

QFT'S non-speculative, automatic predictions of particle masses

Re-presentation of model on p. 48 of vixra 1111.0111, U(1)xSU(2)xSU(3) QG successes

Nigel B. Cook

Revised version, 22 May 2014

ABSTRACT

We re-present a theory *entirely based on observed, accepted components of QFT, re-arranged more logically to produce checkable calculations of particle masses*. Consider first the heavy isomers of the electron, the decaying muon and the tauon. These heavy leptons particles have additional mass, and the ability to undergo decay. A simple theory for heavy masses is readily available in QFT, in the well-checked phenomenon of mass and charge renormalization. Where enough energy is available in a collision, virtual particle pairs that form in the force field around an electron due to normal vacuum pair production, may be sufficiently radially polarized that they acquire enough energy to form a metastable, beta decaying, effectively onshell arrangement rather than annihilating quickly as predicted by the offshell (Heisenberg) energy-time law. Pair production with vacuum polarization of the pair by the field is a process which absorbs energy from the field, and enough potential energy from the field can be absorbed by the pair to enable them to approach an effectively onshell, metastable state that enables them to live longer than predicted by Heisenberg's law (which strictly applies to offshell, or virtual, particles). This accounts for the significant decay lifetimes of the case of heavy generations, muons and tauons. Generalized, it predicts the generations of the Standard Model.

1. Virtual fermions are radially polarized (driven further apart) by the electric field in which they formed.
2. This polarization supplies the virtual fermions energy, at the expense of electric field, which is thus partly "screened."
3. The energy supplied to virtual fermions by their radial polarization extends their lifetime beyond Heisenberg's \hbar/E .
4. This supply of extra energy moves "virtual" fermions towards the real mass shell, so they briefly obey Pauli's principle.
5. As a result of this, the "virtual" fermions become structured like electron orbits, thereby contributing quantized mass. Different isomers are possible which allow various weak decay routes, thereby predicting the CKM matrix mechanism.
6. Neutrino mass data suggests flavor oscillations are geometric differences in the vacuum structuring of their masses.

Whereas string envisages different quantized masses to arise by analogy to electron energy levels (line spectra), *this model simply uses a quantum gravity calculation to quantize mass*. See page 6 of <http://vixra.org/pdf/1302.004v2.pdf> "Comparison of this result ... with the Newton-Laplace law ... shows that $G = c^3/mH$) and $M^2 = M_1M_2$, quantizing mass into similar fundamental units." I.e. the finding $M^2 = M_1M_2$, implies that $M_1 = M_2$, so that all masses are built up from similar building blocks. This quantizes mass based on a successful quantum gravity that correctly predicted the amount of dark energy observed in 1998, two years before its detection, in 1996. (For more on this quantum gravity discovery, see previous papers like <http://vixra.org/abs/1111.0111> and more recent vixra papers like 1305.0012 and 1304.0175.)

We won't repeat the QG calculations all over again here, but the comparison of predicted and observed masses can be found in places like <http://vixra.org/abs/1111.0111> at pages 48-9. According to this fact-based model (see the six numbered facts above), variations in particle masses arise from some of the "virtual" particles in the field around a real particle core being polarized sufficiently to gain enough energy to be structured by the Pauli principle into shells, and to mire the core with mass, effectively giving it extra weight. QFT does include mass in the renormalization process, so this is hardly radical in principle, but it is a radical way of *calculating* (it's taboo to take quantum fields as anything other than a mathematical mystery, it's taboo to use a simple model of gauge boson exchange in place of abstruse mathematical tools, etc.). What we're saying is that the *number* of "virtual" particles made effectively into a mass onshell condition by vacuum polarization is proportional to the overall mass of a particle, after correction for the vacuum polarization field shielding which determines the coupling of that field mass to the real particle "core" (bosonic field exchange between "virtual" fermions and the particle core determines the effective inertial miring or mass for the particle core when it is accelerated, $F = ma$).

In other words, pairs of virtual fermions formed around an electron core can in collision processes gain enough energy to effectively become onshell particles. Thus, the virtual pairs of fermions becomes non-virtual, so they survive long enough to become structured by the Pauli exclusion principle into a shell structure. By analogy to electron or nucleon

shells, they have particularly “stable” structures consisting of certain numbers of virtual particles, and *only these relatively stable structures persist long enough to actually be observed with the half lives of the muon and the tauon*. Other combinations also exist, but because they are less stable they disappear too quickly, leaving the muon and tauon observable.

This *step-by-step listing of the key physical processes in mixing and mass mechanisms* is not included explicitly on pages 48-49 etc., of our 30 November 2011 paper, vixra 1111.0111, “U(1)XSU(2)XSU(3) Quantum Gravity successes”. The reason for this new paper is an effort to avert the superficial appearance of brevity and to overcome what Professor Jacques Distler has kindly described as a dyslexic “word salad” physics confusion. (While vixra 1111.0111 briefly compiles all the key details, it is clearly not a student textbook. We have published journal articles, but with time restrictions the quality of the organization of the writing of a scientific paper decreases if efforts are focussed instead upon the difficult challenge of forestalling a vast number of possible potential objections and and queries.)

In an ideal world, we would have resolved all the problems and foreseen all the consequences within 10 minutes of coming up with our original QG calculation in 1996, and then we could have concentrated on organizing the material into a textbook. In the real world, science isn’t like that. Put it this way: if it was that quick and easy then somebody else would have done so, probably Feynman, fifty years ago. It has absorbed a lot of effort, and the brief literary write up doesn’t make it easy for a reader to grasp. The theory needs consolidation by re-organization and improved presentation, which will make it easier and faster for outsiders with limited interest in “mere mechanisms” to understand.

INTRODUCTION

We won’t repeat the abstract over again here, but will discuss other aspects. Fermion “bare core” charges (which become more observable in high energy collisions) are greater than their normal textbook (low energy measurement) values, due to the fact that the cores are normally “shielded” by pair-production of virtual fermions. The virtual fermions only exist for practical purposes between two radii, one being a very short radius (normally taken to be the Planck scale) and giving a UV (high energy) cutoff on the logarithmic running of the effective charge (force field coupling) and the other is a larger radius on the order of the classical electron radius for low-energy (Thomson) scattering.

The reason why a short-ranged (UV) cutoff exist is simply that QFT requires it, to prevent vacuum polarization giving unphysically large amounts of momentum and energy to field quanta as zero radius is approached. (By analogy, the “inverse square law” applied to sunlight intensity “predicts” infinity at zero radius inside the sun; in reality that’s clearly false because the sun’s core is at 14 million K or so, not infinity. The geometric “inverse square law” is useful when you are at a distance large compared to radius of the light source. It doesn’t include all the detailed mathematics of the fusion mechanism within the sun, so it breaks down within the sun’s radius, where ionized matter is opaque to sunlight so that light intensity is dependent on local physical processes of absorption and emission.)

The physical limit of the UV cutoff energy is not needed in existing mainstream experimentally confirmed calculations, since you only need to calculate the running of the coupling to energies achievable in particle colliders, currently the LHC TeV energy scale, which is far from the Planck scale. However, consensus or groupthink orthodoxy currently asserts that the Planck scale is the ultimate short ranged UV cutoff energy, based not on direct experimental data but on various speculations and interpretations of extrapolations which don’t carry any water (from our perspective). One is Planck worship: Max Planck’s numerology of combining constants (including his own Planck constant), results in a Planck length and other related parameters. Since he discovered the Planck radiation spectrum formula, this is taken as fact. Another argument for the Planck length is that it has become part of the prattle of “string theorists” like non-Nobel Laureate Edward Witten, who are deemed to explain the UV cutoff as being due to the unproved fact the particles are Planck length-sized strings or loops.

Thirdly, and most interestingly, the Planck length corresponds to a collision energy that leads to the Standard Model’s electroweak and strong running couplings all “unifying” at a “Marxist equality” point on a graph of coupling strength versus collision energy, provided that you merely

- (1) double the number of particles in the universe by adding supersymmetric particles (“sparticles”), each with half inter spin difference to the known particles,
- (2) make these extra particles of much higher energy than the existing particles (over 100 GeV), to explain why they have not so far been observed,
- (3) add over 100 extra (and unknown valued) parameters to the Standard Model, to make at least a Minimally Supersymmetric Standard Model,
- (4) explain away the extra 6 dimensions of space needed to account for this supersymmetry by compactifying them in a “landscape” of 10^{500} different ways (parallel universes) using unknown, unproved metastable Calabi-Yau mani-

folds stabilized by charged branes or other imaginary constructs of eite genuises.

