Title   **Sampling within the Hydrogen Atom**

On the use of the Sampling Theorem to provide a mechanism to describe the quantisation processes inside the hydrogen atom

Author   **Norman Graves**

Abstract

A model is proposed for the hydrogen atom in which the electron is an objectively real particle orbiting at very near to light speed. The model is based on the postulate that certain velocity terms associated with orbiting bodies can be considered as being affected by relativity. This leads to a model for the atom in which the stable electron orbits are associated with orbital velocities where Gamma is n/α, leading to the idea that it is Gamma that is quantised and not angular momentum as in the Bohr and other models. The model provides a mechanism which leads to quantisation of energy levels within the atom and also provides a simple mechanical explanation for the Fine Structure Constant. The mechanism is closely associated with the Sampling theorem and the related phenomenon of aliasing developed in the mid-20th century by engineers at Bell labs.

Sampling within the Hydrogen Atom

Since the emergence of quantum theory just over a century ago every model for the hydrogen atom that has been developed incorporates the same basic assumption. From Niels Bohr through de Broglie and Schrödinger up to and including the Standard Model all such theories are based on an assumption put forward by John Nicholson.

Nicholson was the first to recognise that the units of Planck's constant were the same as those of angular momentum and so he reasoned that perhaps Planck's constant was a measure of the angular momentum of the orbiting electron. But Nicholson went one step further and argued that Planck's constant was the fundamental unit or quantum of angular momentum and therefore the angular momentum of the orbiting electron could take on values which were an integer multiple of Planck's constant. This allowed Bohr to develop a model in which the differences between the energy levels matched those of the empirically developed Rydberg formula[1]. When the Bohr model was superseded Nicholson's assumption was simply carried forward unchallenged into these later models.

However, Nicholson's assumption lacks any mathematical rigour. It simply takes one variable, angular momentum, and asserts that if we allow it to have this characteristic quantisation then we get energy levels which appear to be correct. In so doing it fails to provide any sort of explanation as to why such a quantisation should take place.

In the mid-20th century a branch of mathematics emerged which straddles the boundary between continuous functions and discrete solutions. It was developed by engineers at Bell Labs to address problems of capacity in the telephone network. While at first site there appears to be little to connect problems of network capacity with electrons orbiting atomic nuclei it is the application of these mathematical ideas which holds the key to explaining quantisation inside the atom.

In the 1930's and 40's telecommunications engineers were concerned to increase the capacity of the telephone network. One of the ideas that surfaced was called Time Division Multiplexing. In this each of a number of incoming telephone lines is sampled by means of a switch, the resulting samples are sent over a trunk line and are decoded by a similar switch at the receiving end before being sent on their way. This allowed the trunk line to carry more telephone traffic without the expense of increasing the number of cables or individual lines. The question facing the engineers at the time was to determine the minimum frequency at which the incoming lines needed to be sampled in order that the telephone signal can be correctly reconstructed at the receiving end.

The solution to this problem was arrived at independently by a number of investigators, but is now largely credited to two engineers. The so called Nyquist-Shannon sampling theorem is named after Harry Nyquist[2] and Claude Shannon[3] who were both working at Bell Labs at the time. The theorem states that in order to reproduce a signal with no loss of information, then the sampling frequency must be at least twice the highest frequency of interest in the signal itself. The theorem forms the basis of modern information theory and its range of applications extends well beyond transmission of analog telephone calls, it underpins much of the digital revolution that has taken place in recent years.

What concerned Shannon and Nyquist was to sample a signal and then to be able to reproduce that signal at some remote location without any distortion, but a corollary to their work is to ask what happens if the frequency of interest extends beyond this Shannon limit? In this condition,

Norman Graves, June 2012, Wokingham UK

sometimes called under sampling, there are frequency components in the sampled signal that extend beyond the Shannon limit and maybe even beyond the sampling frequency itself.

A simple example can be used to illustrate the phenomenon. Suppose there is a cannon on top of a hill, some distance away is an observer equipped with a stopwatch. The job of the observer is to calculate the distance from his current location to the cannon. Sound travels in air at roughly 340 m/s. So it is simply a matter of the observer looking for the flash as the cannon fires and timing the interval until he hears the bang. Multiplying the result by 340 will give the distance to the cannon in metres, let's call this distance D.

This is fine if the cannon just fires a single shot, but suppose the cannon is rigged to fire at regular intervals, say T seconds apart. For the sake of argument and to simplify things, let's make T equal to 1. If the observer knows he is less than 340 m from the cannon there is no problem. He just makes the measurement as before and calculates the distance D. If on the other hand he is free to move anywhere with no restriction placed on his distance to the cannon then there is a problem. There is no way that the observer knows which bang is associated with which flash, so he might be located at any one of a number of different discrete distances from the cannon. Not just any old distance will do however. The observer must be at a distance of D or D + 340 or D + 680 and so on, in general D + 340n. The distance calculated as a result of measuring the time interval between bang and flash is ambiguous. In fact there are an infinite number of discrete distances which could be the result of any particular measured value. This phenomenon is known as aliasing. The term comes about because each actual distance is an alias for the measured distance.

Restricting the observer to be within 340 m of the cannon is simply a way of imposing Shannon's sampling limit and by removing this restriction we open up the possibility of ambiguity in determining the position of the observer due to aliasing.

Let's turn the problem around a little. If instead of measuring the distance to the cannon the position of the observer is fixed. Once again to make things simpler, let's choose a distance of 340m. This time however we are able to adjust the rate of fire of the cannon until the observer hears the bang and sees the flash as occurring simultaneously. If the rate of fire is one shot per second then the time taken for the slower bang to reach the observer exactly matches the interval between shots and so the two events, the bang and the flash are seen as being synchronous. Notice that the bang relates, not to the current flash, but to the previous flash.

If the rate of fire is increased then at first, for a small increment, the bang and the flash are no longer in sync. They come back into sync however when the rate of fire is exactly two shots per second, and again when the rate is three shots per second. If we had a fast enough machine gun this sequence would extend to infinity for a rate of fire which is an integer number of shots per second. Notice that now the bang no longer relates to *the* previous flash, but to *a* previous flash. It is interesting to note also that if the rate of fire is reduced from once per second then the observer will never hear and see the bang and the flash in sync with one another and so once per second represents the minimum rate of fire which will lead to a synchronous bang and flash. In fact what we have here is a system that has as its solutions a base frequency and an infinite set of harmonic frequencies.

Suppose now that there is some mechanism which feeds back from the observer to the cannon to drive the rate of fire such that bang and flash are in sync, and suppose that this feedback mechanism is such as to always force the condition to apply to the nearest rate of fire which produces synchronisation.

