International Journal of Radiography Imaging & Radiation Therapy

IJRIRT, 3(1): 66-83 www.scitcentral.com



Original Research Article: Open Access

Light to Radial Velocities

Leonard Van Zanten*

*Riverside Ca. 92505, USA.

Received February 27, 2020; Revised March 12, 2020; Accepted March 14, 2020

ABSTRACT

In this essay I came to define some of the fundamentals in the nature of magnetic and electric, as well as the nature of light for its waves in its computations for radial velocities with its mathematics whereby to find the radial velocity of any object in space. And it illustrates something new and unheard of to everyone -how and why the expansion and contraction of the waves of the spectrum are not proportional to the change in velocity for all lengths. How all waves for their production are based upon the protractor, that as such plays havoc upon the way by which astronomers find their radial velocities, none of which therefore can be correct. Additionally; I took to define electricity in greater and never before heard of details.

Keywords: Light, Velocity, Radial, Electric, Magnetic

INTRODUCTION

Some of the fatal errors that man has made in his science regarding magnetic waves is; first of all to call them "electromagnetic". Secondly; to presume them to be "continues" as if any-one wavelet connects to the other. Thirdly; to super-impose them at different lengths. And fourthly; to call them by frequencies, as if we are generating the full number of events able to fit within a length. And grave as these errors are-they are minor compared to man's vision of the atom that has been constructed of single sided coins. As well as man's theory in how his magnetic waves are generated by what can be compared to a mouse hurling an elephant.

And to detail these one by one, magnetic displays a pattern (coordinate) of force that by lines and direction of movement resembles that of a figure eight (8) also erroneously seen as two circles to a center. Electric on the other hand is no less a force of magnetic. It being a rotating string of magnetic, that like unto its stationary cousin, also presents the north and south polarities but found at the sides of any conductor illustrated by **Figure 1**.

J.J. Thompson with his "discovery of the electron" therefore is false – and his Nobel prize a theft - as experiments have proven and will continue to prove. By illustration **Figure 1**, place a 12-volt battery on any one conductor of electricity and hold a regular magnet next to it. That conductor will then **be push/pulled** to that magnet at the rate of its voltage namely its speed of rotation, the 12 rotations/s, or 120 v to 120 rotations/s/. The pattern of that rotating magnetic field is like unto its stationary cousin, namely; "by figures of eight". All because in generating that electricity we caused the straight stationary lines of a field to twist over one another becoming a twisted line of magnetic.

Illustration in **Figure 1** is very plain and very simple; each set of cross-over is a figure eight of force bound together at their equatorial regions with the center of that eight presenting that typical linear power of magnetic from south to north. As therefore that current rotates it alternately brings these polarities to that stationary magnet whereby of course it is push/pulled.

Simple evidence is it not? Something anyone can do for himself, that of course clearly defeats J.J. Thompson's interpretation of his experiment, as if it were only negative particles on the move, or more properly pronounced as if it were only single sided coins on the move. For no entity can ever have only a positive side with no negative side. No coin, nor anything can ever be found to present but a single side. The terms as such are merely our point of view of the ends or sides of any one part or entity. We acclaim to have electrons and protons with but a single charge, but how or why is it that we have never as yet produced even a single one of these infamous parts so as to prove and convince us

Corresponding author: Leonard Van Zanten, Riverside Ca. 92505, USA, Tel: 1-951-314-5012; E-mail: lenvanzanten@msn.com.

Citation: Zanten LV. (2021) Light to Radial Velocities. Int J Radiography Imaging Radiat Ther, 3(1): 66-83.

Copyright: ©2021 Zanten LV. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.



Figure 1. Evidence to electricity as none other than a rotating magnetic field.

of our fallacy? It is <u>because they have never been found</u> <u>nor ever been detected</u>, any statement to the contrary is obviously false, a lie by misconceptions of our experiments.

How for example will we explain that wire – with only negative parts on the move - to be push/pulled? Obviously it must contain both sides of the coin! Experiments do not lie, nor can any duly proven fact be disproved. But man is prone to be deceived by eyesight whereby he fails in the interpretation of his experiments. And yes I do know that insight is an essential factor, something that can only be granted and not earned, nor acquired other than by a gift of man's Creator.

ONCE AGAIN

But let us do this once again with illustrations to a greater detail if hopefully by some insight it may convince us of our errors. First to make a quotation: "Scientists worked with electricity long before they understood that current was made of electrons. The cathode tube was a prime example. By switching on some voltage, scientists could make fluorescent streams of electricity travel from the bottom part of a glass tube to the top -- but no one knew how it worked. Some thought the rays were a wave traveling through mysterious "ether" which they thought permeated all space. Others thought the rays were streams of particles." For the first sentence man still does not know what electricity is; nor how it works. We construct transformers but have not a clue as to the fundamentals thereof how and why they work as they do. No doubt an eye opener to most everyone when in this essay I come to explain the true fundamentals of those transformers.



Figure 2. J.J. Thompson's experiment-Impossible.

Here are four illustrations. By **Figure 2**, electricity is shown in a straight line across as were it particles. Yet by **Figure 3**, we know very well that electricity at its cathode and anode are counter rotating movements. Why then are those trees in the forest not seen? Are we blind? Too many trees to look at? How can we even think of particles when our experiments show that electricity to be a rotating entity and how it at all times is at odds with itself by two counter rotating strings of movement interweaving with one another? Shall we answer these questions, or just leave them be as food for thought? And so **Figure 2** is tossed, but no less for **Figure 4**, an experiment not in any way understood by its practitioners.



Figure 3. Electricity as counter rotating fields.



Figure 4. Not understood.

Here too those two counter rotating fields are likewise not illustrated, but as if these were no more than a stream of particles heading into one direction. Yet we know from our old TV tubes that these so called particles will go into any and all directions. And from and by **Figure 1** how these rascals will push/pull to any magnet.

Experiments do not lie, but without eyesight how is one to distinguish light from darkness? How do we dare to make illustrations like **Figures 2 and 3**, and call that error of ourselves "the discovery of something that cannot exist"? As in fact we know very well that no coin with but one side can possibly exist. Have we ever found any electrical circuit that lacked a positive, yet had a negative, or visa versa? No, of course not. Nor can I be defeated in that reasoning since I am merely conveying to us the truth, the facts as nature shows them to be.

Are we therefore intentionally deceiving the minds of our students, ruining our very own offspring - while we know better? My illustration **Figure 1** is no deception it really works, it displays the truth in nature that at the same time contradicts both of man's illustration by **Figures 2 and 3**. And so how will we, and our teachers, as all men in the sciences reconcile themselves with their theories verses the truth? <u>Need I say more?</u>



Figure 5. Electricity as counter rotating fields.



Figure 6. Twisting magnetic lines into a rotating magnetic field.

With nature confirming my speech I cannot be in error. For here again what is the idea of coming up with particles on the move as were it electricity when by illustration **Figure 6**, we are clearly demonstrating that we are picking up on magnetic lines of movement? And by picking up on lines of movement twisting them into a braid - how shall that braid be anything else but also movement, and magnetic at that?

Does not that make good sense? For it is a stationary magnetic flux that is utilized by which to form, or bring forth a rotating magnetic flux, something erroneously called electrical. But just as Tesla as well as Thomas Edison, both having constructed generators neither one had any understanding of how their devices worked. The record of history by their own arguments clearly reveal their ignorance. And so - now that we do have electricity and having put Thomas Edison as well as Tesla down under it is

high time for us to learn what it really is that we have done, to as it might be said, <u>come to a reckoning.</u>

What more now shall I plot down by which to convince us of our errors in the foregoing illustrations? Neither Edison nor Tesla were of a mind to be educated, and why then should we? Shall I therefore end my speech to say no more, or continue for them to whom knowledge is not an affliction? Sadly enough I have no choice, I was created to teach, and so I must teach willing or not.

Let us then come to the first fatal error – to put the terms electro together with magnetic, a bird that has never as yet existed, nor will it ever be found. Magnetic is straight, electric is circular. Or; magnetic is linear, electric is angular. Or; magnetic is stationary, electric is rotating. To thus coin the word "electromagnetic" what in fact are we pronouncing? We in all reality are saying <u>that we can walk straight in a circle.</u>



Figure 7. One or the other, not both.

