

Flux Particle Theory

by James Cranwell

<http://www.mccelt.com/>

**Everything in the Universe is made from one type of particle.
All workings of the Universe are result from said particle.**

Nothing is Solid. Space is not Empty. Everything is Connected

Contrary to popular belief... nothing is even remotely solid.

At the sub atomic level it is well known the nucleus radius to electron orbital ratio is one hundred thousandth.

That makes the volumetric or spatial difference one quadrillionth = 10^{-15} = (.000 000 000 000 001) .

This ratio is approximately the same size as a spherical dot (tittle) above the letter " i " (the proton) on the fifty - yard line in a football stadium (the orbital) everything else is empty space.

That's 99.99999999999999 % empty space.

$$\frac{(4/3)\pi 1^3}{(4/3)\pi 100,000^3} = \frac{1}{1,000,000,000,000,000} = \text{one quadrillionth}$$

So, if we think of or visualize a huge sphere the size of a stadium (a small moon for instance), in reality the amount of actual continuous mass (just nuclei) is equivalent to a solid dot above the " i " made of only protons cut up into one quadrillion times 1,000 billion billion pieces and evenly dispersed.

That's how many (one quadrillion) "i" dots would fill the moon sized sphere (ignoring sphere packing) times the number of atomic radii (1,000 billion billion) it would take to fill every "i" dot.

The Basic Fundamental Universal Substance.

Although everything is mostly empty space, that still leaves something that must be there, something that can be considered solid (the one quadrillionth is the solid part.)

What is it made from? Is it like clay? Is it like foam?

There might not be a way to determine what the basic fundamental universal substance is actually made from (you will find out why later)... but we can determine what shape it must be by thinking geometrically.

If we call the basic unit of whatever matter is comprised of a particle. The particle must be capable of conveying information, for instance electromagnetic vibrations.

And since there are different frequencies and / or strengths of vibrations with multiple simultaneous combinations, a zero-dimensional 0-D single (zero) point particle would be incapable of achieving this. It can spin or move or remain at rest but there is no chance of simultaneity or vibrations.

The next possible alternative is the one dimensional 1-D line or string (any intrinsic universal characteristic should always be the simplest and at the same time most efficient option).

The string seems to be the shape of choice in this case. On a musical instrument, a violin for instance, the string can convey a multitude of vibrations, tones and harmonics. This means there can be a lot of simultaneous information transmitted along a one dimensional string.

The one dimensional strings like those explained in this theory not only work but they also give an easy explanation for anything and everything. There is no need to attempt theoretical construction of a particle shaped-like / made-from two dimensional 2-D planes because... you don't keep looking for the answer after you have found it. And, a plane is a 2-D slice of a 3-D solid cube. Making it technically a 2-D solid. Nothing is Solid.

Note: "Nothing is Solid" means there isn't anything that is actually solid.

Everything is made from strings. (not the string theory type)

The basic string is approximately one Ångström in length and can be considered 1-D, that's one dimensional (although in reality it must actually have an infinitesimally small width)

Ten of those strings form the basic particle... that's 10 strings joined at their centers (or 20 radii emanating from a common center).

This is the basic particle that is called a Flux Particle.

Basic Flux Particle...

This is the shape that makes everything work.

If any strings join together at their ends and then more strings are attracted to the joint... it will build into the shape in question. When it reaches a point where there are twenty strings sticking into one center, that's the point where no more strings will fit all the way into the center of the package, it's the cut off point. The vertices of the **dodecahedron** or the faces of the icosahedron (platonic solids.)

This is a way stuff can form and happen automatically.

Space has a high tension particle field (in it)

Space is not empty. It is comprised of a highly stretched (tensioned) particle field.

space is not empty, it is comprised of strings, spheres (bubbles), particles etc.

It is made from the same basic particle as everything else (with nothing balled up, collapsed or twisted) and the particle field in space is also used for conveyance of light and gravity. This means the particle field in space is **dodecahedral**. Easily quantized... one particle per **dodecahedral space pack** (something like sphere packing)

Important Note: If you removed the field and all particles from space... then space would actually be completely null and empty, an endless unbounded void. So, to set the record straight... Empty space would actually be empty but since space has an all-encompassing field in it, it is not empty.

Everything is the same thing.

What you call Gravity, Dark Matter and Dark Energy are all from the same thing.

Dark energy -- Everything is pulled on equally from all directions by the field

Gravity -- When 2 masses are introduced into the field they pull together

Dark matter -- The field itself is made from the same flux particle as everything else, it has mass but can't be seen (it is what is used to convey light and pull objects together) -- It is made from of course strings but not like string theory strings.

An easy to understand two dimensional model of the Flux Particle Field would be something like a highly stretched tennis net made of the finest spiders web. And in this model "matter" would be a balled up piece of the web stuck to the net (everything is infinitesimally small).

This field is not stationary in space with other things rushing through it like Michelson Morley mistakenly assumed. It is everywhere and surrounds matter. Yes, if the object is spherical like a planet or a star... of course the field will be curved around it.

Of course the field is being dragged... Michelson Morley sent everyone down the wrong tracks.

They didn't create an experiment to detect the Ether... they created one to detect if the Earth is rushing through it.

It is a field like any other field, connected to everything... in this case the Earth or Sun or whatever.

If you do an experiment... make sure you test for every contingency.

Isotopes and Nucleus Formations / Construction

When the strings of a particle are balled up or collapsed... they are a proton or neutron.

The individual radii (1 of 20 strings) are the connectors used to connect neutrons to protons (balled up) and protons to electrons (full length but twisted together).

Everything is made out of the same particle and every particle has 20 strings unless it is smashed up deformed matter.

A proton has one string balled (tightly wound together) with a neutron, 18 balled by themselves and one full length twist connected to an electron.

A free proton would look like this ~~~●~~~~ (that's one free string, 18 balled, one free string)

A free neutron would look like this ●~~~~ (19 balled, and one free string)

A free electron would look like this ---*--- (one free string, 18 free strings in a disc shape, one free string)

A proton can grab a neutron and an electron.

●~~~ ~~~●~~~ ---*--- (NPE on the loose)

●●~~~*--- (NPE combined)

(that's a neutron with its previously free string balled up together with one of the proton's previously free strings (now also balled up) and the other proton string is twisted with an electron string (that free proton string and electron string twists are still full length))

Two free protons ~~~●~~~ ~~~●~~~ can combine and still be 2 protons ~~~●●~~~ (that might look like 2 free neutrons but it is not because there are also balled up strings in the middle of the package holding them together.

To clarify: two free neutrons ●~~~ ~~~● that are now combined would look like this ●●

If you throw another free proton into that 2 proton package ~~~●●~~~ ~~~●~~~

you will get one changing into a neutron when they combine ~~~●●●~~~ that's Helium-3

If 4 free protons ~~~●~~~ ~~~●~~~ ~~~●~~~ ~~~●~~~

...grab each other 2 will change into neutrons ~~~●●●●~~~

And then the outer two that still have a free string can grab electrons...

---*~~~●●●●~~~*--- that's regular Helium, it can also be called Helium-4

If you understand the way this works... with a little thinking anyone can figure out isotopes.

For instance why 3 protons would not make lithium-3 ...

i.e. why there can be extra neutrons but not just a bunch of protons (or extra protons)... we've just seen that above the way Helium-3 was created.