We now have a mechanism which can cause a variable, in this case the rate of fire of the gun, to take on a series of discrete values even though, in theory at least, the rate of fire can vary continuously. Equally important is that if the feedback mechanism is capable of syncing the system to the lowest such frequency then all the multiples of this frequency are also solutions, in other words if the base frequency is a solution then so are harmonics of the base frequency.

This idea of are multiple discrete solutions to a problem which are harmonics of a base frequency is an interesting one since it straddles the boundary between domains in which there are continuous variables, but only discrete solutions. What the example of the cannon shows us is that any system which produces results which are a harmonic sequence must involve some sort of sampling process. This becomes clear if we consider the Fourier representation of a harmonic sequence. A harmonic sequence of the type described consists of a number of discrete frequencies, spreading up the spectrum and spaced equally in the frequency domain with each discrete frequency represented by a so called Dirac function. Taken together they form what is described as a Dirac comb, in this case in the frequency domain. The inverse Fourier transform of such a Dirac comb is itself another Dirac comb, only this time in the time domain, and a Dirac comb in the time domain is a sampling signal.[4]

This link between a Dirac comb in the frequency domain and a corresponding Dirac comb in the time domain means that if ever we observe a set of harmonics in some natural process there must inevitably be some form of sampling process taking place in the time domain.

One such example, in which this relationship has seemingly been overlooked, is found in the structure of the hydrogen atom.

By the beginning of the 20th century it was becoming evident that the universe was composed of elements which were not smooth and continuous but were somehow lumpy or granular in nature. Matter was made up of atoms, atoms themselves contained electrons and later it emerged that the atomic nucleus was itself composed of protons and neutrons.

Perhaps even more surprising was that atoms could only absorb or emit energy at certain discrete levels. These energy levels are characteristic of the atom species and form the basis of modern spectroscopy. The problem facing the scientists of the day was that this discrete behaviour was not associated with the discrete nature of the structure of the atom; that could readily be explained by asserting that any atom contained an integer number of constituent particles. Where energy levels were concerned however, the quantisation effects concerned some sort of process that was taking place inside the atom.

The atom with the simplest structure is that of hydrogen, comprising a single proton surrounded by an orbiting electron and work began to investigate its structure and to understand the mechanisms which gave it its characteristic properties.

The first such theoretical model was proposed by Niels Bohr[5]. Bohr used simple classical mechanics to balance the centrifugal force of the orbiting electron against the electrostatic force pulling it towards the atomic nucleus. He needed a second equation in order to solve for the radius and velocity of the orbiting electron and came upon an idea proposed by John Nicholson[6]. Nicholson had noticed that the units of Planck's constant matched those of angular momentum and so he proposed that angular momentum could only take on values which were integer multiples of a base value and that the base value was Planck's constant.

Bohr's equations worked, but they threw up a strange anomaly. In Bohr's model each energy level is represented by the orbiting electron having a specific orbit with its own particular orbital velocity

Norman Graves, June 2012, Wokingham UK

and orbital radius. The really strange thing was that in order to fit with the conservation laws, transitions from one energy state to another had to take place instantly and in such a way that the electron moved from one orbit to another without ever occupying anywhere in between. This ability to jump instantaneously across space was quickly dubbed the Quantum Leap in the popular media, a phrase which still has resonance today.

The Bohr model

$$l = m v_n r_n = n\hbar$$ Equation 1

$$\frac{Kq^2}{r_n^2} = \frac{mv_n^2}{r_n}$$ Equation 2

$$v_n = \frac{Kq^2}{n\hbar}$$ Equation 3

$$r_n = \frac{n^2\hbar^2}{mKq^2}$$ Equation 4

Where:
m is the rest mass of the electron
q is the charge on the electron
r_n is the orbital radius for the nth energy level
v_n is the orbital velocity for the nth energy level
l is the angular momentum
K is the Coulomb force constant
$\hbar$ is Planck's constant

Equation 1 represents Nicholson's assumption that angular momentum can only take on values which are integer multiples of Planck's constant
Equation 2 balances the centrifugal force against the electrostatic force
Equation 3 shows that the orbital velocity decreases with increasing energy level.
Equation 4 shows that the orbital radius increases as the square of the energy level and leads directly to the idea of the Quantum Leap.

It was widely accepted that the Bohr model contained substantial flaws. Not only did it throw up the quirky quantum leap, but it took no account of special relativity, it failed to explain why the electron orbit did not decay due to synchrotron radiation but most important of all it failed to explain the nature of the quantisation of angular momentum[i]. The fact is that Bohr's assumption that angular momentum was quantised lacks any mathematical rigour, the assumption is arbitrary and expedient

---

[i] It is also interesting to note that the computed energy of the orbiting electron in fact decreases with increasing energy level thus forcing the introduction of the idea that this was not the energy level of the electron itself but instead was some sort of energy potential or negative energy of the atom. The absorption and emission spectra of the atom are calculated by taking the difference between energy levels and so, with the exception of the odd minus sign, these differences match the values calculated empirically by Rydberg.

and does not address the question as to why and how such quantisation occurs but merely asserts that if we make the assumption then the numbers seem to fit. Nevertheless, and despite this, the Bohr assumption has continued to be accepted and forms an integral part of every theory which has come along since.

In a paper published in 1905 Einstein had shown that light, which had hitherto been considered a wave, was in fact a particle[7]. In an effort to explain quantisation the French mathematician de Broglie turned this idea on its head and suggested that perhaps the electron was not a particle but should be considered as a wave instead.   He calculated the wavelength of the electron, dividing Planck's constant by the electron's linear momentum and found that when he did so the orbital path of base energy state contained one wavelength; that of the second energy state contained two wavelengths and so on, in what appeared at first site to be a series of harmonics[ii].

On any other scale the wavelength of an object in orbit is associated with the orbital path length or circumference of the orbit and can be derived as a result of dividing the angular momentum of the orbiting object by its linear momentum. According to Nicholson angular momentum is an integer multiple of Planck's constant and so Planck's constant is an integer fraction of angular momentum. In choosing to substitute Planck's constant in this way instead of the angular momentum when calculating the wavelength, what de Broglie is doing is to coerce the wavelength of the electron to be an integer fraction of the orbital path length. Viewed in this light de Broglie's contribution can be seen as less of an insight and more of a contrivance.

Other later models, such as that of Schrödinger, are based directly on the work of de Broglie and therefore inherently follow the Nicholson/Bohr assumption, up to and including the currently proposed Standard Model.