The reference here is to **Figure 7**. I have never been able to walk in a circle straight on, nor do I wish to mention it **lest I be commended for an asylum.** Let's be realistic, we can walk in a straight line or in a circle but not both of them simultaneously. Therefore, the terms of magnetic and electro <u>are never at all to be connected</u>, to do so lacks apprehension, it lacks insight, it fails for knowledge. We came to it because we had never as yet been educated in the fundamentals of nature.

But that need no longer be so - if we are humble enough to recognize our frailties and accept them as such.



Figure 8. Wavelets never continues.

The second fatal error can be demonstrated by **Figure 8**. Here we have a conveyor belt moving at 100 ft per min. If then we wish our boxes placed upon it to be continues, meaning one touching the next, we must place them upon that belt at the rate of 100 each and every minute.

This never happens does it? Unless we slow down the belt or work ourselves to death. In this case with the boxes we can do both, but not so with natures magnetic conveyor belt since the velocity of that fundamental movement is at all times an unwavering velocity to the tune of 300,000 km/s. To thus fill that line moving at least six times around the whole world in any one second, we must deposit 300 billion boxes that are one-meter long each and every second upon that belt. And that my dear reader is also never done wherefore **no magnetic wave of any kind is ever continues.**

With this exception that the electrical is always continues and so are those inhibiting our magnets, because these are at all times connected to their source, while the waves like of light always travel free from their source. Cut any electrical circuit and it will show itself as if it no longer exists. It however still exists but no longer functioning. The magnetic as well as the electrical can only exist or function with a full circular loop. We can cut the rotating type of magnetic, but never the stationary magnetic. Break a magnet in halves and it will become two magnets. Breaking the rotating magnetic creates open ends, a none functional entity.



Figure 9. The magnetic conveyor belt.

Figure 9 illustrates the constant at which all magnetic waves are at all times transported to the tune of 300,000 km/s. When therefore we create a pulse like at "A" to "B" to create a so called indent, an angular momentum and we do so at the speed of constant, then "A" to "B", as well as "B" towards "C" are at the same velocity and no wave-form is produced. But if A to B is 1 angstrom and we wish to have a wavelength at 7000 A, the half-length (B to C) would be 3500 A. And 300,000 divided by 3500 is 85.7 km/s. Red light therefore stands at the factor of 1 to 3500. 85.7 km/s then is a velocity obtained of and by atoms, and not otherwise.

Notice how in producing waves it is never to full length, but always half lengths, Full lengths only exist mathematically, **never in reality.** As for example electricity at the rate of 120 rotations/s heats a tungsten element; that rate of movement in itself is not sufficient to produce light, but it does accelerate the atomic movement that then in turn comes to the rate of producing light. But how shall any one wavelet be continues with the next when a pulse is a momentary event that must come to its return whereby to restart again?

A pulse to produce a radar or microwave signal is done magnetically utilizing cavities. When that comes to a wavelength of 12 cm, it in 300,000 km comes to a rate of events at 2.5 billion as the possible frequency of it. But with our device we are only pumping those pulses at a rate of – let's say – 1-million events. That comes to a spacing of 2500 km between wavelets, between events. Or have we yet to realize that frequency - is nothing other than events per units in time? If we are educated we will do away with mentioning everything by frequencies. In a previous essay published by the "Journal of Advances in Physics" [1] I wrote:

"If there be 100 companies wishing their own highway in the sky by which to transmit voice communication - then allocate each one of them a different wavelength by which to transmit the common set of frequencies. For it sounds ludicrous to say that one must operate on a certain frequency, since each and every one of them without any choice in the matter must transmit by the same frequency, namely the frequency at which voice and musical impulses are brought about. Any and all voice communication cannot be deposited faster than the speed of sound or set for a number of frequencies greater than what it is spoken, the maximum at about 15 KHz. Therefore, if the FCC tells you that you must transmit your voice communications at 800 million events per second, have them committed to the asylum for the insane. If however they tell you to use the 37.5 cm band then consider them educated, and allow them to leave the asylum."

The "Doppler" effect is one of the ways by which to find the velocity of any moving object. These waves then as illustrated by **Figure 10** are hardly continues. In radar it is more like this: When a pulsed signal is send at 10 thousand events per second, (each 1 meter long) there is a spacing of 30 kilometers between each of these 10 thousand wavelets. When these are bounced off (reflected) from an oncoming vehicle traveling at a speed equal to reducing that spacing by a factor of ten, the reflected signal will come to a count of 11 thousand events that we calibrate into km or miles per hour. Or in a receding vehicle down to 9 thousand events.



Figure 10. None existent.

It is therefore not as illustrated by **Figure 10** in any continues wave, not with radar nor with light or any wave of the magnetic spectrum. Who in the world can speak fast enough to deposit 800 million events on any one line or conveyor belt as it is likened to? Or what device do we have to create impulses at that rate of events? Our electricity in an incandescent lamp certainly does not come anywhere near to that, considering that the power companies only come to a quarter million rotations at their high voltage wires.

But like taking a very large gear by which to turn a much smaller gear and that again to again a smaller gear, so we come to high speed rotations and consequent high-speed impulses. From 1000 rpm to a factor of 100 comes to one hundred thousand and that by another factor of 100 comes to a rate of 10 million. In that way we are driving the atoms in a tungsten element to the tune of producing those minute wavelengths of light. Or a torch upon a metal bar to raise the spin of the atoms to the tune of light. With radio we are driving whole molecules by number of to come to its wavelengths, that in turn take their circumference around a great number of atoms and molecules. Therefore, also these can pass through walls while light for its minute circumference is stopped at the first atom larger than its diameter.

Waves Never Continues

But am I convincing? Example: If a 5 cm carrier wave is produced it will travel at the diameter of 0.004584 cm, its relative velocity then will be 299,138 km/s. If then we wish to imbed an 8/cm wave upon it as our code, the 8/cm will have a relative velocity of 299,461 km/s. The 8/cm wave then cannot possibly be imbedded because it will and must travel 323 km/s faster than the 5/cm wave. Conclusively we can never at any time attach or imbed any wave upon another wave of any different dimension, since each different wave always travels by its own relative velocity.

But we ought to know all this, should we not – very well knowing that blue light travels slower than red light, and turns shorter than the red. And so where is our logic? Where did our common sense hide itself? Anyone that tells us that he is imbedding a voice communication upon a carrier wave – as they continually do - is uneducated and without common sense.

Nor is it possible to generate any wavelength to its maximum frequency. The 5/cm wave has room for 30 billion wavelets end-to-end in 300,000 km to pass in one second. If then we could turn a switch on and off at the speed of a wave at 30 billion times in one second, the one would be 15 billion, with off 15 billion. Our frequency would then be 15 billion, only half of what it can contain. Or for light a length at 5500 A, with 500 trillion events per second, it still would be a frequency of 250 trillion, more than what any nuclear bomb produces by which anyone will be burned and blinded. Nor therefore can these many wavelets be continue, but each individual is spaced by the distance of another individual.

But why should we wish to come to such number of events when even a fraction of them will do the job? When red light comes to us at no more than 50 cycles, it seems to flicker, so we increased it to 60 cycles. If then we receive 10 thousand red wavelets per second from the sun, by which to warm ourselves in full light, how fast would we disintegrate by receiving 420 trillion each and every second on any one line from the sun? I venture to say less than a second.

We do not have any device to make anything turn off and on at that rate, or even to speak that fast. If we generate 15,000 voice impulses per second on a 5/cm band there are 2 million open spaces between wavelets, and that can hardly be considered continues. When only 15,000 wavelets are on a line able to contain at least 300 billion of them, it appears more like an empty line, yet all of these 15,000 arrive in one single second. And for the lady at the other end to make out weather we love her or not, we cannot speak to her any faster than those 15,000 events per second or she would hear no more than a whine.

The waves of the spectrum for all its octaves are never at all continues, these come as individual wavelets, like a code placed upon a line, and they serve us as codes in much the same way as done with the old telegraphs, and that can be done with any of them inclusive those of light. The common way is to set up a standard frequency, then to vary the impulses, modulation as it is called. These impulses as codes serve us and nature in many ways each in their own way for size and multitude. For just as a picture can be converted into wavelets, it by the same token can be reconverted into a visible picture again.

