1st "A" Law tells us that there is a possibility that two free electrons can attract each other providing that any portion of their closest sides are spinning in the same direction at the same frequency. This means either their sides can be spinning in the same directions or they can be lined up so that both of their poles can be spinning in the same directions: Any such two electrons **will attract each other**.

Then we see that there is something else: This torque twisting force - on BOTH free items - depends on the cosine of the angle of their respective spin planes.

As this force begins to act, it in turn causes this 90-degree gyroscopic torque to **twist** both of those totally free electrons **away from this initial attracting position**, doesn't it?

So because of this gyro torque, two free electrons can never remain in a full attracting position and they will therefore be forced to stay more in a **repelling** position. Therefore free electrons will always end up repelling each other and this repelling is not explained by using this thing called charge: it is explained only by simply using **global** inertial qualities and our new global "A" Laws.

The above 8 paragraphs explain not only why electrons repel each other but they also explain why any two perfectly free similar spinning objects of the *same size* must repel each other. So now you know why both electrons and galaxies stay well away from each other.

This is Einstein's cosmological constant.

This same type attraction disrupting itself is also very apparent with binding energy (pi bonding).

Please note the following **quotes** from the **1997 Britannica CD**. (my emphasis)

" A simple single bond, known as a sigma bond results from head-to-head overlap and is symmetrical about the line between the two bonded atoms. A second type of bond, known as the pi bond, results from sideways overlap."

"A pair of atoms may be connected by one or by two pi bonds only if a sigma bond also exists between them;"

", , , but reactions do occur that break the pi bonds to form stronger sigma bonds."

". . . a pi bond will draw to itself atoms or atomic groupings that are electron-deficient, thereby initiating a process of bond-breaking that can lead to rupture of the pi bond"

What is plain to see from the above quotes is that there is enough rigidity in the system to allow the sigma bond to be maintained once it is aligned because the sigma bond pull is a direct, in line, attraction but since the pi bond attraction is off center it disrupts and destroys its own alignment.

This is why you can have a lone sigma bond but never a lone pi bond.

Once the stronger sigma bond attraction is maintained then other weaker pi bonds can also attract without rupturing the molecular bond.

Something somewhere has to be **"locked"** in place and synchronized in frequency with the electron's spin or a close subharmonic of the spin to get any kind of **attracting force**:

Yes, the proton attracts an electron. When two up quarks combine with one down quark to form a proton then the two up quarks are able to synchronize in with the electron's spin frequency and **"lock"** two electrons thereby preventing these electrons from precessing or wobbling and therefore the up quarks can attract the electrons.

This is why aggregations come together (gravity) and larger aggregations come

together and accumulate because as these things grow in size there are more things "locked" in place strengthening the attractive force of the 1st "A" Law.

Once we knew about quarks then we should have realized how those two 'up quarks' in the proton are set up spin up-spin down (The 'up quark' does not signify orientation). Those two spin up-spin down 'up quarks' are spinning - in the same equatorial plane - at a higher frequency but all 'up quarks' spin at a harmonic of the electron's spin frequency allowing a spin up and spin down electron to be attracted to them in the same equatorial plane. We will soon know even more about the **attractive** quark **strong force** binding functions. Attraction is **always** a **synchronized frequency attraction** and it is **not** simply the old idea of plus and minus charges.

All attractions in this theory must be synchronized frequency attractions.

Both light and inertial mass are caused by these synchronized frequency attractions.

As quantum theory shows us, the orbital of an electron on a distant star goes down a certain amount while the orbital of the electron receiving this quantum of energy---in your eye---goes up the exact same amount. But what quantum mechanics does not tell you is that these two energy-exchanging orbitals must be in the same exact plane. Not only that but each orbital must be a mirror image of the other with the electrons in each rotating and revolving in the exact opposite directions so that at the time the energy exchange takes place the closest sides of both electrons are going in the same direction. You can see from this that this energy change is merely a **MOMENTARY DIRECT PULL** from the electron, on the star, to the electron in your eye. These electrons will make many revolutions, rotations and wobbling oscillations during each change of those orbitals giving you the light that you see.

If two distant quarks are lined up so that their closest sides are in the same directions as the two aforementioned electrons then they too will momentarily bind with each other---even from a vast distance---and cause what we see as inertial mass. But since the quarks in the proton and neutron tri-quark entities do not oscillate and wobble quite like the electron then this pull of the two quarks is a steady momentary binding pull where **BOTH** quarks are pulled away from the other two quarks but **NO PERMANENT Energy CHANGE** is made in either

tri-quark entity (neutron or proton).

