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#### Abstract

This essay introduces a realistic look at our laws of gravity, and the effects thereof, and it goes beyond to reveal how and by what gravity comes about in the fundamentals of nature upon which the earth and all spheres rest.
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## ESSAY

Our weight upon the scale is said to be the force of gravity, and right we are, but there is more to it for while we are drawn to earth's center we at the same time are traveling towards the east that in itself places an additional force of gravity upon us. To therefore acclaim that a person's weight of $165 / \mathrm{lb}$ is the full force of gravity upon him or her is wrong since our velocity in that uniform circular movement is to be added as the total of g force.


Figure 1. Illustrates gravity by weight plus gravity by circular movement.
For the example, reference Figure 1; by the law of gravity as given by Newton, (Ref 2) we are to take the scale weight twice over times its velocity and divided by the radius. Radius is: 4000 miles X $5280-\mathrm{ft}=21,120,000-\mathrm{ft}$. Velocity near the equator: $1000-\mathrm{mph} \times 5280=5,280.000-\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{hr}: 60=88,000-\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{min}: 60=1,467-\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{sec}$.

Accordingly $165 \times 1457=242,055 \times 1467=355.094,685: 21,120,000=16.81-\mathrm{lb}$.

The centrifugal inertia upon that person traveling at $1000-\mathrm{mph}$ is thus 16.81 pounds, and every ounce of that is augmented, or counter-acted by the gravitational force of the earth. That amount of gravity then cannot possibly show up on the scale since it are two impacts, off-setting one another. But the conclusion here is that the full amount of gravitational force upon a person at $165-\mathrm{lb}$ is $181.81 / \mathrm{lb}$ of g . ( 16.81 centrifugal, 165 scaleweight.)

Then comes the question as to "why" we have to square the force of velocity, rather than simply weight times velocity? The reason lies in the combination of inertia, the $165 / \mathrm{lb}$ of his angular inertia shown as weight upon the scale plus the added inertia of his movement in the linear. As one moves, his velocity in the linear compounds with his angular momentum, the grand total of the atoms in their movement keeping him in place, and affixed to the earth, normally referred to as his weight. As therefore the linear multiplies it does so upon the angular coming to a four-fold force.

The $16.81-\mathrm{lb}$ added to the person of $165-\mathrm{lb}$ was at the equator, at the speed of $1000-\mathrm{mph}$. At New York for example one is not as far removed from earth's axis as the former wherefore his velocity will be less and likewise his radius. If then we place ourselves at either pole, there is no velocity, nor radius, and our scale weight comes equal with the normal gravitational pull.

Next we must come to understand the mechanics of nature, in particular the nature and effect of inertia, from where we come to how and why the earth's magnetic force picks up on it. Inertia is that tendency of any object once in motion to stay in motion, something we experience every day in our four wheeled toys that for their weight and velocity wish to continue moving, and resist a change in direction, like in taking a turn. Note how I said "weight and velocity" not just weight, nor just velocity, but both, even as our calculation to force is not once but squared. Inertia thus is a "twofold factor", the weight is one, the velocity is another, weight as such is a factor that once at idle will remain at idle unless acted upon by a force to the contrary.

And to dig deeper into the fundamentals thereof, it all boils down to movement, fundamental movement. All nature is made up of atoms, and atoms are like spheres, either round of oblong, all of which are in motion, in rotation that is. A rotating movement then is a motion that always returns to itself, it does not displace, like a top or a gyro that resist being moved, all because its movement is circular, it as such returns to itself, for which reason once in place stays in place, similar to once in motion stays in motion. It is that fundamental angular inertia in all things that present their weight, while it is by the linear inertia that a vehicle wants to keep on moving straight on.

Evidence that all atoms are in rotational motion lends itself to the fact that all mass must have inertia, and inertia comes about by movement, like once in place stays in place, and once in motion stays in motion. All this confirms atomic rotation.

The atoms as angular momentums thus present the angular inertia, and once put into linear motion will present the linear inertia. An automobile in motion therefore presents a twofold inertia, its weight in the atoms of its mass, and these set in linear motion, to add motion-to-motion, or inertia-to-inertia. Therefore when we take the law of gravity to put an object into orbit and we wish to discover its resistance in the centrifugal as well as the gravitational hold upon it, we must square the force. It is once for the atoms in their rotational movement, and second for the additional inertia of velocity.

