

## Re: Zero Point Electron Orbit Stability?

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.particle/2004-12/0005.html>

---

**From:** EL (*hemetis\_at\_hotmail.com*)

**Date:** 11/22/04

Date: 21 Nov 2004 23:49:33 -0800

John Sefton <vegan16@accesscomm.ca> wrote in message news:<41a0de51@news.accesscomm.ca>...

> *John Sefton wrote:*

>>

>>

>> *James Landle wrote:*

>>

>>> *But what Timothy Boyer had done, and what Hal then perfected, was to*

>>> *show that if you take into account the Zero Point Field, you don't*

>>> *have to rely on Bohr's dictum. You can show mathematically that*

>>> *electrons lose and gain energy constantly from the Zero Point Field*

>>> *in a dynamic equilibrium, balanced at exactly the right orbit.*

>>> *Electrons get their energy to keep going without slowing down because*

>>> *they are refuelling by tapping into these fluctuations of empty space.*

>>> *In other words, the Zero Point Field accounts for the stability of the*

>>> *hydrogen atom – and, by inference, the stability of all matter. Pull*

>>> *the plug on zero-point energy, Hal demonstrated, and all atomic*

>>> *structure would collapse."*

>>

>> *Except electrons don't tap the Zero point;*

>> *they cycle through the proton to re-charge.*

>> *It is the proton that taps the Zero point (or whatever).*

>> *John*

>>

> *But anyway, the sense is there.*

> *Otherwise atoms are perpetual motion.*

> *I, 4 1, like it.*

> *John*

[EL]

I would like to make a statement here.

Any {{ABSOLUTELY}} closed system with moving components embedded must be, by definition, a perpetual motion system.

Think about it first.

Then try to find any system that is ultimately {CLOSED}.

We may imagine an abstractly closed system for sake of analysis but nature has no such "absolutely" closed systems.

Then think about this idea in its context.

A neutron may be considered as a closed "charge" system, but since it

has an externally interactive mass then it must be gravitationally open.

An electron has mass and charge properties, which by definition imply that an electron must interact gravitationally and electrostatically with the rest of nature.

To say that an electron is a perpetual motion system then is out of question.

Now let us examine the concept of energy and if it applies to an electron in a classic orbit.

We first ask if an electron was a fixed geometry that orbits in a path about a nucleus.

The answer is definitely NO.

Take into account the "Probability Space" that each electron, within a finite energy level, may occupy.

The higher the energy level the more complex is the probability space.

We know that the molecular level of matter binding has a state that is affected by the ambient energy level.

That dynamic medium of waves does not penetrate the atomic structure unless a higher frequency wave is reached.

The photoelectric effect proved that atomic components shall only begin to absorb waves that are adequate in wavelength.

IOW, the electron, if it was moving in an orbit, it would be affected by a certain range of wave-frequencies.

In a departure from the classic idea of an atom, the modern aspect is that the electron is the orbit and not a point in an orbit.

At least this is my postulate that I am proposing. :-)

In my model, the electron is not moving around the nucleus and has no "energy" requirements to keep moving, (which is not happening).

However, the electron-dynamic-orbit is still interacting with a certain range of waves and it absorbs them and emits them dynamically.

This also means that there is no such problem that demands "taping" into the ZP as mentioned above.

ZP boundaries are at constant dynamic interference serving a chaotic background out of which all order emerges.

An electron is a wave and this is empirically demonstrated by applying Electron Wave Holography to photograph magnetic fields inside magnets.

Now connect this information with the fact that high energy gamma rays "bumping" into magnetic walls break down into electron-positron pair avalanches.

Then think about a photon as a quantum and ask if it needs energy to propagate through space or that IT IS energy propagating through space.

Here I would like to introduce the classification of waves into self-referencing topologies and externally referenced topologies.

An electron participating inside any atomic system is a standing wave but once it is detached and begins to propagate we have two cases. The first case the displacement of the electron with an intact topology resembling a vortex and qualifying as a quantum. The second case is when the electron is annihilated as a particle but emerging as a component in a non standing wave by positron coupling.

Here we feel ready to accept the fact that the inner structure of an electron qualifies as energy rather than matter demanding energy to move.

We can blow air to displace a spinning top made of ice, where the ice-top demands external energy for displacement. Similarly, very strong wind can displace a tornado as a whole, but a tornado is in itself wind in a spin. If wind resembles energy in our analogy, then a standing wave of energy demands a propagating wave of energy to be displaced as a whole. This does not negate the fact that a spinning energy is energy in itself.

If we have accepted the fact that "light" or electromagnetic waves may propagate indefinitely in spacetime then why do we demand a cause to sustain the motion of a spinning wave?

We should not be concerned here about energy keeping energy in motion but rather we should be concerned with the primordial cause of energy motion. This is to say, we need not search for "energy that moves energy" but what makes the "mover that moves the being moved", move in the first place.

Energy waves are temporal force-vector patterns that are carried away constantly in all directions unless being clipped by others in a forceful interaction.

It must be a dynamic background that carries away any local property of the wave. The speed "c" happens to be the speed that we observe as the characteristic of EM wave motion in vacuum.

The final conclusion should be that Zero Point boundaries expand or collapse at a radial speed "c" in all the infinite directions at all the infinity of localities. This should be a fair enough cause to keep the spinning spinning and the propagating propagating unless otherwise noted.

sci.physics.particle: Re: Zero Point Electron Orbit Stability?

Thus, no system is absolutely closed and there is no perpetual motion systems, but we might wish to investigate the Zero Point concept in deeper details.

:~)

EL