Light and microwaves from the sun serve us for warmth simply by their rotation that as they strike upon the larger atoms cause an increase in their rotation that in turn spells heat, a higher temperature. The greater the number of them falling upon any one spot will increase that temperature, like a magnifying lens to start a fire. For that is also why we sweat at the equator and freeze at the polar region, the quantity of waves at any one area. As now the electrical wave is at all times a "<u>continues</u>" format and that obviously so since it is at all times connected to a source, and likewise those of the linear magnetic flow always inhibiting their source, yet these show themselves in circles rather than conventional waves. The electrical as a rotating magnetic format [2] first of all shows itself in the same manner like any magnet, but because it rotates it alternately brings its north and south polarity to our probes that then can be imprinted upon a screen at any rotational speed that we desire making its up and down <u>polarity</u> "<u>appear</u>" as waves.

All other waves are like momentary indents imbedded upon the fundamental movements and at that instantly taken away by the constant. And since we can't very well observe a single wavelet traveling at the speed of light upon any screen these waves can never be seen, nor displayed. Nor can we at any time cut any line of magnetic of any figure of eight. These are a circle of movement laid half over resembling the figure of eight. And eight mind you are forever, and at that untouchable.

Mathematics now is not the best side of man, which is primarily due to a lack of knowledge in fundamentals, as well as recognizing common sense. How for example was the speed of light calculated? It appears we had no means to calculate the velocity of any wave; instead it was measured and accepted at 299.792 km/s in space. That particular measure however fails to provide at what wavelength that was. Although understandably when the waves arrive at all lengths once cannot just pick one unless we make our readings with a single wavelength.

As then all waves travel with an angular moment in conjunction with its linear movement (like unto a coiled spring) it must pass by a certain width, an amplitude. And how much shall that be, and/or how does one go about discovering that amplitude for a specific measure thereof? For the velocity of any wave can always be found mathematically as long as we have its particulars, length, width, and constant. A wave is never a line, or else it is not a wave, wherefore its amplitude is as important as its length.

I now am enabled to show how simple it is to mathematically obtain the velocity of any wave for its distance in time, along with its correct amplitude. I did so by utilizing the longest of wavelength in the optic range by our reading of 299,792 km/s. Since then that is a velocity <u>for</u> <u>distance in time</u> we must also have a velocity whereby the waves are factually transported, like that of magnetic that we have taken at an arbitrary measure of 300.000 km/s. That then is the **velocity of a straight** magnetic line without any angular moment.

Consequently, when we come to calculate a wave of that line, its net velocity will always be less to the constant since it must pass by a wave formation that **adds its angular to its linear,** reducing its speed into a velocity for distance in time. And so now we have two of the three factors, the length that we wish to have our data on, and the constant for our calculation. Then comes the amplitude that we have yet to discover. And taking the 7000A length its amplitude must correspond to that velocity of 299.792/km/s, if not our findings would be in error. And it must be large enough to pass around the atoms in the air, for we know that the 7000A length always passes through air without any obstruction but not so upon the surface of the earth where the atoms are too large for light to pass. Or even the water molecules in the air to block the waves showing us the clouds.

So I came up with an amplitude in the diameter of 1.5414 A that times 3.14 comes to a circumference of 4.84 A. Here we add that angular moment to the nominal length of 7000 to 7004.84 A - that then divided into the constant comes to 42.8275 etc. and that time the nominal length of 7000 comes to 299.792/km/s. That circumference therefore is correct – as it must be correct - since it is just large enough to pass the atom/molecules of the air and in glass as well as in water, and it corresponds to the velocity that was obtained.

Only in water or glass the oxygen atoms have several atoms at its side, at which the light in circumventing them sooner or later come to strike at the connecting points of these hydrogen atoms hanging at its side. Therefore in water, like the ocean, the waves of light may pass around billions of those molecules yet sooner or later it is bound to strike upon the connecting points and be terminated, wherefore the shortest of all may reach down as far as 600 ft. in water at which time all of the light waves will be terminated. That is how and why it is dark deep down in the ocean, while its depth is but a mere ten kilometer, while from the sun light travels unobstructed for some 94 million miles.



Figure 11. Light's mode of travel having to go around atoms by a constant velocity is reduced for distance in time called its "relative" velocity when measured straight on.

Now that we have the 3 primary factors by which to perform our mathematics, **Figure 11**; will help to illustrate just how that comes about. From "A" to "C" (the crest to crest measure) is the <u>nominal length</u> of the wave as it rotates forward around the perimeter of the atoms in its path. The reason that it rotates is because all wavelets are at all times formed in that manner and are at all times singular wavelets, like a code or indent transported by the all-pervading movement that as such is called the fundamental movement of nature. And since; as far as we can determine; it has a fixed rate of velocity at 300,000 km/sec, therefore it is termed the "constant" [3].

The same then is often referred to as the magnetic motion that is found throughout the whole universe forming and upholding all the mass within it, stars, galaxies, planets, and all else. That fundamental movement in velocity then is procured by what is yet more fundamental by which all atoms come to their nature of being. But that is deep seated, and nor for discussion. As then the format of the wave proceeds from point "A" to "C" it does so over "B" passing around a perimeter being driven at the rate of 300.000/km/sec. As thus that format passes around a circumference (A/B/C) the net velocity of the whole is reduced compared to that velocity it would have traveled in a straight line from "A" to "C:

Light therefore cannot be thought of nor calculated on any single line because <u>it is a wave</u> and <u>a wave presents an angular moment to be incorporated in the calculation for its net velocity</u>. As then I said that; "It is a wave". A wave never travels as a wave, or even that it is a wave; it is no more than a linear movement traveling by a circular path, **like unto a coiled spring**. Therefore, when looking at its path it <u>only appears</u> as a wave. Real waves are found with water and with sound.

The formula then by which to find the velocity for distance in time called its "relative velocity" is simply to add the circumference to the nominal length (as the real full length) divided into the velocity of constant - that then is multiplied by the nominal length. Conclusively there are always two velocities of any wave, nor therefore can the notation of the speed of light be written as c. But rather as V_c, as the notation for the velocity of constant, that never needs to be calculated residing at 300.000 km/s. With its time in distance velocity as R_v , meaning relative velocity. The term c therefore is abolished as it must be, with the formula as follows:

Length 7000 angstroms, amplitude $1.5414a \times 3.14 = 4.84 + 7000 = 7004.84a$ into 300.000; resultant times 7000 is 299.792 km/s. Or; 4000a at 4004.84 into 300.000 times 4000 = 299.637/km/s. The diameter at 1.5414 A is correct for those of light, anywhere from 1000 A to about 10.000 A. Any other wave like those of radio is then bound to travel around thousands of atoms within its amplitude, while for light it is around single atoms. If not, then light could pass through walls like those of radio, and we would never see the surface of anything. I then estimate the increment for larger and larger waves to their diameter to come by a factor

of ten. A 10 meter wave would thus come to a circumference of 4.84/cm at a velocity of 298.554 km/s.

Turns of Movement

I promised to define the fundamentals whereby transformers operate. By **Figure 12** when we input 200 volts into 10 turns at a metal bar, and we place 50 turns at the output end, the voltage is raised 5 times over to 1000 volts. Shall then the electrical in the input coil be transferred to the output coil? And how would it do so through the metal?

The answer is yes as well as no. The metal core acts as a generator, a real generator, for there is no physical contact between the input and output coils. But in order to accomplish that feat we in principle must do the same thing that we do by a standard generator (as shown by **Figure 6**) in short – **to cause rotations.** This is done by applying an alternating current to the input that in all reality serves as a pump, or like a piston to drive a wheel or crankshaft into rotation. The input current as a rotational magnetic field sets up a linear magnetic field within the core that will conduct its stationary field into the output coil. Only there can be no rotation in that output coil unless and until we switch that magnetic field within the core back and forth (alternating) that is done by the AC application at the input coil. Like a steam locomotive is driven.



Figure 12. Stationary generator.

