

# Characterization of Fundamental Particles

Ben J. Baten  
Westminster, CO, USA  
email: [bbaten@gmail.com](mailto:bbaten@gmail.com)

## Abstract

*This report provides an alternative to the Standard Model of particle physics. The characterization of particles suggested in this report and the Standard Model have many similarities but significantly differ in terms of their assumed physics. The model described here is based on results from Quantum Field Mechanics, according to which all fundamental particles originate from the interaction of two protofields. These pre-space/pre-time fields facilitate the four fundamental interactions. The long-range electromagnetic interaction and short-range weak interaction are mediated by the relatively mobile electromagnetic protofield. The long-range gravitational interaction and short-range strong interaction are mediated by the stiff gravitational protofield. Therefore, in contrast with the Standard Model, (virtual) interaction-particles are absent in the description of any of the four fundamental interactions. The suggested model assumes that massive particles consist of one or multiple quantum beat processes which perform a spatially random oscillating quantum beat dynamics. Electrons perform a single quantum beat process while mesons and baryons have, respectively, two and three bound quantum beat processes. For an electron, the rest-mass is determined by the quantum beat oscillation frequency. The rest-mass of more complex particles is also determined by coupling between quantum beat processes. Quantum Field Mechanics suggests that the charge of an electron and positron can be identified with the two possible phases of a quantum beat process as observed in the electromagnetic protofield. This report assumes that short-range binding interaction between quantum beat processes has a masking effect on the externally observable charge of hadrons. Using this assumption, the internal structure of particles is derived from their known particle charges and relative masses. The particle structures are used to obtain the so-called charge-quantum phase law. The fractional charge of quantum beat processes inside a particle is deduced by rewriting the charge-quantum phase law in terms of a linear combination of charge contributions of individual constituent quantum beat processes. The fractional charges are  $\pm 1/3$  and  $\pm 2/3$  for baryons and  $\pm 1/2$  for mesons. The latter result does not necessarily contradict physical observations since, as far as known to the author, the fractional charge of mesons has never been measured. Strangeness and isospin are mathematically defined in terms of the quantum beat phases of sets of particles of the same type. The definition of strangeness circumvents the need to introduce quark flavors in accordance with the Standard Model. Application of conservation laws to particle processes leads to relations between quantum phase, strangeness and isospin.*

## Table of Contents

1	Introduction.....	4
2	Overview of Quantum Field Mechanics.....	4
3	Particle Classification.....	5
4	Particle Mass.....	6
5	Particle Charge and Quantum Phase.....	7
5.1	Photons and Photon Emission.....	7
5.2	Leptons.....	9
5.3	Mesons.....	9
5.4	Baryons.....	11
5.5	Neutrinos.....	14
5.6	Particles and Anti-particles.....	15
5.7	Charge-Quantum Phase Law.....	16
5.8	Charge-Quantum Phase Law applied to Baryons.....	18
5.9	Fractional Particle Charge.....	19
6	Strangeness.....	21
6.1	Definition.....	21
6.2	Charge-Strangeness Multiplets.....	24
7	Isospin.....	26
7.1	Definition.....	26
7.2	Isospin-Strangeness Multiplets.....	27
8	Fundamental Interactions.....	28
9	Particle Processes and Conservation Laws.....	29
9.1	Conservation of Charge.....	29
9.2	Conservation of Strangeness.....	30
9.3	Conservation of Isospin.....	30
10	Conclusions.....	30
11	Acknowledgements.....	31
12	References.....	32

## Figures

Figure 5.1: Meson Photon Emission.....	8
Figure 5.2: Baryon Photon Emission.....	9
Figure 5.3: $J=0/1$ Mesons.....	11
Figure 5.4: $J=1/2$ Baryons.....	13
Figure 5.5: $J=3/2$ Baryons.....	14
Figure 6.1: $J=0$ Meson Baryon Charge-Strangeness Multiplets.....	25
Figure 6.2: $J=1/2$ Baryon Charge-Strangeness Multiplets.....	25
Figure 7.1: Hadron Isospin-Strangeness Multiplets.....	27

