

**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 Word](#)

[Fitz's 1966 book in PDF](#)

<http://rbduncan.com/WIMPs.html>

[WIMPs in Word](#)

May 9, 2019 ALL you need to  
know about **Dark Matter** particles - (WIMPs).

[WIMPs in PDF](#)

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



Shedding

a bit of light

on all spinning things  
in this entire universe.

*"I consider it quite possible that physics cannot be based on the field concept, i.e., on continuous structures. In that case, nothing remains of my entire castle in the air, gravitation theory included, [and of] the rest of modern physics."* (Albert Einstein 1954)

**"Math can only explain simple things but a simple MODEL can explain a complicated universe."** (Stephen Wolfram)

Here's Wolfram's best selling book, proving the above statement, in e-book form free: [Wolfram's 1,000 page "A New Kind of Science"](#)

It's really  
phase causing the spins of  
not only armatures in electric motors but  
quarks, electrons, planets, stars, galaxies  
and super clusters.

Essentially what well known mathematician Stephen Wolfram has proven is that if the model you believe in keeps making you see your universe as more and more complicated — *dark matter, dark energy* — then you are believing in the wrong MODEL because as Wolfram has shown, "... a simple MODEL can explain a complicated universe."

Einstein was right: People resist religious change, nevertheless this old field religion must be changed to get the big picture. If you want to see how this universe works then you cannot use field concepts such as charge and gravity when it's crystal clear that **phase** — *that can also be seen as relative motion* — is the underlying cause of both charge and gravity. **Phase** has no constraints whatsoever, whereas charge is limited to the microcosm and gravity to the macrocosm. So to understand this *entire* universe you

must take a quite different view and see what is really going on using this simple MODEL of a frequency and **phase** universe:

This is the **only** MODEL that *adequately* explains the inertial forces and our complicated universe.

Using this simple MODEL you take a quantum leap in science.

In this universe — *in both microcosm and macrocosm* — items **attract** and bind with similar spinning items whenever their closest sides are harmonically spinning together *in phase*. They will **repel** other objects where their closest sides are not in a harmonic relationship and are *spinning out of phase*:

This is the simple harmonic **phase** MODEL that better explains our *entire* universe in both micro and macro worlds.

We know the microcosm is a frequency world in which we can utilize **phase**. Yet **phase** — *more easily viewed sometimes as relative motion* — is something that can be used in the macrocosm too.

The **strongest** attraction between two magnets is when the electrons — *causing that magnetism* — in both magnets are spinning *in phase* (*spinning in the same direction, more or less on the same spin axis*): The entire portions of these electrons are therefore all spinning at the highest possible *in phase* amount. Because all portions of these electrons, in both magnets, are spinning *in phase* then both magnets will

*attract* each other the strongest amount. **This is a known fact!** The old field concept of "*opposite poles attracting*" show none of this. So see the magnetic attraction explained the correct way by purely using this new **phase** MODEL.

The old field religion doesn't adequately show you why we have mass or why with centrifugal force things are attracted to the surrounding stars (*Mach's Principle*) or what holds you up as you ride a bicycle but this **phase** model certainly does.

It's really nothing more than **phase** in an electric motor, between the armature and the surrounding field windings, that causes the armature to spin.

The armature tries to stay *in phase* — *in harmonic resonant attraction* — as much as possible to the rotating surrounding field. This is true in both AC and DC motors. This rotating surrounding field can be effected in DC motors by using brushes. Brushes are not needed to produce a rotating field in AC motors.

Everyone knows the polar magnetic attraction is a stronger attraction than the weaker side to side magnetic attraction you get when the poles are reversed. It's — *a harmonic relationship* — spinning electrons, binding to each other — *with a portion of their closest sides moving the same direction* — that are causing this. Field theory's "*opposite poles attract*" has nothing to do with what is really going on. Not only does it give a wrong and even opposite picture of what is happening but it only tells you how the stronger poles

react. It does not show how the sides will react. This new **phase** MODEL shows you exactly how — *and gives the reason why* — both poles and sides react the way they do.

