Why I Will Never Receive the Nobel Prize in Physics

The title of this essay implies I think I may deserve the Nobel Prize in physics. That may seem a “bit” arrogant. Please forgive me if it seems as such; I have spent 52 years attempting to emulate God’s humility. Besides, if “my” ideas are correct, God deserves the credit, not me.

I studied quark theory as a teenager. I understood it exists in an attempt to explain the particle zoo produced in “atom smashing” experiments. Part and parcel of quark theory is the “color force” and gluons, the bosons responsible for sub-nuclear adhesion. Everything made sense to me until I tried to understand time and antiparticles.

Richard Feynman proposed “antiparticles” travel backwards in time. Antiparticles in quotes because what he really said was, for example, “a positron is an electron traveling backward in time”. So, according to Feynman, antiparticles are simply ***particles going backwards*** in time. I consider Feynman the greatest physicist of all time.

Quark theory does not allow isolated quarks to exist. They are considered ***fundamental*** particles. In science, if you cannot isolate a fundamental building block, you must necessarily treat your ideas/framework as theory. So, quark theory will always remain “just a theory” forever. ***However***, as it is treated by convention, it is considered ***fact***. I cannot emphasize this enough for ***absolute clarity*** and reader comprehension. ***Quark theory is considered fact.***

This has ***profound*** implications in science. What if, what if valid unification could ***ONLY*** be found ***OUTSIDE*** quark theory? Einstein, De Broglie, and Bohm ***all*** questioned the Standard Model which is ***based*** in quark and boson theory. The ***founder of Relativity*** and one of the ***founders of quantum mechanics both*** had ***serious*** doubts. All of this was I aware, when I studied quark theory as a teen.

Please read the following page:

Antimatter and Time

Antimatter has been conjectured to travel backwards in time. It's an interesting idea but has nothing to do with reality. In other articles, we've established the plausibility of two concepts: gravistrong and temporal elasticity. Gravistrong is the proposed low-energy non-bosonic unification between gravitation and the nuclear strong-force. Temporal elasticity is the non-bosonic mediator of both. In the process of development of these two concepts, we realize space-time is an oxymoron because they're absolutely disparate with completely distinct attributes: impedance and elasticity for space and time respectively.

One of the "fundamental problems" of cosmology is baryon asymmetry. We do not observe equal amounts of matter and antimatter astronomically:
"The Big Bang should have produced equal amounts of matter and antimatter. Since this does not seem to have been the case, it is likely some physical laws must have acted differently"
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Baryon_asymmetry

Idio-pedia answers their own question: physical laws must be different for antimatter. Ya think? The simplest way to understand this issue is by analogy: concave vs convex. Concave lenses focus light; convex lenses disperse light. Similarly, positive temporal curvature is associated with matter; negative temporal curvature is associated with antimatter. To get our intuitions to jive with reality, we must understand that positive temporal curvature equates with time slowing down; negative temporal curvature equates with time speeding up. A consequence is that antimatter does not attract inside a nucleus because ***antiparticles have a repulsive strong-force***. This explains why we don't observe equal amounts of antimatter astronomically.

QED, sgm, 2018/JUN/11

“Half” of the Standard Model is based on boson virtual exchange. The other “half”, inherent indeterminancy. “non-bosonic mediator” used above implies half of the Standard Model is useless, misapplied at best. At the moment, the reasonable compromise between frameworks is:
electro-weak including boson virtual exchange
gravi-strong including temporal elasticity

Explicitly discarding: the Higgs, quark theory, gluons, and Feynman’s idea of antiparticles. Peter Higgs was just recently awarded the Nobel Prize; Richard Feynman in 1965. I don’t suggest revoking Feynman’s, merely Higgs’. Since the Nobel Prize cannot be awarded posthumously, knowing the inherent intransigence of convention, and considering the four areas above that require discard, I’m fairly certain I’ll never be awarded the Nobel Prize for physics ***even if I’m right*** about baryon asymmetry.

sgm, 2018/JUN/12