## Tables

Table 5.1: Lepton Charges and Quantum Phase Forms.....	9
Table 5.2: Meson Charges and Quantum Phase Forms.....	10
Table 5.3: Baryon Charges and Quantum Phase Forms.....	12
Table 5.4: Quantum Phase Forms for various Particle Classes.....	15
Table 5.5: Values of B and N.....	17
Table 5.6: Charge-Quantum Phase Law for $J=0$ Mesons.....	17
Table 5.7: Charge-Quantum Phase Law for $J=3/2$ Baryons.....	18
Table 5.8: Fractional Charges.....	20

## 1 Introduction

This report builds on earlier obtained results from Quantum Field Mechanics in an attempt to construct a model of fundamental particles. Lacking a better name, this model is referred to as Particle Model and provides an alternative to the Standard Model of fundamental particle physics. The model is developed solely from experimentally known facts about particles, a few core ideas from the Quantum Field Mechanics, and additional assumptions that seem to be physically plausible but remain to be verified. For the development of the Particle Model, no use has been made of conventional Quantum Mechanics as far as expressing wave-functions of particles as a linear superposition of orthogonal waves since, according to QFM, this provides an incorrect representation of physical behavior. The description has been made as explicit as possible to illustrate internal consistency of the model and to facilitate verification of the model.

## 2 Overview of Quantum Field Mechanics

This section provides a short overview of the Quantum Field Mechanics (QFM) developed by Andrei P. Kirilyuk [1-6]. This theory provides a complete self-consistent integration of Quantum Mechanics and relativity theory for a prototypical particle that can be identified with an electron. The theory is supported by derivations of well-known relations from quantum physics and relativity theory such as de Broglie's momentum-wavelength relation, Newton's second law and the Schrödinger wave equation [3-5].

From physical observations, four types of interactions are distinguished, namely the long range electromagnetic and gravitational interactions and the short range weak and strong interactions. Consistent with the observation of four types of fundamental interactions, QFM postulates that the electromagnetic and weak interaction are mediated by a relatively mobile electromagnetic protofield and that the gravitational and strong interaction are mediated by a stiff gravitational protofield. This explains the difference between the interaction strength of the electromagnetic and gravitational interaction. Self-sustained behavior cannot be expected from independent homogeneous pre-space/pre-time protofields and, therefore, it is assumed that they interact. The protofield interaction is mathematically represented by a so-called *existence equation* that can be viewed as a generalized Schrödinger equation [1-4]

$$[h_g(\xi) + V_{eg}(q, \xi) + h_e(q)]\Psi(q, \xi) = E\Psi(q, \xi) \quad (2.1)$$

The linear operators  $h_g(\xi)$  and  $h_e(\xi)$  represent the gravitational protofield and electromagnetic protofield, respectively. The state-function solution  $\Psi(q, \xi)$  is expressed in the electromagnetic protofield degree of freedom  $q$  and the gravitational degree of freedom  $\xi$ . Analysis of the linear existence equation shows that a state-function solution possesses unceasing highly non-linear oscillating dynamics that can be identified with a massive particle. The dynamic behavior executed by the state-function, which continuously performs a dynamical reduction (squeeze) and subsequent extension (unsqueeze) within both protofields, is called a *quantum beat process*. Space is dynamically created by the emergence of subsequent high-density *reduction centers*

(space points) which appear in the course of reduction events. Time dynamically results from the sequence of dynamically creation of reduction events, and is inherently asymmetrical due to the random quantum beat process dynamics. The behavior of the quantum beat process between any two subsequent reduction centers is called a *quantum beat cycle*.

Mass of a particle with a single quantum beat process is identified with the quantum beat frequency of the quantum beat process and, therefore, originates from the interaction of the two protofields. The nature of charge, its quantization and the phenomenon of particle annihilation can be identified with the existence of two opposite electromagnetic protofield phases of quantum beat processes. More specifically, for a consistent description of the notion of charge it must be assumed that [1-7]

- All quantum beat processes of electrons and positrons have exactly the same quantum beat frequency and are, thus, frequency synchronized.
- The quantum beat process of an electron and a positron have an exact opposite phase, i.e., their quantum beat processes possess opposite phase-synchronization.

The existence of only two phases in the electromagnetic protofield can naturally explain why like charges (same phase) repel and unlike charges (anti-phase) attract with a force of equal magnitude for particles at equal distance. Having the same phase, like charges move away from each other so as to reduce the tension within the electromagnetic protofield. Unlike charges on the other hand, can reduce this tension by moving towards each other.

The objective of this report (section 5) is to investigate under which conditions the property of the frequency/phase synchronization of quantum beat processes can be extended to more complex particles.