We reject it as physical garbage, unproved either by a meaningful theory: after all, the black hole radius of an electron is far smaller than Planck's length and has physical significance as proved in our 2011 paper, so why not use that instead? The running couplings don't need supersymmetry to produce a grand unified theory if you both go over to the black hole scale as the UV limit, and also switch your ideology from Marxist "equality" to force field energy conservation, wherein the *decreasing energy density* of the strong force coupling with increasing energy (or decreasing distance) is physically connected to the *increasing energy density* of the electric field as you approach a quark.

In other words, the physical mechanism for the opposite variation of the strong and electromagnetic running couplings with energy is simply this: the energy used by the electromagnetic field to create virtual pairs *automatically makes some quark pairs with colour charged gluons which effectively creates the running of the strong charge around a quark.*

What we're saying is that there's a simple mechanism involved, just as Feynman was originally ridiculed at Pocono in 1947 for coming up with simple Feynman interaction diagrams to understand, organize, explain and develop the hitherto obstruse mathematical "theory" of QFT. This renormalization mechanism, while originally considered a mathematical tool only, has well established experimental evidence for its mechanism of pair-production. Quarks have large masses because their strong color charge field produces a great effective mass of virtual particles, electrically charged leptons like electrons have smaller masses because electric charge is weaker than the strong force, and neutrinos have very small masses because their weak isospin charge is of weak strength compared to strong and electromagnetic charge.

This detailed mechanism yields checkable, non-*ad hoc* predictions of particle masses. Vacuum polarization of virtual fermions supplies them energy, by moving the oppositely charged virtual fermions apart, extending their lifespan (time to annihilation) beyond Heisenberg's $t = \hbar/E$, at the expense of the energy density of the Coulomb field which is polarizing them. Hence, vacuum polarization "screens" the Coulomb field, causing the well-established basis for renormalization (the running of the coupling or effective charge in the region between a low energy "infrared" cutoff and the high energy "ultraviolet" cutoff). Thus, vacuum polarization pushes truly off-shell particles towards the being on (mass) shell, so like real particles, they are no longer totally chaotic, but instead survive long enough to be subjected to orbit-type structuring by the Pauli exclusion principle, so they contribute a quantized mass to the total mass of the particle in a simple, predictable way. We prove this mechanism and give its predictions.

The radial charge-polarization mechanism for pair production around lepton cores of virtual color charged quarks (at high energy, beyond existing experiments) spontaneously transforms the "screened" electric charge energy into geometrically "emergent" strong color charge (i.e. radially polarized color charge surrounding a lepton core). This explains the fractional (screened) electric charges of quarks which are observed, and binding pairs and triplets of leptons into effective mesons and baryons of quarks with the observed strong running coupling. This unified the running couplings for electroweak symmetry with quantum chromodynamics without requiring supersymmetry, and it also resolves two major existing SM beta decay anomalies and predicts existing ad hoc SM couplings and mixing angles.

A quantum field basis for particle mass is established. The charge of a particle causes pair production of off-shell (virtual) particles in the surrounding vacuum with a lifetime given by Heisenberg's uncertainty principle, but because of vacuum polarization, these virtual particles are pulled apart, extending their lifetime beyond that predicted by the Heisenberg uncertainty principle, making them approach the mass shell and hence giving them a transient real mass. Virtual fermions which are polarized and approach the mass shell condition are influenced by the Pauli exclusion principle, which therefore structures the polarized vacuum particles into shell structures analogous to electron or nucleon shells, which predicts the three generations of the Standard Model by analogy to isotopes of nuclides (e.g. the different masses and stability for electrons, muons, and tauons), the CKM matrix amplitudes for weak decays to result in different generations, and neutrino mixing.

Quarks have large masses because their strong color charge field produces a great effective mass of virtual particles, electrically charged leptons like electrons have smaller masses because electric charge is weaker than the strong force, and neutrinos have very small masses because their weak isospin charge is of weak strength compared to strong and electromagnetic charge. Comparisons between the predictions and observations are provided. This theory makes checkable quantitative predictions which are more accurate and extensive than the usual lattice (non-perturbative) QCD calculations which of course do not include predictions of lepton masses.

HISTORY: RELEVANT LITERATURE SUMMARY

Nobel Laureate Yoichiro Nambu, the proposer of QCD color charge and the discoverer of the Nambu-Goldstone spontaneous symmetry breaking theory for strong interactions in 1960, in 1952 published *An Empirical Mass Spectrum of Elementary Particles* (*Progress in Theoretical Physics*, v7, 1952, pp. 595-6), arguing:

“It seems to be a general conviction of current physicists that the theory of elementary particles in its ultimate form could or should give the mass spectrum of these particles just in the same way as quantum mechanics has succeeded in accounting for the regularity of atomic spectra. ... it may perhaps be too ambitious and rather unsound to look for an empirical ‘Balmer’s law’. Nevertheless we should like here to present one such attempt because it happens to be extremely simple ... The π -meson [pion] mass, being $\sim 274 = 137 \times 2$ electron masses (m_e), gives us a second, rather fanciful hint that $137m_e$ could be chosen as the unit ... the adopted mass unit incidentally agrees with Heisenberg’s natural unit. ... Bosons seem to have integral, while fermions half-integral, mass numbers. ... The small mass value of the electron ... as well as the proton-neutron and [charged pion compared to uncharged pion] mass differences correspond to a kind of fine structure. Indeed, their magnitude is just of the order of $1/137$ mass units. ... only those particles which have favorable lives as well as abundances for detection have so far been observed, and we have to grounds at all to exclude the possibility that there exist other particles which are liable to escape direct observation.”

Nambu showed that the muon and the nucleon are 1.5 and 13.5 respectively, in mass units of $137m_e$ or m_e/α just as expected for half-integer fermion spin, while the Pion is 2.0 in similar units, as expected for integer boson spin. Nambu’s theory is therefore that fermionic (half-integer spin) particles should have a mass of $\frac{1}{2} nm_e / \alpha = 35.0n$ MeV, where n is an integer, while bosonic particles should have a mass of $1 nm_e / \alpha = 70.0n$ MeV. He attributed lepton masses and the “mass splittings” or differences in mass between charged and neutral versions of particles like pions to “fine structure,” namely, masses smaller than the unit for hadrons by a factor of $1/\alpha$. Another mechanism affecting Nambu’s mass predictions lies in a constant coupling α , due to the fact α runs as a function of the logarithm of the energy, and is only a constant for energies below the IR cutoff, $m_e \sim 0.5$ MeV. This is the energy needed for colliding particles to experience an electric field exceeding Schwinger’s threshold electric field strength for pair production, 1.3×10^{18} v/m.

In 1978, the three generations of leptons and quarks of varying masses led Sheldon Glashow (*Comments Nuclear and Particle Physics*, v8, 1978, pp. 105) to remark:

“We have no plausible precedent for, nor any theoretical understanding of this kind of superfluous replication of fundamental entities. Nor is any vision in sight wherein the various fermions may be regarded as composites of more elementary stuff. No problem is more basic than the property of flavor, and it has been with us since the discovery of muons. Sadly, we are today no closer to a solution.”

