

# Re: Binding Energy Question

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2008-03/msg00022.html>

---

- *From:* [srp2inc@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:srp2inc@xxxxxxxxxx)
  - *Date:* Fri, 29 Feb 2008 21:22:16 -0800 (PST)
- 

On 29 fév, 21:58, hgis <[hg...@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:hg...@xxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

On Mar 1, 10:18 am, srp2...@xxxxxxxxxx wrote:

On 29 fév, 19:29, hgis <[hg...@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:hg...@xxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

On Mar 1, 2:26 am, srp2...@xxxxxxxxxx wrote:

Therefore sometimes I just want to forget about all this and not think about physics. Or maybe I can learn to ignore them and instead listen for instance to your simple world with simple physics so as to cool the mind.

My view is, if you still have not completely let go of common sense, that you can reverse the process and learn formal logic. There are books explaining hoe. If you ever chose this path, I garantee you that you will not regret it

Physicists don't operate with common sense,

## Re: Binding Energy Question

they just follow the math. Without the math, they can get crazy just thinking about one of the concepts such as Many World or GR time travel (these words belong to patients at mental institutions). So to avoid losing their mind, they hold on to math. Without math, they would do exactly like you... who have to reject Copenhagen because your mind just can't take it anymore.

Actually I never took it. I was lucky to read de Broglie's work before having gotten too deep into the Copenhagen circus. This got me direct to Maxwell. This was way back.

de Broglie work is kinda similar to yours. Schrodinger wants to do away with the particle picture by suggesting only waves are real. Born gives us back the particle aspect. Bohm and Riley digs up the de Broglie work but have to add quantum potential to make it consistent with quantum theory.

Not so. None of them picked up on de Broglie's hypothesis on localized photons.

Andre Michaud wants to get back to de Broglie period and just ignored the theoretical framework experimental results produced several decades after de Broglie. This is what you are basically doing dude.

Not so. I integrated a de Broglie hypothesis that no one else really explored before.

He apparently was right since it perfectly integrates with Maxwell if the space geometry is expanded properly.

Anyway let's just focus on your model as it's quite interesting. Fighting or Defending Copenhagens can wait another day.

I like your all EM-matter thing where only EM is the

## Re: Binding Energy Question

only force. In the case of the quarks. How does your EM bind them again?

Just like it binds the electron to the proton in the hydrogen atom. Since they are closer together the threesome has way higher energy level, but still only related to the inverse square law of distance. Very clean and the math pans out finely correlated with the estimated volume the proton is deemed to occupy.

Also how does your EM thing be compatible with the Sci-Am article and data you mentioned.

Depends on what data item you mean.

Pls. explain how your EM can produce attractive force between the quarks, etc.

Simple Coulomb force. It induces in each quark energy in relation with the distances involved, the sum of which amounts to the measured mass of the proton, which the model reveals is mostly relativistic. The quarks themselves are only marginally more massive than an electron. I couldn't explain why without extensive setting up.

## Re: Binding Energy Question

Electron is negative, proton is positive, that's why they attract. In the case of the quark. An up quark has a fractional charge of  $+2/3$  and a down quark has a fractional charge of  $-1/3$ .

That's how they end up. Yes.

In the case of the proton composing of 2 up quark and 1 down quark. Total charge is  $(+2/3+2/3-1/3)=+1$ . This is why proton is positive.

Absolutely.

Also quark is said to have color charge.

Well, that's already Copenhagen at work. QCD.

No go.

In normal EM, there are only + and -. In quarks, there are 3 kinds of charge called color charge.

No. In real quarks, there are no colors. Only + and -, and there are only 2 kinds up and down.

To make quantum mechanics calculations accomodate them. We need 8 quanta.. these make up the 8 kinds of color gluons. The mathematics is the SU(3) gauge group.

## Re: Binding Energy Question

And they simply can't add up as you saw in the SA article.

In your case. You just want EM to bind the quarks.

Not really that I just want it. The model does not require more than + and -.

How exactly is it arranged.. like how your EM bind the 2 up quarks (+2/3) and down quark (-1/3) together to form say the proton?

I'm afraid I couldn't explain without very extensive set up.

And most important, how do you make it mathematically consistent?

Very easily. But again, there is no way to explain it without extensive setting up.

Part of the reason for the 8 kinds of gluons being cooked up is to make it compatible with the operations of the Schroedinger Equations when it is applied relativistically in a field environment to the quarks (called QCD) and gauge group SU(3).

The Schrödinger equation was meant to describe the electronic world. Never meant to describe stuff that no one even imagined existed when it was cooked up. It doesn't apply. Nucleons

## Re: Binding Energy Question

are totally relativistic.