Thus far only the behavior of massive particles has been described in the context of QFM. Another class of state-function solutions of the existence equation is identifiable with photons. Photons exhibit a soliton-like behavior, unlike massive particles they do not exhibit internal randomness, and therefore, perform linear motion.

### **3 Particle Classification**

This section provides a classification of particles according to the Particle Model. This classification is made under the assumption that QFM provides an accurate description of nature. However, identification of particles with specific solutions of the existence equation remains a topic for further research. Additional assumptions are provided later in this report and are explicitly stated so as to indicate areas for experimental verification.

As mentioned before, the existence equation indicates that a prototypical quantum particle, that can be identified with an electron, performs a quantum beat process [1]. This report proposes an extension of this result to other kinds of particles – the QFM existence equation seems to allow for solutions consisting of multiple bound quantum beat processes, each performing unceasing oscillatory reduction-expansion behavior. The

quantum beat processes reduction into a highly concentrated space point is consistent with the hard pits detected during hadron scattering experiments.<sup>1</sup>

It is proposed that particles with one, two and three quantum beat processes can be distinguished. Fundamental particles are named as follows

- *Baryon* – a massive particle consisting of three bound quantum beat processes.
- *Meson* – a massive particle consisting of two bound quantum beat processes.
- *Lepton* – a massive particle with a single quantum beat process.<sup>2</sup>
- *Neutrino* – a particle which is, at present, difficult to characterize but are assumed to have two quantum beat processes (section 5.5).
- *Photon* – a soliton-like particle without random wandering (resulting in zero mass).

According to this particle classification, the class of leptons does not contain neutrinos, which obviously differs from the definition of leptons in the Standard Model. In the subsequent sections the above lepton definition is used for the description of the Particle Model.

The existence of particles consisting of bound quantum beat processes can be made plausible by considering them the result of the attractive dynamic short-range 'strong' gravitational protofield interaction between the constituent quantum beat processes. When the quantum beat processes in a multi-process particle get, on average, slightly separated, an even stronger attractive force occurs between the quantum beat processes, which opposes their separation. The internal random quantum beat process dynamics driven by the dynamic non-linear protofield interaction and the strong force operating between quantum beat processes makes it extremely difficult to physically characterize the properties of particles in terms of their individual quantum beat processes. Furthermore, bound quantum beat processes cannot really be partitioned into discrete particles as they form holistic structures and, therefore, masses of individual quantum beat processes are not defined. This makes it clear that, for instance, protons and neutrons should not be perceived as composite particles.

#### 4 Particle Mass

According to QFM the rest-mass  $m$  of a prototypical particle that is identified with the electron can be equated with the frequency of the oscillating quantum beat frequency process according to the relation

$$m = \frac{h \nu_0}{c^2} \quad (4.1)$$

where  $h$  is Planck's constant,  $\nu_0$  is the quantum beat frequency of the stationary electron and  $c$  is the speed of light [1,3,5].

---

<sup>1</sup> In contrast, in the Standard Model the hard pits are identified with quark particles.

<sup>2</sup> As will be seen later, in this classification, the class of leptons excludes neutrinos.

The inertia of an electron is caused by the internal random motion of the dynamic quantum beat process. Particles consisting of multiple quantum beat processes must have a larger inertia since any change in motion of one quantum beat process will be hampered by random motion of the other quantum beat processes. As a consequence, such particles must be assigned a larger rest-mass that, due to internal non-linear behavior, cannot simply be calculated by a summation of the quantum beat frequencies followed by application of (4.1).

This explanation of the notion of rest-mass for complex particles is substantially different than provided by the Standard Model. It is well-known that the summation of 'quark-masses' leads to large discrepancies with the real masses of particles.

## 5 Particle Charge and Quantum Phase

The Particle Model proposes that the phases of internal quantum beat processes and the particular way in which these processes are bound together inside the particle both determine the externally observed charge of particles. For this purpose, several assumptions are made in this section that seem somewhat unusual at first sight, but lead to a self-consistent model for fundamental particles that resembles many of the properties of the Standard Model.