And while we have the acceleration of gravity at $32.174 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{sec}$ (sea level) (Ref 1) it is equally a factor of gravity, and more so a factor of inertia. The fact that movement is the inertia rather than the mass is shown by any top as it spins, and a vehicle in the turn resisting the change in direction.

Our automobiles in the turn are not affected by gravity, but they are affected by inertia, their own inertia, the nature of which is none other than movement. The reason that at sea level it is $32.174 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{sec}$ is because its inertia is 32.174 that as such is the factor of it, be it inertia, or gravity, it is the factor of both, two names for a single factor, a single factor that is always twofold.

When for example we calculate the centrifugal impact upon a vehicle in a turn, the factor is the same as it is for gravity, all because that factor is not really of gravity, but of inertia. And equally so to set a vehicle in motion, the factor is again that of inertia. Centrifugal for example is not really a force as it is an impact, a resistance to force. And the same is true for gravity, it too is not a force, but no more than an inclination to the force that draws us to the earth.

Figures of speech then are one thing, but for reality one must use proper wording. We however are taking this step by step that we may be educated into what no man could possibly discover, and if anything we ought to be grateful to our Creator for having awarded us with that secret of His handiwork. And if one is so inclined there is a much deeper meaning for the how and why in motion to inertia.

We have the habit of saying that "all stars and planets are held gravitational", quite incorrect, but then ignorance becomes us. Or I could say that such a statement is in error since by our own law of gravity we ought to know better. Who has ever sit down behind a calculator to compute the force of gravity at various altitudes? We do know and admit that gravity diminishes as the elevation rises. If then we had made the calculations we would have discovered that earth's gravity comes no further away from us than some 3300 miles, (Ref-3) how therefore can the moon be held gravitational?

Now we must adapt a few terms to ourselves, the ever rotation of the atoms shall be the " A " factor with the linear movement as the "L" factor. The twofold factor of inertia therefore is $A$, and $L$. And so take a ride with me as we dig down to the most fundamental part in nature, the atom.

What is an atom, and what may be found upon it? Shall it be like unto a solar system as currently thought? No not likely, the ideal of a solar system is not in the least suited to lock onto one another. As such we would not have any kind of substance, nor are there such things as single sided coins to wit protons and electrons, these simply do not exist. I too at first was deceived with man's illicit fantasies, until I took on education with plain common sense and logic. Magnets however join very well together even as they will depart from one another or stay aloof, but more than that I came to understand the very essence in the fundamentals of all things, their how and why, an awesome store of knowledge.

The atom is none other than a minute magnet, and may be classified by size or volume of, that at the same time includes and coincides with the quantity of its magnetic format that then as such is properly called its coordinate. The basic Oxygen atoms in air for example cannot be single, or our air would be solid, these come in pairs binding very well together but in such fashion to have little or no polarity to other pairs. The same is true for Nitrogen, yet when their fundamental movement is brought way down, to freeze it, their polarities will turn to unite with one another, becoming like ice or snow.


Figure 2 Atoms in ice arranged and bound by magnetic polarities
And even the water molecule (Figure 2) has this effect to become frozen when the rotational movement of its three atoms is slowed down that as such changes or re-directs its polarities to bind together. And how do they bind? Ever notice these grids to have open spaces, how or why these exist - it is for like polarities to face
each other all around these open spaces, while their other ends join. For all things in nature are dual, any one line has a coming and going, a north and south, or positive and negative, none of which can exist singular.

If we say; he has a positive or negative attitude, the terms as such may have some reality, but in the world of science these terms are devoid of reality. For the linear magnetic force, our regular magnet, it is north and south, and either side can be called by these terms, since the reality is nothing other than an ingoing movement on the one side with an outgoing movement on the other side. (Reference Figure 3) We then adapt terms for the one side and the other.


Figure 3. Polarities project direction of movement.
In the case of the electrical nothing is ever positive nor negative, no such thing exist, these are no more than terminology for a point of view. Electricity as the angular magnetic force at the two ends of its circuit present nothing other than a clockwise rotation and a counter clockwise rotation. Either end or direction of movement then can be called positive or negative. It does not matter which end is called which, since neither side exist in the meaning of those terms. Its no more than a direction of movement.