The trouble with all of these models is that Nicholson's assumption was not based on finding any mechanism that leads to angular momentum being quantised in this way. Bohr's assumption was simply expedient – it just happened to give the right answers for the absorption and emission spectra of the hydrogen atom.   Having been adopted by Bohr, later theorists simply continued with this working assumption and incorporated it into all subsequent models for the atom, without ever bothering to go back and justify it, until now it has become an item of received wisdom and an article of faith.

The year 1905 was an eventful one for Albert Einstein. In that year, he not only published his paper on the discrete nature of the photon but he also published two further seminal works as well as submitting his PhD thesis. The most famous of his other papers concerned the dynamics of moving bodies[8]. This is the paper whose later editions contained the equation $e=mc^2$. The paper was based on a thought experiment and concerned the perception of time, distance and mass as experienced by two observers, one a stationary observer and one moving relative to the stationary observer at speeds approaching that of light.

What Einstein showed was that time elapsed more slowly for the moving observer, that distances measured by the moving observer were foreshortened relative to those same distances measured by the stationary observer and that the stationary observer's perception of the mass of the moving object was that it had increased. All three effects occur to the same extent and are governed by a factor γ (Gamma). The time between two events observed by the stationary observer as time t is seen by the moving observer as time $T=t/\gamma$. Similarly the distance between two point measured by

---

[ii] In fact they are not harmonics of a single fundamental frequency, but instead each harmonic relates to a different base frequency and these two effects combine in such a way that they form a sub harmonic or inverse harmonic sequence.

the stationary observer as distance *d* is seen by the moving observer as distance *D=d/γ*. And as far as the stationary observer is concerned the mass of the moving object is seen to increase by this same factor *γ*.

Gamma is referred to as the Lorentz factor and is given by the formula:

$$\gamma \;=\; \frac{c}{\sqrt{c^2 - v^2}} \;=\; \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \dfrac{v^2}{c^2}}} \qquad\qquad \text{Equation 5}$$

Both observers agree on their relative velocity, but go about calculating it in different ways. For the stationary observer the velocity of the moving observer is the distance travelled divided by the time taken as measured in his stationary domain. For the stationary observer the velocity is:-

$$v = \frac{d}{t} \qquad\qquad \text{Equation 6}$$

For the moving observer the distance as measured in his own domain is foreshortened by the factor Gamma, but the time taken to cover that distance reduced by the same factor Gamma.

$$v \;=\; \frac{D}{T} = \frac{d/\gamma}{t/\gamma} = \frac{d}{t} \qquad\qquad \text{Equation 7}$$

There is a great deal of experimental evidence to support Einstein's Special Theory. One of the more convincing experiments was carried out at CERN in 1977 and involved measuring the lifetimes of particles called muons in an apparatus called the muon storage ring[9]. The muon is an atomic particle which carries a charge, much like an electron, only more massive. It has a short lifetime of around 2.2 microseconds before it decays into an electron and two neutrinos.

In the experiment muons are injected into a 14m diameter ring at a speed close to that of light, in fact at 99.94% of the speed of light. At this speed Gamma has a value of around 29.33. The muons, which should normally live for 2.2 microseconds, were seen to have an average lifetime of 64.5 microseconds; that is the lifetime of the muon was increased by a factor Gamma. This comes about because the processes which take place inside the muon and which eventually lead to its decay are taking place in an environment which is moving relative to us at 99.94% of the speed of light and where the time, relative to us, is running 29.33 times slower. Hence the muon, in its own domain, still has a lifetime of 2.2 microseconds, it's just that to us, who are not moving, this appears as 64.5 microseconds.

Traveling at almost the speed of light a muon would normally be expected to cover a distance of 660 metres or roughly 7.5 times around the CERN ring during its 2.2 microsecond lifetime, but in fact the muons travelled almost 20,000 metres or 220 times around the ring. This is because distance in the domain of the muon is compressed so what we stationary observers see as being 20,000 metres, the muon sees as being just 660 metres.

Both parties agree that during its lifetime the muon completes some 220 turns around the ring. We stationary observers see this as having taken place in some 64.5 microseconds, while the muon sees these 220 turns as having been completed in just 2.2 microseconds. Hence for the muon and indeed

all objects orbiting at close to light speed orbital frequency is multiplied by a factor Gamma relative to that of a stationary observer.

We have seen that speed is invariant with respect to relativity. Both the moving object and the stationary observer agree on their relative speed. This invariance of speed is central to the derivation of special relativity and so is deemed to be axiomatic. There is however one circumstance where this may not be the case. For a stationary observer we normally require the use of two clocks in order to measure velocity; one at the point of departure and one at the point of arrival (at least conceptually). An object which is in orbit however returns once per cycle to its point of departure and so we can measure the orbital period of such an object with a single clock.

We have seen already in the case of the muon that considerations of special relativity can be applied to objects in orbit, this despite the fact that object in orbit are subject to a constant acceleration towards the orbital centre. However where the orbital velocity is constant, it is reasonable and correct to apply considerations of special relativity around the orbital path. In effect what we are doing is to resolve the orbital velocity into two components, one tangential component which has a constant velocity and one radial where there is a constant acceleration[iii].

Thus for an object in orbit it is possible to define two velocity terms relating to the tangential or orbital velocity[iv].   The first of these I have called the Actual Velocity and is simply the distance around the orbit divided by the orbital period as measured by the stationary observer. The second velocity term is the distance around the orbit as measured by the moving observer divided by the time as measured by the stationary observer. Such a velocity term straddles or couples the two domains, that of the orbiting object and that of the stationary observer and so could sensibly be called the "Coupling Velocity" or possibly the Relativistic Velocity. A simple calculation shows that the Relativistic Velocity is related to the Actual Velocity by the same factor Gamma an hence

$$v_R \ = \ \frac{d}{T} \ = \ \frac{d}{t\gamma} \ = \ \frac{v}{\gamma} \hspace{4cm} \text{Equation 8}$$

Thus far Relativistic Velocity is only a definition. However there is one set of circumstances where such a velocity term can indeed be justified and that is when dealing the orbital velocity. It is considered here to be meaningful to use this Relativistic Velocity term when dealing with orbital velocities such as occur when calculating angular momentum, centripetal and centrifugal force and acceleration.

If Nicholson was right about Planck's constant being a measure of the angular momentum of the orbiting electron, but wrong in suggesting that it could take on values which are an integer multiple then, using Relativistic Velocity, Planck's constant is seen, not as a quantum of angular momentum, but instead as providing a limiting value for angular momentum.   The effect would not be significant at low velocities, but if the electron orbiting the hydrogen atom were to do so at close to light speed then –

[iii] Appendix 3 delves in more detail into the link between the tangential velocity of an orbiting object and the centripetal acceleration to which it is subject.
[iv] In fact it is possible to define a further two velocity terms, the relativistic distance divided by the relativistic time and the actual distance divided by the relativistic time. The first of these is the invariant velocity discussed earlier. As a stationary observer we do not have any direct access to the moving clock and so these velocities can only be described mathematically and appear to have no physical significance.