This device thus really is a generator, although they are called transformers. If per example we applied a direct current to the turns at the input, we would merely magnetize the bar to set up a linear field within it. Here then is something for us to realize, when we think of alternating current, we think of a back and forth switching, first one direction, then stopping and going back the other direction. But with our electricity and any other magnetic inputs like waves etc, this is not so. This is most logical and obvious since that current is a rotational movement to begin with. So it is that the alternating magnetic field in the core becomes a rotating field that then conducts its rotation in the output coil, where it becomes a separate field because it is physically isolated from the metal. The core here with its AC input does the same thing that the armature does in conventional generators.



Figure 13. Flow of AC current.

Then for the question as to how AC works: By illustration **Figure 13**, the AC as it comes by number 1 to number 2, does not stop there to return but **goes around returning** by number 3 to 4. Then as it is forced into the other direction it **continues the circle** indicated by the broken line number 4 to 5. It therefore in all reality completes a figure eight of movement, **as in rotating by that pattern**. This is obvious since the line of that rotating field is always rotating, following the wavy formation of the eight as illustrated by **Figure 13**.



Figure 14. Electric wave in a conductor.

One of these wave-lines in **Figure 14** is always into one direction, with the other in the opposite direction, as illustrated. More accurately that line as such is constructed of segments each single figure eight of movement being a part of that line. Accordingly, even electricity is made up of many segments coupled together, unlike waves in which the segments are always separate from one another.

The most fascinating part however is that turns are turns, and I am going to repeat it, how <u>turns are turns</u>. And what that means is; -- be it an immaterial coordinate of movement in rotation as we conduct into the core, or on the wire, - these themselves are but physical entities, even as the turns are. **But turns compensate for turns, all because turns are turns**. At the input there are but 10 turns while we placed 50 physical turns at the output, and in so doing because turns are turns, we increased the rate of rotation 5 times over.

Here it shows again that electricity is none other than magnetic movement and that **in and by rotation.** And as in any movement there is the linear and the angular, so magnetic being none other than a specific coordinate of movement - has its linear and angular. **The angular being termed electrical, with the linear as plain magnetic**. But why does it do so; namely that rotational magnetic field to increase or decrease its rotational velocity simply by adding or taking away turns, physical turns? For while the rotation of an armature comes to something moving, the wire laid into a circle is a none moving physical turn.



Figure 15. Fundamentals into and of magnetic.

And for that quest by **Figure 15** the magnetic movement by any straight line comes to the velocity of 300,000 km/s illustrated by points X to Y. Then if we insert physical turns into that wire and pass our electrical movement from M to N; it still wants to get from one point to the next at 300,000 km/s. As then from X to Y there was zero voltage, zero turns of rotation, it from M to N having to pass in a circle some 20 times - **it's entire length will now have a rotational speed of 20 each and every second.**

As then we look at this pondering in our mind - how it is that by no rotational movement rotation comes about, how that can be with no more than a wire would in circles? And yet by those stationary circles the magnetic movement brought upon it comes to rotate. True as that is, that magnetic movement starting out at M, was of course a rotating field of force to begin with, because it was electricity, and electricity does not subsist without rotation. If thus we started out with a none rotating line passing it through the circles it would not cause that line to rotate on account of it.

But then we are not here speaking of a line, but rather of a braided line and a braided line must always have a rotation or else it would not be braided, not be electric. Yet for as much as these turns of wire do indeed increase the rate of rotation – these do indeed act additionally. Wherefore where I said; **"True as that is,"** <u>does indeed come to bear upon it.</u>

That current then from M will not arrive at point N at a velocity of constant, but by a reduction **for time in distance** by way of those 20 turns that it was forced to pass. Notice here that "**Movement into distance is bound to a timing factor**". And yes, how shall I put that to grant my reader the same depth of insight given me? Forcing something so

immaterial into a rotation by physical means to instigate immaterial rotation. No, I am not really able to place the depths of my thoughts into words. The spiritual far exceeds the means to physical, and so the beauty of mind in all reality cannot be illustrated, wherefore I am left alone with it. Wisdom is most grandiose but must be had in order to behold its incomparable beauty. For She at all times is incomparable.

As then considering that coil to have a circumference of 5 cm, 20 times 5 = 100 cm. Wherefore in 1 second it came short by 100 cm in the span of 300,000 km. At the coil from R to P that coil (used to drive sparkplugs) has sufficient turns to raise its rotational velocity to 15,000 volts. And considering its circumference to be 4 cm times 15,000 turns comes to 60,000 cm, down from 30 billion-cm to 29 billion 999 million 940 thousand-cm/s – as it would be for its relative velocity. Accordingly considering a wavelength of 10-cm times circumference of 4 cm = 14 cm. 300,000 then divided by 14 times 10 comes to 214.285.7 km/s.

All this no doubt is a new knowledge, something as yet unheard of - all because we first had to learn what electricity really is. And the fact that the rate of rotation can be raised or lowered simply by physical turns of wire - also confirms electricity for a rotating agent. It does not matter if first of all our armature brought it to rotation into what are none physical rotations, it will increase that rate of rotation simply by additionally forcing it around a number of physical turns. "None physical rotations" then means coordinates, a coordinate of movement passing over and around the atoms of the conductor (Figure 14). The current never at all moves any of those atoms, it just uses them - just as an automobile uses the road to travel upon. Circular movement thus creates again circular movement. And all such movement is none physical as motion is a none physical entity operating by coordinates, by patterns of. Or at least to us, and to our standards it is so, since I am not able to find words for the greater depth of it.

But none of these can actually be called movement unless and until it is "upon" or "by" physical entities. Like an airplane is a physical entity, while its movement through the air is none physical, and yet how dependent that none physical is upon the physical, the air as well as its own body. For so also I came to say; "Nature is - **Matter in Motion by Coordination**". And as such **movement adheres to matter in and by coordinates.** Motion then is not conductive with the exception of that one and only fundamental movement. And so you see I am trying to paint the unseen on a canvas to be seen.

While then it lays hold of matter, it is not conductive to matter, but conductive to the movement that resides upon matter, and whereby matter became matter, **and is at all times maintained as matter**. (As one of the secrets I will **reveal**). A mouth full is it not? And yes how easy it is for me to understand things by but a few words, while to relate the same to others I am forced to use many words.

Another way to clarify it is how the atoms in a copper wire are all linked together magnetically that as such present the multitude of the small segments along which the greater or overall coordinate, like that of a rotating magnetic coordinate, takes its path, it being conductive to each and every one of them. This however is not true for all substances, but for those only whose coordinates are compatible to that specific coordinate by which electricity is formulated, and the same being true for the linear magnetic. We simply refer to them as conductive or none conductive, the cause for which lies in their coordinates, in the pattern of movement by which these exist.

This then comes in handy for us, by way of diodes; these in their coordinate have a very specific and ridged rotation of movement, being conductive to the electrical format yes, but only in a single direction of rotation. Therefore, by passing AC through them we can weed out, or block any opposite rotation of movement.

And now in reference to **Figure 12**, to ask a question: How do we suppose our electrons would pass from the insulated input wire through the metal to the insulated output wire and go into circles 5 times as fast??? Would we not say that this is absurd, against all logic and common sense? That metal core is made up of atoms all of whom are magnetic fields joined one to the other. If then even the smallest of thief's with any amount of magnetic or electric upon it attempts to pass through these many atoms – it be arrested at the first atom.

There is no way in heaven or hell for any kind of mass to pass through such a maze of atoms. If one doubts my word try it out for yourself. Let us see how one can pass even the smallest of magnets through a maze of magnets. Do we not know that magnets have the ability to draw to one another as well as hold themselves at bay from one another? And how the spacing between them is full of magnetic lines conductive to all others?

What would be my reply? I could compare it to a vehicle attempting to pass through a maze of vehicles on a six-lane freeway all of whom are bumper to bumper blocking all lanes. The answer is; "No way." Or I could say as I will say; Wake up, we have been asleep too long, forget your teachers, forget your so-called experts since these will come to shame. All that think themselves to be wise in the earth will come to be known for fools, and why should you be one of them?