Figures 4 qnd 5. Angular magnetic force for its single direction of movement displays opposite directions of rotation seen at its ends.

And in everyday use we have the habit of calling one and the same end positive as well as negative. For whatever end the manufacturer picks up to fasten to the frame is termed as negative regardless of its mode of rotation, since both sides of any and all electrical circuits is a single rotation. That single rotation then when laid in a circle or $U$ shape are obviously in opposte rotation of one another. Nor has annyone ever seen anything electrical to push or pull, or adhere, only magnets do.

How therefore can there be particles such as electrons to be only negative, when in the first place no such reality exists in the world of science. And secondly the term of negative being nothing more than a point of view of either end of a single entity, it can never exist or be known singular - since all things and all single entities always have two sides, either front and back, left and right, top, bottom, etc. The single sided coin does not exist, other than in the mind of man.

Sooner or later man will have to smell the daisies, look at our electrical and observe how right I am. Cut your electrical in halves and you will again have both one side and the other, just as our magnet will become two magnets always presenting both sides of the coin.

No part nor entity can be only positive nor only negative, they as such would be no more than a single sided coin that has never as yet been found, nor could they exist. If anyone factually present a single sided coin then I will concede to have erred.

And how is a planetary system to lock onto other planetary systems whereby a metal hook may hold out to lift ten tons of weight? Magnets will hold on to one another with such strength, for these always present both sides of the coin, while an only negative, or only positive part or entity has yet to be found, and will never be found, since not only that they do not exist, but simply cannot exist.

When we have both sides of the coin the movements encircles one another, which makes for a good bond, for how is a man to hold himself on a rope with his hands flat against the rope? He must close his fist to encircle the rope. Nor can anything negative join itself with positive, that my dear reader is utterly impossible.

The so called negative of an electric circuit has (for the example) a clockwise rotation that then will not join nor adhere to the other so called positive side because it is in a counter clockwise rotation. Touching them together is like touching two grinding wheel in opposite direction of one another, that can only come to the destruction of one or both. And equally so with the linear, the regular magnet, since only those sides of like directions of movement will join, unlike directions will repell. But it so happens that the north of one magnet is alike unto the south of another magnet, their movements being in like directions. And so it are ALIKES that JOIN, while unlikes repell, our terminology for these ends being no more than a point of view.

All the evidence in nature clearly shows that no electrically negatively charged electron can possibly draw to or join itself with any so called positive proton, these would simply destroy each other, wherefore the atom cannot possibly exist as man has formulated them to a planetary system. Nor is there any such thing as "electromagnetic", a single bird, but it does exist as two birds, to wit; "electro---magnetic". The electro is an angular, while magnetic is a linear, and unless one can say that he went straight ahead walking in a circle, electro and magnetic are two seperate birds.

And so we have a new atom, a real atom to work with, so that with them we may have an earth, and at last produce an inclination to gravity. And these having a rotational movement they are the likes of any top or gyro, their angular movement causing them to be thus. Not that it is all that simple, but this is not the place to go into the many different coordinates by which atoms bind or unbind, have great strength or little strength, or to go from neutral to one another to absolute adherence of one another, a lengthy subject so I assure you.

Yet Figure 6 may serve as a presentation of an atom in the range of Nitrogen, with those of steel larger and more complex while those of Hydrogen with but a single format. The lighter elements at higher revolution will expand their format decreasing for the greater more complex atoms such as steel. When steel is heated as high as steam to separate into its two components the steel will melt but not expand like the water did into steam, all because its own magnetic format for their firm grip on all neighboring atoms serves as its own brake to that extend.


Figure 6
The speed now at which the magnetic flow proceeds by its format is at or near $300.000 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{sec}$. The speed at which the format of electricity extends itself is then found by the three dimensional calculation, to wit; its wavelenght added to the circumference divided by the constant of $300.000 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{sec}$ and that multiplied by the nominal length.

Example: $50-\mathrm{mm}$ wavelength, \# 14 wire at $5-\mathrm{mm}=5 \times 3.14=15.7-\mathrm{mm}$ plus $50-\mathrm{mm}=65.7 \mathrm{~mm}$ divided by $300.000=4566$ times $50=228.310 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{sec}$. Its speed of rotation then is called voltage.