Norman Graves, June 2012, Wokingham UK

$$I = \hbar = (m\gamma)\, r \left(\frac{c\,'}{\gamma} \right)$$

Equation 9

Where

I is the angular momentum
$\hbar$ is Planck's constant
m is the mass of the electron
r is the orbital radius of the electron
c' is the orbital velocity of the electron and is very close to c, the speed of light.

Both the mass term and the velocity term are affected by relativity. The mass term because mass increases by factor Gamma as the object's velocity approaches the speed of light and in this case the velocity term is affected because we are dealing with an object in orbit and it is therefore appropriate to use Relativistic Velocity which is the Actual Velocity divided by Gamma. However since we are concerned here with an orbital velocity very close to the speed of light, to a first approximation we can substitute c for c' in equation 9.

$$I = \hbar = (m\gamma)\, r \left(\frac{c}{\gamma} \right)$$

Equation 10

The two Gamma terms will cancel. The terms for rest mass, Planck's constant and the speed of light are all constants, which must therefore mean that the orbital radius is also a constant.

$$R = \frac{\hbar}{mc}$$

Equation 11

This not unfamiliar term is known as the Reduced Compton Wavelength although here it takes on a new and special significance as the characteristic radius at which an electron will orbit at or near light speed. This explains why the orbiting electron does not emit synchrotron radiation. It does not do so because it is not driven to orbit the atomic nucleus by virtue of being accelerated by forces towards the orbital centre in the normal way, instead it is constrained to orbit at this radius by the limiting effect of Planck's constant. It is as if the electron is orbiting on a very hard surface from which it cannot depart and which it cannot penetrate. Equation 11 also means that there is no need to introduce the idea of a quantum leap. If the electron is constrained to always orbit at a fixed radius, then changes in energy level have to take place as a result of changes in velocity, with no accompanying change of radius.

Substituting Relativistic Velocity into the force balance equation that Bohr himself used, but at an orbital velocity very close to that of light yields another interesting result[v]

$$\frac{Kq^2}{r^2} = \frac{(m\gamma)}{r} \left(\frac{c}{\gamma} \right)^2$$

Equation 12

Which combines with Equation 11 and simplifies to give

---

[v] Once again since the orbital velocity is very close to the speed of light we can, to a first approximation, substitute c as the Actual Velocity.

Norman Graves, June 2012, Wokingham UK

$$\frac{Kq^2}{\hbar c} = \frac{1}{\gamma}$$
Equation 13

Readers may be familiar with the term on the left of this equation which is known as the Fine Structure Constant often written as α (Alpha). And so

$$\gamma = \frac{1}{\alpha}$$
Equation 14

α has a value of 7.2973525698 x 10^{-3}

From this and Equation 5 we can easily calculate the corresponding orbital velocity and frequency.

$$\frac{v}{c} = \sqrt{1 - \alpha^2} = \cdot 999973371$$
Equation 15

The orbital velocity c' turns out to be 99.9973% of the speed of light c, thus vindicating the first approximation made in Equation 11[vi].

And the frequency (in the domain of the stationary observer)

$$\omega_1 = \frac{v}{R} = 7.76324511 \times 10^{20}$$
Equation 16

The physicist Richard Feynman once said of Alpha that

*"It has been a mystery ever since it was discovered more than fifty years ago, and all good theoretical physicists put this number up on their wall and worry about it. Immediately you would like to know where this number for a **coupling**[vii] comes from: is it related to pi or perhaps to the base of natural logarithms? Nobody knows. It's one of the greatest damn mysteries of physics: a magic number that comes to us with no understanding by man. You might say the "hand of God" wrote that number, and "we don't know how He pushed his pencil." We know what kind of a dance to do experimentally to measure this number very accurately, but we don't know what kind of dance to do on the computer to make this number come out, without putting it in secretly!"[10]*

Equation 14 effectively solves the mystery, providing an explanation for the physical significance of the Fine Structure Constant. It is seen simply as the ratio of two velocities, the Relativistic Velocity and the Actual Velocity of the orbiting electron. Since these two velocities share the same orbital period, it can also be seen as the ratio of two orbital path lengths, the one traversed at non-relativistic speeds to that traversed by the orbiting electron at near light speed. The Fine Structure Constant is seen to be dynamic in nature. Its value relies on the fact that the electron is in motion, orbiting at near light speed; it does so at a speed that is necessary to maintain structural equilibrium within the hydrogen atom, since it is only by travelling at this speed that the structural integrity of the atom can be maintained. In the world of the atom, where there is no friction and in the absence of any sort of external input, the atom remains stable and, unless disturbed in some way, the electron will continue in this state indefinitely. In this sense it defines the speed at which the electron has to travel in order to achieve a stable orbit.

[vi] A more analytical approach to the method of first approximation is given in Appendix 1.
[vii] My emphasis – the term Coupling Velocity resonates with the idea of Alpha as a coupling constant.

Norman Graves, June 2012, Wokingham UK

We have seen that one of the effects of relativity is to multiply frequency in the domain of a moving object by Gamma. The frequency in the domain of the electron which corresponds to this stable state is simply calculated by multiplying by Gamma – equivalent to dividing by Alpha - to give.

$$\Omega_1 = \frac{\omega_1}{\alpha} = 1.06378925 \times 10^{23}$$
Equation 17

But just as was the case with the observer and the cannon if there is a frequency Ω at which the atom is stable then frequencies of n Ω must also be stable for all n = integer which in turn means that there are stable states for all

$$\gamma_n = \frac{n}{\alpha}$$
Equation 18

And so

$$r_n = R = \frac{\hbar}{mc}$$
Equation 19

And

$$\frac{v_n}{c} = \sqrt{\frac{n^2 - \alpha^2}{n^2}}$$
Equation 20

Equation 19 shows that the orbital radius remains the same for all energy levels, while Equation 20 describes the orbital velocity for the nth energy state.