Nucleus 3 can only be helium-3 ~~~●●●~~~ or Hydrogen-3 (tritium) ●●●~~~

(Lithium-3 would be a nucleus with 3 protons and zero neutrons... and that can't be a nucleus)

"Lithium-4 contains three protons and one neutron. This is the shortest-lived known isotope of lithium. It decays by proton emission to helium-3 with half-life of about 10^-23 seconds."

~~~●~~~ ~~~●~~~ ~~~●~~~ ~~~●~~~ (start with 4)

~~~●●●~~~ ~~~●~~~ (combine in only way possible to make 3 protons, 1 neutron... notice one proton is on the loose... not attached to

nucleus, say goodbye, it's unstable, eject it)

Atom

Something like an atom with Protons, Neutrons and Electrons has to be the correct model. Things are different weights, different colors, different properties, etc. but everything has to be made out of the same thing. An atom is the way to do it. They almost have the model correct... but everything is actually just strings and tension

Electron ---*---

An electron is shaped like the metal spines of an umbrella (without the hinges or fabric of course). One string extends from where your hand would hold it up to the center of axis. There, eighteen strings (or radii) extend out in the same curved disc type shape as the umbrella. The last string goes straight up (the same length as all the rest) and connects with the field in space (space is made of the same stuff by the way). Notice the way some elements in vertical columns in the Periodic table chart have an atomic number with difference of 18 between them. Most of the chart is like that (notice how many columns there are). It's because **18 is the determinant number in electron shell configuration.** Every electron particle has 20 strings. One string is attached to the proton. One string connects with space (or an electron in the next outer shell). The other 18 strings form the electron disc.

When electrons connect with each other they have 18 strings to play with.

Check the larger noble gases: Argon 18, Krypton 36, Xenon 54, Radon 86, the amount of electrons in outermost shells will always sum to 18, the first three even have atomic numbers that are multiples of eighteen. Three groups of six radii from one electron can form (along with seven other electrons) the corners of a cube or the "Octet Rule" and seal off the package.

Important note: Electrons are actually particles but they (the strings they are made from) form a mesh-like cage around the nucleus. They are also held in place by string connections to the protons.

An electron is actually not moving... only the vibrations that are traveling around the strings are moving... and that's what everyone mistakenly thinks an electron is.

Electrons (particles) cannot orbit around a nucleus.

The protons are stationary and the (multiple) electrons that supposedly are orbiting would require a massive amount of bearings and axles. And

they would also interfere with each others orbits.

You can't use "force" as the holder (or carrier) because any force is also made from particles or their connection.

To make matters worse... an equatorial orbit (supposedly happening) would need something like a circular track around the proton (actually the nucleus as a whole) with a sliding connection. That's ridiculous.

Proton ~~~●~~~

The proton is 20 strings (like everything else) one string radii is attached to a neutron, one is attached to an electron and the other 18 remaining string radii are balled up or collapsed.

If the strings collapse in groups of three each that would make 6 groups ($3 * 6 = 18$) or six types of (what they call) Quarks.

And if they collapse in groups of six each that would make 3 groups ($6 * 3 = 18$) or three (what they call) Quarks in three flavors.

Maybe the grouping during collapse happens in different numbers like... 3, 6 and 9 ...that still sums to 18 strings.

The jury is still out on all of this Quark business. When they smash up protons they assume they have found different subatomic particles because of the different weights. That is just a different number of strings being smashed apart.

If you magnified a proton until it was the size of the dot above the letter "i" then the strings could be compared to something a lot finer than the web of a spider extending out a few hundred meters. Fine enough where eighteen strings can curl into a space the size of the proton and have a spaghetti ball type configuration with a very loose string (or filament) pack.

It is the way to make the most universe with the least amount of material. And only one type of material.

Neutron ●~~~

A neutron is the same as proton but with 19 string radii balled up or collapsed. And when it is in the nucleus all 20 are collapsed (although one of the 20 is collapsed in unison with a proton string)

One Proton string and one Neutron string balled up or collapsed together is called a **Meson**.

Neutrino ●

A Neutrino is a completely balled up or collapsed particle ● (all 20 strings) or a group of completely balled up particles ●● NOT connected to the field or anything else.

The speed of light is completely irrelevant to a Neutrino. The speed of light is field stuff, the neutrino is on its own.

You could say the Neutrino is in the "ultimate time" zone.

Everything Particle...

Remember... regardless of the theory, everything is made out of particles.

That includes all forces and all fields.

A field is a group of particles.

A force is a particle(s) action on other particles (i.e. particles pulling other particles).

If anyone explains for example the four forces... what they are really saying is there are four different particles and / or groups of those particles. (actually it's the same particle doing four different things)

Electromagnetic field? -- That would be a group of particles.

Gravitational field? -- That would be a group of particles.

Gravitational force? -- That would be a group of particles pulling.

The strong nuclear force? -- That is supposedly a gluon -- a particle.

Example: A supposed graviton, that is the supposed force carrier for gravity? So any force is comprised (made) of particles.

Everything (except energy) is either a particle or a group of particles.

(energy is vibrations traveling in particles (a photon is also only a particle vibration))

If you find forces or fields mentioned anywhere... just (mentally) replace the words "force" (or field) with "particle(s)." Then it's easy to see if the explanation is ridiculous because most times it becomes nonsense, can only work by magic or is just plain wrong.

Particles in explanations can also become doubled up... they might say a field (actually a group of particles) has a "mediator particle" or a "force carrier" (a particle). That is a great example of not knowing how something works so they add more stuff (actually the same stuff with a different name) in to try and explain it.

If you ever hear something like... "A field has a force carrier" ...do not walk away, run!

The Intrepid Photon?

What they refer to as a photon is actually just a vibration traveling along the strings. (not the string theory type)

~~~~~ $\nu$ ~~~~~

That is why Wave Particle Duality is a mess...

Light is not a particle. That would mean there is some type of stuff involved.

### **If light were a particle it would be some type of particle stuff.**

Does anyone really think there is a stream of massless particles leaving your flashlight at the speed of light when you turn it on?. Think about the huge amount of particles that would be bombarding us from the Sun... where is it all going?

Visible Light is only a small section of the electromagnetic spectrum...

There is a huge amount of other frequencies.

And if they are all massless particles it would mean that space is filled with vibrating massless particles coming and going (zipping around at the speed of light) in every possible direction, frequency and intensity.

Think about how many particle collisions there would be.

A photon is a particle...? Nope... that's ridiculous, and even though it's wrong it still results in space being filled with particles (which is actually correct... they are just not zipping around).

## Gluon

### All forces are made from particles

Here are two particles... ● ●

A gluon is holding them together?

●§●

Ok... but there must be two mechanisms,

●~~§~~●

one mechanism would be holding first particle to gluon and the other mechanism would be holding the gluon to the other particle.  
So the particles must also have the mechanism built in...

●~ ~§~ ~●

and therefore they do not need the gluon...

●~~●

Whatever the mechanism is... that is what they mistakenly think a gluon is.

Get it? Every particle has / is something that can connect to other particles.

And all forces are made from particles.

That eliminates most of mainstream physics.



## No Quarks

There are no quarks like they say there are.

A quark would have to be connected to other quarks in only specific arrangements.

There would have to be multiple connection mechanisms that only allow those certain arrangements.

A red can only connect to one blue and one green.

If a red is connected to a blue, another blue (or red) is not allowed.

A blue can only connect to a green and a red etc.

To form correctly they would need a fairly large set of rules, but that cannot be because it is basic stuff working at a fundamental (simple) level. And everything would of course have to work and form automatically.

As a group quarks are called a Neutron or a Proton and they also have to be connected to each other (but the connection would actually be coming from a quark) proton is only the name for a group. That's another specific type connection mechanism

And they would have to be connected to the electrons supposedly in orbit. That's another specific type connection mechanism.

Stuff is not happening like that. It would require at least 5 different type connection mechanisms.

I bet you cannot even think of two. You cannot say "force" because any force has to be made out of particles and that does not solve the problem. The force particles would still need connection mechanisms.

Do you have even one way particles can connect at a quantum level? Ummm... no, you don't.

And if you add "gluons" into the stupidity, you get the same type of mess.

But it does show how if there is a mechanism the gluons are not needed because the mechanism must be built into the particles.

## Vacuum of Space?

Space is not a vacuum, it is normal, we are under pressure.

also... I'm sure the vacuum energy of (actually non) empty space is not a vacuum, it is tension on the field of strings. I would bet my life on it.

It also explains (what they call) Dark Energy... everything is being pulled on (not pushed) equally from every direction.

If there are two end points (any type of matter, planets or anything) that creates a stronger connection and they pull together -- that's gravity.

## The Four Forces using strings and tension...

**Strong Force** -- When two strings are completely balled up in the proton-neutron pack. A neutron has 19 strings balled up and one connecting to a proton (also balled up, they are calling those two balled up strings a gluon). ●●

**Electro-magnetic force** -- If there is one full length proton-electron connection twisted together like a corkscrew that is another strength force. (different \\\ direction // corkscrew... different type... matter , anti-matter. )

Electrons in their shell also connect to each other but the amount of string that is twisted together is different relative to the distance out in the shell. Further out... bigger sphere, less string twist connection, less stable.

An easy to visualize model is folded hands tightly together would be small size atoms. But as you pull your hands apart there would be less and less of your fingers touching until only the finger tips touched... that's large size, outer and unstable.

