Feynman Lectures on X−ons

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.particle/2005−02/0187.html

---

From: Q−on (*physicsofchi_at_yahoo.com*)
Date: 02/17/05

Date: 16 Feb 2005 19:23:50 −0800

(ok, bryan testing 1 2 3...)

Quoting Richard Feynman in his book "Feynman Lectures of Physics Vol. 2" pp. 12.12, 12.13:

"Could it be that the real world consists of little X−ons which can be seen only at very tiny distances? And that in our measurements we are always observing on such a large scale that we can' t see these little X−ons, and that is why we get the differential equations?

Our currently most complete theory of electrodynamics does indeed have its difficulties at very short distances. So it is possible, in principle, that these equations are smoothed − out versions of something. They appear to be correct at distances down to about 10−14 cm, but then they begin to look wrong. It is possible that there is some as yet undiscovered underlying "machinery," and that the details of an underlying complexity are hidden in the smooth − looking equations − as is so in the "smooth" diffusion of neutrons. But no one has yet formulated a successful theory that works that way."

LaViolette, a scientist, comments on the above Feynman lectures in the following (I like his theory that particles are not close system but open system, I'll comment after the following). La violette wrote:

"The idea that a particle's energy potential field could be due to the diffusion of some kind of subquantum medium was put forth in a very hypothetical way in 1964 by the Nobel laureate physicist Richard Feynman and two of his colleagues, R. B. Leighton and M. Sands. In their introductory physics text, Feynman Lectures of Physics, they compared the electric potential field around an electron to the concentration profile produced by neutrons diffusing out of the core of a nuclear reactor. They portrayed an e lectron as a tiny nuclear reactor whose core radiates a flux of subquantum particles called "little X−ons";

the concentration of these outwardly diffusing particles, they noted, would drop off inversely with radial distance, just like the electric potential field around an electron. Speculating that the electron's field might actually be an X−on concentration profile, they state:

(shown in the Feynman quotes at the start this message − Q−on)

At the time of their writing in the early 1960s, little work had been done on open reaction systems. Had these physicists known about the Model G reaction−diffusion system and its ability to spawn localized field−generating concentration patterns, perhaps they would have given more serious attention to their reactor model analogy. To do so, however, they would have had to take the bold step of rejecting the special theory of relativity and returning to the concept of an ether. (X−on note: La Violette is using the Lorentz Ether Theory as support of his extended model)

By explaining how a particle's charge and mass originate and how they generate a particle's electric and gravitational potential fields, the open−system physics ("") explains aspects of the microphysical world left unexplained by modern physics theories. Modern physicists usually reduce charge, mass, and spin to symbols (q, m, and s) and mathematically define them in reference to specific sets of observational data. They do not explain how these properties come into being, nor how they generate a particle's electrostatic or gravitational field.

The energy fields of the ("") ether physics have several other advantages over modern field theory models. First, they avoid the so−called infinite−energy absurdity of contemporary physics. in conventional field theory, a particle's field arises from an infinitely small point, and the energy potential of the field increases without limit toward the particle's center. In the ("") reaction−kinetic physics, on the other hand, the particle's field potential tapers off to a finite value at the particle's center .

The field model that emerges from the ("") physics also resolves the so−called field−particle dualism that has long troubled physics. This problem had its roots in the mechanistic luminiferous ether theory devised by physicists of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Physicists in those days sought to describe nature in terms of two very different substances: ether and matter. They hypothesized the existence of an ether primarily as a way of explaining the long−range transmission of light, radiant energy, and forces. Material bodies, on the other hand, were thought t o be composed not of ether but of fundamental particles configured as tiny impenetrable spheres. The ether was conceived to surround these spheres as water surrounds immersed stones (figure 10.6a). Moreover, the ether was assumed to be completely frictionless and inert and hence incapable of exerting

any kind of force on matter.

This ether−particle dichotomy presented the following problem. An electrically charged particle was supposed to generate and somehow impress an electric field upon the ambient ether, and this in turn was supposed to exert forces upon distant charges and cause them to move. But how could two compositionally distinct entities, matter and ether, act upon one another and, at the same time, be totally isolated from one another and mutually noninteractive? When physicists abandoned the ether concept, they did not rid themselves of this dualism. The same force field equations developed during the era of the luminiferous ether were carried forward, leaving this dualism hanging in the vacuum of space like the grin of an invisible Cheshire cat. Only its name changed; it came to be called the field−particle dualisrn. Fields mediated the interaction of fundamental particles, but paradoxically they did not compose them.

Einstein opposed this fragmented view of nature. He noted that the practice of treating subatomic particles as mass points distinct from their field ambient fragmented the field−continuum of space into a nearly infinite number of pieces. He felt that a workable field theory should require that the field have unbroken continuity throughout all regions of space. In his 1950 magazine article, he stated:

The combination of the idea of a continuous field with that of material points discontinuous in space appears inconsistent. A consistent field theory requires continuity of all elements of the theory, not only in time but also in space, and in all points of space. Hence the material particle [as a distinct entity] has no place as a fundamental concept in a field theory.

Einstein sought to devise a unified field theory that could represent physical reality by a continuous field that in turn would account for the laws of electromagnetics as well as for the laws of motion and gravitation. He saw a material particle not as a mass point, but as a limited region in space having a particularly high field strength or energy density, a bunching of the field continuum itself (figure 10.6b). His thoughts later developed into what is today called quantum field theory.

In proposing this bunched−field concept, Einstein was borrowing an idea put forth earlier by ether theorists such as Hendrik Lorentz and Gustav Mie, who had proposed that subatomic particles form out of an ether substrate. A similar concept is encountered in the ether physics of ancient times as well as in contemporary subquantum kinetics. The field pattern that forms the subatomic particle farther out becomes the particle's peripheral field; one blends into the other in a continuous manner. Mie, Lorentz, a nd Einstein, however, did not offer an explanation of how the

particle might come into being out of the surrounding ether or field continuum. Nor does modern quantum field theory offer an explanation. On the other hand, ("") subquanturn kinetics present a feasible theory of matter creation.

End of Laviolette quote:

−−−−−−−−−
Back to X−on

Note La violette is producing the conceptual foundation of Lorentz Ether Theory. His work is in
http://www.etheric.com/LaVioletteBooks/ether.html

I am studying it as alternative because if I use Einstein Special Relativity. I require to believe that when I throw dirty qi from a patient body to a basin of salt water. I am throwing away superluminal substance from the patient to the basin. How can superluminal stuck to the salt in the water. This doesn't make much practical sense even with Tiller 9D deltron particles coupling superluminal and subluminal realm. I'm running out of model to explain my experience. Thomson and Keto got most of their hypothesis incorrect. So there is nothing much left and I'm struggling with the physics of qi in an hourly basis. Then I got hold of his book by Paul A. Laviolette and it put some sanity to everything as it can explain the physics of qi. Laviolette thesis imply that particles are not close system but open system with exchange of something from the surrounding.. this is exactly what qi do that we qi healers categorically know is real. Of course it boils down to whether Laviolette and Lorentz Ether Theroy can explain Qi.

Q−on