Table 1 below shows the resulting orbital velocities for the first 13 energy states and the theoretically infinite state of the hydrogen atom and as you might expect they match the absorption and emission spectra of the hydrogen atom perfectly[viii].

n	v_n/c	$1/\gamma_n$	ω_n	Energy eV	ΔEnergy eV
1	0.999973371	0.007297559	7.76324511E+20	255485.925	13.607
2	0.999993343	0.003648853	7.76340016E+20	255496.130	3.402
3	0.999997041	0.002432577	7.76342887E+20	255498.020	1.512
4	0.999998336	0.001824435	7.76343892E+20	255498.682	0.850
5	0.999998935	0.001459549	7.76344357E+20	255498.988	0.544
6	0.999999260	0.001216291	7.76344610E+20	255499.154	0.378
7	0.999999457	0.001042536	7.76344762E+20	255499.255	0.278
8	0.999999584	0.000912219	7.76344861E+20	255499.320	0.213
9	0.999999671	0.000810861	7.76344929E+20	255499.364	0.168
10	0.999999734	0.000729775	7.76344977E+20	255499.396	0.136
11	0.999999780	0.000663432	7.76345013E+20	255499.420	0.112
12	0.999999815	0.000608146	7.76345040E+20	255499.438	0.094
13	0.999999842	0.000561366	7.76345061E+20	255499.452	0.081
∞	1.000000000	0.000000000	7.763451838E+20	255499.532	0.000

Table 1

[viii] In Appendix 2 I show how to derive the Rydberg formula analytically based on Relativistic Velocity.

Norman Graves, June 2012, Wokingham UK

During the 1930s and 40s Einstein and Bohr disagreed over the nature of reality, with Bohr arguing that the laws of physics were different on the scale of the atom and that as a consequence reality becomes subjective in nature. Particles are not considered to discrete point particles in the classical sense, but instead are considered to be nebulous wave-particles which manifest themselves as either particles or as waves when subjected to some sort of observing process. Einstein on the other hand took the view that reality had to be objective and that particles must therefore be discrete point particles having deterministic position and velocity.

In the end the debate was resolved by default. Bohr simply outlived Einstein and so his ideas prevailed and form the basis of today's Standard Model. Einstein is nowadays often described as being an old man, set in his ways and unable to accept the new ways of thinking. But this is to misconstrue Einstein's position, which was one of principle.

If we begin from the premise that Einstein was correct and that reality has to be objective and also to accept his hypothesis that the laws of physics are the same for all observers, extending this to be independent of scale, then we must ask ourselves the question: what is it about the laws of physics that needs to change in order to bring about such consistency and at the same time to explain the mechanics of the most basic of atoms. The idea postulated here does just that. It provides a model for the structure and dynamics of the hydrogen atom which is consistent with particles which are objectively real. At the same time it does what all previous models have failed to do and provides a mechanism to explain the quantisation of the energy levels of the atom without resorting to arbitrary assumptions.

The postulated idea of a Relativistic Velocity or Coupling Velocity, a velocity term which is affected by relativity, solves all of the problems that faced Niels Bohr with his model and produces a model for the hydrogen atom which matches the emission and absorption spectra of the atom.

Such quantisation takes place with respect to Gamma as the orbital velocity of the electron gets ever closer to the speed of light with increasing energy level, and not with respect to angular momentum as postulated by Bohr. Angular momentum for the orbiting electron remains substantially constant and equal to Planck's constant over all of its energy levels as the orbital velocity varies from 99.99733% of c for the base energy state upwards as energy levels increase, although never quite achieving the theoretical limit of 100%, while Gamma is constrained to take on values which are integer multiples of a base value.

The orbital radius of the electron remains substantially constant irrespective of the energy level of the atom and so transitions from one energy state to another take place without the need to introduce the idea of discontinuity of position, inherent in the Bohr model, or its equivalent probability density functions and wave particle duality found in other more recent models. Such transitions are easily explained as simple changes in the orbital velocity of the electron over a dynamic range which lies very close to the speed of light.

Thus the morphology of the atom remains substantially unaltered for all energy levels. This is consistent with the atom having the same physical and chemical properties irrespective of energy level.

The model explains all of the shortcomings of the Bohr model, the absence of orbital decay due to synchrotron radiation, the need for a quantum leap and the introduction of negative energy. Bohr had ignored the effects of special relativity on the energy levels of the atom, even though they

Norman Graves, June 2012, Wokingham UK

should have been small but significant at the velocities predicted by his model. Here they are fully integrated into the model.

The model sheds a new light on the nature of the wave particle duality. The electron is seen as a point particle in the classical sense, having deterministic position and velocity[ix]. Electrons are thus objectively real. The waves are seen as the projection of the circular orbit of the objectively real electron onto an external observer, in much the same way that we can describe the orbit of the moons of distant planets as having a wavelike nature. There is no need to invent the ether or what has more recently passed for the ether, the so called fabric of space time, as a medium in which these waves exist. In the final analysis where vacuum contains absolutely nothing, there is nothing to wave except the particle and that is precisely what the model provides.

The introduction of Relativistic Velocity has another major implication. It extends the laws of physics down to the scale of the atom and possibly beyond. With its introduction the same set of physical laws extends from a scale of approximately 10^{-20} m to 10^{20} m thus doing away with the notion that a different set of physical law applies on the scale of the atom. It is quite likely therefore that a single set of physical laws exists for all scales and throughout the universe.

And finally it provides a simple mechanical explanation for the existence and the value of the hitherto mysterious Fine Structure Constant.

[ix] This is not to say that uncertainty does not exist, it does, but it is seen as a practical issue of measurement when the scale of the measurement tools is similar to that of the measured object and not as being an intrinsic property of the particle.

Norman Graves, June 2012, Wokingham UK

Appendix 1

A more analytical approach for calculating the value for c' can be found without the first approximation used above:

The equation for the value of gamma

$$\gamma = \frac{c}{\sqrt{c^2 - c'^2}}$$

Equation 21

Can be manipulated to give an expression for c':

$$c' = c\sqrt{\frac{\gamma^2 - 1}{\gamma^2}}$$

Equation 22

And substitute this value for c' into the force balance equation:

$$\frac{m_0 c^2 (\gamma^2 - 1)}{R\gamma^3} = \frac{Kq^2}{R^2}$$

Equation 23

This can be simplified to:

$$m_0 c^2 R \frac{\gamma^2 - 1}{\gamma^3} = Kq^2$$

Equation 24

And recognising that $\hbar = m_0 R c$ gives:

$$\frac{\gamma^2 - 1}{\gamma^3} = \frac{Kq^2}{\hbar c}$$

Equation 25

The term on the right hand side is the Fine Structure Constant which is denoted by α. Substituting and rearranging gives the following equation for γ.

$$\alpha\gamma^3 - \gamma^2 + 1 = 0$$

Equation 26

The numerical value[x] for α is 7.2973525698x10^{-3}. Substituting this and calculating the three roots gives:

γ = 137.028700944403
γ = -0.996384222264

γ =1.0036823521665

Only the first of these three values is significant, the second implies orbital rotation in the opposite sense, while the third implies a velocity greater than that of light. This cubic equation gives a more precise value for gamma. By recognizing that c' is very close to c in the force balance equation the value of Gamma can be calculated as:

$$\gamma = \frac{1}{\alpha}$$

Equation 27

Substituting in the equation for γ gives a value for c':

$$c' = c\sqrt{\frac{\gamma^2 - 1}{\gamma^2}} = 0.999973371\, c$$

Equation 28

c' is the Actual Velocity of the electron around its orbit and as can be seen it is very close to c, the velocity of light, being some 99.9973371% of c, which is in agreement with the method of first approximation to the first 8 significant figures.