The *quantum (beat process) phases* of particles are indicated by the signatures + for a positive phase and – when a quantum beat process has a negative (i.e. opposite) phase. To indicate the aggregation of quantum beat processes within a strongly bound group, a *quantum phase form* is used. Examples of such forms are (-), (--), (-,+), (-,-,-), (-,+)(+). They indicate that a particle may consist of a single quantum beat process or multiple quantum processes that are tightly bound together under influence of short-range interactions (strong and weak force as they are called in current physics).


Some examples of quantum phase forms for specific particles are  $e^- = (-)$ ,  $\pi^- = (-,-)$ ,  $\pi^+ = (+,+)$ ,  $N^+ = (-,+)(+)$  and  $\Omega^- = (-,-,-)$ . In this section the quantum phase form of these particles is derived based on their externally observed charge and quantum beat process grouping assumptions. It is assumed that all particles have a unique quantum phase form.

In this report the notion of particle is often used somewhat ambiguously. However, from the context it should be clear when it refers to all particles including anti-particles, or to the half of this set by excluding anti-particles. The notation  $p$  indicates any particle including anti-particles. If  $p$  is a particle then  $\bar{p}$  indicates its associated anti-particle.

### 5.1 Photons and Photon Emission

Experimentally, it is known that photons do not have an electromagnetic charge. In terms of the Particle Model this means that they are special kinds of solitons that are bound between the electromagnetic and gravitational protofield (section 2). Since photons do not execute an internal randomized quantum beat process their effective quantum phase is equal to 0.

Mesons and baryons can be organized in schemes called *multiplets*. In this section, multiplets of the Standard Model will be used to illustrate discussions. Figure 5.1 indicates a meson multiplet with particles and anti-particles and photon decay paths.<sup>3</sup> Figure 5.2 depicts a baryon multiplet with photon decay paths.<sup>3</sup> Both figures, and the figures in the rest of this report have been derived from [8]. The structure of these multiplets has no significance for the derivations of the quantum phase forms of particles.




**Figure 5.1: Meson Photon Emission**

In the figures, particles are horizontally organized according to charge with values in the range  $(-2, -1, 0, +1, +2)$ . Vertically, they are organized having particles of approximately the same mass on the same row. Photon emission does not change observed particle charge. It is assumed that photon emission also does not change the quantum beat process grouping of particles, which originates from the fact that photons do not execute a quantum beat process. (section 2). This implies that different types of particles may have the same quantum phase form.

Therefore, when the structure of one particle is known, the structure of many other particles is known by implication. This is not so much of importance for mesons since, as will be seen, their quantum phase forms can easily be determined. But for the baryons this structural equivalence helps significantly to determine the quantum phase form of many particles.

<sup>3</sup> In the Particle Model most of the multiplets for hadrons will be exactly identical to the ones of the Standard Model.





**Figure 5.2: Baryon Photon Emission**

## 5.2 Leptons

The relation between the charge of leptons and phases of quantum beat processes is defined by the following *lepton charge - quantum phase rules*, which originate directly from the Quantum Field Mechanics (section 2)

- If a lepton has a negative charge (-1) then its quantum beat phase is defined as negative (-1).
- If a lepton has a positive charge (+1) then its quantum beat phase is defined as positive (+1).

These relations will make much more sense after mesons and baryons are considered in the next sections. These rules are summarized in Table 5.1.

Charge $Q$	Quantum Phase Form
-1	(-)
1	(+)

**Table 5.1: Lepton Charges and Quantum Phase Forms**

Examples:  $e^- = (-)$ ,  $e^+ = (+)$ ,  $\mu^- = (-)$ ,  $\mu^+ = (+)$ ,  $\tau^- = (-)$ , and  $\tau^+ = (+)$ .

## 5.3 Mesons

To extend the lepton model of the nature of charge to mesons requires making further assumptions that are compatible with physical observations. For particles with two quantum beat processes, i.e., for mesons, the observed electromagnetic charge is assumed to be dependent not only on the phases of the individual quantum beat processes but also

on the particular binding of these processes. Again, it will be assumed that each quantum beat process, as primarily observed in the electromagnetic protofield, can only have one of two possible quantum beat phases. The relation between the charge of mesons, and the pairing of quantum beat processes is postulated to adhere to the following *meson charge-quantum phase rules*

- If a meson has a negative charge (-1) then both quantum beat phases are assumed to be negative.
- If a meson has no charge then both quantum beat phases are assumed to be opposite; one is positive and the other one is negative.
- If a meson has a positive charge (+1) then both quantum beat phases are assumed to be positive.