In this new **phase** MODEL we do as Einstein told us to do. We disregard all the old ancient beliefs of field theory and its components: This means doing away with plus and minus charge and forgetting north and south poles.

We now merely look, at all these round, spinning things, and say sides *in phase attract* and sides *out of phase repel* each other. We use this simpler **phase** MODEL which does completely away with the former complicated field concepts and easily explains everything in this entire universe.

A pi chemical bond should be the strongest chemical bond because in a pi bond both electrons are spinning the same direction on the same spin axis. But since — *Niels Bohr proved the microcosm is in motion* — these electrons, bonding to electrons in different molecules, only line up pole to pole at intervals while the sigma bonds — *that remain in the same equatorial spin plane* — are constant bonds: So over any period of time the sigma bond ends up with more attractive force than the pi bond.

All chemists know the polar pi chemical bond cannot be established unless spin up—spin down — *closest sides in phase and in the same equatorial spin plane* — sigma bonds are already established first.

Why?

This is telling you something important: It's telling you that these electrons are always trying to **precess** away from their strongest **polar** position of *in phase attractive* binding. You can only have a pi type polar bonding if these bonding electrons are sufficiently restrained from **precessing**.

Knowing this we can safely say that all distant quantum type forces must be exchanges of spin up—spin down — *closest sides in phase* — sigma style bonds. All energy exchanges — *from either electrons or quarks* — turn out to be nothing more than sigma style bonding exchanges where *a portion* of the closest sides of each round spinning entity are *in phase* and remain in the same equatorial spin plane:

Energy — *you create as you ride your bicycle* — here turns into inertial mass as quarks here — *in your bicycle wheels* — bond with stronger binding energy to quarks in the surrounding stars. *This is why the bicycle wheels hold you up so well on your bicycle.* For energy not to be created nor destroyed and for you to actually add more and more mass to each of these distant quantum quark bindings — *with the surrounding stars* — as you pump harder and harder going faster and faster, all these quantum bindings must be impedance matched.

Click: [quarkspin](#) or [quarkspin.pdf](#)

That same inertial mass now gradually turns into energy — *keeping the bicycle rolling* — as those quarks in the surrounding stars gradually lose those stronger bondings with quarks in the bicycle's wheels. *This is why the bicycle no longer holds you up as you slow down to a stop.*

In Faraday's first motor, the wire was rotated by electrons **precessing** 90 degrees as they approached the central magnet. From this we note the magnet is causing electron gyroscopic **precession**. This is similar to the surroundings that Ernst Mach claimed is producing all the inertial forces that give us mass, centrifugal force and gyroscopic **precession**.

We know each and every force the electron produces and none of them are gravitational in nature. But since we can relate each of these electron spin shifts to a force we say electron spin is conserved. Now you will see that all these inertial forces — *in the macro world* — are being produced via resonant quark spins. From this paper the scientific community will eventually learn that quark spin is also conserved.

Ernst Mach said our surroundings caused all these inertial forces. He was absolutely right and now, we'll shed a bit more light on Mach's principle and see what is really going on:

Quarks, electrons, planets, stars, galaxies and super clusters spin because they are trying to stay as close as possible *in phase* to their surroundings — *the same as a motor armature* — yet they are forced to remain a certain distance from their surroundings via a myriad of *out of phase repulsive* quanta forces that actually give us our space.

We see that the armature, in an electric motor, is held a certain distance from the field windings by a steel motor housing. There is an important *attractive in phase out of*



*phase repulsive* harmonic relationship between down quarks and electrons that determine the fabric of this steel motor housing giving it a certain strength and size. A similar housing — *an invisible one* — exists in the macrocosm where there is *that same* important *attractive in phase out of phase repulsive* relationship that the spinning planets, stars, and galaxies also have with their surroundings that keep them spinning and attractively linked to their surroundings yet keep them a certain distance from their surroundings as well.

Shades of Ernst Mach indeed!

