

# Re: A Theory of Everything that explains Gravity, Magnetism, Electrostatic force

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2005-09/msg01063.html>

---

- *From:* "PD" <[TheDraperFamily@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:TheDraperFamily@xxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* 9 Sep 2005 11:36:40 -0700
- 

franklinhu@xxxxxxxxxx wrote:

- > I have created a web site which re-posts my Theory of Everything and it
- > also includes separate supporting articles from previous usenet
- > posting. This will be updated from time to time as it gets developed.
- > See it at:
- >
- > <http://www.geocities.com/franklinhu/theory.html>
- >
- > This is, of course, only the barest of models

Well, it's good you didn't try to flesh it out further because there are problems associated with it even at the barest level.

"The fundamental building blocks of the universe consist only of the proton and electron. Bound together, these form a neutral neutrino-like particle. This particle fills all of empty space and makes up the aether of empty space. It can be thought of as a matrix of alternating protons and electrons and forms a crystal structure like salt (NaCl). Electromagnetic waves travel through the crystal neutrino sea."

1. The proton is known not to be a fundamental building block since the mid-60s. We know at the very least that it is composed of quarks and gluons. This is verified from high-energy particle experiments in which the quarks and gluons are extracted from the incident colliding protons. This structure is \*certainly\* smaller than the structure you imply with the simple cubic structure of the neutrino sea, and so these same experiments would have easily been able to discern the proposed structure, and they do not.
2. The only forces which bind together the proton and the electron are the weak interaction and the electromagnetic interaction. Neither of these interactions are strong enough to bind them together tightly enough to form a neutrino (either to match experimental constraints on dimensions or on bound state mass).
3. Neutrinos never, ever decay into a proton and an electron, even when struck at high energy.

4. If a medium underlies a wave, then the elements of the medium need intercoupling, and it is in fact this intercoupling that enters into the constants that drive the wave equation. In this case, neutrinos cannot comprise the medium underlying electromagnetic waves, because neutrinos have been shown to not interact electromagnetically.

5. The lattice unit in NaCl has a measurable dipole moment. The neutrino does not. Note that a dipole moment does *\*not\** require that have enough resolution to spatially resolve the two charges in the dipole, because the field a large distance from the dipole expresses the structure of the dipole. It is this fact that is instrumental in the process of NaCl dissolution in a polar solvent (i.e. forming a solution in water).

6. Protons have a nonzero quantum number called baryon number. In any interaction that a proton undergoes, baryon number is strictly and always conserved in every experiment conducted (including some tests that effectively ruled out a likelihood of violation to less than one occurrence in  $10^{25}$  years!), and any composite that consists of protons has a baryon number that is the sum of the baryon numbers of its components. The baryon number of a neutrino is experimentally zero.

7. If electromagnetic waves traveled through a neutrino sea, then the earth's motion through this sea would vary by time of day, by latitude, and by season. This variation was experimentally ruled out by the Michelson–Morley experiment, as well as a slew of others that followed.

8. Neutrinos are observed to break spatial parity almost maximally. Protons and electrons do not, nor does a simple cubic lattice of protons and electrons such as you propose.

Since the barest of models fails to match up with a number of experimental observations, the model must be abandoned with dispatch. It's recommended that the author learn quite a bit more about what is known experimentally before trying to develop a model to explain those observations.

Intuition does not a theory make.

PD

- > but you might find it
- > amusing if you're interested in finding ways to intuitively weave
- > together various physical phenomenon.
- > fhutoe

.

Re: A Theory of Everything that explains Gravity, Magnetism, Electrostatic force

- **Follow-Ups:**

- ◆ **[Re: A Theory of Everything that explains Gravity, Magnetism, Electrostatic force](#)**

- ◆ *From:* franklinhu

- **References:**

- ◆ **[A Theory of Everything that explains Gravity, Magnetism, Electrostatic force](#)**

- ◆ *From:* franklinhu

- Prev by Date: **[Re: ISS FUBAR to cook](#)**

- Next by Date: **[Re: A Hole through Earth?](#)**

- Previous by thread: **[Re: A Theory of Everything that explains Gravity, Magnetism, Ele...](#)**

- Next by thread: **[Re: A Theory of Everything that explains Gravity, Magnetism, Electrostatic force](#)**

- Index(es):

- ◆ **[Date](#)**

- ◆ **[Thread](#)**