```

---*~~~*~~~*---
---*---*---*---
---*---  ---*---  ---*---

```

**Weak force** -- radioactive decay and instability in certain nuclei... the reason for instability in heavy (larger size) elements is the connecting strings are a certain length and the bigger the atom gets the less the string connections become...

Big atoms with weird configurations, something odd with the assembly and other problems.

**Gravitational force** -- The particle radii are arranged in the dodecahedral axis shape, packed together in space something like sphere packing and only near the endpoints of strings are touching. Hardly any string twisted together, very weak force (maybe only endpoint touching) that is the gravitational field (made of particles (of course))

### Cosmological Constant: Fifth Force : Dark Energy : Quintessence ...

are what others have been unknowingly calling the the stretching property (tension) of Flux Particle Field.

## Dark Matter :: Luminiferous Æther :: The Aether etc.

That's what the field itself (and any loose particles) which completely fill space are unwittingly called. ([you cannot see something that conveys light](#))

If you took a size 4 chunk (volume) of the particle field (that would be 4 particles) and used the 4 particles to make regular matter (something like hydrogen gas, that's 2 balled up protons and 2 electron wrapped around the protons) it would occupy a size 1 chunk, and that comes out to be about 25%.

**4 units of space equals 1 unit of real / normal matter.**

Space has all particles expanded to full size.  
Matter has the particles balled-up and or wrapped around the nucleus.

That means the field in space is the equivalent of 25% matter, but since it is actually just the field that you cannot see, I guess you can call it Dark Matter.  
Got it? If you think of all the particles in space that are filling the Universe and convert them into normal matter... you would get a Universe that is filled with 25% matter.

Regardless of the theory something like this must be true.

In this theory I use the finest string filament (not the string theory type) and only one field. And it still equates to supposedly empty space actually being filled with what you could consider 25% real matter

Mainstream (physicists) think there are 5 or 6 fields in space?  
That equates to insanity.

A size 4 chunk (volume) would have  $4 \times 6 = 24$  particles. That would mean a "space" that is actually more dense (particle matter wise) than something like the Sun. (every field would equate to about one quarters worth of the volume in real matter.)

One particle field means space is 25% dark matter  
Two particle fields means space is 50% dark matter  
~~~~~  
Six particle fields means space is 150% dark matter

Higgs, The God particle. etc.

Are what one individual particle has been inadvertently called (actually only one aspect of the particle).

Fields Primer

An electric field would have to be made from connected particles. The particles would have to pack space (it's safe to assume something like sphere packing (like a bag of marbles) that's only the way they pack though, not the shape of the particle).
Every electric field particle would have to be connected to all of its neighbors, that means every particle has approximately 12 neighbors / connections.

The individual particle shape cannot be "fat". A point particle would be like a tiny sphere. Spheres are the same as marbles. Marbles are the ultimate "fat" and that would result in a just-about-solid Space.

Everyone knows that "nothing is solid" and normal matter (atoms) are mostly empty space.
Outer space (the void) is absolutely less dense than normal matter. So the field particles must be long enough to connect to other field particles but extremely fine and thin. Like the finest filament string (not the string theory type).

A 2-D spiders web is filling, connecting and commandeering a giving area but the area is still mostly empty space. The same thing is possible with a 3-D spiders web but that would fill (commandeer) a given volume. The string filaments of course must have tension on them or nothing will work... for instance vibrations

Electric field particles can only connect to other electric field particles.

You cannot have electric field particles connecting to any other type of field particles. And since every field would have to be something like described above, that means if there are 5 or 6 fields all occupying the exact same area in space it would just be a big mess. But that's o.k. because everything can work and be easily explained with just one field.

Fine-Tuned Laws of Nature?

If you changed the value of for instance the Cosmological Constant (that's the field tension) would that make our existence impossible? No, everything else (including gravitational strength and the speed of light, etc.) would change right along with it... completely proportionally. If the Universal field tension did change we might not even notice it and we would measure it (actually what we mistakenly think *it* is) as the same it has always been. Explained further here... [time](#)

Gravitational field intensity...

Gravity is when 2 or more objects are connected by field strings and the added tension pulls them together. Gravitational strength is the number or amount of field connections...

one connection per atomic width (regular matter),
 one connection per neutron / proton width (neutron / proton star),
 one connection per string width, that's just connections (that would be what they say a black hole is).

Atoms are mostly empty space (99.99999999999999 % empty space)
 Protons and neutrons are solid?

From NASA...

http://imagine.gsfc.nasa.gov/docs/science/known_1/pulsars.html

*"A neutron star is about 20 km in diameter and has the mass of about 1.4 times that of our Sun.
 This means that a neutron star is so dense that on Earth, one teaspoonful would weigh a billion tons!
 Because of its small size and high density, a neutron star possesses a surface gravitational field about 2×10^{11} times that of Earth."*

$2 \times (10^{11}) = 200,000,000,000$

The field connections (strings) from any object are only connecting to the gravitational field via the protruding surface strings of the object. So to

The field connections (strings) from any object are only connecting to the gravitational field via the protruding surface strings of the object. So, to find how many neutrons would fit in the same size circular surface area as an atomic width (that would be the number of actual field connections) just use a simple circular area.

This should give the increase in surface gravitational field connections...

$$(3.1416 * 100\ 000^2) / (3.1416 * 1^2) = 10,000,000,000$$

hmmm... amazing number. It is 1 / 20 the number given by Nasa.

That means to make my number fit exactly I need to multiply it by 20.

Anyone know what that might be? Why 20 connections more?


What the hell could be made of 20 somethings?

p.s. A Black Hole gravitational field works the same way, it just has a lot more connections, also very easy to figure out.

Also... A neutron star cannot be made entirely of neutrons...



The outer edge (surface) would have to be either protons with a very tightly packed (and weird) electron configuration (that explains the extra 20) -- OR -- just protons, possibly even a number of levels deep (this also might be 20) with the lower level free strings sticking up through the spaces between the outer level. I'm not absolutely sure... I've never been there, done that.



The electrons normally form an atom sized spherical mesh type cage around a tiny nucleus with only a dozen or so free proton strings going off in every direction. The electrons would be evenly spaced around the sphere.

With a neutron star it is a completely different story... a small section of the surface area could be considered flat and the billions and billions of extra connections are almost straight-up parallel.

Black Hole - Void Sphere - Null Space

There is No need for a Black Hole.

NOTE: I am not saying there are no Black Holes, this is just an example of how observational evidence is worthless and might be completely wrong.

This video show stars orbiting around something non visible, what appears to be nothing, so it must be a black hole?

[Stars Orbiting Milky Way Super Massive Black Hole](#)

You know what else they could be orbiting?

Nothing!

Any two objects like planets are connected by a string field with tension.
(or if you are still living in the past you can say there is a curve or warp)

There must be some kind of connection from one to the other (warp or space is curved)

So if you add more objects and they are swirling around a common center. That means there would be a tension stretch coming from every direction concentrated right in the center of the swirl.

So if there is a star near the common center with the massive concentrated omni-directional tension (call it warp or curve if you like) which way do you think the pull would be? Toward the massive amount of tension or away from it?