While some investigators attempted to tackle this problem using “top down” grand unified theories like SO(10) and later superstrings, A. O. Barut in 1979 responded to Sheldon’s challenge by publishing a mechanism to explain and predict the three generations of leptons in a paper called *Lepton Mass Formula* (Physical Review Letters, v42, 1979, p. 1251), arguing for a link to the anomalous magnetic moment of leptons, $1 + \frac{1}{2\pi} \alpha$ Bohr magnetons:

“Recently I have suggested that the mass formula for the muon, $m_\mu = m_e + \frac{3}{2}m_e/\alpha$, can be derived on the basis of magnetic self-interaction of the electron. The radiative effects give an anomalous magnetic moment to the electron which, when coupled to the self-field of the electron, imply extra magnetic energy. ... The magnetic energy of a system consisting of a charge and a magnetic moment quantized according to the Bohr-Sommerfeld procedure implies quantized energies $E_n = \lambda n^4$, where n is a principal quantum number. [Bohr-Sommerfeld quantization gives $mvr = n\hbar$ so that $r = n\hbar / (mv)$, which is inserted into the magnetic dipole force $F = ma = mv^2/r = q\mu v/r^3$ giving quantized magnetic energy $\frac{1}{2} mv^2 = \frac{1}{2} n^4 \hbar^2 / (q v)^2$. So energy is proportional to n^4 where n is an integer.] Determining the proportionality constant λ from the muon-mass formula ($n = 1$), we obtain $m_\tau = m_\mu + \frac{3}{2} n^4 m_e/\alpha = m_e + \frac{3}{2} m_e/\alpha + \frac{3}{2} (2)^4 m_e/\alpha = 1,786$ MeV.”

Barut’s theory gives electrically charged leptons quantized masses of

Electrons ($n = 0$):	m_e
Muons ($n = 1$):	$m_\mu = m_e [1 + \frac{3}{2} (1)^4/\alpha]$
Tauons ($n = 2$):	$m_\tau = m_e [1 + \frac{3}{2} (1)^4/\alpha + \frac{3}{2} (2)^4 m_e/\alpha]$.

Hans de Vries and Alejandro Rivero⁽⁴⁾ (4: arxiv hep-ph/0503104 v1) in 2006 published *Evidence for Radiative Generation of Lepton Masses*, correlating Schwinger’s tree-level lepton magnetic dipole moment anomaly with weak boson masses:

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \alpha = m_\mu / m_z = 0.00116, \text{ giving } m_\mu = \frac{1}{2\pi} \alpha m_z.$$

and the vacuum polarization (loop) difference between magnetic dipole moment anomalies for the muon and electron:

$$(\alpha/\pi)^2 = m_e / m_z = 5.60 \times 10^{-6}, \text{ giving } m_e = (\alpha/\pi)^2 m_z,$$

after allowing for the running of α to the collision energy scale for measurement of $m_z = 91.19$ GeV. The muon's magnetic dipole moment anomaly is larger than the electron's because of the muon's larger mass, yet the perturbative expansion used to calculate the factor of roughly $(\alpha/\pi)^2$ did *not* involve the mass m_z so it is not "circular reasoning".

There is a simple physical mechanism for Z bosons arising from pair production in the weak force fields around a *moving* lepton to act as massive *neutral currents*, physically miring the motion of the lepton, and thus contributing mass.

Robert A. Stone, Jr.,⁽⁵⁾ (5: *Progress in Physics*, v1, 2010, pp. 8-10) in 2010 published *Is Fundamental Particle Mass 4π Quantized?*, finds that $m_w = 2m_p/m_e = 80.4$ GeV, where m_p is uniquely significant because it is the only stable hadron.

A similar factor 2 occurs in a correlation between weak and Higgs boson mass⁽⁶⁾: $m_H = (2m_w + m_z)/2 = 126$ GeV.

The Higgs "mechanism" for particle mass in the Standard Model doesn't predict any masses, so is unsatisfactory. Once the mass of the Higgs boson is put into the Standard Model, Feynman's rules easily permit the spin-0 massive propagator to be evaluated in a perturbative expansion to calculate the interaction probability cross-sections for various different Higgs reaction rates, and these agree with measurements. This just "validates" the Feynman rules, the empirical laws of the Standard Model, and the existence of a spin-0 boson. It doesn't prove that the exact structure of the Standard Model is completely correct. Our evidence (see our 30 November 2011 paper) suggests that the mathematics of the SM groups, $U(1) \times SU(2) \times SU(3)$ is correct but also shows that there is a mainstream misunderstanding in the $U(1) \times SU(2)$ electroweak group, affecting the details of the mixing and symmetry breaking (which occurs in a slightly different way to Higgs's idea, although you still of course get a spin-0 boson).

In short, $U(1)$ hypercharge is the symmetry group for the repulsive, universal "dark energy" that produces "quantum gravity" predicted in 1996 by our first paper, as a LeSage effect by analogy to the Casimir force mechanism of electromagnetism. $SU(2)$'s massless charged bosons gives a two-charged boson electromagnetic theory, since $SU(2)$ unmixed with the mass-giving quantum gravity $U(1)$ gives charged massless bosons that correctly have infinite magnetic self-inductance (preventing one-way propagation). This physical mechanism (infinite magnetic self-inductance) that prevents any one-way propagation of massless electrically charged bosons automatically cancels the charge-transfer term out from the Yang-Mills (non-Abelian) equations so they appear to use as the Maxwell equations.

To put it another way, the quadratic term is zero for charged massless gauge bosons. For the exchange (two-way propagation) of similar sign charged, massless bosons between two similar charges, the curls of the magnetic fields cancel out and so does the problem of infinite magnetic self-inductance. Hence, there's a physical basis for saying that $SU(2)$ with massless charged bosons is the symmetry group for electromagnetism.

Not only that, but by getting rid of $U(1)$ as the electroweak kernel for Maxwell's electrodynamics (it becomes the kernel for mass, because dark energy causes effects traditionally attributed to quantum gravity), we get rid of Dirac's anti-matter problems. E.g., if $U(1)$ is behind electromagnetism, then all positive charges must be anti-particles of negative particles, because $U(1)$ has only one charge element! This causes terrible problems in physics, because matter predominates over anti-matter.

As we stated in the 30 November 2011 paper, the particular (non-random) handedness of the magnetic field's curl around the direction of propagation of electrons or electric current was explained by a chiral mechanical model of spin by James Clerk Maxwell. This theory is a chiral $SU(2)$ theory, akin to the chiral (left-handed) weak interaction! Mathematical obfuscation since Maxwell's time has censored out his model of gauge boson spin using Einstein's arguments against quantum field particles, which went out of fashion when the SM was validated in the early 1970s. But by that time, Maxwell's $SU(2)$ physical model of gauge boson spin processes had become as popular as Lamarkian evolution was in Darwin's time, and anybody mentioning it was basically wearing a target circle for the bigots of physics to shoot at in an effort to be awarded prizes like censorship ("peer" reviewer) jobs for "professional" (i.e. \$) journals.

Our point is that $SU(2)$ with massless bosons - i.e. when $SU(2)$ is unmixed with $U(1)$ which provides the mass - gives you the Yang-Mills equations of electrodynamics which due to the self-inductance mechanism automatically lose their quadratic term, effectively reducing them to the regular Maxwell equations we all know so well. But the mixed portion of $SU(2)$ gives rise to the massive $SU(2)$ bosons which media the weak force just as in the regular SM. In other words, we're pointing out that not all the $SU(2)$ bosons undergo mixing with $U(1)$, and arguing that this *partial* mixing only, explains why the weak interaction (via massive $SU(2)$ bosons) is *left-handed*. Weyl showed that the Dirac equation's spinor can be decoupled into two handed terms, and these can be used for $SU(2)$ representations.

HIGGS BOSONS AND THE MECHANISM OF $U(1) \times SU(2)$ ELECTROWEAK SYMMETRY BREAKING

Weak boson “mass” is given by combining 1 longitudinal polarization from a spin-0 Goldstone boson to 2 transverse spin polarizations from a massless spin-1 boson, giving 3 polarizations, i.e. a massive spin-1 boson. This combination is analogous to symmetry-breaking condensates, like Cooper pairs of electrons.

Anderson’s 1963 paper “Plasmons, gauge invariance and mass” (*Physical Review*, v. 130, p. 439) argued that Nambu’s 1960 idea that pions are low-energy, symmetry-breaking Goldstone bosons is analogous to the idea that in superconductivity, Cooper pairs of electrons are a symmetry-breaking bosonic condensate. The “symmetry” in the gas of conduction-band electron current flow at high energy is broken at low energy, where conduction electrons move slowly and so are able pair up (under the Pauli exclusion principle) into condensates, which behave like massive bosons, allowing electric currents to flow with very little resistance. The surfaces of such conductors are superfluids. But the massive Cooper pairs of low-energy electrons in superconductivity are a non-relativistic situation. Anderson didn’t prove that it applied to relativistic gauge theories, and Gilbert claimed incorrectly in 1964 that Lorentz invariance prevents Anderson’s non-relativistic analogy from applying to gauge theory (*Physical Review Letters*, v12, p. 713).