These geodesic spin-paths, followed by everything in this universe — *both in micro and macro worlds* — are those spin-paths where *attractive in phase* and *repulsive out of phase* forces — *with the surroundings* — are evenly matched.

All **free** objects — *not only electrons* — with the same makeup, size and spin will always repel a similar **free** object with the same makeup, size and spin. ***This is why electrons, stars, galaxies*** — *and other things in this universe* — ***repel each other while maintaining a certain distance from each other.*** This is an *out of phase* rule that can be used both in the microcosm and macrocosm:

So the 1<sup>st</sup>. supreme rule is that *out of phase* forces repel and the mean or average of these *out of phase* quantum type forces actually build and determine space.

The reason this rule works is that totally **free** spinning objects can and do **precess** away from their fellow objects



enough that they can never have an *in phase* link where they become *attracted* together.

However, this rule only applies to entirely **free** objects that can **precess**.

Two entirely **free** objects — *quarks, electrons, stars or galaxies* — **try** to attract each other but as they both move in the direction of the strong pole to pole attraction, gyroscopic **precession** now makes them **precess** 90 degrees and **away** from this attractive force, thereby denying them the same spin and same spin axis where they both would have the strongest attractive binding to each other.

This is the real reason quarks, electrons, stars, galaxies and super clusters repel each other. Yet nothing in field theory tells you this because field theories were all made before anyone realized this.

But all these objects must be entirely **free** to completely **precess** away from these positions of attraction: If one spinning object is not entirely **free** and somewhat restrained from **precessing** then it most certainly can attract and link up with a perfectly free spinning object (sigma electron to electron chemical binding or two binary stars) using a

spin up—spin down bond where a tiny portion of the closest sides of each are *in phase*.

Binary stars are the only spin up—spin down stars that have a tiny portion of their closest sides *in phase*.

Of all the other stars **none** have *any* portion of their closest sides in phase like binary stars.

Stars, galaxies and free electrons have all fully **precessed** to the point where their closest sides to their nearest neighbor are completely *out of phase* and *repelling* their nearest neighbor.

Only this simple **phase** MODEL tells you why that is.

This important **precession** — *that eliminates polar attraction* — does not happen to those objects, like electrons, that are attracted to down quarks harmonically spinning at the square of the electron spin frequency. These electrons, linked *in phase* to down quarks, can no longer freely **precess** and therefore can find *in phase* bonding links with other electrons, like in sigma and pi chemical bonds. A molecule can build *only* because an electron can have an attractive *in phase* harmonic bonding link with a down quark.

Not only that but every quark bound electron can attract any **free** electron because their closest sides can have an *in phase attraction*, thus large molecules can be built. In fact each quantum of light comes to your eye from a distant star because of an electron on that distant star that

is acting — *exactly like a sigma bond* — *in phase* with and moving an opposite spin electron in your eye.

All this shows us that the 2<sup>nd</sup>. important rule is that *all in phase* quantum bonding links — *both quark and electron* — are powerful attractive links that do not vary in strength as the square of the distance: Only the number of these individual bonds varies as the square of the distance. This is why your eye receives each quantum of light full strength from distant stars.

There is a limit to this distance that we can see starlight and this is the Hubble limit.

These *higher* frequencies of starlight can penetrate further into space than lower frequencies but the problem is they get bent more than the lower frequencies just as violet light gets bent more than the lower frequency red light in a prism.

We know future space telescopes will get us even closer to evidence of the Big Bang but how close will depend on how much space bends these ultra *high* frequency waves — *away from what we see as a straight line* — on their way to these future space telescopes.

The down quark spin frequency is the square of the electron spin frequency. One of the proofs that this quark spin causes gravity is that even though we can no longer see into a black hole, we can nevertheless feel the gravitational attractive force from that black hole because

the quark spin frequency is so much **higher** than the electron spin frequency.

Quarks *a*lso bind to distant quarks full strength despite distance. The asymptotic freedom of quarks is not freedom at all but those quarks coming to the edge of nuclei are being pulled there by far distant quarks, causing what we see in our macro world as mass, **precession**, gravity, inertia or centrifugal force: Therefore, the strong force is **not** contained and — *as the scientific community now learns* — quark spin is conserved exactly like we know electron spin is conserved.