And at the same time that atom may spin at let's say 1 million revolutions $/ \mathrm{sec}$. Upon our earth that format spins as slow as once in 24 hours, but for the atoms it can be any rate of revolutions. And the acceleration upon most lighter elements can be near the speed of light as noted with gun powder and fuels like gasoline.

When for example we take a $1 / \mathrm{cm}$ wavelet to travel at near $300.000 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{sec}$ in that distance there are 30 billion possible wavelets, and as they rotate once for each $1 / \mathrm{cm}$ that comes to apr. 29.6 billion revolutions $/ \mathrm{sec}$. Then for the atom with a diameter of about 1 Angstrom if it turned at the rate of 1 million revolution/sec, it traveled a distance of no more than $0.64 / \mathrm{cm}$ in that single second.

Some of these things become almost unthinkable to us, and so there is a lot more to this whereby to define the nature and complexity of the atoms in all of their elements, both singularly and otherwise. The man that could explain the various formats that proceed when water turns to ice, and how uranium is so unstable, and how for the mere rate of velocity the atomic formats change their polarity, is a very blessed person, I can conjecture some, but the bulk is yet beyomd me.

But now to enter into the how and why of gravity, recall how the pull of gravity is our weight plus the additional $g$ of our circular movement. The type of gravity affecting our weight then is different from the gravity that keeps us in a uniform circular movement. The gravity for weight is vectored to the center of the earth, while the additional $g$ is vectored to the axis of the earth.

The first is born forth because the earth is a magnet, meaning an endless array of figure eights of force that by their particular nature or coordinate quells all things to its center, which is a center of center, a force in eight at full equilibrium. But when we take on a circular movement at a location in Canada our vector is no longer to the center of the earth but upon the axis of the earth directly beneath our feet where the norm of gravity augments our centrifugal impact by a factor of speed into radius.

But we ought to get to our atomic gyros and what role they play in the phenomena known as gravity. A gyro now seems to defy gravity, but it only seems that way, in reality a gyro effects inertia, to stay put, to stay in place, or position. But when acted upon by any push, any linear movement, it becomes known as a torque upon it, and they begin to spiral, to wobble in place.

Then we come to the ever-fundamental movement in nature, the kind that we cannot see but know to exist like between two magnets to draw or to push. These so-called lines are susceptible to all that is construed as a medium, or matter if you will, evidence to this is also found with all waves in reflection and refraction.
(To say "So called lines" is more of a crux for what magnetic motion really is, it only becomes lines when formed into wave formations)

But how are these lines of magnetic movement that pass along all atoms able to take a hold of them so as to draw them to their center of equilibrium, to exhibit gravity? We know that magnets do to one another but here we are dealing with all other matter, supposedly none magnetic. The secret lies in entwining, for one entity or movement to entwine itself around the other, much like the woman embracing her man who then will take her home.


Figure 7. Gravity as an inclination to movement becomes entwined with the magnetic potential pulling it to its center of the force.

By Figure 7, in the "how" to gravity when the ever angular " $C$ " is displaced, that is - set into linear motion, it tends to precess, noted A-B. It then is by this precession whereby it comes entangled with the lines of movement, embracing them whereby of course the substance is drawn down. (quell) Formerly with the atomic gyro at a standstill the lines merely pass, but once set in motion it is like a matrimony.

This therefore is important to remember that a gravitational movement does not proceed unless there is a torque upon its inertia, (also said; unless there is movement into the linear) after which it essentially screws itself down by virtue of the magnetic lines (fabric) of movement. And to go one step further in what manner the 3 M (magnetic motion) actually draws upon all substance. It is not like grabbing a hold of the bottom and pulling, but for its full embracement it is more like going around it - and push/pulling on it in a circular manner. It is for that reason that I drew a lead/lag scenario by which anything into an angular precession also moves into the linear, the screw of a propeller giving a likeness thereto.