Learn from the lips of your Creator, for He alone is truth, and declares truth. He alone is able to instruct man rightly, for it was also Him who formed everything that is. And He does not leave us ignorant, but by those chosen of Him He teaches man. And He does expect us to have knowledge because we took from that tree of knowledge to know right from wrong. Therefore, we are without excuse. And so I might say: It is a fatal mistake to ignore His teaching. Do me and yourself a favor: - never, ever mention the word evolution on a positive tone or one will come to die a thousand deaths. I know, I do indeed know.

Calculating Spectral Shifts

Now that we have some insight into what magnetic is as well as electric, and how waves come about, and how to accurately calculate the (R_v) relative velocity of any wave let us see how that applies to some of our spectral readings. Below are the readings of how the astronomers came to a radial velocity. Quote:

Absorption lines of hydrogen, normally measured to be at 4861Å and 6563Å, were measured in the spectrum of a particular galaxy to be at 4923Å and 6647Å. And so: The speed of light, c, has a constant value of 300,000 km/sec. Therefore this galaxy has a red shift of z = [(4923 - 4861) / 4861] and z = [(6647 - 6563) / 6563] z = [62 / 4861] and z = [84 / 6563] z = 0.01275 It thus is moving away from us with a velocity, v = c * z = 300,000 km/sec * 0.01275 = 3826 km/sec [1] (Funny how I am not allowed to write seconds as sec, but others are, the very ones who reproved me, as noted above)

Now however let us calculate this **in the proper way rather than Hubble's way**, and utilize the waves circumference at 4.84A as a standard for it.

The laboratory velocities as noted for hydrogen are: 4861 into 300.000 = 299.701 km/s 6563 into 300.000 = 299.779 km/s Then the spectral shifts are: 4923 into 300.000 = 299.705 km/s 6647 into 300.000 = 299.782 km/s

Comparison

(299.705 minus 299.701 = **4 km/s**) (299.782 minus 299.779 = **3 km/s**)

The comparison of the laboratory from the factual shifts come to no more than 3 to 4/km/s, and not anywhere near the 3,826 km/s that the astronomers came up with. How therefore are they so much in error, since we - as we know - in this case cannot be in error?

Then for wisdom notice how in the shorter length it came to 4-km, while the longer length showed only 3-km, and how and why may that be? The answer is further on in this essay, by the protractor. To put it bluntly - in order to use light as a measuring tool one must foremost have a good understanding of it. And this we lacked because the Almighty Creator of man did not furnish man with that understanding.

This kind of wisdom the Lord teaches only to His sons, and then only to very few that those in turn may teach his fellows. King Solomon was one of them, and it pleased the Almighty One to grand me that wisdom and knowledge as well. Nor therefore was I taught in vain but that I in turn may teach others. My degree is not of any earthly standard, but of a much higher order; a master's degree in science as well as in philosophy. (This I mention because some are asking; "Who is this author, and how does he know so much?)

The error of the astronomers was in not understanding their measuring tool leading them to the wrong calculations; to use a two dimensional calculation failing to incorporate the angular moments in the wave. A percentage in expansion is not for a wave in its movement, or else it should not be called a wave. Moreover, the light as it was traveling away from that galaxy was moving at a clip of 299.701 km/s. If then the galaxy receded from it by 3,826 km/s - as noted - that adds up to 300.027 km/s, a velocity faster than the constant of all magnetic when it is a straight line.

In answer therefore to those many persons that obviously question the validity of any star or galaxy or anything moving that fast, or faster than the speed of light. Know this for a fact; That nothing in physical nature ever moves faster than the constant of magnetic, only in the spiritual world is the speed of light - like the speed of sound is to us.

But how can we be so sure that indeed that galaxy is even receding at a clip of 4 km/s? It may very well be at an idle with us, because that light as it traveled through space for let's say one light-year, how many red and/or blue shifts did it go through in that year? How many stars did it graze, and what other galaxies did it pass through? And who knows how many refractions it went through by which to determine its true position in the sky? In other words; our findings are at best estimations. The only thing that we can reasonably be sure of are those measures and velocities in our own backyard, our solar system.

Another example

When for example we calculate one of the most distant objects found, measured by the Lyman-alpha emission line at 1216 A shifted by 8300 A, their calculations came to a radial velocity of 287,000 km/s [4]. The 1216 A wave now has a velocity of 298.810 km/s. Its expansion to 9516 A brings it to a velocity of 299.847 km/s. The increase in velocity of that wave thus comes to 1037 km/s. That mind you is not anywhere near to 287,000 km/s. If thus we add the 287,000 velocity to the existing 298,910 (km/s) velocity we arrive at a radial difference of 585,910 km/s, nearly twice the speed of light.

Frequency

For any radial movement to find its velocity the frequency of the wave is irrelevant. Just as a pig has nothing in common with a dove, so the number of events for radial velocity is of no account. And that is especially so since events are never measured or calculated, if not so we would not be speaking of frequencies as we usually do. Frequencies are found mathematically for its tally in any length, or the full 300,000 km length. None of the waves of light received from outer space ever have a full frequency, nor from anything produced on earth.

When we speak of wavelengths, we utilize the full crest to crest measure for our calculations and for calculations only. While full lengths hardly ever exist, the wavelets of light on the move are rated by half lengths as the angular moment of them. For that is what they really are, **simply angular moments that rarely ever come to what we mathematically convert to full lengths**. (Check the heat in a microwave oven; it too reveals only half-lengths). Quite obviously when an entity for a specific distance has come to one half of a turn in the circumference, the full length for our mathematics will always be times 2.

And from that we <u>mathematically</u> come to a frequency, the number of lengths that will fit whereby the constant has its movement in one single second of time. But as we discussed earlier these angular moments as wavelets are never generated to the full capacity, nor need they be. Frequency is only useful for and in our mathematics, it has no other useful purpose. <u>Another term for frequency is "Captain</u> <u>Dunsel."</u> (Dunsel now was a term used by midshipmen in the 23rd century (Startrek) to describe a part, which served no useful purpose.)

Obviously, Hubble's formula does not work, nor does any credit belong to Georges Lamaitre, [2] **both were wrong**. Nor is there any credit due to me since I was taught by the all-time Teacher to whom belongs the credit. There are too many variables in the light of any star or galaxy that it may have passed through before it came upon our spectral plate at either a blue or red shift that we for lack of better knowledge turn into velocity.

Our astronomers will of course not be too happy with these findings, nor with the right way of doing things. All the work they have done at great costs and lack of sleep, and here – (by their standards) - an uneducated man will put us in the wrong! This is not acceptable. But to me truth ranks above all else, nor do I have the fear of any man, or any number of them. To me the homeless sleeping under a bridge is judged the same as any king or leader in the earth.

At this point to enumerate the factors by which magnetic waves are susceptible, reflection and refraction are most

common to us. The latter comes by a factor of density, either red or blue shifted for the change thereof. That in other words reveals how very susceptible these waves are to the media, any media <u>and how very dependent these are upon</u> <u>that media for their velocity for distance in time</u>. Something that Michelson and Morley in neither their experiment never understood, nor others after them, especially not Einstein.

As then the average light-wave is spaced over some 4000 atoms in air alone – their movement associating with the movement of each and every atom, - that in itself confirms their circular path around these atoms. All this while that wave pattern of light connects with but a fraction of each one of those spinning atomic movements, passing thousands of them by which to complete but a single turn around the circumference.

How utterly fantastic that a mere coordinate at such high velocity does not miss to greet (make contact with) a single atom in its path. This we know from that mirage when on a warm day the road up ahead appears to be wet. Here from a minor greater spacing between atoms the light is instantly redirected causing us to look into a void, a void that appears wet. The Lord God made everything to perfection, and I mean true perfection.

The next faculty of light by its high linear and angular velocity whereby it comes to warm things is - to increase the internal movement within all substances by which it is not able to pass. This it does by its high rotation accelerating other rotations. And by certain substances like solar cells to drive the normally stationary magnetic coordinates of those molecules into rotation, into a string of rotation, called electricity. Similar to **Figure 12**, where instead of an AC current causing rotations, sunlight for its rotation creates rotations. Light therefore does the same thing that is accomplished by a transformer and conventional generators, principles of alike, **rotation to rotation, movement to movement.**

Then there is the fact that we have our beholding from such wavelengths. That however is not anything mechanical, but spiritual, namely - our interpretation to beholding, - just as smell and taste are our interpretation from mere patterns of movements, properly termed coordinates. All our senses are by movements in speed and formation.