This makes far more sense with the quark spin force (*strong force*) now similar, but more powerful, than the spin forces of the electron. The more powerful quark spin produces the weaker force of gravity because there are far fewer available **free** quarks than available **free** electrons.

The 3<sup>rd</sup>. important phase rule is that the more massive objects link *in phase* with and prevent the less massive from fully **precessing**. Far distant from stars we see these large dust clouds in space because these particles must all spin and repel themselves via **precessing** if there is no massive entity in their vicinity.

But this mass that eventually locks on and prevents **precessing** is why we have not only molecules but star planetary systems and galaxies.

In this **phase** symmetry model the spin frequency is the important frequency. **Phase** and **precessing** are both very important in this new model.

Ampere didn't know about electrons yet he saw if these things flowed the **same direction** in parallel wires then those wires attracted. This is nothing more than an *in phase* attraction. Not only that but we know that if electrons are prevented from **precessing** by being attracted to down quarks — *forming a molecule* — then the closest sides of these electrons will link — *via Ampere's laws* — with the closest sides of other electrons when tiny portions — *of their closest sides* — are going *(in phase)* in the same direction: This — *spin in phase binding* — is exactly what we have, causing attraction, in sigma and pi chemical bonding and in magnetism.

In both sigma and pi chemical bonding, and also in magnetism, electrons do attract other electrons: *This is the reverse of what they are supposed to do in electron field theory.* In electron field theory electrons are always supposed to repel each other: **Nothing** in that theory tells us that **precessing** is the important factor in electrons repelling each other.

So, there are no such things as charge or gravity: But there is **phase** that better explains both.

Einstein recognized in 1954 that all field theories, although extremely useful, were also inherently flawed.

Yes, Maxwell's math works beautifully with field theories. We wouldn't have all these things we have today without Maxwell's math and these various field theories. The big problem comes unifying them which we have to do to find out how this universe really works.

Benjamin Franklin invented the concept of charge hundreds of years ago. The concept of gravity is even older. Even though we know far, far more now than those people did way back then, almost no one has tried to find the correct MODEL to use to see what is really going on. If you will read my other papers then you will find this simple **phase** MODEL does indeed explain everything in our universe including the reason for the Big Bang and all this Dark Matter and Dark Energy.

This **phase** symmetry **precessing** MODEL not only works but unifies macro and micro worlds and shows us Einstein was right in what he said about field theory in 1954 and Wolfram was right about a simple MODEL being able to explain a complicated universe.

<http://www.amperefitz.com/phase.symmetry.htm>

and

<http://www.amperefitz.com/phase.symmetry.pdf>

Thank you,

*Daniel P. Fitzpatrick Jr. April 28, 2014*

**VERY LATEST IN SCIENCE: Do Ampere's Laws give us the *final answer* to DARK MATTER?**

[7-7-2017.The final answer to the cause of Dark Matter.htm](#)

**Final and SIMPLE answer to the DARK MATTER attractive force.**

In Word: [7-7-2017.Answer to DARK MATTER.doc](#)

7-7-2017 Answer to DARK MATTER [also](#) in Adobe.pdf - [7-7-2017.Answer to DARK MATTER.pdf](#)

If you copy this with its [links](#) to your computer then you will have some other pages ([links](#) - both *htm* and *Adobe pdf*) to read because we've only barely scratched the surface of things in this short paper.

Fitzpatrick's website is at <http://www.amperefitz.com>

Another older website carrying Fitzpatrick's works FREE is:  
<http://www.rbduncan.com>

[World Scientist Database - - Daniel P. Fitzpatrick Jr.](#)

[4 Decades of writings of Daniel P. Fitzpatrick Jr.](#)

Have a good day & visit my site at goodreads:

<http://www.goodreads.com/user/show/276352>

Click ANY of these [links](#) to get what you want

\*\*\*\*

Read my **latest** book FREE: (these two [links](#) below)



[http://www.amperefitz.com/ua\\_20071020\\_ck\\_ds\\_jm\\_ds.pdf](http://www.amperefitz.com/ua_20071020_ck_ds_jm_ds.pdf) (This is the book in Adobe)

or

<http://www.amperefitz.com/unvasleep.htm> (This book [link](#) opens faster if you have dial up.)