If we ever wondered why all objects of varied weights fall with the same rate of acceleration, here is the answer; a nut will go down along a treated bolt by the angular moment of the tread, irrelevant as to how large that nut may be. The speed of acceleration then is by the angular moment of the $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{factor}$. The greater the
g/factor, the greater the acceleration will be. Move yourself far enough away from the earth where the $\mathrm{g} /$ factor comes to zero, there will be no acceleration, no falling down by conventional gravity.

And to go over this once again by Figure 8, at K assume any number of atoms that for their "inclination" towards precession trace out the pattern of a circle noted at $P$. These by their number then produce an "overall" pattern angularly induced. The oval at P represents precession, P2 is a top view with P3 a side view.


Figure 8. Pattern of precession whereby objects are moved according to the torque upon them expressed as "The factors of gravity" towards acceleration.

As thus a torque is placed upon the mass at K , the coordinate movement changes in this manner, at P2 - the leading end S , dips under (Precesses) so that now instead of a flat circle it takes on the resemblance of a screw as shown by P4, and P5. Additionally I demonstrated the same in figure 7, by the picture of the screw propeller.

The factor of gravity may then be illustrated here in the torque by the degree thereof. At P4, the strength of the force being greatest shows itself by the figure of 32 , which is in lb. While at much higher altitudes, the $\mathrm{g} /$ factor having been reduced to 16 (in lb) the torque is seen to be equally less. This then is accurate, for if from this, one construes that at a g/factor of 32 the rate of acceleration is $32 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{sec}$, while at 16 the rate of acceleration is at $16 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{sec}$, he is quite correct.

There is of-course a lot more to this but so far it does represent the "principle fashion" how all substances come into the embrace of the 3 M , the ever-magnetic movement that is everywhere. But none of it would become gravitational unless it is first set in motion, any linear motion, and since all things are always moving so gravity is found near any celestial body.

Consequently the power of gravity is magnetic, with gravity as such nothing more nor less than an "inclination" towards downward movement in and by the inclination to precession forming an overall pattern, or coordinate that is like a nut on a bolt. And so now - in principle - we know the secret of gravity and are ready for the next step to behold the greater formations.

## GRAVITY BEYOND EARTH

There are always more questions like how is the earth held to the sun, and the moon to the earth, and we along with every other none magnetic body to mother earth?

By illustration Figure 9, we will first assume our earth at a "stand still", and to place a force upon it at point H , to drive it away in a straight on trajectory towards $M$ to the tune of $15 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{sec}$. Then in going back to basics all that angular movement of the fundamental parts of any mass have this tendency, to resist being moved, and once in motion to resist being stopped, as well to resist any change in direction.

Thus with the earth at an idle the angular momentum of its mass may be likened to a gyro at balance. Here the $\mathrm{A} /$ factor is active, but the L/factor is at zero, wherefore the atomic gyros are at what we call in a state of balance. Then as we began to move the earth to accelerate it - the L/factor stepped in, placing a torque upon that angular motion, and reaching our maximum velocity of $15 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{sec}$, the force at figure $8-\mathrm{H}$, is abandoned, while the earth continues to move at its now constant velocity in a straight trajectory, direction " M ".


Figure 9. The earth susceptible to gravity by movement like unto a gyro upon which a torque is placed that as such works itself into the magnetic fabric.

At this point there is not as yet a vector, nor therefore an orbit. As thus we visualize that earth now without any power acting on it happily moving at its said velocity, the only real action occurring within at those fundamental levels is the A/factor, the atomic angular movement that can never be removed. Yet now for its added linear movement it has a degree of overall precession upon its general movement. This part though it is not as yet an empowered inclination towards gravity, it is nonetheless a factor upon which the 3M, the magnetic is susceptible.

The earth at this point has no inclination to slow down, for even as much as it resisted the acceleration, it equally resists any deceleration. And while thus far there is not any magnetic force to be found, the earth continues on its straight trajectory oblivious to anything, nor therefore any gravity. It is no more than a mass moving in space.

Then let us have that circular movement, which when twisted by 180 degrees over itself becomes what we call - "magnetic." But in order to secure a magnetic entity one needs a body to implement it upon, which as such then becomes a vector. And for our first consideration, let it be the sun, at point G, in Figure 9, so that we might make some use of that mass in space, to create a home for ourselves.