There are supposedly 100 billion stars in the galaxy. So that means there are 100 billion things pulling on a [common center](#). There actually doesn't have to be anything there. Galaxies might have what is referred to as a black hole but they can also hold themselves together. The galactic tension pull is actually planar not omni-directional so it is even more concentrated then what you were just thinking.

And if there were enough tension on the common center to create a tear in the "fabric of space" it would create a void or a null-space-sphere (actually an [oblate spheroid](#)). The edges of the void sphere would have the build-up of the torn / ripped particle field - just like a rip in a fishnet stocking - that is now [enclosing literally nothing](#). That instantly disperses the tension from a single point to the surface of a hollow sphere. So if space ever does actually rip... it has a way to seal itself right back off (stop the tear) and eliminate the chance of it happening again in that spot. Can light travel through it on the inside? No! Light is only a vibration traveling through the particle field. Inside the void sphere there are no particles.

Can you travel into the void sphere? Yes, but inside there is no light or heat transmission, no gravity and no particle field -- and that is what is

transmitting all the vibrations (energies) so, you can't lose any heat, it has no where to go, it can't vibrate away anymore.

Will you collapse because of the loss of field tension? Maybe, maybe not... if you have a highly stretched tennis net and cut a piece out of it... the piece is not going to collapse into nothingness.

Any light hitting it (from 100 billions stars etc.) would be forced / coerced into traveling around what can be called the event horizon of the sphere -- just like an electrons string-mesh-type-cage (that's the only place it can travel) there of course would be a build up and the only place to release is at the poles as [jets](#) (no extreme tension there).

To sum it up: "Nothing" has all the properties they say a Black Hole does. And sometimes "nothing" can be a real cool hand!

-- -- - -- -

No Magic Allowed...

Everything has to be directly (physically) connected.

1) Energy cannot be out on its own... there is no such this as "pure energy."

Energy is a vibration on a particle or movement of particles.

Think of a guitar string. If you pluck it... it will move and vibrate and that is the energy...

Could you convert the vibrations or movement into mass?

No, and if you take away the string you won't even have a way to make vibrations or movement.

Is there pure energy? Just energy? ...Nope.

2) A force has to be (made out of) something. i.e. a particle.

You can push or pull particles with other particles... you cannot push or pull particles with nothing.

3) Particles have to be directly (physically) connected to other particles or they won't be able do anything (except magic).

Think about a magnet and iron filings... the magnet can move and actually hold the filings in place.

That could not happen unless there was a continuous connection of particles.

MAGNET~~~~~IRON

Look what happens if there is a break in the field (the particles)...

MAGNET~~~~~ ~~~~~IRON

Would that still work?

A magnetic field is a field.

A field is made out of particles.

If there is a break in the particle field that means there is absolutely nothing where the break is.

Nothing is Nothing. (Something nonexistent is not something, it is nonexistent)

4) Everything has to happen (or form) automatically but it cannot be by magic.

The Universe did not come with an instruction manual. Anything that happens, forms, changes, etc. has to happen all on its own.

5) What Einstein calls "Space-Time" has to be made out of something. And something has to be particles (it can't be nothing.)

Anything (field, foam?) that fills space will also have to convey light (and a host of other things).

If something fills space and you can see it... that would mean you would not see anything, it would be like being immersed in a pool of dark muddy water. When you open your eyes you can't see anything... the muddy water is right up against your eyes.

p.s. foam will not work.

6) Think about it... stuff at the most basic level (proton, electron, quark, etc.) cannot be spheres, sphere-like or zero-point \emptyset -D. Spheres can only spin, remain at rest, or travel in a straight line... no vibrations, and vibrations are everything.

And how is a sphere going to be held in place?

If anything is not actually held together it will just fly apart.

Anything "spinning" is completely out of the question... it would require axles and universal joints.

Nothing could be held together by particles exchanging or "shooting" other particles at each other... that's ridiculous non-sense.

7) A basic force cannot be a large scale group process, like friction or glue.

Glue for instance is a large molecule. When you think in terms of the very small you can't use things like that.

It could not be the most basic particle construct.

Basic things have to operate automatically with a very basic process.


You cannot explain the basic working of something and use something that only works as a large scale group of things.

Do you catch my drift? If things were held together by glue (at a quantum level) you are not at the smallest level and you would also have to explain how quantum glue works.... and you can't have glue or stickiness at that basic level (very small size). And above all else... a basic force would be the action of (most likely) just one particle.

Electric and Magnetic field

Both of those (particle) fields are only an effect that originates from the same thing... the actual particle field the encompasses space made of strings.

The electric and magnetic particle field (they originate from the same thing) are just vibrations or a shape change in the real (flux) particle field. An easy 2-D example is the highly stretched tennis net made of the finest spiders web.



If you were on one side of the net and plucked a string, the vibration would travel along string to the other side of the net. That vibration would set off perpendicular vibrations (and in the real field a shape change if strong enough) up and down in it's travels.


If you ask... "wouldn't the whole net just vibrate?" ...Yes, of course it would but using another example of an actual spiders web...

If the spider is sitting directly in the middle of his web and something (a bug) lands in his web... he knows the exact direction and placement of the bug.

This is because the spider and the bug have now actually set up endpoints for a more powerful string vibration... there is a mass on both ends of the web string. And of course whatever string had the initial pluck would have the most powerful vibration.

of the web string. And of course whatever string had the initial pluck would have the most powerful vibration. Remember this is a linear one string example, in a real field the vibration would expand away spherically. But there is of course always endpoints, every atom with protons / neutrons is an endpoint.

The field also has lattice type properties so it can fold-up or curve around objects. If it folds in one particular direction that means there would be a lot of string connections in parallel with the fold (that would make it a lot stronger in whatever direction that might be.)



Think about how easy it is to fold up a tennis net. Even if there was a person on every one of the 4 corners tensioning the net... an increased diagonal pull from opposite corners would easily change the direction of all strings in the net, actually almost lining them up.

"Spooky action at a distance...?" that's when two endpoints set up their own string connection.

Dimensions.

There are no higher dimensions, no alternate universes, no parallel worlds. Anything like that would be noticed as a disruption in the (particle) field. A large enough cohesive group of anything would interact with the particle field and get noticed. The only out-of-the-ordinary type thing happening is individual neutrinos passing through everything.

No lower dimensions either... Even the one dimensional string used in this theory (or string theory)... it doesn't matter how small it is... it (of course) has a length but it would also have to have an infinitesimally small thickness, that would give it a height and width, or three dimensions.

Theoretically a string is 1-D, but it is actually 3-D.

Everything is actually 3-D (the strings) but theoretically (mathematically only)... nothing is 3-D.

A proton is 0-D (zero-D). Most of the strings (19 out of 20 if in a nucleus) are balled-up / collapsed into (what can be called) a point.

A string is 1-D theoretically or mathematically.

The electrons are (for the most part) 2-D (two dimensional). 18 of the electron (1-D) strings form a 2-D disc (umbrella like, curved plane) pattern.

2-D or the electron (2-D), strings forming 2-D disc (umbrella like, curved plane), pattern...

When a group of electrons join together they form a spherical string-mesh-type-cage around the nucleus... and that is how they can mimic a 3-D solid (maybe you can actually call that "theoretically 3-D?" A spiders web would be a 2 dimensional object but if you wrapped it around a basketball, the spiders web would be spherical... mimicking 3-D).

We're seeing this whole configuration through a 10-D particle field.

The 10 axis of the individual particles are arranged in 10 different directions forming the field and that can be considered a 10 dimensional particle field.

So if you want to bump up one dimension higher than the dimension you actually see things in, you're going to have to contemplate a mysterious visitor from the eleventh dimension (not the fourth).

Spatial dimension is directions.

An Abbott Flatlander from Flatland living on a two dimensional plane (like a piece of paper) would actually be living on an infinity of dimensions if he can turn or move through every angle or vector direction on the supposed plane. And... of course, nothing is solid.

If you had a literally solid 3-D cube (which cannot / does-not exist)... a piece-of-paper-like plane would be one slice of it. That means a paper plane is a 2-D solid. Nothing is solid. Paper-like planes do not exist.