While all the links on this page are OK and presently working, unfortunately only about two thirds (2/3) of the links I gave, years ago, as proof (click & see: <http://www.amperefitz.com/presskit.html>) for statements in this latest book, published in the year **MMVI**, are now still working **BUT** your search engine will probably take you to a similar area where you should be able to read similar proof material.

\*\*\*\*

## **& super popular now:**

[\*OED - Feynman's Strange Theory of Light and Matter\*](#) "Feynman's Strange Theory of Light and Matter"

<http://amperefitz.com/einsteins.cos.c.htm> Einstein's Cosmological Constant.

<http://www.amperefitz.com/two.magnets.htm> Two magnets will show you more than thousands of books.

<http://amperefitz.com/exexshorttoe.html> Extra short Theory of Everything.

<http://www.amperefitz.com/45years.htm> 45 Years of Putting this Jigsaw Puzzle together - of unifying Gravity with all the other forces.

<http://www.amperefitz.com/question.htm> "Ampere's Long Wire Law is a fact!"

<http://www.amperefitz.com/why.general.relativity.htm> Why we have General Relativity or why mass increases with speed."

<http://amperefitz.com/answers.to.mendel.htm> "Dan Fitzpatrick comments on Theoretical Physicist Mendel Sachs' Beliefs."

<http://amperefitz.com/quarkspin.htm> "While the electron spin causes magnetism, GRAVITY & INERTIA are caused by the QUARK SPIN."

<http://amperefitz.com/abstract.htm> "ABSTRACT of scalar, standing wave concept."

<http://amperefitz.com/lawrm.htm> "It all begins with this all important science law."

<http://amperefitz.com/energy.htm> "All energy is a form of binding energy." (science) e-letter by Fitzpatrick.

<http://amperefitz.com/dark.m.e> Why NASA tells us we have 72% Dark Energy, 23% Dark Matter and 4.6% Atoms.

<http://amperefitz.com/gold1.html> More wave and scalar wave questions answered by Fitzpatrick.

<http://amperefitz.com/fermbos.htm> ELECTRONS are fermions but not when paired spin up - spin down."

<http://amperefitz.com/bond.strengths.htm> "Sigma Bond strengths in the microcosm."

<http://www.amperefitz.com/acceleratingexpandinguniverse.htm> "Accelerating, expanding universe."

<http://amperefitz.com/not.quite.everything.for.a.theory.of.everything.htm> "Not Quite Everything for a Theory of Everything."

[Schrödinger's Universe](#) **Schrodinger's Universe**

<http://rbduncan.com/why.we.have.gravity.htm> "Why we have GRAVITY and why we have Centrifugal Force.

<http://amperefitz.com/einsteins.blunder.htm> "Einstein's Biggest Blunder - Wasn't?"

<http://amperefitz.com/plawrm.htm> "Electrons normally repel BUT . . ." says Dan Fitzpatrick Jr.

[http://www.rbduncan.com/letter\\_june2004.htm](http://www.rbduncan.com/letter_june2004.htm) "And Hubble warned us this was NOT an expanding universe."

<http://www.rbduncan.com/binary.htm> Binary Stars act exactly like Electrons.

<http://rbduncan.com/TOEbyFitzpatrick.htm> A "Theory of Everything" by Daniel P. Fitzpatrick Jr.

<http://rbduncan.com/boson+.htm> Bosons?

[http://www.rbduncan.com/letter\\_june2004.htm](http://www.rbduncan.com/letter_june2004.htm) Newton and Einstein only gave us HALF the story.