Norman Graves, June 2012, Wokingham UK

Appendix 2

The Rydberg Formula

Joseph Jakob Balmer (1825-1898) was a Swiss mathematician and numerologist who, after his studies in Germany, took up a post teaching mathematics at a girls' school in Basel. A colleague in Basel suggested that he take a look at the spectral lines of hydrogen to see if he could find a mathematical relationship between them. Eventually Balmer did find a common factor $h = 3.6456*10^{-7}$ [xi] which led him to a formula for the wavelength of the various spectral lines.

$$\lambda = \frac{h \, m^2}{m^2 - 4}$$

Equation 29

Where m is an integer with values of 3 or higher

Balmer originally matched his formula for m = 3,4,5,6 and based on this he predicted an absorption line for $m = 7$. Balmer's seventh line was subsequently found to match a new line in the hydrogen spectrum that had been discovered by Ângström.

Balmer's formula dealt with a particular set of spectral lines in the hydrogen atom and was later found to be a special case of a more general result which was formulated by the Swedish physicist Johannes Rydberg.

$$\frac{1}{\lambda} = R_H \left(\frac{1}{n_1^2} - \frac{1}{n_2^2} \right)$$

Equation 30

Where λ is the wavelength of the spectral line
R_H is called the Rydberg constant for hydrogen
n_1 and n_2 are integers and $n_1 < n_2$

By setting n_1 to 1 and allowing n_2 to take on values of 2, 3, 4 … ∞ the lines take in a series of values known as the Lyman series. Balmer's series is obtained by setting $n_1=2$ and allowing n_2 to take on values of 3, 4, 5… . Similarly for other values of n_1 series of spectral lines have been named according to the person who first discovered them and so:

n1	n2	Series
1	2 … ∞	Lyman series
2	3 … ∞	Balmer series
3	4 … ∞	Paschen series
4	5 … ∞	Brackett series
5	6 … ∞	Pfund series
6	7 … ∞	Humphreys series

Other series beyond these do exist, but they are not named.

[xi] *h* here is not to be confused with Planck's constant

Norman Graves, June 2012, Wokingham UK

By substituting different values for R, it was found that Rydberg's formula worked for all so called *hydrogenic[xii]* atoms.

The value of R_H can be found by considering the case where $n_1=1$ and $n_2=\infty$, a condition which represents the maximum possible change in energy level within the hydrogen atom. R_H is then the wavelenght of the absorption line associated with such an energy change and was calculated to have a value of $1.097*10^7$

This was subsequently found to be given by the formula:

$$R_H = \frac{1}{4\pi}\frac{m_0\,c\alpha^2}{\hbar}$$

Equation 31

The highest possible energy level for the atom occurs when *n*, the energy level, equals the theoretical value of infinity. The corresponding value for the Actual Velocity would then be *c*, the speed of light.

The equation for the energy of an orbiting body of mass *m* with velocity *v* is easily obtained in any standard text and is given by:

$$e = \frac{1}{2}m\,v^2$$

Equation 32

The maximum possible energy of an electron orbiting the hydrogen nucleus where the orbital velocity has a theoretical value of *c*, the speed of light and the mass of the electron is m_0

$$e = \frac{1}{2}m_0\,c^2$$

Equation 33

The energy potential for a hydrogen atom in any arbitrary energy state *n* is the difference between this maximum energy value and the energy of the nth state, which for the base energy state is

$$e_p = \frac{1}{2}m_0\,c^2 - \frac{1}{2}m_0\,v^2 = \frac{1}{2}m_0\left(c^2 - v^2\right)$$

Equation 34

Where *v* is the orbital velocity in the base energy state

We saw earlier that gamma could be expressed in terms of *c*, the velocity of light and *v*, the Actual Velocity using Einstein's equation for special relativity:

$$\gamma = \frac{c}{\sqrt{c^2 - v^2}}$$

Equation 35

This is easily rearranged to give and expression for $c^2 - v^2$:

$$c^2 - v^2 = \frac{c^2}{\gamma^2}$$

Equation 36

[xii] A hydrogenic atom is one which is ionized such that it has only one orbiting electron. In theory, at least, any atom can be ionized so as to become hydrogenic.

Norman Graves, June 2012, Wokingham UK

But for the base energy state

$$\gamma = \frac{1}{\alpha}$$

Equation 37

and so for the base energy state:

$$c^2 - v^2 = c^2 \alpha^2$$

Equation 38

Hence the maximum energy potential of the hydrogen atom is given by

$$e_p = \frac{1}{2} m_0 c^2 \alpha^2$$

Equation 39

Substituting the numerical values for m_0, c and α gives the value for the energy potential as:

$$e_p = 2.18009839066480 \times 10^{-18} \ Joules$$

or

$$e_p = 13.607105 \ eV$$

The successive stable energy states correspond to increasing values of Gamma given by the formula

$$\gamma_n = n\gamma_1 = \frac{nc}{\sqrt{c^2 - v^2}}$$

Equation 40

for n = 1, 2, 3...

It is therefore possible to calculate the energy potential for any energy level.

$$e_{p_n} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{m_0 c^2 \alpha^2}{n^2}$$

Equation 41

Hence the difference between any two energy levels: n and m, is given by:

$$e_{n,m} = \frac{1}{2} m_0 c^2 \alpha^2 \left(\frac{1}{n^2} - \frac{1}{m^2} \right)$$

Equation 42

And therefore the difference in orbital frequency

$$\omega_{n,m} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{m_0 c^2 \alpha^2}{\hbar} \left(\frac{1}{n^2} - \frac{1}{m^2} \right)$$

Equation 43

Norman Graves, June 2012, Wokingham UK

Where $m > n$.