The way this actually works is by using axial directions as dimension.

An actual working two dimensional model of space would be an infinite array of 2-D (XY) axis shaped particles arranged in a plane.

```
+++++
+++++

+++++
+++++

+++++
+++++
+++++
```

In this 2-D model light is coerced into traveling in straight lines in only two directions (This model can also warp or flex, forcing the curvature of light). If you took enough 2-D particles and curved and connected them into a spherical surface shape, it would be misinterpreted as 3-D.

The actual 2-D electrons are pulling this same prank by arranging themselves spherically and mimicking a 3-D solid. Nothing is actually 3-D and / or solid.

A 3-D model would also include the toward and away (XYZ) axis. But in the real world particle vibrations (light transmissions) occur in every possible direction, a 2-D and / or 3-D particle will not sufficiently transmit vibrations along a diagonal. So, a 3-D particle cannot be the correct model for space.

The particle capable of angular conveyance must be of higher dimension (axial directions) and have the most efficient shape to pack space. It turns out to be a particle with 10-dimensions or ten axes.

This axial concept allows for an actual visual of higher dimensions.
You have to remember... nothing is 3-D and / or solid.

The Dodecahedron

The Dodecahedron (DDH) is the pattern or axial arrangement used by the particle (10 axis, 20 radii). It is stackable hyperbolically and absolutely the most efficient way to pack space with the least amount of material (smallest angle of symmetrical invariance). Any more than ten axes per particle and they won't connect.

The only problem is the vertices are tri-linear (where any axis terminates it will intersect with three others). If a frequency traveling along an axis passes directly through the center, then out any of the tri-corners, that same linear direction will not pass through any other of the twelve Dodecahedrons in proximity. It will be directly on the edge where any four Dodecahedrons meet. So the individual Photon which we now know is one vibration traveling along the Unit Flux strings can never take a straight path. The vertices where the Dodecahedrons meet have four paths. If you place three base balls on the ground in a triangle then place another on top to make a pyramid shape, that will be the way the base balls and Dodecahedrons stack. The only problem here is where the base balls touch each other is not where the Unit Flux Strings are located. The end points the Flux Strings terminate on tri-corners. Thus sending the intrepid photon on a Zigzag, Corkscrew, and other intricate paths destined to scatter.

It is easy to angle out of position with nothing else around. It is the combined effect of many photons initially heading in one direction with momentum that keep each other in line and in proper direction except of course near the scattering outer fringes. This is the reason why one photon particle traveling in a zigzag can also be interpreted as wave function. Its path is forced into a wave type motion. A vibration sets off resonant vibrations in itself, perpendicular to the original path. Thus creating other fields and background radiation.

Waves...

Space is a string particle field.

The vibrations (energy) move in waves. When light is emitted from a source it will actually be a group of vibrations (what they call photons).

You can have the individual particles vibrating in some type of unison creating a traveling wave or a massive shock to the whole field. If you have a beach towel made of vibrating particles you can also give it the sine wave shake to get the sand off.

Here's a question: The speed of light would be the speed the particle vibrations travel through the towel... what is the speed of the shock wave / sine wave? (a shock wave would be caused by something like a supernova)

NOTE: You can also have a compression type wave.

—

Everything is inert...

The energy contained in the nucleus of an atom is actually only potential energy

Mass... for instance something that has a proton, that's a particle with most of its strings balled up, sitting there completely inert with the field strings (by way of the electron strings) pulling tension on it / them from multiple directions. It doesn't actually convert into energy... it releases what can be considered its energy by un-balling. The particle is still there but now its shape has changed into the regular particle (un-balled) 10 strings with common center (or 20 radii).

When something like a reaction happens and the balled up proton strings can unwind... the field strings will pull (actually snap) all of the proton strings to their full length (that's the same length as the field strings) going from the size of a proton to commandeering the volumetric size an atom takes up in space. Every proton unballing would add a new field particle (or unit of space) thereby displacing the field particles that were already there. This instantly creates the massive disruption (instant extra field particle strings) in the particle field in one spot and the electromagnetic pulse.

Note: this is not the same as accelerating protons in the LHC. There, the protons actually do have energy because they are moving and smashing together.

Mechanical reason for speed of light "c" in $E = mc^2$

Here is the one inch equation everyone talks about... $TL = mc^2$ (notice both sides are equal to "E")

$$TL = mc^2$$

|--inch--|

It incorporates string tension and length, mass and the speed of light. Equation itself explains their correlation and gives understanding of the way things work.

Ether is what they called they conveyance of light or what is filling space. The strings are actually how light is propagating.

A photon is not a particle. It is only a vibration travelling along / through the string field. The **speed of light** "c" is of course the speed vibrations travel along the strings. The particle field strings have a certain amount of tension, length and mass. That makes 'c' the speed it is. If the tension, length or mass changed so would 'c'

So the strings are what Newton and everyone else thought the ether was. Einstein was smart... he knew how to keep everyone happy, and called it Space-Time.

The math was easy, actually serendipity...

The equation... $TL = mc^2$...looks like I was trying to copy Einstein or something because Tension times length also equals Energy $TL = E$... but that is not the case.

I was actually trying to find the **tension of space** (actually the tension of the string particle field that is in space)...

We know there is a field of strings encompassing space and the reason for energy is just vibrations caused by tension on the strings.

Protons, neutrons, etc. everything is inert.

Everyone knows the speed of light. That would be the speed the vibrations travel along the strings. So I found the formula for tension...

Tension = velocity squared x mass / length.

I needed to find a mass and a string length. The length of the string is easy, it would be the somewhere around the atomic width or one angstrom. But finding even an approximate mass... that is a different story.

The strings in question here are the **basic universal substance**. When you see something you are really only seeing the strings vibrate. What is considered "mass" on the other hand is the strings pulling objects together. I'm not sure if there actually is a way to determine the mass of something that is used as the mechanism of mass itself?

Example: any two objects connected by a string. The tension and the length can remain the same no matter what the mass of the string actually is. On a vh guitar the six strings are all the same length and basically the same tension but vary greatly in mass.

So I used the closest known available approximation I could think of..

electron mass = $9.10938188 \times 10^{-31}$ kilograms... actually 1/10 electron mass. (any particle including the electron has 10 strings joined at their centers, one string should be 1/10 of that and should be the mass of one string?).

So, I plugged everything in...

$$\text{Tension} = c^2 \times (1/10 \text{ electron mass}) / \text{angstrom}$$

So the formula is now... $T = c^2 * m / L$

Then I multiplied both sides by "L"

Formula is now... $TL = mc^2$

Both sides of the equation are in joules or energy... equivalent to "E".

I was completely amazed. It means the Tension of the strings in space times their length is equal to their energy.

And I arrived at that completely independently.

This is why the speed of light is involved in Einsteins mass energy equivalence equation...

$E = mc^2$...I always wondered why... now I know.

It had to be something mechanical... tension and string lengths!

So, you can arrive at Einsteins famous formula from completely different directions.
You can think energy is contained in mass and released.

$$E = mc^2$$

Or you can think there is a field of strings and **mass is inert**, the energy is only potential...
released (actually pulled) by tension on the strings

$$TL = mc^2$$

Tension of Space

((the speed of light²) * .1 * electron mass) / (1 angstrom) = $8.18710414 \times 10^{-5}$ newtons

Exact proton to atomic width size change:

The width of an atom is 100,000 times larger than the nucleus.

That makes the volumetric (spherical) difference of helium one quadrillion... 1,000,000,000,000,000

That means one quadrillion nucleus sized spheres can fit inside an atom sized sphere.

So if a proton converts from balled up to atom size, that is the exact change in size of the field at the spot. The amount of disruption or change in field size (commandeering) is from nucleus size to atom size.

This is the equivalent of energy (vibrations into the field) released by the shape change.

It would be like having one particle then having one quadrillion particles.

The check... $E = mc^2$...mass times speed of light squared is the amount of Energy.