As thus a change in density either expands or contracts that spiral (light's movement likened to a long drawn out coiled spring) so its velocity for distance in time is sped up or curtailed as it is forced into more or less turns around the circumference for any given distance. A one-kilometer wavelet need turn only 300,000 times in any one second. The one-meter length must complete 300 million turns in that same single second for the same distance. Density therefore affects the compression and expansion of not only light but all magnetic waves. ((Note how I said "magnetic" waves, not electromagnetic - since I am unable to walk a straight line in any circular path.)). That then <u>in turn</u> regulates the relative velocity, (distance in time) while the constant of velocity; the full 300,000 km/s never varies for any kind of density. In other words that which drives all magnetic waves is completely oblivious to the density of any media, as is obvious and also natural.

The latter of these may be difficult to grasp, it being far reaching into the fundamentals of the first of all fundamentals, something we are not getting into. Then there is something new for us with the trajectory of light hardly anyone has thought of. This may be illustrated by **Figure 16**. As the light from a star passes through the atmosphere of the sun we acclaim that it slows down. And right we are since an atmosphere is usually denser than open space. Then there is also the bending of that ray of light for no other cause than why we observe a red morning and red evening, or the rainbow of colors in the sky or by a prism. That cause is called **"refraction"**, that occurs when a beam of light strikes a change in density **out of the normal**. Into the normal is straight-on where the light is either compressed or expanded **but not refracted.**



Figure 16. Light refracted passing near a star.

"Dislocation" is the term that applies here to the waves of light rather than most other longer waves. Or in more fundamental terms, the dislocation of a beam of light is almost exclusively applicable on any wave operating <u>on the</u> <u>atomic level</u>, and that level <u>only</u>. From X to Y in Figure 16 the light not only passes through a denser media, but that media also rotates as the star rotates. Here is where dislocation comes in, to be carried sideways. It may be fraction by fraction, but in all of the 8 min it takes the light to get from the sun to the earth - if and when there is a counter moving media through which it must pass - it will come to some small degree (relevant to the speed of that media) of dislocation.

As then we must speak of gravity, allow me to quote the following: "According to Newtonian gravity, light is not affected by gravity, as light is mass less. Einstein's law $E = mc^2$, immediately suggests that light is affected by gravity. This is indeed the case and has experimentally

been observed via gravitational lensing and other effects".

Shall we now debate the nonsense that Einstein came up with as if the bending of light near a star was due to gravity; when all evidence shows the contrary? Also for another there is no such thing as gravitational lensing. And Einstein's $E=mc^2$ is the most infamous nonsense that has ever crept into the world of science refers to energy not gravity [2]. But Sir Isaac Newton had better sense even though - thank God - he was wrong about his law of gravity in mass to mass, but correct in his law whereby to calculate the factor of gravity [5]. A million Einstein's could not come to stand within the shadow of the knowledge that God had granted to Isaac Newton. But unless Newton in no uncertain terms would have acclaimed that he never at all discovered gravity, he would always be wrong about gravity. God alone can grant us that knowledge or else none of us would have any being. The reference here is to Jeremiah 31:37 [6].

Radial Velocity

Now that we seem to have a good understanding in how light travels and how radial velocities are to be calculated, we have as yet to hear the full of it. Below is a Radial Velocity chart, highlighting five readings. The first column shows the radial velocity obtained by man in his calculations. The second column shows the change in wavelengths. The third column shows the velocities of the first noted lengths of the waves. The fourth column shows the velocities of the expanded waves. The fifth column shows the true and correct radial velocities.

Notice how it is from 3 km/s to 6 km/s while the difference in the expansion came to 35a, 36a and 60a. The last one on the list is the one really out of bounds, a radial velocity of no more than 77 km/s that is interpreted into some 274,000 km/s, which of course is absurd (**Table 1**).

Then to draw our attention to the expansions in the shifts verses the radial velocities. For each of the 35/36A in wave expansion there was an increase of 3 to 6 km, while the one with the greater expansion of 60 A came to 77 km increase. And why may that be so? The answer is - because it is a longer length, and as the lengths are greater and greater so the increase in their lengths must be greater to account for the same value in velocity.

This may be demonstrated by **Figure 17**. If the angular moment in the light is shifted 10 degrees from 20 to 30, there are (for the example) 5 points expansion in wavelength. From 30 to 40 it becomes 6 points. And to increase the angle by another ten degrees it becomes 9 points. Where from 50 to 60 degrees there are 15 points, another ten degrees will then multiply that to 40 points.

Radial	Calcium	V of	V of	V
velocity	K in	Normal	Shifted	Radial
	(Dif)	length	length	
0	3933 to	299.631	299.634	= 3
km/sec	3968 (35)	km/s	km/s	km/s
100	3934 to	299.631	299.634	= 3
km/sec	3969 (35)	km/s	km/s	km/s
1000	3946 to	299.629	299.635	= 6
km/sec	3981 (35)	km/s	km/s	km/s
10,000	4064 to	299.643	299.646	= 3
km/s	4100 (36)	km/s	km/s	km/s
274,000	6560 to	299.703	299.780	= 77
km/s	6620 (60)	km/s	km/s	km/s

Table 1. Radial velocity chart.

When therefore a receding object pulls on a wave by some 20 km/sec, if it be the shorter one like at 50 degrees, it must expand the wave more than if it were one at 30 degrees. And that expansion in the wave becomes greater and greater for the longer lengths just to keep up with the receding velocity.



Figure 17. Radial velocities verses wavelengths.

And so it becomes obvious how a shift in wavelength is not directly proportional to the change in radial velocity. Yet we are quite able to determine the correct relative velocity of any wave as long as it is computed <u>by its three dimensional</u> format. And for this we need the correct diameter of the wave into its circumference that varies for each octave of the spectrum. I then came to the correct diameter and circumference by which light travels by using our own reading of the speed of light at 299.792 km/sec that I applied to the red length at 700/nm since that being the longest and fastest is first to arrive, that then came to 4.84A in the circumference.

The protractor in **Figure 15** depicts <u>the reality in how</u> <u>waves are formed</u>. Remember how all atoms are in rotation and when we impose fluctuations, or vibrations upon them to in all essence impose indents. Those indents are in the angular by and in the natural rotations, that then as such become circular indents, a wavelet on the move rotating around a fixed diameter, a diameter implemented by our equipment, or in and by the composition. Electricity upon a filament in a standard light bulb will not generate radio waves, but the resonance is high enough for light-waves. For a radio wave our impulses need to be much longer for longer lengths and on a greater scale; a larger diameter.

Wave Production

At this time, it warrants us (for a second time) to behold just how waves are implemented. We used to do so with tubes etc.; that is now replaced by diodes and transistors. But old or new it all comes down to switching devices together with the speed at which that is done and in what frame of reference. High or low, long or short the principle in wave production is one and the same illustrated by **Figure 18**.

It all starts out with nature's fundamental movement that at all times moves at the velocity of 300,000 km/s, our constant. That movement is not like any other movement, it being the fundamental one seen with all that is magnetic or electric, or any wave of the spectrum all belonging to what is termed "magnetism" [2]. Then there are the atoms in nature that are driven in rotation for several reasons, first and fundamentally by that movement of constant in conjunction with what is yet more fundamental that as such I must leave to speculation.

In reference to **Figure 18** there is the ever fundamental movement to the left as indicated. Then as we with our devices create impulses by oscillation, vibration, or resonance, it is like driving an angular momentum from X to Y. When therefore the diameter across which we are creating our drive is 10 mm, and we did so at the speed of 10,000 km/s X to Y, our belt moving at 300,000 km/s, the forward point of our impulse instead of arriving at Y; came to Z. This may be compared to a transport belt at which packages are places going down the line.

Our wave would then have a half-length of 30 mm with its full length at 60 mm passing around the circumference at 31.4 mm. The faster the impulse is driven so much the shorter the wave becomes, or slower to longer lengths. <u>Point X then is the central point of the protractor in Figure 15.</u> How long therefore might this wavelet be? We acclaim it at 60 mm, but that is because we doubled the half-length, the real factual length, or as I would acclaim, its angular moment. Most commonly I estimate and believe them to be half lengths, the half of the full. By radio and microwave

their power seems to be by half lengths also, although I have no certification of this.