Not correct. Even though Schroedinger Equation was originally cooked up to explain the electronic structure. It is upgraded to deal with fields and changing states like the electrons emitting photons and taking into account the mass of the system as energy as in the Klein-Gordon equations.

Not applicable with my model since it mandates that all em particles be localized at all times, even as they move.

Then it was applied using Gauge principle to the electroweak theory and the strong force. Maybe you are not just familiar with the Schroedinger Equations and modern QFT that's why you seem can't get it.

Feel free to think that I don't get it if you like.

But QFT, Klein-Gordon relativistic equation or any other wave based equation simply make no sense in my model and are just not required in any way shape or form.

I'd love to hear alternative explanations about the nucleons because there seems to be a problem with QCD in that you can't pull the quarks apart because the strong force only gets stronger when there is larger separation.

In reality they have been pulled apart countless times. As soon as they cease to be under high energy stress, they simply come out as electrons and positrons, when not temporarily as muons or as twins of quarks that soon degrade as gamma and electrons, positrons, or muons.

Hmm.. how come physicists haven't detected free quark that can turn into electrons, etc.?

## Re: Binding Energy Question

Well maybe they see the electrons but don't recognize that they are what they were looking for.

Don't look for something and you are certain not to find it.

free quark can only be created as quark-antiquark pairs but only momentarily.

Why, in your opinion ? What do you think happens to them ?

They all end up as electrons and positrons since this is the final stable state.

If you can mention experiments that show this. It would give more credence to your idea.

No need for any credence. Verify any paper on destructive scattering of nucleons. there are a lot. Of course they won't find free quarks. How could they ?

My model implies that they simply come out of the mix as simple electrons and positrons, or momentarily excited states like muons, or maybe taus if the collision was energetic enough or any momentary mesons that soon release pairs of electron positrons as they lose their excess energy.

But feel free to think they don't.

Can we conjure matter from nothingness?

No, but the model predicts that it can be conjured up from energy.

## Re: Binding Energy Question

Energetic enough photons can convert to electron-positron pairs and threesomes of the two possible mixes of thermal electrons and positrons will accelerate and ultimately produce protons and neutrons.

That's a definite prediction of the model.

Do you watch star trek, can this model be made to create the holodeck where matter just got conjure up from the machine? Is this what your new source of energy can do?

Absolutely not.

The new source of energy is this.

Summarily put, you take 2 1.022 MeV photons, cause them to split into two pairs, which already gives you  $3.643752752E-30$  kg

Then, take the two positrons and get them close enough to one of the electrons with not enough energy to escape mutual attraction and they will accelerate until they can get no closer due to equilibrium between energy expense at that translation radius and the energy constantly re-induced at that distance and you end up with a proton with

## Re: Binding Energy Question

mass  $1.67262158E-27$  kg which as it stabilized emits three very high energy photons that are most likely to split right away again.

Sumarily put, you start with 2.044 Mev of energy and you end up with the mass of a proton that you can use as reaction mass, or burn as hydrogen.

You reuse a small part of the energy to help maintain the process.

A high enough local concentration of thermal electrons and positrons should do the trick. Not all of them will end up as positronium. When the process is better understood, fine control will no doubt become possible.

Are their physicists or folks working on this concept?

My concept you mean ? Not that I know of, since this is not predicted by any orthodox theory.

Pls. give the papers or other references about what you are describing.

The only "paper" around that describes it is my book.

## Re: Binding Energy Question

What?? You mean you have wrote a book? Why didn't you say so.

I did tell you. In one of my first answers to you if I recall.

What is its title? I can't find your name in amazon. Pls. give the chapters in your book. I'm curious how to varies with Tom Lockyer Vectorial Particle Physics, etc.

The title is "Expanded Maxwellian Geometry of Space", 4th Edition, SRP Books, ISBN 0-968174868

Probably can be ordered from any bookstore that can order Canadian books.

If you want to understand the model, you would be well advise to really get clear on the underlying geometry. If you are looking for a mind stretcher, you will be well served.

There are thousands of copies floating about. I'd estimate between 3 and 4 thousand by now. I've been at it since 2000, ever since I presented the fundamental geometry at Congress-2000 at St Petersburg State U.

I'd like to get a copy of your book. It would be an exercise to point out the flaws as well as listen to some new wonderful insights. Because there is even iota of possibility string theory is correct. There are different parallel worlds with different laws of physics. String theory predicts there is even an infinite of them so what you state in the book can make up one of the parallel worlds. Complex things may not exist

Really ! The whole universe can be built with my model, however complex any of its parts can be.

in your world but perhaps some blobs or lumps of matter depending on the mechanism and accuracy of your model.

Re: Binding Energy Question

André Michaud