Higgs’s 1964 paper, “Broken symmetries and the masses of gauge bosons” (*Physical Rev. Letters*, v. 13, p. 508) overcomes Gilbert’s objection in the *relativistic* case, by showing that massless gauge bosons can gain mass when a spin-0 Goldstone boson from a broken local symmetry mixes with a massless gauge boson. Two polarizations from a massless spin-1 vector boson combine with the single polarization of the spin-0 Goldstone boson to give three polarizations which constitute mass ($2 + 1 = 3$ polarizations). Applying this to broken electroweak symmetry, an additional spin-0 boson with 3 polarizations was predicted, a “Higgs boson”. Anderson has a physical mechanism, but Higgs did the arithmetic and made a prediction. (Higgs original paper didn’t mention his spin-0 boson, and the referee turned the paper down. This forced Higgs to think about implications, leading to his prediction of a spin-0 boson.)

CONCLUSIONS

Feynman’s 1985 book *QED* forcefully argued that the Standard Model is inconsistent, inelegant and incomplete. We highlighted in our 20 November 2011 paper a typical inconsistency in the beta decay scheme interpretation, which arose after the introduction of weak vector bosons (the previous beta decay of Fermi lacked this inconsistency because it contained no weak boson). Note that the existence of weak bosons is an experimental fact. The problem is therefore in the *dogmatic interpretation of beta decay*, which distinguishes leptons from quarks by the fact that leptons don’t have strong color charge but quarks do. We predict is that color charge emerges at extremely high energy at the expense of electric charge: the fractional electric charges of quarks is due to vacuum pair production (including production of colour charged particles with colour charged gluons) and associated vacuum polarization screening, which permits a mechanism for strong color charge effects to emerge spontaneously from the fields around leptons at extremely high energy, beyond existing experiments.

In addition, the mechanism makes a new prediction which unifies leptons and quarks at an energy beyond existing experiments, since the pair production of virtual color charged particles with color charged gluons in very strong (high energy) lepton electromagnetic fields gives a mechanism by which leptons can be transformed into quarks, by transforming some electric charge energy into effectively into “emergent” strong color charge. This makes new predictions about unification of the running couplings, and also resolves existing anomalies and calculates existing ad hoc SM couplings, etc.

A quantum field basis for particle mass is established. The charge of a particle causes pair production of off-shell (virtual) particles in the surrounding vacuum with a lifetime given by Heisenberg’s uncertainty principle, but because of vacuum polarization, these virtual particles are pulled apart, extending their lifetime beyond that predicted by the Heisenberg uncertainty principle, making them approach the mass shell and hence giving them a transient real mass. Virtual fermions which are polarized and approach the mass shell condition are influenced by the Pauli exclusion principle, which therefore structures the polarized vacuum particles into shell structures analogous to electron or nucleon shells, which predicts the three generations of the Standard Model by analogy to isotopes of nuclides (e.g. the different masses and stability for electrons, muons, and tauons), the CKM matrix amplitudes for weak decays to result in different generations, and neutrino mixing. Quarks have large masses because their strong color charge field produces a great effective mass of virtual particles, electrically charged leptons like electrons have smaller masses because electric charge is weaker than the strong force, and neutrinos have very small masses because their weak isospin charge is of weak strength compared to strong and electromagnetic charge. Comparisons between the predictions and observations are provided. This theory is quantitative and allows physical predictions which have been confirmed, and are more accurate and extensive (including leptons) than the usual lattice (non-perturbative) QCD calculations (which obviously don’t include any predictions of lepton masses).

Our 30 November 2011 paper contains the following predictions and comparisons to experiment:

- Dark energy: equation... comparison to observational data ... (see 30 November 2011 paper for details)
- Gravity coupling: equation... comparison to observational data ... (see 30 November 2011 paper for details)
- Masses of hadrons: equation... comparison to observational data ... (see 30 November 2011 paper for details)
- Masses of leptons: equation... comparison to observational data ... (see 30 November 2011 paper for details)

APPENDIX

1. Simple energy conservation mechanism for local wavefunction invariance in gauge field theory

By Noether's theorem, gauge field theory's local and global symmetries are physical processes for energy and charge conservation mechanisms, respectively. In 1929, Weyl differentiated the complex exponential solution to the Schroedinger equation, $\Psi_S = \Psi_0 e^{iS/\hbar}$ as follows, using just the product rule, $d(uv) = (u dv) + (v du)$, and the rule $de^{f(x)}/dx = f'(x)e^{f(x)}$.

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mu} \Psi_S &= d_{\mu}(\Psi_0 e^{iS/\hbar}) \\ &= e^{iS/\hbar} d_{\mu} \Psi_0 + \Psi_0 (d_{\mu} e^{iS/\hbar}) = e^{iS/\hbar} d_{\mu} \Psi_0 + \Psi_0 (ie^{iS/\hbar} d_{\mu} S/\hbar) \\ &= e^{iS/\hbar} [d_{\mu} \Psi_0 + (i/\hbar)(d_{\mu} S)\Psi_0] \end{aligned}$$

The new term $(i/\hbar)(d_{\mu} S)\Psi_0$ prevents local wavefunction phase invariance, which requires $d_{\mu} \Psi_S = e^{iS/\hbar} d_{\mu} \Psi_0$ instead of $e^{iS/\hbar} [d_{\mu} \Psi_0 + (i/\hbar)(d_{\mu} S)\Psi_0]$. Physically this extra term $(i/\hbar)(d_{\mu} S)\Psi_0$ accounts for the conservation of energy, because a field must supply energy to a particle in order to make its wavefunction amplitude change by the amount $\Psi_S = \Psi_0 e^{iS/\hbar}$. This *work done changing a wavefunction simply takes some energy away from the Dirac field lagrangian*, thereby automatically replacing

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{Dirac}} = \bar{\Psi} (\gamma^{\mu} d_{\mu} - m) \Psi$$

by a lagrangian containing the "interaction term" iqA_{μ} for the interaction between charge q and field potential A_{μ} :

$$\mathcal{L} = \bar{\Psi} [\gamma^{\mu} (d_{\mu} - iqA_{\mu}) - m] \Psi, \text{ where } (d_{\mu} - iqA_{\mu}) = D_{\mu}, \text{ which is called the "covariant derivative."}$$

The substitution of Dirac's non-covariant derivative d_{μ} with Weyl's covariant derivative $D_{\mu} = d_{\mu} - iqA_{\mu}$, preserves gauge invariance by allowing for the change in the potential of the field vector, $(A_{\mu})_S = (A_{\mu})_0 + d_{\mu} S/(q\hbar)$ where q is the charge (or coupling). *The point we emphasise is that there is a simple energy conservation mechanism for local wavefunction phase invariance.*