It can be seen that this is structurally similar to the Rydberg formula. The essential difference is that here we have calculated the frequency as an angular frequency in radians per second. Rydberg dealt with frequency in Hz and with the wavelength which is 1/frequency. To convert Equation 43 to such a wavelength we need to divide both sides by 2π which gives

$$R_H = \frac{1}{4\pi} \frac{m_0 \, c\alpha^2}{\hbar}$$

Equation 44

and

$$\frac{1}{\lambda} = R_H \left(\frac{1}{n^2} - \frac{1}{m^2} \right)$$

Equation 45

Appendix 3

Derivation of Centripetal Acceleration under relativistic conditions

The idea that orbital velocity is affected by relativity is central to the theory presented here, so it is perhaps worthwhile examining this idea in a little more detail. Before doing so however it is necessary to restate that the use of Special Relativity in dealing with objects which have constant orbital velocity is entirely appropriate, this despite the fact that such objects are subject to acceleration. The velocity of an object which is in orbit can be considered as having two components, a tangential component and a radial component. For constant orbital velocity, the tangential component is itself constant and therefore can be dealt with using Special Relativity which affects the time and distance measured along the orbital path. Direct evidence to support this comes in the form of the Muon ring experiment described earlier.

Such an orbiting object is subject to constant acceleration towards the orbital centre and it is this acceleration which in effect maintains the circular path. Conventional wisdom has it that this centripetal acceleration is not affected by relativity, since it acts in a direction which is normal to the velocity of the object. Here it is argued that this cannot be the case since the distances involved in calculating centripetal acceleration derive directly from the distances travelled around the orbital path and that these distances are affected by relativity. It can then be shown that this is equivalent to substituting Relativistic Velocity in place of Actual Velocity in the standard formula for calculating centripetal acceleration.

Einstein showed that objects which are traveling at close to light speed are affected in three ways, time in the domain of the moving observer advances at a slower rate than it does for a stationary observer, distance for the moving object is foreshortened in the direction of travel relative to that same distance as measured by the stationary observer. The mass of a moving object appears increased as far as the stationary observer is concerned. All three effects occur to the same extent by the factor Gamma (γ). Gamma is named after the Dutch physicist Hendrik Antoon Lorentz (1853 – 1928). Gamma is given by the formula

$$\gamma = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}}}$$
Equation 46

Examination of the effect of relativity on an object moving at close to the speed of light however reveals that both time and distance are scaled by a factor $1/\gamma$ and so from Equation 45

$$\frac{1}{\gamma} = \sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}}$$
Equation 47

It can be seen that this is the equation of a circle, more specifically a quadrant of a unit circle, since v is constrained to lie between 0 and c as shown in Figure 1.

Norman Graves, June 2012, Wokingham UK

Figure 1

If the object under consideration is in circular orbit, then this quadrant can be superimposed on the orbital path to form a hemisphere. Objects orbiting at non-relativistic speeds see the path length around the orbit as being equal in length to the equator, while objects orbiting at higher speeds follow a path length described by a line of latitude on the hemisphere. An object orbiting at the theoretical maximum speed of light would then be pirouetting at the pole. We can consider the length of the orbital path as being represented by the line of latitude formed by a slicing plane which cuts through the hemisphere parallel to the equatorial plane. In Figure 2 this is at approximately 15% of the speed of light c and so the orbital path length is just a little less than the equatorial path length, around 99%.


Figure 2

Norman Graves, June 2012, Wokingham UK

In Figure 3 the orbital velocity is approximately 80% of the speed of light and so the orbital path length as seen by the moving object is approximately 60% that for an object moving at non-relativistic speed.


Figure 3

In Figure 4 the orbital velocity is around 98% of the speed of light and the corresponding orbital path length is approximately 20% of that for non-relativistic motion.


Figure 4

This hemispheric model of the motion of an orbiting object is useful because it allows us to visualise the orbital path length as being foreshortened by relativity while at the same time the radius of the orbit is unaffected by relativity. The orbital geometry is non-Euclidian and in reality all takes place in just one plane. The introduction of this third dimension is just a device to allow us to visualise what is going on. The orbiting object sees the distance it travels around one orbit as being reduced by a factor Gamma, but nevertheless sees the orbital radius as being unaffected by relativity since this is

at right angles to the direction of travel. Thus we can represent the radius of the orbit as being the distance from a point on the relativistic orbit to the centre of the hemisphere.

The term Actual Velocity has been adopted to describe the velocity of the orbiting object as seen by a stationary observer. This is easily calculated as the circumference of the orbital path, the equator of the hemisphere *(d)*, divided by the orbital period *(t)*, both measured by the stationary observer.

The theory postulates that there is a velocity term which is affected by Gamma. This is termed the Relativistic Velocity, but only becomes significant when the Actual Velocity is close to the speed of light. This velocity term can be calculated by taking the foreshortened distance around the line of latitude, which represents the orbital path as seen by the moving observer, divided by the orbital period as measured by a stationary observer. The foreshortened distance around the orbit is calculated as d/γ and the orbital period remains the same as for Actual Velocity *(t)* and hence this Relativistic Velocity is then easily calculated as $v_R = d/t\gamma$.

We can use this term directly in calculating the angular momentum of the orbiting object. This is simply a restatement of the argument used earlier. Angular momentum is the product of the mass, the velocity and the radius of an orbiting point object. However the mass of the object is affected by relativity, appearing to increase the mass by a factor Gamma (γ) and so:

$$I = (m\gamma)\, r \left(\frac{v_R}{\gamma} \right) \qquad\qquad\qquad \text{Equation 48}$$

However since for Gamma to take on a significant value v_r must be very close to c, the speed of light and so we can write:

$$I = \hbar = mrc \qquad\qquad\qquad \text{Equation 49}$$

Since the angular momentum of an electron in orbit around an atomic nucleus is given by Planck's constant we can substitute this for *I* in Equation 47.

In effect we are simply substituting Relativistic Velocity for Actual Velocity in the standard textbook formula for calculating angular momentum. This is recognising that the orbital velocity is the distance around the orbit as measured by the moving object divided by the orbital period as measured by a stationary observer.

We can of course use this same argument to substitute Relativistic Velocity for Actual Velocity in the formula for centripetal acceleration and hence derive expressions for centripetal and centrifugal forces. However in the case of centripetal acceleration it is also useful to derive an expression for the relativistic case from first principles.

The formula for centripetal force was first derived by Christian Huygens in 1659 and describes a constant force acting on a body in circular motion towards the centre of the circle. When combined with Newton's second law this leads to the idea that a body in circular motion is subject to a constant acceleration towards the centre called centripetal acceleration.

Figure 5

It is customary when deriving the formula for centripetal acceleration to use velocity vectors directly. Here we take a slightly different approach and use the distance vectors instead. This is because the in the proposed theory only the distance component of velocity is affected by relativity and not the time component. In other respects the derivation is the same as that found in many standard texts.

Consider an object in orbit around a point C at radius R. At a particular instant t the object is at point A and some short interval of time later Δt it is at point P, having moved through an angle subtended at the centre of the circle of $\Delta\theta$.

