

Re: What is the source of charged particle's seemingly limitless charge

Re: What is the source of charged particle's seemingly limitless charge

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2006-09/msg02824.html>

- *From:* "Greg Neill" <gneillREM@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 28 Sep 2006 16:26:58 -0400
-

"rds" <rdschwarz61@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:1159470391.950016.285620@xx

Greg Neill wrote:

"rds" <rdschwarz61@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:1159380485.060142.58450@xx

What causes the protons and electrons to maintain charge.
What is the
source of the charge.

Fundamentally, as far as Physics is concerned, there's
no better answer to that than "that's the way we
observe it to be".

We theorize conservation of several properties
like energy, charge, color (quark charge) and
note that it seems to be for all tests performed
to date.

"Charge" is just a label for a property or
concept that we have assigned to make our
description of nature consistent.

The color of a light is blue. Color is a property not a thing. But what
is color. This used to be a similar question. Now we know that color is
related to wavelength (and therefore energy level) of the polarized em
field. Or the space(time) between field polarization peaks.

Just because we call something a property does not mean that property
does not have a source.

So what, fundamentally, makes light of a given wavelength

Re: What is the source of charged particle's seemingly limitless charge

Re: What is the source of charged particle's seemingly limitless charge

"blue" other than that we choose to assign it that name?
What we see is nothing more than light's interaction with molecules in our eye, converted to electrical impulses, and interpreted by our brains by assigning the property of "blueness" to the signals that stimulate certain cells.

A given wavelength is no more the source of "blue" than is a given electrical stimulus in our brains.

We defined an electron as a mass particle. Now we know that electrons are nothing more than localized contained energy whose radius is in the gama radiation waveleghth. In order to create an electron, all you need its equivalent mass energy polarized at the gama radiation wavelength. Isn't this how Pair Products (electrons and positrons are created form just gama rays?)

Define mass. Define energy. What is stuff? What contains energy? Why do electrons have spin? Does energy have charge? Why do electrons have charge if they are only contained energy? What is momentum? Inertia?

I'm afraid it's elephants all the way down until you reach a floor of metaphysical philosophy, and from there on it's nothing but word salad. It's easier (and more practical) to draw a line somewhere and define a consistent set of properties.

This should give us a hint about charge since electrons are the primary charge carrier particle.

electrons are just "energized" space vibrating at gama wave frequencies. Whose effective rotational mass/ spin / momentum prohibits the escape of radiated energy and instead exhibits what we call a charge. Its direction and localized spin polarizes space.

Word salad. You're just inventing your own set of properties and rules in a completely ad-hoc manner.

A proton consists of a neutron plus a positron (a positron has exactly the same mass as an electron, but is positively charged). Neutrons decay into an electron and a neutrino while protons decay into a positron and a neutrino. This is true even though the effective mass of the neutron is

Re: What is the source of charged particle's seemingly limitless charge

Re: What is the source of charged particle's seemingly limitless charge greater than the proton.

Neutrons decay into a proton and an electron and a neutrino.
Protons have never been observed to decay.

Mass of proton : $1,6726 \times 10^{-27}$ kg
Mass of neutron: $1,6749 \times 10^{-27}$ kg
Mass of electron: $0,00091 \times 10^{-27}$ kg

it almost appears that:

neutron = proton + electron or:
neutron = (neutron + positron) + electron = neutron (since the electron and positron essentially cancel

In any event this still does not describe charge, but it begins the process I think.

Since we know that a positron and an electron can cancel each other (like two hurricanes spinning in opposite directions when they collide) isn't it feasible that charge or space polarization is due to the spin direction or phase shift of the spins between these particles?

Photons have spin but no charge.

Isn't an electron simply a phase shifted positron? Such that if the phase shift of the rotation is 180 degrees they cancel upon colliding? (And I imagine its tough to keep them apart)

And if they have an offset in phase only that is less or more than 180 degrees we get a static field set up.

If we have a frequency offset we might see it see as EM waves and or quanta rings at the difference frequency and its harmonics.

Any thoughts?

Yes, most of what you are imagining is contradicted by empirical evidence.

.