2. Propagators for evaluating Feynman's perturbative expansion (S-matrix components) to the path integral

Feynman's "path integral" replaces the *single* wavefunction amplitude in Dirac's "interaction picture" of quantum mechanics, $\Psi_{H,t} = \Psi_0 e^{iHt/\hbar}$ (which is the time-dependent solution to Schroedinger's equation) with interferences between *multiple* wavefunction amplitudes for *mechanical* interactions, each represented by a Feynman diagram consisting of the exchange of a gauge boson which hits an effective interaction cross-section which is proportional to the square of the running coupling. The probability or relative cross-section for a reaction is proportional to

$$|\Psi_{\text{effective}}|^2 = |\Psi_1 + \Psi_2 + \Psi_3 + \Psi_4 + \dots|^2 = |\int e^{iS/\hbar} D_{\mathbf{x}}|^2 = |\int e^{i \int L dt/\hbar} D_{\mathbf{x}}|^2.$$

where $\Psi_1, \Psi_2, \Psi_3,$ and Ψ_4 are individual wavefunctions (path amplitudes) representing all the different ways that gauge boson exchanges mediated forces between charges in the path integral, $\int e^{iS/\hbar} D_{\mathbf{x}}$. The complex wavefunction amplitude e^{iS} where S is the path action in quantum action units, is unjustified by the successes of quantum field theory where measurable (probabilities or cross-sections) are *real* scalars. So the observable resultant arrow for a path integral on an Argand diagram must be always parallel to the real axis, thus instead of e^{iS} as a unit length arrow with variable direction, can replace

it by a single variable scalar quantity, $e^{iS} \rightarrow \cos S$, eliminating Hilbert space and Haag's theorem to renormalization. Distler points out that in the Optical Theorem (by Bethe) in QM, you use complex space in making calculations. Sure you do, because the direction of arrow on the Argand diagram represents effects like the direction of spin for spin-polarized particles, which have different cross-sections when colliding, depending on whether they collide with their spins parallel or anti-parallel. This is a physical effect, however, and doesn't "prove" complex Hilbert space is the only description of reality possible. We could for instance simply add a suitable cosine angular term to carry the information on spin polarizations in particle collisions. Put another way, while complex space *can* be used helpfully in QFT, that fact alone doesn't prove that Hilbert space is the *only* way or even the *best* way. It depends on whether we *really want to understand* dynamics, or not!

Just because one mathematical tool proves useful, you can't use that to ban other tools being applied if they yield more light and prove more helpful to physics! Occam's Razor favours simplicity, yet the world often turns out to be complex, not simple; so Occam's often plain wrong. Sure, try a simple theory first, but don't use Occam's Razor to ban development of a more complex theory if you can't get the simple theory to work. This seems a key failure of modern "professional" science, where a couple of big star theories are falsely used with Occam's Razor to ban any forays into the outback to think about totally radical ideas. Someone else once developed a similar piece of sophistry to Distler's, when he argued using Occam's Razor that because electromagnetic energy transfer can be accounted for by the electromagnetic field, the physical mechanism of electron currents is unnecessary redundant, a myth! This sophistry is like saying that because you can walk, bicycles and cars are consequently "disproved" by Occam's Razor. In a sense, Einstein's "derivation" (using assumed postulates based on the invariances of Maxwell's equation and light velocity measurements) of the Lorentz contraction without recourse to Maxwell's physical model of a vacuum containing particles that cause forces. Then, after Heisenberg's bootstrap S-matrix theory finally gave way to quantum field theory in the early 70s with the rise of the SM, nobody dared to revisit Einstein's use of Occam's Razor. It had become a political taboo, shutting down mechanisms in fundamental particle physics forever in the interests of "defending" the statue of Einstein (elitism that Einstein hated!).

This reduction of quantum field theory to real space gives a provably self-consistent, experimentally checked quantum gravity. Path integral $\int e^{iS/\hbar} D\mathbf{x}$ is a double integral because action S is itself the integral of the lagrangian energy for a given Feynman diagram, which must be integrated over all paths not merely the classical path of least action, which only emerges classically as a result of multipath interferences, where paths with higher than minimal action cancel out.

E.g, if a magnet causes an electron's spin direction to flip, or a compass needle to rotate, then some energy of the magnetic field is used, so the magnetic field is affected. This is an undeniable, provable consequence of energy conservation or, viewed (even more simply), work-energy mechanics. Work must be paid for. Newton's classical theory *simply makes no correction for the Earth's gravitational field energy when some of it is used up when accelerating an apple's fall to the ground* (which converts gravitational potential energy of the Earth's field - the apple's gravitational field is relatively trivial - into sound waves and mechanical action, bruising the apple). Weyl's utilization of Noether's theorem to relate symmetry to conservation of field energy, correcting the field potential for the energy that is used in doing work by changing a wavefunction amplitude, is thus applicable to gravitational as well as electromagnetic fields. Hence, there is no physical inconsistency.

Dirac's bra-ket notation was introduced a decade later, in 1939, and isn't of interest to us since we're only interested in obtaining real numbers, i.e. "resultant vectors" which as arrows always lie parallel to the real plane on a complex/Argand diagram; for all real world tested probability and cross-section predictions from the path integral of 2nd quantization we can thus replace $e^{iS/\hbar}$ with real scalar $\cos(S/\hbar)$. In other words, complex wavefunctions solutions to $\Psi_S = \Psi_0 e^{iS/\hbar}$ are irrelevant and discarded ... [care - Distler!!].

General relativity predictions from Newtonian gravity lagrangian, with a relativistic metric

In 1915, Einstein and Hilbert derived the field equation of general relativity from a very simple lagrangian. The classical "proper path" of a particle in a gravitational field is the minimization of action:

$$S = \int L dt = \int \mathcal{L} d^4x = \int R(-g)^{1/2} c^4 / (16\pi G) d^4x$$

where the Lagrangian energy $L = E_{\text{kinetic}} - E_{\text{potential}}$, and energy density is $\mathcal{L} = L/\text{volume}$, which gives Einstein's field equation of general relativity when action is minimized, i.e. when $dS = 0$, found by "varying" the action S using the Euler-Lagrange law. To Weyl and his followers today, the "Holy Grail" of quantum gravity research remains the task of obtaining a theory which at low energy has the Lagrangian gravitational field energy density component, $\mathcal{L} = R(-g)^{1/2} c^4 / (16\pi G)$, so that it yields produces Einstein's field equation as a "weak field" limit or approximation.

But the Einstein-Hilbert Lagrangian density $R(-g)^{1/2}c^4/(16\pi G)$ is a relativistic, spacetime curvature-based generalization of classical Newtonian gravity, since Ricci's scalar, in the isotropic radial symmetry of gravitational fields produced by a fundamental particle, is: $R = g^{\mu\nu}R_{\mu\nu} = R_{00} = \nabla^2\phi = 4\pi G\rho$. Since the Newtonian gravitational potential energy is proportional to mass, $L_{\text{field}} = -E_{\text{potential}} = -\int_r^\infty (-GMm/x^2)dx = GMm/r$, it follows that Poisson's equation is the weak field, non-relativistic Newtonian limit for the Ricci scalar, $R = 4\pi G\rho$, so the non-relativistic Lagrangian energy density is:

$$\mathcal{L} = \rho = (\nabla^2\phi)/(4\pi G) = R/(4\pi G),$$

which upon multiplication by $(-g)^{1/2}c^4/4$ gives general relativity's Einstein-Hilbert relativistic lagrangian. This $c^4/4$ factor is the conversion from time to space units for 4-dimensional spacetime (d^4t is changed into d^4x by employing multiplication factor $d^4x/d^4t = c^4$), and the fact that the fraction of the gravitational field energy density acting in one dimension (say the x direction) out of four dimensions is only 1/4 of the total isotropic energy density. The relativistic multiplication factor $(-g)^{1/2}$ occurs because g is the determinant $g = |g_{\mu\nu}|$ of metric tensor $g_{\mu\nu}$ and Ricci's scalar, $R = g^{\mu\nu}R_{\mu\nu}$, is clearly a function of the metric.

For isotropic radial symmetry ("spherical symmetry") coordinates ($r = y = z = x$), the Schwarzschild metric implies $(-g)^{1/2} = [1 + 2GM/(rc^2)]^{1/2}$, the gravitational field equivalent of the inertial mass Lorentzian spacetime contraction, $(1 - v^2/c^2)^{1/2}$. In other words, the Schwarzschild metric is the Lorentzian metric converted from velocity v to gravitational field effect $2GM/r$ by Einstein's equivalence principle between inertial and gravitational mass, which states that *the effects of a given inertial acceleration are indistinguishable from those of a corresponding gravitational acceleration*, or equivalently (if the accelerations on both sides of this equivalence may be integrated to yield velocities), that the properties of any body having velocity v are equivalent to those of a similar body which has acquired an identical velocity as a result of a gravitational, e.g., $v = (2GM/r)^{1/2}$ (the escape velocity of any body from mass M , which is equivalent to the velocity acquired in falling to the same mass). For weak gravitational fields, $(-g)^{1/2} \approx 1$, thus the non-relativistic approximation: $R(-g)^{1/2}/(16\pi G) \approx R/(16\pi G)$. So general relativity by writing Newton's law as $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Newtonian}} = R/(16\pi G)$ and then including a relativistic metric determinant $(-g)^{1/2} = [1 + 2GM/(rc^2)]^{1/2}$, i.e. the empirical Lorentz contraction factor with Einstein's equivalence principle to convert from inertial accelerations and velocities to corresponding gravitational accelerations and velocities.