And the Energy is equal to Tension times string Length... $TL = mc^2$

And since everything is strings, and there are 20 string per particle, and there were 4 protons / neutrons in the nucleus (of this model).

Here is the answer (in meters per second)...

speed of light squared / one quadrillion = 89.8755179

And there are 20 strings per particle...

$89.8755179 / 20 = 4.49377589$

And there where 4 particles (proton, neutron) in the nucleus...

$4.49377589 / 4 = 1.12344397$

Since the answer is almost exactly one... it means if you divided the speed of light (squared) up into one quadrillion proton sized particles with 20 strings each they would almost exactly fit inside an atom sized sphere.

You have to understand what I mean by commandeering to understand this.
 p.s. if you take sphere packing into account the answer might be even closer to one.
 You have to remember the 100,000 (thousand) sized difference (although very accurate) is only an estimate.

Mass doesn't actually convert into energy... it changes shape.

Mass (a proton) changes in shape and that shape change vibrates the field... that is energy. The proton was made of balled-up strings and they are still there but straightened.
 It is kind of like if you had a guitar string with tension on it and added a millimeter instantly to the length... it would make the string vibrate.
 They call it potential energy.

Extrapolate it yourself...

- 1) There is definitely something filling space and there are lot of different models and names for it.
- 2) Einstein called it Space-Time, others call it the Higgs field, others call it something else.
- 3) It has to be made out of something and strings are a good choice. Individual string particles (not the string theory type) that join together forming a field. (zero-dimensional \emptyset -D point particles won't work, next option 1-D strings)
- 4) Particles in the field also pop-in and pop-out of existence... that means the field has to be made of the same thing that forms regular matter.
- 5) Everything also has to have a direct physical connection (or the only way things would work is by magic (and magic is not allowed)). So the particles also have to be able to disconnect and reconnect by themselves.
- 6) Everything would also have to work and form automatically (particles do not come with an instruction manual they can look at). Here is an example of spontaneous [self-assembly](#) formation... Something like that must also be happening at the quantum (most basic fundamental) level.
- 7) If you add in things that you know are happening (like light or energy being transmitted at specific frequencies and definite speed) you can eliminate a lot of theories that cannot be correct.... like foam and most others.

Automatic Arrangement

Everyone has seen a [balloon cluster](#) (for instance) in a car dealership?
 There will always be 12 balloons if they pull the knotted ends into a common center.
 That is exactly how many fit. It is the same as the faces of the dodecahedron.

Notice where the balloons always touch in groups of three? There are twenty spots like that. If you stuck drinking straws or pencils into all twenty spots all the way into the center... that is how the arrangement of strings form. Flux Particle fits perfectly inside dodecahedron .

Note: No one is shooting for that shape when they tie balloons together. Everyone comes up with the same shape because 12 is how many fit together like that. It's an automatic shape.

Automatic shapes happen. It is the way everything happened.

The Goldilocks Corkscrew

Check out this shape... [corkscrew ball](#)

This is only an example but if there were a lot of these things floating around and they got near enough to touch they would automatically connect... actually form a field on their own. If you had a whole bag full of them you would not need the bag anymore... they would stay together on their own. They can only form a field by connecting then pulling, no pushing allowed, it would just become floppy, no Dark Energy (in the way 'they' think it works anyway).

If there were no corkscrew and the strings were straight nothing would connect. So there must an ultimate / optimum amount of (the Goldilocks) twist to readily allow connection and disconnection

NOTE: this is only an example of automatic connection and it is easy to see it could be happening at a quantum level. There is no glue at quantum level. Connections can only be basic and automatic. If anyone can come up with any other mechanism of automatic connection I would really like to hear it.

Stationary Ether?

They used to think light needed a medium to propagate. That is actually correct. The only mistake they made was thinking the medium was fixed in space and the Earth must be rushing through it (that is what they call an erroneous constraint).

The medium is actually the string particle field.

The field from the Sun encompasses the solar system (plus more) and the field moves with the Sun. The Sun (and solar system field) are also moving at high orbital speed around the galactic centre. If you had to pick a fixed position for a supposed stationary field (or medium), that would be a better choice... but not the best because the Milky Way Galaxy is also moving through the Universe.

Claiming a fixed field would be relative solely to the Earth's orbit is not only wrong in more ways than one... it is complete baboonery.

The Earth has of course the same field but smaller and it is inside the Sun's field.
The Earth's field is moving with the Earth. You have a field surrounding you.

MM tested for a Stationary Ether... They thought the Earth was rushing through it at an enormous speed... how could that work if you are inside a closed building or underground in a cave?

»»»»»»»» / » \ »»»»»»»»»»»»
»»»»»»»» / »»»» \ »»»»»»»»»»»»
»»»»»»»» / »»»»»» \ »»»»»»»»»»»»
»»»»»»»» / | - - - - | \ »»»»»»»»»»»
»»»»»»»» | »»» | | »» | »»»»»»»»»»»
»»»»»»»» | »»» | | »» | »»»»»»»»»»»

Does the Ether rush through the walls of your house or do sections get cut off and stay in place?
It does not matter... neither of those work.

Do little sections of the stationary field (that the Earth is supposedly rushing through) get cut off and remain in place behind closed doors? That would mean the field is being dragged. So it is not stationary.

Anybody understand this?

The only way for a stationary Ether to work is if it could penetrate all matter. But then that would mean the light that is using this stationary field would also penetrate everything. Get it? If that were the case you would not be able to see matter because light would go right through it.

- 1) If light could pass through things completely unfettered... everything would be completely invisible.
- 2) If light can pass right through something but you could still tell that something was there it would look like glass or clear ice.

GP-B just tested for Space-Time... Yes... It is there. What is space-time? it is this same particle field of strings explained in this theory.

Is the field it creates curved? Yes, but only because the mass it surrounds is spherical. You can think of it like an atmosphere. Any light passing through a curved field will of course obviously curve (gravitational lensing) or deflect.


The field is responsible for the conveyance of light, electromagnetism, gravity, dark energy, mass and everything else.
Everything is made from the same thing, the string particles.
The particles and the fields they create are all there is, it is everything.

Big Bang RED SHIFT

The only reason for the Big Bang Theory is the red-shift of light. And there are dozens of alternative reasons for the red-shift. Here are three...

The speed of light is the speed vibrations travel along the strings. The frequency is something different... that would be the number of vibrations per second, i.e. the note or the color perceived.

For red and blue light etc. the waves would travel at the same speed but the blue light would have more waves (or beats) per second.



There are billions and billions of stars and their fusion reactions are constantly dumping more and more of what we actually call space (flux particles) into space thereby either increasing the mass of space -- OR -- reducing the tension by adding extra particles to the field -- OR -- both.

NOTE: In the suns fusion reaction the balled-up protons and neutrons (and attached electrons) would unball and detach thereby changing shape into the same particles that are used in the field in space. It's that simple.

Velocity of propagation equals the square root of the quantity Tension divided by the Mass per unit length...

Tension = velocity squared x mass / length.

1) Mass increase: As light travels through space, and space (the field) itself is getting thicker and thicker (more dense over billions of years), it of course will slow the frequency of light. Even if all light from all stars started out in a field of the same density, the further it has to travel means the more thickening it must go through and be slowed down in speed.

When we look back in time through a telescope we don't see the speed of light from a star billions of light years away, we see the speed of light after it has traveled and slowed through the thick field right next to us.

Special Note: "Mass increase" (of space) means the amount of actual material (or particles).

You cannot see anything 15 billion light years away -- OR -- 15 billion years ago. You only see the light that has traveled (actually through time and space) to right here right now.

2) Tension reduction: If the tension is being lowered due to an increase in particles added to the field that would change the speed of light itself, actually slowing it down. And that in turn would also slow down the frequencies and red-shift light. If it is an on going process it means that light starting out in a high tension field would keep getting lower and lower in frequency as time goes by. The further back you look through a telescope the more drop in tension the light has had (getting here) and the more red-shifted it would be.