<http://www.rbduncan.com/mybook.htm> "A New Science Tool" (science) e-book by Fitzpatrick

<http://rbduncan.com/Gspeed.htm> "Speed of Gravity is  $9 \times 10^{16}$  meters per second."

<http://rbduncan.com/phase.coherence.htm> Phase Coherence and the Inverse Square law.

<http://amperefitz.com/lisiimp.htm> "Why Garrett Lisi's Model is so important."

<http://amperefitz.com/ffacts.htm> "Little Known Facts about Well known science Terms" (science) e-book by Fitzpatrick.

[Mach's principle](#)

[Stephen Wolfram](#)

**Adobe [pdf links](#) below give you **more important** actual science about what is really going on in our universe.**

QUICK version of Ampere's Laws.

<http://amperefitz.com/qamp.pdf>

Two magnets will show you more than thousands of books.

<http://amperefitz.com/two-magnets.pdf>

Sigma bond strengths in the microcosm

<http://www.amperefitz.com/bond.strengths.pdf>

"An important Quark message no one is heeding!"

<http://amperefitz.com/quarkspin.pdf>

45 Years of Putting this Jigsaw Puzzle together - of unifying Gravity with all the other forces."

<http://www.amperefitz.com/45years.pdf>

"Ampere's Long Wire Law is a fact!"

<http://amperefitz.com/question.pdf>

"Affenstall Science Christmas Message"

<http://amperefitz.com/affenstall.pdf>

"Dan Fitzpatrick comments on Theoretical Physicist Mendel Sachs' Beliefs."

<http://amperefitz.com/answers.to.mendel.pdf>

"Why we have general relativity or why mass increases with speed."

<http://amperefitz.com/why.general.relativity.pdf>

"Fitz answers some Scalar Wave questions."

<http://amperefitz.com/26nov2006.pdf>

"And Hubble warned us this was NOT an expanding universe."

<http://amperefitz.com/lj2004.pdf>

"Ampere really gave us this Relative Motion Law in 1825 for things he knew were moving in the wire (electrons)."

<http://amperefitz.com/relMlaw.pdf>

"Fitz talks about some basic problems in physics." - by Fitzpatrick.

<http://amperefitz.com/3dec2006.pdf>

"Little Known Facts about Well known science Terms" (science) e-book by Fitzpatrick:

<http://amperefitz.com/ffacts.pdf>

"Lisi's E8 model seems to show us why we get space & time!"

<http://amperefitz.com/e8.pdf>

"Why Garrett Lisi's Model is so important."

<http://amperefitz.com/lisi-important.pdf>

"What Dr. Milo Wolff says connects with what A. G. Lisi is showing."

<http://amperefitz.com/a.g.lisi.pdf>

A radioman sees us all as radios tuned in to this universe.

<http://amperefitz.com/noaether.pdf>

WHEN DID YOU PUBLISH "Out-of-phase waves give us space and repulsive force."

<http://amperefitz.com/4apr04caroline.pdf>

But then Caroline - from Cambridge - repudiated what she had discovered: one of the most important scientific discoveries EVER MADE! Incredible! Simply Incredible!

<http://amperefitz.com/Carolines.pdf>

"Why we have GRAVITY."

<http://amperefitz.com/why.we.have.gravity.pdf>

"Speed of Gravity is  $9 \times 10^{16}$  meters per second."

<http://amperefitz.com/Gspeed.pdf>

"Einstein's Principle of Equivalence or why gravity acts like acceleration."

<http://amperefitz.com/principle.of.equivalence.pdf>

Is Saul Perlmutter explaining the reason for us having the principle of equivalence?

<http://amperefitz.com/saultony.pdf>

"It's understanding the Binding Energy Curve" says Dan Fitzpatrick Jr.

<http://amperefitz.com/b.e.curve.pdf>

"All energy is a form of binding energy." (science) e-letter by Fitzpatrick.

<http://amperefitz.com/energy.pdf>

"Shedding light on Energy Quanta."

[http://amperefitz.com/letter\\_july2003.pdf](http://amperefitz.com/letter_july2003.pdf)