However, while $\mathcal{L} = R(-g)^{1/2}c^4/(16\pi G)$ appears mathematically incontrovertible for the Lagrangian energy density of quantum gravity, it isn't logical or correct physically, simply because this Lagrangian is *contrived to model only the classical path of least action (i.e. the real or onshell path in a path integral), unlike quantum field theory Lagrangians, which are generally applicable for all paths.*

Hence, we point out that the Einstein-Hilbert free-field classical lagrangian of general relativity $\mathcal{L} = R(-g)^{1/2}c^4/(16\pi G)$ is "Newtonian-Poisson gravity, $Rc^4/(16\pi G)$, multiplied by a relativistic spacetime contraction correction factor, $(-g)^{1/2}$, which the contraction due to motion in Lorentzian/FitzGerald/special relativity, $[1 + 2GM/(rc^2)]^{1/2}$, with Einstein's equivalence principle of inertial and gravitational motion, $v = (2GM/r)^{1/2}$." However, the fact remains that the Einstein-Hilbert lagrangian $\mathcal{L} = R(-g)^{1/2}c^4/(16\pi G)$ cannot itself be taken as a "rigorous piece of mathematics" when it merely gives the correct path of *least action*. In quantum field theory, we need a lagrangian that holds good for *all paths*, not merely the path of *least action*. The way that Einstein and Hilbert "derived" $\mathcal{L} = R(-g)^{1/2}c^4/(16\pi G)$ was contrived as the simplest free-field lagrangian that would - when "varied" with respect to action - yield the correct path of least action. In other words, while we accept $\mathcal{L} = R(-g)^{1/2}c^4/(16\pi G)$ to *include* correctly the classical path of least action, that *doesn't mean that we accept it to also include off-shell (non-least action) paths that must be included in a quantum gravity theory, and which in the low energy limit are merely unobservational due to multipath interference in the path integral.*

Our approach to quantum gravity consistency with "general relativity" in <http://vixra.org/abs/1111.0111> is to point out that general relativity was derived by Hilbert and Einstein in the first place as a rank-2 spacetime curvature mathematical modelling exercise, as opposed to the rank-1 curving field lines of Maxwell's equations for electromagnetism. If only Maxwell's laws of electromagnetism were reformulated as spacetime curvature, we'd have a rank-2 version of electromagnetism in which forces are propagated by spin-1 field quanta, thus breaking the popular but mathematically false dogma that the rank of the field equation model is equal to the spin of the field quanta (as spin-1 for rank-1 Maxwell equations, and spin-2 for rank-2 general relativity).

There are numerous deficiencies mathematically and physically in the dogma that gravitons are spin-2, some of which are discussed in <http://vixra.org/abs/1111.0111>. First of all, it's reductionist. If only two masses existed in this universe, and they were found to attract, then yes, that observation could prove the need for a spin-2 graviton. But this is not the case, since the Casimir effect shows how metal plates can be "attracted" (pushed together) by spin-1 electromagnetic field quanta in the surrounding vacuum (virtual photons with wavelengths longer than the separation distance between the metal plates don't contribute, so the force of repulsion between the plates is less than the force pressing them together). This Casimir effect relies on offshell field quanta, so the old arguments against LeSage onshell gas pressures in a vacuum are negated. No offshell field quanta cause drag or heating effects on planets (the traditional anti-mechanism no-go theorem).

So it is quite possible for spin-1 gravitons to exist, causing repulsion of masses (e.g. our correct quantitative prediction in 1996 of the positive sign amount of "dark" graviton energy causing the cosmological acceleration first observed by Perlmutter in 1998). The only reason why apparent "attraction" ("gravity") arises is that the immense surrounding masses in the universe are practically isotropic and are unable to avoid exchanging gravitons with all other masses. Local masses are proved in <http://vixra.org/abs/1111.0111> to precisely have the right gravitational interaction cross-section to produce the cosmological acceleration. The real reason why spin-2 gravitons have become dogma, aside from the simplistic reductionist idea of ignoring graviton exchange with distant masses (Occam Razor's, gone too far) is Edward Witten's M-theory, which relies on a spin-2 graviton to defend 11 dimensional supergravity bulk and its 10 dimensional superstring brane as being the only intelligent theory of quantum gravity. In Witten's marketing process (*Physics Today*, April 1996), all the caveates that should be included about the assumptions behind the Pauli-Fierz spin-2 gravity wave are eliminated, to leave the impression that the mere existence of observed gravity is itself proof that gravitons have spin-2. (Similarly, Ptolemy dismissed Aristarchus's solar system with the allegation that anybody can see that the sun orbits the earth. This kind of political claim to "close down the debate" before the facts are checked, is very convenient for censors and peer-reviewers!)

What we point out in <http://vixra.org/abs/1111.0111> is that the correct theory of quantum graviton is in effect what is now taken to be QED, namely an Abelian U(1) theory. This quantum gravity U(1) gauge theory literally replaces the electromagnetic (hypercharge, prior to mixing) U(1) in the Standard Model, and electromagnetism is transferred to SU(2) massless gauge bosons, replacing Maxwell's equations by the SU(2) charge-carrying Yang-Mills equations, which merely reduce to what appear to be Maxwell equations when the field quanta are massless. This is because the two charged SU(2) massless field quanta of electromagnetism have infinite magnetic self-inductance which prevents a net flow of charge. Their magnetic fields (self inductance) are only cancelled when there is an equilibrium in the exchange of charged massless field quanta between similar charges. Thus, the positive electric field around a proton is simply composed of virtual photons with a positive charge sign. The dynamics of this are inherent in the properties of the Heaviside energy current, which is precisely the charged electromagnetic field quanta in electricity. The two "extra polarizations" which the electromagnetic gauge boson has in order to allow both attraction and repulsion are simply the two electric charge signs.

The charge transfer term of the Yang-Mills equations is constrained to a value of zero, because two protons can only exchange positively charged massless gauge bosons for "electromagnetic" repulsion when the rates of transfer of charge from one to the other and vice-versa are identical. This means that there is an equilibrium in the transfer of positive charge between the two protons, so they both appear to have a static, constant amount of positive charge. Hence, the Yang-Mills charge transfer term is effectively suppressed, reducing the Yang-Mills equations for SU(2) into Maxwell equations, and this explains why historically Maxwell's equations look good superficially (like Ptolemy's superficially good-looking dogma that the sun orbits the earth daily), but it obfuscates electroweak theory.

Schwinger argued correctly but disingenuously in 1949 (see *Physical Review*, v76, p790) that electric charge conservation forces the photon to be massless. We reverse this: massive electrically neutral photons do exist but have 91 GeV so Maxwell never discovered them or had any need to include them in his equations! The photon is not forced to be massless. The Z boson (which is the field quanta of neutral currents) is a photon which has acquired mass and thus has "weak isospin charge." The only reason why these massive Z photons were not known to Schwinger in 1949 is that their energy is 91 GeV, far beyond 1949 physics. In other words, what happens in the history of physics is that incomplete observations are "explained" in a contrived way, and these explanations become hardened dogma. So theories are developed in an ad hoc way to incorporate previous dogma, so that they will overcome peer-review and get published, without questioning dogma.


We conclude that the mathematics of general relativity and quantum field gauge (interaction) theory are fully consistent with the simple mechanism in <http://vixra.org/abs/1111.0111>; the quantum gravity lagrangian is similar to U(1) QED.

The hardened fanatics of Ptolemy's epicycles developed trigonometry, but that didn't prove their sloppy muddled-up physics. Vacuum polarization causes the running of all effective charges or couplings with collision energy, or distance from the

core of the particle. When similar charged particles are collided, the distance of minimum approach occurs when the potential energy of the Coulomb field repulsion is equal to the kinetic energy of collision, so there is a relationship between distance and collision energy. For electromagnetism, the coupling is expressed in terms of the Sommerfeld fine structure constant of quantum mechanics, α which predicts the correct black hole unification scale on a plot of energy versus running coupling charges; for further details please see <http://vixra.org/abs/1111.0111>.