The scary thing about the tension model is... the tension keeps getting less and less.

If the tension was 10 Newtons at 10 billion years ago, then 9 Newtons at 9 billion years ago... that means there is going to be a time where the tension drops right off the scale to zero and there is no tension. You could actually call that being caught in the moment (and it would last for ever.) The field tension is directly responsible for vibrations and their speed, and although it is completely variable it is how we perceive time.

If vibrations stop... everything would stop... including time.

if vibrations stop... everything would stop... including time.
 NOTE: amount of Newtons used was only to make it easy to explain.



The field tension is the sole reason for vibrations... and that is energy.
 Even the smallest amount of tension would be fine... as long as it is not zero because without tension (think of a tennis net) the field would become loose and floppy and every thing would just stop.

3) String length: The field in space has basically the same tension everywhere. The distances to some stars is of course further than others. This would have the same effect as playing a longer violin string and getting a lower note. Light would still transfer at the same speed but an overall increased string length (of course) lowers the frequency.

NOTE: The Big Bang Singularity supposedly had tremendous (or infinite) energy. That cannot be correct. Energy is vibrations, if everything was compressed into a Big Bang singularity, nothing could vibrate.

Think of a truckload of guitar strings... they would not be able to vibrate, it would just be a big inert (vibration-less) lump.


Spatial Expansion?

Ummm... No!

Imagine an orange or grapefruit floating in space and then the space around it expands.
 What happens to the grapefruit...? Nothing, it does not move.
 The supposed expansion has to be happening on all sides



Can the field push or pull matter...? It would have to be pushing or pulling on all sides.



Push on both sides of an orange really hard...



Which way did it move? Whoooops, it didn't move.

Above is an example with one object and space supposedly expanding.
Notice with one object it is very easy to see nothing is going to move.
But when you add more than one object into the scenario you might get fooled into thinking objects will move...

Here is how it looks with more than one orange (object), look at it as a whole and then look at individual objects.

<--> ● <--> ● <--> ● <--> ● <--> ● <-->

Add pressure or increase field strength... the field will just get thicker.

<==> ● <==> ● <==> ● <==> ● <==> ● <==>

No movement, no change in distance between matter
Net effect? Nothing.

Easy Analogy:

Imagine a bunch of oranges on a table in a room and then you pressurize the room...
Will the oranges move apart from each other? Of course not.

If expanding space is causing a flowing in one direction... then space would just flow around any object. The object will not move. And even if flowing space could move objects... the objects would not expand away from each other. They would just move away from the point of flow origin. That would mean there is spot in space that creates flow. And it would also mean there would be a spherical outward-from-center flow, with less and less flow further out in the sphere (more area to cover with same initial amount of flow). That just doesn't work.


If space is expanding uniformly... the expansion would be on all sides of any object and nothing would move. Anyway you look at it nothing happens. The spatial expansion (more particles introduced into the system) cannot be happening in one spot and it cannot be happening everywhere at the same time. Neither will do the expansion.

And you have to remember... we are talking about a particle field.

It doesn't matter what the individual particles actually are. You would need a continuously attached group in order to do something. You can pull on a string attached to a kite and reel it in. But there is no way to could push a kite away with an attached group of string particles (or any type particles). Pushing away with a field only works with same pole magnets and very short distance.

Pulling (gravity) works because you can have tension on the particles between matter.

It's simple... the field has an overall tension on it coming from infinity (that could be considered dark energy) and any objects in the field of course will have a higher tension between them (there are more field connections) -- once again, that's gravity.



Quantum Friction?

Space is just the field of strings. **(not the string theory type)**

Friction is just a transfer of energy (that's a particle vibration) to something else, and at quantum level there cannot be friction... it is a large scale thing.

A vibrating guitar string would lose energy to the guitar body or the air as sound, etc..

A (quantum) vibration can't get off (leave) the strings. (not the string theory type)

The string itself is vibrating and air is made from the same strings.

It can be thought of like a string vibrating in completely empty space. There is nothing there to stop the vibration. And the vibration can only transfer to other strings.

Supernova Neutrino Constraint...

Everything is made from a high tension string particle field **(not the string theory type)**.

As easy to visualize 2-D model would be a highly stretched tennis net made of the finest spiders web silk thread.

The speed of light is the speed vibrations travel through the net.

Mass is a (proton / neutron / electron) package with proton and neutron threads balled up and attached to the electron. The whole package is attached to the net (at one of the plus sign + intersections) by a string twist coming from the outer electron.

A Neutrino would be a balled up piece of silk thread not attached to the net.

●

---+---+---*~●●●~*---+---+---

The balled up neutrino is of course so small is can zip right past mass and through the net completely unfettered.

They are very hard to detect and their interaction with the field is almost negligible unless there is a supernova.

When a star goes supernova a massive amount of Neutrinos are created and there is a massive shock-wave of the field released as vibrations.

You can think of this as if you were holding one side of the tennis net and giving it a repeated up and down shake (in the same way you would shake a small rug to remove dirt and sand). A sign wave like vibration would travel along the net and bump some of the neutrinos into the same speed as the vibration... and that is the speed of light.

They start out from the supernova by riding the massive shock wave like a surfer and then they are on their own.

Neutrinos can have any speed.

Although they are basically the same as a proton... they are not what is considered mass because they are not connected.

P.S. Can you see the strings?

No... You don't actually "see" anything.

Light vibrations from any object travel through the particle field to your eye.

EYE ~~~~~ OBJECT

The field is made of strings, all you are seeing is the piece of the string "x" immediately next to (actually touching) your eye.

EYE (x) ~~~~~ OBJECT

And you are not actually seeing that piece of string (or field at) "x"

You are only **seeing** how fast it is vibrating... the frequency.

You can't actually see the field, electrons, photons, or strings.

You only get an image because all the different frequencies are perceived as different colors.

The frequency of vibrations determines its color:

4×10^{14} Hz is red light,

8×10^{14} Hz is violet light,

and between these (in the range $4 - 8 \times 10^{14}$ Hz) are all the other colors of the rainbow.

If you "see" something red... you are actually only seeing 4×10^{14} Hz.

EYE (red) ~~~~~ (4×10^{14} Hz)

And if you'd like to get even more insanerer...

I can't even think of a way to ever actually supposedly see the strings themselves (even taking into account you only see vibrations and frequency).

Example: If we replace the OBJECT with a group of 6 strings (~~~~~) you will understand what I mean...

EYE (x) ~~~~~ (~~~~~)

The strings are what is used to convey light (vibrations)... how are you going to see what is used to convey vibrations?

It's a double whammy. If you look through a telescope you will see the stars... you will not see the telescope. You are using the telescope to see things with.

In other words... you can't see something that is used to see.

What are Strings made from?

...that's a mind bender.

Oxygen has 8 protons, 8 neutrons and 8 electrons making a total of 24 particles per atom.

Aluminum -- number 13 -- would have a total of 39 particles.

Gold -- number 79 -- would have 237 particles.

The properties of elements are known with great precision but they are in actuality just a different number of the same thing (that is true regardless of the theory).

Some things might be soft, hard, liquid, gas, solid, different colors, magnetic, rubbery, stiff, etc. but they are all just a different number of the same particle. You don't know the properties of it... you only know the properties of a large group of it.

In other words... even though you might know a string has a string-like shape, you can't know what the string is made from because it is what is used to make things.

A different number (amount) of the exact same thing makes completely different things (elements.)

If you do a chemical test and you find out something is Aluminum... you have only found out there are 39 string particles in a group... not what the actual strings are.

So, it (a string) is not an element and cannot be like any element or molecule unless it is by pure coincidence.

The string (purely by happenstance) might be just like a bendable but non-stretchable fishing line or spiders web. But they also might be something that is completely inconceivable and unknowable to humans.

Also... when you look at Gold you can see it has a nice color, correct? No, gold is a group of atoms made from 237 particles each. And those particles are made from strings.

Color is only the frequency of vibrations that are traveling to your eye along the strings. No matter what you are looking at you are only seeing a different vibrational frequency from a different number of strings in a group.