But am I convincing? An electrical current with its rotating north and south polarities will obviously cause the atoms in an element to vibrate that then as such produce light-waves [6]. Or when we do the same thing with whole molecules, a million pack of them we will have much longer waves at much greater diameter. And why should they be rotational, why not flat on through space and air? A flat on wave would be stopped at the first atom it encountered. If rotating waves have at least a 98 percent chance of getting around an oxygen atom in water, the instant it strikes upon the connecting point with the hydrogen atom it is history, how much less when for its width larger than any oxygen atom it would attempt to pass between atoms.

A wave as a flat entity – or back and forth movement - is simply preposterous, not only because it has no way to go,

but it can never attain to the speed of light. And even by driving a single atom linearly into two other atoms as a fluctuation it by all logic becomes a rotational impulse. Our driving mechanism being rotational upon other rotational factors **can only produce a rotational result** taken away by the ever constant of velocity. Consider how a straight line is never a wave, but a line passing along atoms that when it circumvents these **atoms appears as a wave**.

Only a rotating wave-like-line is able to pass through the media without any real obstructions other than as mentioned. Moreover; a wavelet of 5500 A in lengths traveling at a diameter of less than 2A – when viewed by us in real time appears more like a straight line, its ratio being 2750 to 1. No wonder therefore that its velocity comes so close to the constant of velocity, while it's high rotation provides for a straight trajectory.

More to the protractor

Now that we have noted wave production that at all times follows in the way illustrated by the protractor we might wish to **see more evidence**. Therefore, below is a "Comparison chart". Note when a blue color wave is expanded by 40 A, it required a 3.6 km/s velocity, the same expansion by an 8000 A wave came to only 0.9 km/s. At 6800 A with a 200 A expansion comes to 6.1 km/s, but at 8000 A it will only be 4.4 km/s. As the length of a wave is greater, so much the more it needs to be increased in length for the same value of velocity (**Table 2**).

1:	4000 to 4040A	299.637.4 km/s to 299.641.0 km/s	= 40a = 3.6-km/s
2:	6800 to 6880A	299.786.6 km/s to 299.789.1 km/s	= 80a = 2.5-km/s
3:	6800 to 6900A	299.786.6 km/s to 299.789.7 km/s	= 100a = 3.1-km/s
4:	6800 to 7000A	299.786.6 km/s to 299-792.7 km/s	= 200a = 6.1-km/s
5:	8000 to 8040A	299.818.6 km/s to 299.819.5 km/s	= 40a = 0.9-km/s
6:	8000 to 8200A	299.818.6 km/s to 299.823.0 km/s	= 200a = 4.4-km/s

Table 2. Comparison chart (4.84a circumference).

Another chart shows the lengths from 1500 A to 8000 A by an increase of 500 A, and their velocities. When therefore there is a 500 A red shift into any wavelength, what must the radial velocity be in order to accomplish the same? It by no means is a straight-line calculation, but **fixed to the protractor**, in its angles towards a line upon it. In other words, by the degrees illustrated here. The velocities and consequent increase or decrease in radial velocities, with the increments as shown all in itself **confirms how light is generated and send on its way in that manner.** Amplitude (diameter) into circumference at 4.84 A.

For a short wavelength of no more than 1500 A to be red shifted by 500A, a radial velocity of 240 km/s is required. Whereas at the other extreme when a 7500 A is red shifted

by 500 A; a mere 14 km/s will accomplish it. Or looking at it the other way around, a radial velocity of 145 km/s will red shift a 2000 A length by 500 A, while the 6000 A length will receive the same 500 A increase in length by a mere 18 km/sec. And notice how the increments from 8000 A to 1500 A graduates from 1.73 to 95.2, all because of the nature in the protractor. (Degrees in the circular to a fixed line) (**Table 3**).

Wavelength	Relative/Velocity	Radial/Velocity	Increment	Red shift
8000 A	299,818 km/s	12 km/s		500 A
7500 A	299,806 km/s	14 km/s	> 1.73	500 A
7000 A	299,792 km/s	16 km/s	> 2.12	500 A
6500 A	299,776 km/s	18 km/s	> 2.65	500 A
6000 A	299,758 km/s	22 km/s	> 3.38	500 A
5500 A	299,736 km/s	27 km/s	> 4.39	500A
5000 A	299,709 km/s	32 km/s	> 5.85	500A
4500 A	299,677 km/s	40 km/s	> 8.04	500A
4000 A	299,637 km/s	52 km/s	> 11.48	500A
3500 A	299,585 km/s	69 km/s	> 17.21	500A
3000 A	299,516 km/s	96 km/s	> 27.52	500A
2500 A	299,420 km/s	145 km/s	> 48.55	500A
2000 A	299,275 km/s	240 km/s	> 95.20	500A
1500 A	299,035 km/s			

Table 3. These charts provide the evidence that waves are produced by and in the manner of the protractor.

Conclusively, the longer the length, so much the smaller the radial velocity will be in order to come by an equal proportion in the expansion of the wave. Or putting it another way, a longer length must be expanded more for **the same radial velocity compared to any shorter length.** All this because waves of all kind and size are formed by the manner illustrated by the protractor, that is the same as saying, into the angular from zero to 90 degree, in the full relevance thereof.

A wave that goes once around the circle in a distance of 2000 A, will travel slower by 543 km/s than a wave going once around the circle in a distance of 8000 A. The more turns a wave must make for any given distance so much more its velocity for distance in time will be decreased. That is how and why a blue color wave is always slower for distance in time compared to the red color wave. And this holds true in any and all media inclusive so called empty space – that is never empty.

In the manner by which all waves are propagated every different length can only and must always travel at its own relative velocity. In my estimation the first segment of the waves range from 100 nm to 1000 nm, all of which are formed on the atomic level, by a circumference to fit around the atoms. When thus the lengths come to exceed 1000 nm, these can no longer be formed on the atomic scale, since then these would come to be more of a straight line. In other words; too close to the 90 degree mark.

The next segment of waves for their circumference must be produced on the molecular level, for as the circumference increases so longer lengths may be produced.

What we need is to perform some research, like for the example, taking a 1 cm, or 1 m wavelength and somehow accurately measure at what speed that wave will travel. With that information we can then find the correct amplitude, and circumference by which it traveled. We know that waves on the atomic level, such as light - do not pass through a stucco wall, yet a radio wave does. And that as we conjecture is because it travels on something greater than the atomic scale, wherefore I pronounced to say molecular. But how exactly is it for a radio wave to pass so easily through a stucco wall? That is something we ought to apply our minds to. Or again, what is it that will stop or divert a radio wave, or a microwave? If we correlate all that information along with it, we may come up with some answers.

By my calculation a 1 meter wave might travel by a diameter of nearly 5 mm, but if this be correct or not is as yet to be established. The principle may be correct, but the figures used are but to convey the principle and will require a factual reading of some waves in different segments to come to more accurate figures. Will I now be taken at my word, or will it be said; "We can't tell if he be right?" I do not expect anyone to take me at my word, **but I do expect man to consider and accept such facts as are obviously displayed for their reality.**

HOW LITTLE MAN HAS GATHERED

The atom of man's construction is sheer fantasy. Three things man never seems to do is - to do his homework, to test his theories, and to think things through. Man lacks insight, so he fails in what is fundamental. How sad not to see one's nose between his eyes, he does have mirrors but to no avail. He looks at Hitler and Himler as bad persons, not realizing how these were sons of the devil, and did what is most natural to them, to cause as much evil as they can so as to ruin mankind. Hitler never loved Germany but would destroy it as well for his own glory.

Closer to home is Donald trump, another son of the devil always doing what he loves most, to lie, steal, and commit as much evil as possible, because he is as the Lord said; "Vipers-brood." And in order to succeed his father the devil brainwashes enough others to support him. He too has no love for the USA, but only for his own glory.