The infinite magnetic self-inductance of charge is given in the calculation by I. Catt, reproduced below:

PROOF THAT THE TOTAL FLUX GENERATED BY EVEN A SHORT LENGTH OF STRAIGHT WIRE CARRYING A CURRENT IS INFINITE



Consider a short length of wire Δs radius a carrying a current i . Let us integrate the total magnetic flux entering the paper by first finding the flux in a small area $\delta r \times r \delta \theta$, integra-

ting from $\theta = 0$ to $\theta = \infty$ so as to get the total flux, Φ_{ring} , through the half-ring, and then integrating outwards to get the total flux through the whole surface, starting at a distance r , from the wire and ending at infinity.

$$\delta \Phi = \text{area of element} \times \text{flux density}$$

$$= \delta r \cdot r \delta \theta \times \frac{\mu \delta H}{4 \pi r^2}$$

$$= \delta r \cdot r \delta \theta \times \frac{\mu i \Delta s \sin \theta}{4 \pi r^2}$$

by the Biot-Savart Law.

$$\Phi_{ring} = \frac{\delta r}{4 \pi r} \mu i \Delta s \int_0^\pi \sin \theta d\theta$$

$$= \frac{2 \delta r \mu i \Delta s}{4 \pi r}$$

Now let us integrate the flux in the half-rings, from r to ∞ .

$$\int_r^\infty d\Phi = \Phi = \frac{2 \mu i \Delta s}{4 \pi} \int_r^\infty \frac{dr}{r} = \infty$$

So if a current flows down a short length of straight wire, the resulting total magnetic flux is infinite.

The Standard Model mixed Abelian U(1) and Yang-Mills SU(2) symmetries to produce electromagnetic and weak vector bosons, and includes an SU(3) symmetry for quarks which doesn't apply to leptons. Mainstream orthodoxy aims to derive the Standard Model as an approximation to a unified theory in which the strengths of all fundamental interactions become identical near the Planck scale, and in which gravitation may be included. This paper takes a very different route, by examining the mechanisms of the Standard Model interactions and identifying the approximations in the Standard Model as it stands which can be corrected to reveal the correct unified theory. The basic Yang-Mills theory of weak and strong SU(2) and SU(3) interactions is empirically defensible. The error lies in the Abelian U(1) hypercharge theory behind QED. We give evidence that rejects the long "established" Abelian electrodynamics theory.

Electrodynamics is the transfer of electrically charged massless gauge bosons, which can only propagate by the *two-way path equilibrium in the exchange process*. *Charged massless radiations are classically forbidden by magnetic self-inductance, but the equilibrium in the two-way exchange is proved to cancel out the self-inductance because the magnetic field vectors cancel out.* Therefore, the Yang-Mills equation of electromagnetism gives rise to the usual Maxwell equations for the condition of massless field quanta, which imposes the constraint physically that a perfect equilibrium of exchanged charge must exist which cancels out the Yang-Mills term for net charge transfer. The correct gauge theory of electromagnetism then becomes SU(2), so electromagnetism becomes the massless, non-chiral vector boson version of the existing weak interaction. The Abelian U(1) theory is now a modification for the Higgs mechanism, since it represents quantum gravity and mixes with handed spinor SU(2) bosons to give them "gravitational charge," i.e. mass. Going back to the basic mechanism for forces, fundamental forces are repulsion-only interactions. Apparent attraction arises from anisotropy such as caused by mutual shielding from vacuum gauge boson fields, like the Casimir attraction of metal plates. The development of the theory in this paper began in 1996 with the prediction of the cosmological acceleration of the universe from a theory based on observables and physical laws.

First quantization for QM (e.g. non-relativistic Schroedinger equation) quantizes position and momentum of an electron, but not the Coulomb field which is treated classically. This is physically false, as Feynman explains in his 1985 book QED (he dismisses the uncertainty principle as complete model, in favour of path integrals) because indeterminacy is physically caused by virtual particle interactions from the quantized Coulomb field becoming important on small, subatomic scales! Second quantization (QFT) introduced by Dirac in 1929 and developed with Feynman's path integrals in 1948, instead quantizes the field. Second quantization is physically the correct theory, and first quantization by Heisenberg and Schroedinger's approaches is physically wrong: it's just a semi-classical, non-relativistic mathematical approximation useful for obtaining simple mathematical solutions for bound states like atoms. Indeterminacy arises from multipath interferences, i.e. the probability that an electron in orbit could interact with all the various virtual particles in the vacuum that cause it to deflect randomly, creating a chaotic orbit rather than a classical one. There's not a single "wavefunction" for an elec-

tron in orbit, there's a multipath summation of a separate wavefunction amplitude $\exp(iS)$ for every possible interaction, so the electron in orbit has many wavefunction amplitudes, one for each discrete interaction with a field quanta, that may or may not occur.

David Bohm's "hidden variables" and Bell's inequality test on them assumes falsely first-quantization, i.e. only ONE wavefunction per particle, so Bohm and Bell are not correct: their hidden variables are horseshit with a single wavefunction amplitude that's somehow "guided" by another potential which acts like magic. That's wrong. However, there's a tendency for mechanism hating cranks and paid quacks in the physics population media to try to use the disproof of Bohm's hidden variables to rule out not only Bohm's theory and Bell's "test" of the single wavefunction horseshit, but also to rule out any mechanisms like Feynman's path integral, where indeterminacy occurs because of a multitude of wavefunction amplitudes, one for each of the possible quantum interactions, which interfere where more than one interaction can occur simultaneously.

Multipath interference existed in HF ionosphere reflection for long-range radio, before satellites. Part of the radio beam would be reflected by a low layer like the D layer of the ionosphere, but part could penetrate (for some frequencies and times of night, when the ion density was low) and be reflected by layers of charged air at higher altitudes which were irradiated by cosmic rays. The radio receiver would then receive a superposition, or sum over histories, of radio travelling along both paths, the higher path involving more distance and thus taking longer, so that the received signals are out of phase and interfere with one another. This caused what was termed radio "interference", a multipath integral effect. There was no mystery involved, just a simple physical mechanism. When you calculate what an electron might do using a path integral, you're taking account of various possibilities using probabilities, just like modelling Brownian motion where a fraction of a pollen grain is agitated chaotically by the impacts of individual, invisible molecules of air going at 500 m/s. It's taboo to even say this, and people try to use Bell's single wavefunction test horseshit as an excuse to disprove any mechanism for QM by claiming that Bell's test by Alain Aspect ruled out path integrals.

Wrong. Bell's inequality is statistical shit, which tests Bohm's first quantization religious pilot wave, SINGLE wavefunction versus a null hypothesis of normal 1st quantization. It doesn't include the 2nd quantization multipath model, which replaces 1st quantization with multiple wavefunctions. So it fails to "test" the real explanation.

An analogy is the 1967 "megalithic yard" theory: Alexander Thom in 1967 "proved" the lie with 99% Chi-squared statistical probability using a chi-squared test that ancient Britons used an 83-cm long "megalithic yard" to build Stonehenge, but his statistical test - like Bell/Aspect on "quantum entanglement" only included two possibilities (a null hypothesis of random distance spacing versus the theory of his special yard stick), so he *missed out the real mechanism which was that people simply paced out distances without any yard stick*. When his pacing possibility was replaced with the random distance assumption by Hugh Porteous in 1973, who actually simulated a walking pace as a distance unit, it debunked the 99% "proved" Thom megalithic yard hypothesis. Now, if you have a cult like QM, where alternative ideas beyond the top two are rigorously suppressed to maintain Plato's *Laws* argument that "kids must be protected from innovations that may be wrong", Porteous would have been censored out, and the megalithic yard would be a dogmatically defended myth, like quantum entanglement.