Could a string actually have a color anyway? Or even be white, black or grey? I have absolutely no idea. I'm sure it cannot be invisible though, because... for something to be invisible it would mean that light passes through it. And light is only a vibration coming from that same type of string. There isn't anyway to see it but it is not invisible.

Everything is correct with Math...

I like math. You can describe anything you want with it.

Think about all the theories in physics that are opposite or oppose each other.

They all use intricate, exacting math equations to describe the theory in question.

But since we can be sure only one theory has a slight chance of being correct... that means all the rest are flat out wrong and at least 90% of the math used is describing nothing more than a fantasy (or a cranky theory).

Got it? Even if you can back up your theory with math... it doesn't mean a thing.

You can make anything appear correct using math.

hmmm... yes, that is the problem.

Idiots come up with wacky math equations then try to make the Universe fit it.

Then idiots who understand the math are fooled into thinking it is correct because they understand it.

It should be the other way around... get a good idea of what is really going on then formulate some math equation and see if it also fits mathematically... but that's the original problem, you can make anything seem correct mathematically.

So what is the real problem?

That's easy... idiots are (and always were) the problem.

And remember... Math does not describe reality.


Math does not describe reality.

If you have an equation for a sphere, it is mapping out a solid sphere...

Nothing is Solid (except something like a neutron star, protons and neutrons are supposedly solid but they might just have a very loose string pack)

A "reality" math would be based on strings and commandeering sections of space.

In a 3-D world (only XYZ axis) a 1 x 1 x 1 cube would look like picture below.



The 3-D axis shape on the left is actually the string cube. The amount of space it commandeers is the cubic region on the right. Remember... Nothing is solid.

The graphic below would be a "reality" 2-D plane. It would be made of only the XY axis particles attached together.

Any masses in the field will of course have / develop more connections and pull together.

NOTE: The mass(es) in this scenario / instance would be called up XY axis particles. Everything is the same construct

NOTE: The mass(es) in this scenario / instance would be balled up XY axis particles. Everything is the same construct.

```

+++++
+++++
+++++●++++
+++++
+++++
+++++

```

The field lines from any particle will go off in every direction but of course two masses in proximity will have a stronger tension between them than the field line tension coming from infinity.

NOTE: This does not mean that all math is wrong.

How fast is a car traveling? That's easy... meters per second, and m / s is absolutely correct...

But things with a volume in them... technically nothing is solid so the answers you get are not even in the ballpark.

Dimensions...

```

.....mass = [M] = kilograms
.....length = [L] = meters
.....time = [T] = seconds
...frequency = [T^-1] = seconds ^-1
.....speed = [L]/[T] ..... = m / s
acceleration = [L]/[T^2] ..... = m / s^2
...momentum = [M][L]/[T] ... = kg_m / s
.....force = [M][L]/[T^2] . = kg_m / s^2
.....energy = [M][L^2]/[T^2] = kg_m^2 / s^2

```

The one inch equation below is acceptable (defines actual reality) even though it is using regular math because it is actually a string tension equation (non-solid).

Notice there is no width. And the mass used is the theoretical mass of a 1-D electron string.

NOTE: The " T " in the equation... TL = mc^2 ...below is tension and that's a force.

NOTE: The [T]'s inside brackets below are [time]

Tension times Length is equal to Energy.

```

TL = mc^2
|--inch--|

```

```

tension [M][L]/[T^2] * length [L] = mass [M] * speed c^2 [L^2]/[T^2]

```

Nothing Is Solid II

Atoms are mostly empty space.
Space is not empty... it has a particle field.

An (helium) atom has 2 protons, 2 neutrons and 2 electrons.
<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Atom>

The volumetric difference between nucleus and shell would be 1 quadrillion. (1 then 15 zeros)

So on a scale from...
Zero to 1,000,000,000,000,000
literally nothing is zero and
literally solid is one quadrillion...

ZERO	Thousand	Million	Billion	Trillion	Quadrillion
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

The helium atom would only be a notch above zero (zilch) at 1.

And that helium atom is using 6 particles.

The field in space commandeering the same amount of space as the atom would be using only one particle (with nothing balled up into the nucleus) and would be some percentage even less than 1
Nothing is solid and space is not empty... on the scale of solidity what you think is a solid object and what you think is empty space are approximately just about the same, approximately almost nothing.
Solids are actually almost nothing and space (the field in it) is just slightly more than nothing

Worm Hole.

Yes... something like a worm hole is possible but it would not be like what you might think.

Read [time](#) first.

Space has an all encompassing field of connected string particles. **(not the string theory type)**

A "Worm Hole" would be a completely empty "void" tunnel (with no particles) going through the field.

~~you know one that is connected between the Earth and Mars... you can't go into space, get out and build one... it's far beyond them... but it's~~

If you have one that is connected between the Earth and Moon... you can get into your rocket sled and build up a lot of speed then snoot into the tunnel.

```

+++++
+++++
>>===>
+++++
+++++

```

When you are inside you are completely disconnected from everything that we know of as reality.

No particle field with vibration, no light, no gravity, no time, etc.

The speed of light is the speed vibrations travel through the field (of strings) and that is actually not very fast.

The only reason we think it is fast is because we are completely immersed in the field, our brains are using (working at) the same speed and everything is proportional.

You will have enough inertia to easily get to the Moon (there is nothing to slow you down or change your speed). And although you are traveling at the speed of the rocket sled (maybe 1,000 kph) inside the (disconnected) tunnel... you are actually traveling at a speed maybe greater than the speed of light relative to the people back on Earth (still connected to the field).

So, you shoot into the worm hole tunnel and spend about 2 weeks traveling to the Moon but everyone on Earth sees you enter the tunnel then immediately exit on the Moon.

Time.

There are actually two different types of time.

1) Ultimate Time: If you removed all matter and energy (all particles) from the universe and were left with only an observer (for instance Einstein) and his pocket watch... would time still exist?

Yes... that is ultimate time in a null universe. This would be unchangeable constant flow.

2) Field Time: As soon as you step back into the what Einstein calls 4-D space-time (FPT field with tension on it) everything is completely regulated by the field tension. **This is completely variable.**

The field tension is the universal cosmic speedometer.

If the tension goes up... gravity goes up, and so does the speed of light and everything else with it.

That includes any type of measuring device and the speed your brain is working.

Increase or decrease tension and it changes everything along with it, that's all electro-magnetic phenomena, vibrations... everything.

It's like being a character in a movie and you don't know the speed the projector is running... fast, slow, stop, start... you don't know.

Net effect: you might not notice anything.

But if you could remove yourself from the projector, take a step away from everything and take a look back, you would see the speed everything is happening.

If the tension has been changing over billions and billions of years... this would be readily visible as red-shifted light.

I'm talking about something completely independent from everything.

Like H. George Wells sitting in the time machine.

Anything Einstein said or proved is completely irrelevant to **George**.

George can see things happening at all kinds of different speeds... and everyone else is completely unaware of it.

The same thing can be happening without a time machine.

There is no way to know the speed things are really happening.

If everything is happening very slowly so is the way the brain sees it.

You have to think a level or two deeper to understand and most people can't.

There was an [episode of STV](#) with a planet with fast time. The inhabitants of the planet were completely unaware they were moving so fast.

Same thing is true for anyone / everything... there is no way to know your true speed (unless someone / something comes along with different speed... but you still won't know the true speed... you will only know your speed is different than someone else's.

For true speed you have to remove yourself from everything (the field), take a look back and hope there is a noticeable change in speed in the field time (or figure out how to negate the field time your body might still be using).


3) Planck Time? (this might take a while)

"A new scientific truth does not triumph by convincing its opponents and making them see the light, but rather because its opponents eventually die, and a new generation grows up that is familiar with it." -- Max Planck

TL = mc²
|--inch--|



[deutsch](#) [russian](#) [italiano](#) [svenska](#) [francais](#)
mcc = e = lt ...McCelt





The McCelt Tartan