Or man's day of Christmas: For centuries the Jews celebrated the <u>sixth of June</u> as the day of Christ birth, for so the Lord by Moses said: "On that day I will bring you a deliverer, This is the day of the oath, that I will send you My Messiah." Then in the book of Luke he specifies Christ birth to have come in the month of June.

With all this knowledge for so long why is mankind celebrating Christ day of birth in December? Is he blind? Is he illiterate? Are all man's priests, and evangelists like unto morons? Or are they so wicked to purposely corrupt things?

Ask what "voltage" is. He will answer; "An electromotive force or potential between two points." Obviously man is without understanding, lacking the sense of logic. Voltage is not a force, nor is it between two points, although it is a potential – even as any rate of velocity can be expressed as a potential. Man's word instantly reveals his ignorance. He knows very well that there is rotation around the wire, and how it is not for the blades of an impeller to rotate without the hub to which they are fastened.

Where thus is our common sense to speak so ignorantly about electricity in its terms of voltage and ampere as well as everything else about it? Voltage is no more than a rate of rotation, nor is it a power other than in unison with ampere. Even as a high speed vehicle is able to present more power on the road than low speed, so it is with electricity in its rate of rotational speed. But neither one is of any value until it is in conjunction with its weight in one, and ampere in the other.

But then again ampere for its reality is likewise not understood; quote "An ampere is a unit of measure at the rate of electron flow or current in an electrical conductor."

Current may be correct, but electrons are a fantasy, and so is the "flow of." There is never any flow in electricity, it rotates in place; with its format alone extended at near the speed of light, and calculated the same as light is calculated for its R_v . The right term for ampere is to "quell." Ampere was the name of a person, not the reality of what presents power in anything electrical.

Likewise there is no such thing as voltage with electricity, that term was no more than the name of a person. Its real behavior comes to the term of "rotation." But by now it is awkward to say: "Rotation," or "Electric at 120 rotations. It could be said as "120 R/s, instead of V." For it is the rate of rotation in one second of time that is termed voltage.

And how then do we come to quell? Ask yourself how one accelerates his vehicle on the road? For just as opening the carburetor to allow more air to flow – so the engine speeds up, equally so by opening up on the rotational movement the quell increases. Why for example should our internal combustion engines come to speed up simply by allowing it more air to suck in? It is because it draws by its own nature of operation without limit.

Even so with electricity the limit to which is a direct ground, or as it should be said – until it completes a full circle without any intermediate. All magnets are full circles without intermediates. But not so when we make a string of magnetic lines in rotation – that for its two ends touched upon one another are in opposite direction of rotation from one another that can only come to the destruction of it. Therefore the turns as intermediates are applied, like transmissions in our automobiles.

When will man learn? When will he come to a reckoning? Why are those high voltage lines hung so far from the poles? Our answer is because it would ark over, but that is not my answer, I want real answers, I want to know how and why these would ark over. May it be because single sided coins can jump great gaps? Show me one first or else keep your fantasies to yourself.

Is it not because that electricity is still an open circuit, and as long as it is open it will attempt to close itself, even as an engine with unlimited feed will destroy itself, so the electric will seek its nearest point to connect upon. Lightning is that way, any place it can equalize itself upon.

Just because God taught man how to make atomic bombs and computer chips, did not lead man to any greater knowledge of the very things he worked on. Ask him how the atomic bomb explodes, and he will raffle off his fantasies to you. Ask him how water turns into steam, one will get the most absurd explanation ever. "Molecules jumping back and forth," so he acclaims. Like babies that come from the stork. He does not realize that just jumping back and forth does not make for greater room. And the harder they hit upon one another so much more room will be created.

But I am long passed the story of the stork, wherefore I can only look upon them as babes still at the breast. We do know it, higher speed of rotation demanding more room. And our atoms being magnets in rotation how shall that be any different? For it is by that expansion that our pistons are driven down, and how the steam locomotive gets its power. As a favor to man I ought to relate these facts, that molecules do not jump, they never do. Expansion is not by molecules, but by atoms enlarging the molecules, nor do atoms jump around, as in fact nothing in nature jumps around, except perhaps man. I did however hear someone say that "Molecules repel," **O how refreshing to hear a word of truth**, if now only we were able to correlate one factor from another, to add two and two to four.

Those that investigate crimes use coloration and seem to be very good at it. In those things man is able to add 2 plus 2 to 4, why not in his sciences? For if molecules repel, these of necessity must be magnetic, seeing how only magnets are able to do so. Are then the molecules magnetic, or not rather the atoms of the molecule? And if it is by heat, then tell me also what heat is.

But then we cannot accept this, namely the truth, because that destroys our cherished labors. With the atoms as magnets it will explain everything we have labored for, wherefore it cannot be so. Reality destroys our glory, truth will make us out for fools, therefore O Leonard we cannot accept your words.

You're (my) mathematics provided for radial velocity here makes perfect sense, and is unassailable, but it shows us astronomers for mere babes. And so we will have to find something wrong with Leonard. Let us shame him by reproving him for writing seconds as "sec" instead of just the "s". And for placing points and comma's in the wrong places, as the US Patent office said to me, when they were ready to grand me a patent on the curved impeller? And my reply was. "**To put that patent where the sun does not shine**". A patent on an item that is used the world over, that for my poverty at the time I was forced to cast over my shoulders. But then thank God I do not have the love of money.

Nasty of me - was it not when at the time I did not have a dime to have my points and comma's put in the right places. I am not allowed to make mistakes, as if I am not human, yet I have seen those in the sciences to make none but mistakes, why then may these do so, but not me? I think just like Howard Hughes said in front of his senatorial hearing; "You dogs are barking at me for an altogether different reason".

I know very well why man as a whole lie in ignorance, and how for his well-being his ignorance can be forgiven, something I can put behind me as if it never existed. This world belongs to the devil. But why are so many of us at ease with him, and many make their covenant with him, with death that is?

Do we not know that once Satan in his great glory thought to make himself equal to God, and God cast him down from the high heavens, that just to be cast down is not sufficient punishment, but that his rule should also be taken from him? Therefore, also God created man to shame the Satan, man taking over his rule. This of course was not to Satan's likens and he thought to ruin that man. Like as he said: **"Not to allow any man to take over his seats in the heavens".**

So it is that as long as my adversary has his rule ignorance is widespread, but his rule is but for a week of time, at best six millenniums, then he will be imprisoned and lose his rule among us. Man lies in ignorance. God has closed their eyes, and stopped his ears, <u>because – like Satan - they took</u> <u>pride to themselves</u>. Therefore, and thereby man came to his fantasies, that at end they may come to fear God, and not take pride for a necklace.

It is written: "The heavens are telling the glory of God, and the firmament proclaims His handiwork. Day to day pours forth speech, and night to night declares knowledge. There is no speech, nor are there words, their voice is not heard; yet their voice goes through all the earth and their words to the ends of the world".

How well spoken, for so knowledge goes forth while it is not seen - and yet seen, not heard - and yet spoken. There is indeed nothing better in this world than to fear God, and abide by His statutes. Then upon request He will grant us wisdom and understanding, as He did to me and others with me. And for our ignorance I will bear the load, my life for the welfare of man.

CONCLUSION

Once we understand the nature of light and adapt the right mathematics we can at last hint at the radial velocities of an

Zanten LV

object in the sky. Refraction then plays a devastating role in finding any object at a straight line of sight. And when we combine changes in velocity with the change in direction there is literally no way to determine a real velocity of any object in the heavens, or its distance from us. Our calculations therefore are mere estimates. We then ought to conform ourselves to the reality in nature not only with waves but with the atom in its whole. And Hubble's law being quite in error.

REFERENCES

- 1. Astronomy at Western Kentucky University (2020) Available online at: http://astro.wku.edu/astr106Hubble_intro.html
- 2. Richmond M (2020) Available online at http://spiff.rit.edu/classes/phys240/lectures/expand/expan d.html
- 3. Zanten LV (2015) Wave Nature. JAP 11: 3050-3080.
- 4. Recessional velocity (2020) Available online at: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Recessional_velocity
- 5. Zanten LV (2015) Rotational magnetic force. GSJ.
- 6. Gonzalez G (2019) Proper credit Who discovered Hubble's law? Evolution News & Science Today: Physics, Earth & Space.