When you spin a flywheel and notice the gyroscopic inertia, you should also notice that the gyroscopic torque that is always 90 degrees to the axis of rotation **can also be seen** as a linkage with the rim of the rapidly spinning flywheel to a path projected in the sky (macrocosm surroundings). The rim tries to stay in this path. This is showing you that you do have an absolute reference frame, which is Mach's principle. Billions of quarks in BOTH the flywheel and in the macrocosm are both being momentarily extended more than normal thus giving you this added gyroscopic inertia.

You might have to read the long TOE at <http://www.rbduncan.com/TOEbyFitzpatrick.htm> to get the full picture of what happens when you crank up a gyroscope or a flywheel or ride a bicycle and produce gyroscopic inertia. It's similar to the reason you need cyclic pitch on a helicopter. When a helicopter moves forward then the blades on one side travel through the air faster than the blades on the other side and this tries to tip the helicopter over. (Igor Sikorsky had to invent cyclic pitch to prevent this).

The same thing happens to certain quarks whose rims line up with the rim of the gyroscope, flywheel or bicycle wheels. The speed that these items are turning---in respect to the macrocosm---now adds to portions of the quark rim speed which before was close to the speed of light and now gets even closer to the speed of light. So you are moving up an asymptotic curve close to the unsurpassable speed of light. And this---even with a miniscule number of quarks involved---gives us this gyroscopic inertia. It does this because the mass of these few quarks increase tremendously as portions of their rim speed approach the speed of light. As Einstein has shown us, mass increases with speed and especially increases when on that asymptotic portion of the curve.

Of available electrons, only the smallest fraction link with others a distance away to transfer light and heat. The same with the spinning quark that causes gyroscopic inertia. All spinning quarks link to cause inertial mass. All these binding linkages are momentary with the electron's oscillations causing a permanent transfer of energy and the various momentary quark bindings causing inertial mass. This could be seen---in gyroscopic inertia---as only a temporary transfer of inertial mass. But if you could increase our surroundings---as will be

the case when our Milky Way galaxy finally collides with the Andromeda galaxy---then anyone here on earth will find both inertial mass, gyroscopic inertia and centrifugal force have all become stronger with the more crowded surroundings.

Now let's go to the stars and you will see the same "A" Laws apply there as well and, as you can see, these too will always have to remain in a repelling position with each other.

Close stars, especially close binary stars, will NEVER be spinning so that their closest sides are moving in the same direction at the same frequency.

Recently Perlmutter discovered this acceleration and showed we must have Einstein's **cosmological constant**---a repulsive force---between all the stars and galaxies.

If you think Perlmutter is wrong then why do we have Einstein's Principle of Equivalence?

Why is the earth's gravity the same as an acceleration?

Present science doesn't answer that but the only possible answer, my friend, is that space-time is being created MORE in the surroundings than it is between you and the earth thereby pushing you toward the earth.

And if gravity can not be discerned from an accelerating contraction (Principle of Equivalence) then that repulsive force in all the surroundings can not be discerned from an accelerating expansion either.

Scientists have been recently wracking their brains to figure out why we have Perlmutter's acceleration because nothing in our present science has even predicted such a thing.

But read those preceding blue sentences again! Now I hope you can finally see that our "A" Laws tell you exactly why we have Einstein's "**cosmological constant**" not only in the sky but in the microcosm as well. And they tell you why we have gravity too. Your present science doesn't even do this.

The reason these "A" Laws work is that this universe is built on an extraordinarily simple principle via an endless chain of vector waves producing lower frequency spherical standing wave, scalar wave resonances that, in turn, produce space-time by spinning, orbiting and precessing.

A **minimum** of space-time is produced between vector waves that are **in phase**.

This leads, in turn, to production of the most important vector forces between the closest sides of such spinning spherical resonances and in the direction of the axis of each spin. There are also vector forces via orbits and spin and orbital precessions.

This universe equalizes the energy vector force input to vector force output of these scalar wave resonances by balancing them on specific spin and orbital geodesics.

These vector forces, in turn, combine to produce lower frequency, hence lower energy, scalar resonances, which in turn, spin, precess and orbit producing still lower frequency space-time and its related vector forces and this goes on and on: Thus is our universe built from the microcosm to the macrocosm and may continue indefinitely because higher frequency waves would always be producing lower frequency, lower energy scalar wave resonances and they, in turn, would be producing even lower energy, lower frequency resonances.

This seems to be an infinite frequency universe with each spin/orbit frequency having inertial and gyroscopic qualities but yet with each spin/orbit frequency having its own distinct symmetry.

Daniel P. Fitzpatrick Jr.

zeusrdx@yahoo.com

[web page](#)