CAUSES OR MOTIVATION OF HUMAN BEINGS TO DO SCIENCE, AND CAUSES OF DIS-MOTIVATION

"... several of the most fertile methods of research discovered by the mathematicians could be expressed much better in terms of the ideas derived from Faraday than in their original form." - J. C. Maxwell, *Treatise on Electricity and Magnetism*, 1873, Preface.

1. Abraham Maslow in 1943 formulated the 'hierarchy of needs,' a series of needs ranging from the most basic needs (water, food, warm shelter) to more advanced needs like safety from danger, social acceptance, self-respect, and individual success in achieving a life-plan. After achieving basic needs, people then strive for the more advanced needs. This theory helps to predict which social groups will buy which particular products.

2. Frederick Herzberg in 1959 formulated the 'two-factor theory,' of human motivation, in which human beings need a 'hygiene factor' (good pay and working conditions) in addition to a 'motivation factor' (recognition and achievement). This verified American theory is rejected by many British businesses, which use only one factor or the other (not both), leading to dissatisfaction and large staff turnovers. Great success requires all factors, not just some factors.

3. David McClelland in 1961 distinguished the need for achievement from the need for mere social acceptance (affiliation). Some people are motivated by a need for achievement, which leads them to undertake larger challenges than those who are merely motivated by a need for affiliation. There are many other members (affiliates) of societies, clubs, institutes, and so forth, who have no need for achievement, but derive satis-

faction merely from being a member (affiliate).

“[Einstein’s] final manuscript was prepared and sent to the *Physical Review*. It was returned to him accompanied by a lengthy referee report in which clarifications were requested. Einstein was enraged and wrote to the editor [27 July 1936] that he objected to his paper being shown to colleagues before publication... Einstein... never published in the *Physical Review* again.”

- Abraham Pais, *Subtle is the Lord, the Science and the Life of Albert Einstein*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1982, p. 495. (How “lucky” for Einstein that they annoyed him after he was famous, not before. They may be relevant! Duh...)

Anthony Robbins on motivation

Immersion: you didn't learn language by learning principles; instead you learned it by being immersed in it and doing it so often that it has a REAL meaning for you, MOTIVATING you.

Why do you do what you do today? What is your *drive* in life? What is your motive for action? How does it change with time during your life? Maslow's hierarchy of human needs (proposed by Abraham Maslow in his 1943 paper "A Theory of Human Motivation") shows how human needs and thus motivations vary as met; first you are motivated to get water, then food, then married, etc., etc.; emotional drive varies as your needs are met. Boredom (an emotion) sets in once all the basic needs are met, making a person. Science of success; simply follow the rules to succeed. Fulfilment is the final step, Maslow's "self-actualisation".

Excuses for failure: lack of time, money, and technology. BUT emotional energy well communicated will beat opponents.

Your *model of the world* is what influences you. Certainty is the first need to avoid pain and be comfortable, but too much certainty causes the stress of boredom. (When we read a book or watch a film a second time deliberately we do it because we want the CERTAINTY of having a good experience again!) Hence, the second human need is exciting uncertainty (pleasant/exciting uncertainty problems, "surprises", not horrible shocks or uncertain survival!). Fourth is uniqueness. Violence is a way people have of gaining uniqueness, making other people pay attention to them by force; pointing a gun at someone makes you important and unavoidable to that person! These four needs are personality needs. Last needs are spiritual: (5) Growth. We need to grow (e.g. adult orthodontic teeth straightening, fitness, swimming, muscle building, language learning, books published, laser eye surgery, etc., etc.), so that we feel we are progressing in time, not degenerating with time, and thus we are confident and able to give to others. We need to constantly be doing new exciting, interesting things, advancing, and progressing. (6) Emotional mastery. Happy, excited, annoyed. Every day give your all, love your all, do your all, don't let anything ever stop you, serve other people. Explore your ideas, your mind, your emotions and your drives, and the drives of other people. That is the way to change the world for the better.

Dismissals of unpopular facts (taboos) as politically-naïve "autism" by tribal, superstitious, group-think, politically-biased-agenda, belief system cults, masquerading as "science"

Left wing efforts to educate everybody to "filter out" (censor) politically unpopular "autistic" (truthfully expressed) facts in order to maintain the illusion of the emperor's new clothes

Karl Marx claimed communism was science, but lied. Adolf Hitler claimed eugenics was science, but lied. Medical Nobel Laureate Dr Alexis Carrel's eugenics 1936 Nazi Germany bestseller *Man the Unknown* passionately insisted that science states we must use gas chambers (conveniently ignored by today's politicians using Godwin's law or whatever) to massacre those who are deemed by politicians to be unworthy of life, but lied. Politics is completely separate from group-think science according to the lying definition of "science" as an uncorrupted religion of objectivity, which has never ever been abused, certainly not in recent times.

Objectors are dismissed as Joe McCarthy's (who, from their communist screaming, supposedly killed more American communists than Stalin killed Ukrainians in the 30s!!). Or perhaps you bring up Hitler's eugenics as an example of group-think science crap, then you are censored by "Godwin's law" -waving critics, ignoring what you're actually saying, the substance of your analogy to the early 1920s, pre-holocaust Hitler. "Godwin's law" is used to conveniently insist that lessons of the past must never be used to prevent a repetition of evil (confusing the 1940s gas chambers situation with the rise of Hitler in the 1920s and 1930s, so invoking a false straw-man mis-analogy to avoid taking seriously a threat from pseudoscience

that's akin to "mere eugenics" in the 1920s). We didn't stop Hitler in 1935, before gas chambers, because of gas science liars like a 1927 lying BBC radio broadcast by the pro-disarmament liar Noel Baker (plus scare-mongering "free press" gas war exaggerating, pro-disarmament liars) that gas masks and gas proof rooms don't work against enemy gas bombs.

It's a pseudo-science that still persists today in the name of "peace in our time", although gas war exaggerations and dismissals of cheap civil defence in the 30s led to disarmament lies that prevented a 1935 preventative war to stop Hitler. Instead of peace, WWII resulted. But today the same lies continue, because it's taboo to learn the lessons of history. Because they're "unthinkable" taboos. These taboos are shocking, and the ideologues who use them should be publically flogged to death slowly by someone very bitter about this sick evil (for example, I'll volunteer to do the job myself, although that's will sadly remain a mere pipe dream).

Why do herds of evil liars still get away with telling politically correct lies? They don't just "get away with it". They get rewarded for "trying" to bring about peace by telling lies, even if they fail as they usually do. The answer to the question is the group-think hatred of perceived "autism" which in effect is synonymous to "truth telling", by the gullible and evil liars who fill the free media and sell false "news" and related lies that people want to hear. Society needs everybody to filter writings and speech to prevent offense. So you had to be nice about Hitler or you were an autistic person or worse a warmonger. Let's take a look at "autism", shall we? Now kids, we want you to: (1) always the truth, (2) always tell lies where it is expedient to avoid causing offence, and (3) act as if there is no lying duplicity involved.

Herman Kahn pointed out that in his great essay, *In Defense of Thinking* (chapter one of *Thinking About the Unthinkable*, 1962) that the *biggest social crimes like child slavery in England, only occurred because evil exploits precisely the loopholes created by taboos. Hitler exploited the irrational, exaggerated fears of aerial bombing in the 30s. Messengers of the facts were censored as being "warmongers". Today, by analogy, pressures on social housing due to immigration during an economic recession are made taboo by simply labelling messengers as "-ists". Shoot enough messengers on a false charge, and the "problem" of "unwanted messages" disappears (although the problems go unresolved). But "closing down the argument" without being objective, by sticking a "imperialist" or "capitalist" or "-ist" label on any argument that contravenes your favourite taboo of political correctness, is itself the real problem of "McCarthyism".*

Indiscriminate, subjective, scare-mongering accusations using mere guess-work about the motivations of messengers of taboo news, in order to dismiss the news without checking it objectively, is a regression to tribal superstitions of the most irrational sort. If you're a communist and your "science" is criticised, you simply shoot the messenger on the triumphed up, unproved, made-out-of-whole-fabric charge that they're as a warmongering imperialist, without addressing the substance of the criticism. Taboos are very convenient if you don't want to get involved in objective fact based debates. (For further reading, please see our vixra book review about corrupt science, entitled *Watermelons*.)