The 3 M of that sun then looks at our $\mathrm{A} /$ factor and observes a precession of it, and for its particular nature of movement being susceptible to that precession it embraces it, or becomes embraced. If then we think, okay it has a good hold of us, we are partly in error, for as long as the earth does not attempt to distance itself from the sun, it is simply an embracing.

But the instant the earth does move away from the sun, then the torque kicks in, On the one hand the magnetic tentacles tighten in on those angular coordinates, while the earth for its mass and speed place a heavy load upon them. And so here comes the equilibrium when both forces come equal to one another.

An example might be when a man embraces a woman it takes no effort to embrace her, but the instant when she attempts to remove herself then we can speak of a force or power holding on to her. And while in holding hands with him she attempts to walk away her movement becomes a circular pattern around him. The faster she moves the harder the pull, and the greater the strain will be upon the man, and so much the tighter the grip becomes. This example depicts the reality of how any planet is held to its star.

And so now that we have our earth bound to the sun at a yearly clip around it, pulling it inwards to itself with the earth resisting that pull in its velocity constantly attempting to take a straight course, so it takes on an orbit. The next essential factor then is to create a magnetic entity upon the earth so that the earth may take on the shape of a sphere. For in placing a magnetic entity on it, it likewise, like the sun at first, - is susceptible to the very same angular precessional movement, and as such holds it in place. But here, there is a distinct difference in that the former magnetic vector was 93 million miles away with only its tentacles holding us that now is seated right upon that very mass itself. That then centers itself upon that mass by virtue of its own design, remembering how that coordinate is in all respects a series of figures of eight.

Then we are to pay attention to what comes next, that well seated magnetic entity does not really need much of a torque in order to hold onto that volume of the earth-mass. That is to say; not any part thereof with a coordinate towards curvature - like one magnet to the other or to any coordinate like a nail, etc., but for the balance thereof a precession is needed so as to instill that inclination towards gravity. And there is plenty of it since the earth is moving in orbit, and along with the sun in its galactic movement. Accordingly there is now a force of gravity upon the earth that can be read upon the scale, while the earth has not as yet a period of rotation.

But now we must also understand how our earth is not only bound to the sun as previously explained, since the sun as well as the earth now are magnets, that by their whole formation latch unto one another as any two magnets will. With the former a so-called force or impact of gravity was formed, which is not so in the second. These thus make for an excellent bond since by the first the whole mass of the earth lies duly in the embrace of the power of the sun. And though that factor of gravity may diminish as it extends outward, the sun could care less since it is only interested in the magnetic mass, holding it to itself in the full factor thereof.

Now then we are going to give the earth a period of rotation. But in doing so - the substance of the earth set into linear movement is also wishing to maintain a straight course but being vectored to the axis it also must take on an orbital track. And by virtue of its rotation the earth slightly bulges at the equator causing the weight upon the scale to vary by about one half of a pound from pole to equator.

Note clearly however that in this case the vector is not the center of the earth, but its axis, the point to which most that mass is drawn. That is a vector some 8000 miles long, towards which the balance of our gross weight in $\mathrm{g} /$ force is drawn. That same scenario then occurs here that previously occurred when we placed a rope from the sun upon the earth to force it into an orbital path, - the $\mathbf{3 M}$ placing a torque - relevant to the axis of the earth.

Now let us step back and take another look at this, and let me repeat what I said namely: "Relevant to the "axis" of the earth." Formerly the sun took a hold on us by our whole volume, east to west and north to south, and yet it appeared as if it concentrated itself to only the center of the center of the earth. This of
course is mere appearance since our force, like all magnetic force - is a coordinate in the design of a figure of eight, which produces a center rather than an axis. And though the sun pulls on the whole of us, it only appears to be on center.

Here the gravitational line to our sun in being vectored to our center is the same as to state how the torque upon the $\mathrm{A} /$ factor - is vectored to it. While the additional torque that the 3 M of the earth places upon it - is vectored to earth's axis, and is found along its 8000 mile length. When therefore one is standing on the very tip of that axis, there is no torque since there is no centrifugal impact, no movement out of the direction of movement, also stated as out of circular. But in coming towards its equator the torque increases proportionally as the velocity of the substance further from that axis increases.

