This paper presents mathematical evidence that the “positron” found in numerous laboratory experiments - is actually a probable version of the muon neutrino, which is ordinary matter, not antimatter. This new evidence is based on the 1024-QAM model as the first Periodic Table for Elementary Particles. There are 16 probable versions of the muon neutrino with one third of the mass of an electron. 4 of these have the same charge-to-mass ratio as a common electron. Another 4 have twice the charge-to-mass as a common electron, but with the opposite charge (+2/3), causing them to move in the opposite direction in a magnetic field. To complicate matters further, note that there are 16 probable versions of an electron, with 4 different charges (0, -1, -1/3, +2/3). A 1024-QAM table was previously presented that graphically displays how all elementary particles are related, similar to the Standard Periodic Table in chemistry. This paper concludes there is no antimatter available in our universe. All such events can be explained as ordinary matter.

1. Introduction
Numerous lab experiments have been conducted since the 1920s showing evidence of a “positron.” Researchers have assumed this particle was the opposite of an electron. This is not correct. The particle in question has the same charge-to-mass ratio as an electron, yet some of the particles have a positive charge. This paper demonstrates these particles are probable versions of a muon neutrino, not a positron.

If we divide the electron mass by 3, we find its mass is very close to the estimated muon neutrino value of .17MeV

The mass($c^2$) of the electron is currently recorded as = $0.510998928(11)$ MeV

To have the same ratio, the muon neutrino will have a mass($c^2$) of:

$0.170332976(04)$ MeV

and some will have the same charge-to-mass ratio as a common electron. There are four probable versions of the muon neutrino, which are predicted by the 1024-QAM table as having a charge of -1/3, and another 4 with a charge of +2/3. For the probabilities of zero charge, then it is easy to understand the ratio.

From the 1024-QAM table (Figure 3), there are 16 probable kinds of muon neutrinos. Also note that there are 16 probable versions of an electron, with 4 different charges (0, -1, -1/3, +2/3).
The positron is actually a muon neutrino with the same charge-to-mass ratio as an electron, which is predicted by the 1024-QAM table. There are 4 probable versions of the muon neutrino that yield the same charge-to-mass ratio as the common electron, with a -1/3 charge, and another 4 probable versions with a +2/3 charge (these would move in the opposite direction in a magnetic field).

**Figure 1.** Note the particles with the same Charge-to-Mass ratio.
Figure 3. Preliminary 1024-QAM. This is how the center of a 1024-QAM table might appear. (This is representative only and may require some changing of positions.) Keep in mind that each particle mass has 16 probability types, which appear as a vertical column (red line) with each particle mass (blue line). Readers should review reference [1] to obtain more information on the 1024-QAM table. The first of 16 muon neutrinos is located in mass group 1, quadrant 4 (MG1-IV).
Figure 4. Matter and Antimatter particles can never meet because they do not exist at the same time, in our terms. When our physical universe blinks off, the antimatter universe blinks on. The Fundamental Carrier Wave operates at 200% amplitude modulation, in our terms, which creates the blinking effect. Each reader must comprehend that our universe literally blinks off and on, approximately 1 trillion times \((10^{12})\) every second. This is why the digital QAM model fits so well – because our universe is blinking.[7]

2. Conclusions

The muon neutrinos predicted by 1024-QAM, show that they have 4 probable versions with the same charge-to-mass ratio as a common electron. These probable muon neutrinos are composed of ordinary matter, not antimatter. This discovery confirms there is no antimatter in our known physical universe.

Because early researchers were not aware of the 16 probabilities associated with each particle mass, they likely had a mix of every probable version in their test equipment. Some of these had the same charge-to-mass ratio, and some had twice the ratio, but with the opposite charge (+2/3). This would cause some of the particles to move in the opposite direction with respect to the magnetic field. To complicate matters further, note that there are 16 probable versions of an electron, with 4 different charges \((0, -1, -1/3, +2/3)\). This makes for an interesting mix of particles in the researcher's experiment. Also, recall that because our universe is blinking, the "lifespan" of any particle is about one billionth of a second, after which the 16 probabilities are invoked, and a new particle of the 16 probabilities appears, which may have the opposite charge. The net result is a continuous supply of new particles into the magnetic field, some of which have the opposite charge, making it appear that "antimatter" is present. This is the wrong conclusion.

Other conclusions from the data arrangement:

1) This discovery lends credibility to the 1024-QAM table.
2) Other antimatter claims can be equally dismissed.

Readers are encouraged to read the associated technical papers at smashwords.com

This is a living document. The author reserves the right to make corrections and changes.
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APPENDIX