The vector representing the distance moved in time Δt is AB and has length d and is tangential to the circle, hence CAB is a right angle. At $t+\Delta t$ the object is at P and has a distance vector PQ, also of length d.   We can translate the vector PQ to A forming AD. The vector BD then represents the distance moved towards the centre of the circle in time Δt. Note that for as $\Delta\theta$ tends to 0 the line BD tends to a straight line.

Then

$$d = R\Delta\theta$$ <div style="text-align:right">Equation 50</div>

And since APC and ABD are similar triangles (for small $\Delta\theta$)

$$e = d\Delta\theta$$ <div style="text-align:right">Equation 51</div>

And the acceleration towards the centre of the circle is

$$a = \frac{e}{\Delta t^2}$$ <div style="text-align:right">Equation 52</div>

Therefore

$$a = \frac{R\Delta\theta^2}{\Delta t^2}$$ <div style="text-align:right">Equation 53</div>

Multiplying both top and bottom by R gives

$$a = \frac{R^2\,\Delta\theta^2}{R\Delta t^2}$$ <div style="text-align:right">Equation 54</div>

But since

$$v = \frac{d}{\Delta t} = \frac{R\Delta\theta}{\Delta t}$$ <div style="text-align:right">Equation 55</div>

Then

$$a = \frac{v^2}{R}$$ <div style="text-align:right">Equation 56</div>

Norman Graves, June 2012, Wokingham UK

When we take into consideration the effects of special relativity, the situation becomes a little more complicated. Although the orbital path is foreshortened, as represented by the line of latitude in Figure 6, and hence the circumference of this circle is reduced by a factor Gamma, the radius of the circle is not affected and remains the same as that for the equatorial orbital path.


Figure 6

Figure 6 attempts to show this by introducing a third dimension and using the hemispherical representation developed above. In reality however the radius and the orbital path are co-planar. It can be seen from Figure 6 that the angle subtended by a short segment of the circumference is less for the relativistic path than for the non-relativistic path. From Figure 6 it is evident that

$$\Delta\phi = \frac{\Delta\theta}{\gamma}$$

Equation 57

And

$$R\Delta\phi = \frac{R\Delta\theta}{\gamma}$$

Equation 58

Norman Graves, June 2012, Wokingham UK

Figure 7 shows the foreshortened orbital path in plan view. The dashed circle represents the non-relativistic orbital path while the radii are shown dotted to indicate that they are not to scale in this representation.


Figure 7

The distance travelled during time Δt is foreshortened by relativity , instead of travelling a distance AB the object only travels a distance A'B'=D in Figure 7.

$$D = R\Delta\phi$$ Equation 59

Once again the triangles CA'B' and A'B'D' are similar and so the distance travelled towards the centre of the orbit E is

$$E = D\Delta\phi$$ Equation 60

The acceleration towards the centre of the circle is

$$A = \frac{E}{\Delta t^2}$$

Equation 61

Which is also

$$A = \frac{R\Delta\phi^2}{\Delta t^2}$$

Equation 62

Again we can multiply both denominator and numerator by R to give

$$A = \frac{R^2 \Delta\phi^2}{R\Delta t^2}$$

Equation 63

Which gives

$$A = \frac{R^2 \Delta\theta^2}{R\Delta t^2 \gamma^2}$$

Equation 64

$$A = \frac{v^2}{R\gamma^2}$$

Equation 65

Equation 64 represents a more general case for calculating centripetal acceleration. When the orbital velocity is low, under non-relativistic conditions, the value of Gamma is unity and the formula can be simplified to the more familiar one shown in Equation 55. Effectively therefore the formula for centripetal acceleration under relativity substitutes Relativistic Velocity for Actual Velocity in the standard textbook formula.

It is the geometry of the triangle AB'D' which lies at the heart of the argument. Here I argue that the length B'D' is affected by relativity even though it is measured in a direction at right angles to the direction of travel. This comes about because the lengths of the two sides AB' and AD' are both affected by relativity and the triangle must have geometric integrity and so B'D' must also be scaled by relativity. If it was not then the triangle AB'D' would be a very strange triangle indeed. It would have to be an isosceles triangle in which the third side could be longer than the sum of the two other sides. The direction of the vectors AB' and AD' could not be preserved and there would have to be some sort of discontinuity when Gamma reached a value of 2 or more since it is at this point that the lengths of the sides would no longer add up. Even in non-Euclidian geometry such a triangle would not be possible and so B'D' must be scaled by Gamma.

The measurement of time on the other hand can only take place in the domain of the observer, so the moving observer sees his time in his own domain and the stationary observer sees time in his domain. The two domains are related by a factor Gamma, but from the point of view of direct measurement this is a theoretical connection. In other words the stationary observer has no direct access to the moving clock and, vice versa, the moving observer has no direct access to the stationary clock.

[1] Heilbron, J. L. (1981), *Historical Studies in the Theory of Atomic Structure*, Arno Press

[2] H. Nyquist, *Certain Topics in Telegraph Transmission Theory*, Trans. AIEE, vol 47, pp 617-644, Apr 1928

[3] C. E Shannon, C*ommunication in the Presence of Noise*, Proc. Institute of Radio Engineers, vol 37 no. 1 pp 10-21, Jan 1949.

[4] Bracewell, R.N. (1986), *The Fourier Transform and Its Applications (revised ed.)*, McGraw-Hill; 1st ed. 1965, 2nd ed. 1978

[5] Niels Bohr (1913). *On the Constitution of Atoms and Molecules, Part I*. Philosophical Magazine 26: 1–24.

[6] Nicholson, John W, (1911*), "A structural Theory of the Chemical Elements"*, Philosophical Magazine 22: 864-889

[7] Einstein, Albert (1905), *Über einen die Erzeugung und Verwandlung des Lichtes betreffenden heuristischen Gesichtspunkt (On a Heuristic Viewpoint Concerning the Production and Transformation of Light)*, Annalen der Physik 17 (6): 132–14

[8] Einstein, Albert (1905), *Zur Elektrodynamik bewegter Körper* (*On the Electrodynamics of Moving Bodies)*, Annalen der Physik 17 (10): 891–921,

[9] Bailey, H.; Borer, K.; Combley F.; Drumm H.; Krienen F.; Lange F.; Picasso E.; Ruden W. von; Farley F. J. M. ; Field J. H.; Flegel W. & Hattersley P. M. (1977). *Measurements of relativistic time dilatation for positive and negative muons in a circular orbit*. Nature 268 (5618): 301–305

[10] Feynman, Richard P., (1985) *QED: The Strange Theory of Light and Matter*, Princeton University Press, p. 129.