All rotating bodies have an axis, magnetism alone presents a center, something that for its coordinate does what nothing else in nature does to present a single point, be it stationary or rotating, as it must since its coordinate is that of an eight. And as such, by its design, or coordinate as I call it, it produces a linear power, and a pherical design. Think about this how unique that magnetic entity is, to perform what nothing else in nature can perform, and how for its unique ability all things in nature are formed by it, as well as sustained by it.

The angular inertia of the earth thus has to do with a torque in two different aspects, one of which is vectored to the sun, while the second is vectored to the axis of the earth. And as such being vectored differently, they not only act, as were they independent of one another, but factually are independent of one another. And for a third aspect acting as were it independent to the two foregoing, is that basic angular inertia of the 3 M , the magnetic entity that inhibits earth, which as such is vectored to the very center of the center of the earth. (The inborn force as I sometimes call it)

As thus we came to question, how weight remains the same all around the earth, and yet by the centrifugal impact - strongest at its equator, there is an additional gravitational pull, the answer is. Because the impact of earth's rotation does not as such register itself upon our scales, but is nonetheless present in and by the centrifugal impact of our daily rotation.

The real answer here lies in the vectors, and I repeat the vectors. The sun has its own, -- our rotation has its own, -- and our mass has its own. Three different vectors upon one and the same angular inertia. Therefore at any given latitude the factor of gravity remains constant, changing only for a change in altitude, a change that brings us, not necessarily further from the axis, but from the very center of the center of the earth, the vector to which it applies. How therefore will the gravitational pull that is vectored to earth's axis show up on our scales, when it is altogether vectored differently? Yet it is very much present, only in order to embark upon it, we must calculate the same.
(The magnetic fabric that inhibits the earth does not have anything to do with centrifugal wherefore its pull can be read upon a scale, while anything in a uniform circular motion effects that which we call centrifugal, that then at all times is subject to and augmented by gravitational implications, and as such cannot show up on a scale.)

Newton's law therefore by which the g/force in the centrifugal are calculated does not apply to our weight nor therefore to the acceleration of g . The $32 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{sec}$ has no relevance to the law of Newton, nor therefore to the center of the earth, other than its axis since that law only applies to anything under the duress of what is called centrifugal, while our weight as a g/force is not as such by centrifugal, if it were there would be no weight to read upon any scale, all because gravity augments all centrifugal ineria. When an upwards force is equally offset by a downward force the net result to be read is zero.

It is ironic now - how we utilize a measure of force that is not of centrifugal by which to compute centrifugal, as well as gravitational. The reason and cause for which is - that this measure of force happens to be the measure of our inertia, as in fact it rightfully is of INERTIA. The scales, as we might say, have
been set to the standard factor of $g$, and that without choice, since these could do no otherwise. As then we said that it may only be in the calculus to embark upon a measure of $g$, in any other vector, there is a secondary means to it, to place a scale in the opposite measuring centrifugal inertia. This we can do when we change into a direction that is out of the direction of gravity, like horizontal upon the earth, but the same cannot be performed to directly measure the centrifugal in the vertical, since gravity defeats that very purpose by augmented every ounce of that centrifugal impact.

There now are ways to double check my teaching, at a midway point between a pole and the equator with our scale weight we are drawn directly to the center of the earth, while the additional g upon us is in line to the axis the earth. Our upright position thus is always to two vectors.

There is thus this experiment one could perform, how our upright position on the earth is tilted by that effect, and also by the effect of the moon upon us, for as the magnetic lines between them become elongated raising the waters to a tide, we ourselves are drawn with that elongation. And this can be done at either or both sides of the earth, under and away from the moon, since all magnetic fabric is by a coordinate resembling the figure of eight. Here thus is the means to test my statements, not theory as many will say, but my statements, since I have not been promoting a theory, but facts as the Almighty Lord taught me. And you will find all these things to be quite correct.

## Conclusion

It warrants us to take due notice of all this since it is supported by evidence, and as such cannot be defeated. It changes the atom from its planetary version to its reality in nature, its magnetic nature whereby it forms all things, unites with one another as well as by varied coordinates remains aloof from one another.

But I know it will take some centuries before man as a whole will come to that reality. Or as some might say, "I am far ahead of my time." But then if I did not say something now how will it come to be adapted in the future?
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