

You and Milo Wolff are the mathematicians, Brian.

I'm merely the change artist who changes various black boxes on your airliner trying to get it airworthy and flying.

I think I've changed the faulty strong force containment black box and inserted a new Mach's principle black box that uses binding pairs that obey the inverse square law instead of using the energy itself obeying that same law.

I haven't fooled with the rest of the airliner but it may fly now.

You and Milo are the pilots - not me.

Dan Fitz

Milo & Brian

Subject: Solving the inverse square law problem

The problem with the inverse square law is that it doesn't relate to quanta which do not behave that way and if energy can neither be created nor destroyed then it would not seem to diminish via the inverse square law.

I saw the answer to this problem years ago, Milo when you showed me that light did not go beyond the Hubble limit.

You have probably forgotten, Milo, but I wrote back to you telling you that this made perfect sense because Einstein's tensor math needed a universe that was finite yet unbounded. Your discovery of no light beyond the Hubble limit gave us a universe that was indeed unbounded to ALL the electrons yet finite to any one single electron.

As I thought more about your Hubble limit I realized that it solved the inverse square law problem as well:

We know that an electron in our eye binds with another in our eye releasing a quantum of binding energy giving us a quantum of light energy.

We also know that a quantum of energy from a distant star loses no strength in that vast distance giving your eye a quantum of light energy.

It seemed to me the only way this could happen was that these polar pi bonds and especially the more important equatorial sigma bonds were the same strength all the way out to the Hubble limit and that these bonding PAIRS of electrons --- between the star and your eye --- were the things that were diminishing as the square of the distance --- not these individual chunks of energy itself.

Inertial mass then is simply these same strength bonds to the surrounding stars.

The more bonds to the surrounding stars you have then the more mass you have.

Each of those bonds to the surrounding stars that is then SHIFTED to a nearby electron then gives a quantum of kinetic energy to their area.

An electron in your eye first gains mass by bonding with an electron in the star then releases this quantum of energy by bonding with a closer electron in your eye.

**It's these pairs of electrons in your eye bonding with the electrons in the star via a sigma bond and gaining mass that diminish via the inverse square law.**

This makes a great deal of sense in why we have the inverse square law.

After you see that then all the pieces of the puzzle, Einstein was trying to solve, fall right into place.

Fitz

Ah but Brian,

What if all these things you see and even your space, time, motion and the math you use to describe what you see, are limited to a certain spacetime realm or certain frequency parameters --- a certain frequency bandsread --- the highest frequency being the orbital frequency of an electron and the lowest frequency having the time of many of those orbitals?

If this is the case, then we must listen to what Kurt Gödel taught us:

Those who cannot see outside of their subset bandsread may believe they have discovered universal laws when all they really have discovered are the rules for their subset bandsread and suitable math for describing the things inside of it.

Once I saw that was the case then I knew another method had to be developed to figure it all out.

Fitz

Milo,

Brian has to be careful about what he says to us because he can't appear to upset the establishment as much as we can. Brian mentioned Scott Chubb, so I've been reading about him. I think I'll stay clear of him. He became exceptionally dangerous to his Canadian employer who was convicted of murder mostly on Scott Chubb's testimony. But I will read as much as I can about his cold fusion concept.

We undoubtdly have the same linkage problem with cold fusion that we have with fuel cells - not enough linkages.

To perfect fuel cells, we need to link up the electrons (spins?) better and in fusion we have to learn how to get more nuclei linking up - getting more nuclear phase cohesion (more quark spins in phase?).

Right now we are packing heavy hydrogen into palladium and undoubtedly getting a few phase cohesion fusions. We know there is a lot of precession there. Only a few lined up correctly at the right distance actually fuse. We don't have to know all that much about how everything is aligned but we do have to have an anode configuration that gives us a better chance of more fusion. So if we keep changing the palladium anode configuration until we see more energy then we

know we are going in the right direction. I don't have quite the money to do it, Milo, so I'll refrain. But you might.

Milo,

Lisi calls his E8 model simple because it is in one single spacetime realm - ours (Electron orbital frequency realm or bandsread?). But it could also be representative of the quark spacetime realm because not only are there more quarks than electrons but the higher the frequency the higher the energy and the lower quark harmonics are probably strong enough to be sharing phase relationships with the electron that we see as charge.

I'm not the mathematician that you or Brian are but if Lisi's E8 model is correct then I'd be betting my money on it showing these quark-electron phase relationships where in phase (phase coherence) means attracting forces and 180 out of phase as repulsive forces and the average out of phase as space itself.

I like doing the easy things first. I'd be working on this and not cold fusion or fuel cells.

Fitz

Milo,

SPIN - Yes it's all Spin

You and I know the ONLY two attracting electron to electron positions (in both magnetism and chemical bonding) are 1. those on the same spin axis and 2. spinning in the same spin plane.

It's their spin action with the surroundings that give them a gyro inertial effect.

You unify the forces then by giving all FREE spinning entities the same properties.

So for electrons, stars, galaxies and even super clusters THE SAME FORCE

THAT IS PULLING THEM TOGETHER (remember, these have gyroscopic inertia) IS ALSO ACTING ON THE GYRO AND TWISTING THE SPIN AXIS OUT OF ANY ATTRACTING POSITION and more into an (out of phase) repelling position.

You end up seeing why all these FREE spinning things repel, don't you?

Brian,

You specifically mentioned the precession of Mercury, which only Milo Wolff's scalar, standing wave concept - with the surroundings being phase resonant - can explain.

You know we have sigma bonding so extend that to the surrounding stars - Mach's principle.

You also know the surroundings have a variety of frequencies to bond with.

As you increase the speed of something then you also are increasing all the spin frequencies of the spinning sides of electrons, quarks, etc. as seen by the closest sides of similar spinning entities in the surrounding stars.

You also know by increasing the frequency that you are also increasing the energy because energy and frequency are synonymous.

Therefore by increasing the energy of the item, by increasing its speed, what you are really doing is increasing its mass RELATIVE to the surroundings because of phase coherence with the surroundings - Mach's principle. BECAUSE NOW each of the spinning entities must impedance match with a higher frequency item in the surroundings than it did before it was accelerated.

Ah yes, and it must be impedance matching because we know energy can neither be created nor destroyed necessitating an impedance match.

Ah, and impedance matching shows not only must it be phase coherence but it must also be quantum phase coherence as well.

So, Brian, without a Schrödinger frequency universe, you can't even arrive at general relativity.

Helpfully yours,

Fitz