This model of meson charges is summarized in Table 5.2. Again, for mesons, charge is not only dependent on the behavior of individual quantum beat processes but also on their binding.

This model appears to be very much at odds with the nature of particles with a single quantum beat process since now both quantum beat processes together determine the observable charge of the particle. However, it should be understood that apparently the notion of charge is meaningless inside a coupled pair of quantum beat processes.

Charge $Q$	Quantum Phase Form
-1	(-, -)
0	(-, +)
1	(+, +)

**Table 5.2: Meson Charges and Quantum Phase Forms**

Charge describes a long-range electromagnetic interaction and, therefore, does not indicate anything about the properties of extremely short-range interactions. The charge-quantum phase rules for mesons in fact expresses the idea that in case of a very compact extremely short-distance interaction driven binding between two in-phase quantum beat processes, it is not possible to distinguish between them, due to their close proximity, with respect to long-range electromagnetic protofield interaction. The two quantum beat processes look like a single electron-like quantum beat process. In case of  $(-, +)$  mesons, the binding may be even more compact and the long-range electromagnetic interaction will effectively be absent, which is equated to a zero charge.

The 1-1 pairing of charges and quantum phase forms according to Table 5.2 implies that known mesons can be directly matched with their quantum phase form. The results are summarized in Figure 5.3, and are in alignment with the photon decay processes as shown in Figure 5.1. The quantum phase form for neutral mesons like  $\eta$  and  $\omega$  can be obtained similarly.




Figure 5.3:  $J=0/1$  Mesons

#### 5.4 Baryons

The lepton/meson charge-quantum phase models can be extended to baryons but requires that yet further assumptions need to be made that are compatible with observed particle charges.

For baryons, having three quantum beat processes, the observed electromagnetic charge is again assumed to be dependent not only on the quantum beat phases, but also on the quantum beat process grouping. Since the electromagnetic protofield can only have two possible phases, the quantum beat process phases and their groupings are assumed to adhere to the *baryon charge-quantum phase rules* as indicated in Table 5.3. This table has been obtained as follows. Particles with two phase groups, that is, particles with a quantum phase form  $(-, -)(-)$ ,  $(-, +)(-)$ ,  $(-, -)(+)$ ,  $(+, +)(-)$ ,  $(-, +)(+)$  or  $(+, +)(+)$  are, from the perspective of charge, considered to be a combination of a 'meson' and a 'lepton'. Their charge is obtained by adding the 'meson' charge to the 'lepton' charge. Baryons with a quantum phase grouping  $(-, -, -)$  or  $(+, +, +)$  have a charge equal to  $-1$  and  $+1$  respectively. From a charge perspective they are perceived as 'leptons'. Since no unique integer charge can be assigned to the quantum phase forms  $(-, -, +)$  and  $(-, +, +)$  it is assumed that particles with such a quantum phase form do not exist in nature.

Similar to mesons, the baryon charge-quantum phase rules express the assumption that extremely short-range binding between quantum beat processes has a 'masking effect' by which different 'internal' quantum beat processes are, due to their close proximity, not distinguishable in terms of their long-range effect in the electromagnetic protofield. Examples of such short-range compact bindings are  $(-, -, -)$  and the binding  $(-, +)$  in particles with quantum phase form  $(+, +)(-)$ . In the latter case the binding between  $(+, +)$

and (-) apparently has a long-range effect within the electromagnetic protofield because their charges are additive.

Charge Q	Quantum Phase Form
-2	(-, -)(-)
-1	(-, -, -)
not existing	(-, -, +)
-1	(-, +)(-)
0	(-, -)(+)
0	(+, +)(-)
1	(-, +)(+)
not existing	(+, +, -)
1	(+, +, +)
2	(+, +)(+)

**Table 5.3: Baryon Charges and Quantum Phase Forms**

In case of baryons unique quantum phase forms exist to obtain a particle charge equal to -2 and +2. For the charges -1, 0 and +1 there are two possible phase forms. This multiplicity makes it harder to determine the phase form of a given particle, but the exercise can be simplified in two ways

- Particles and anti-particles have an opposite quantum phase form. This cuts the search for the proper quantum phase form in half.
- Photon decay paths within or between particle multiplets impose constraints on the transitions between quantum phase forms.

According to Table 5.3 there are eight possible baryon quantum phase forms. Four forms are for particles while the other four (inverted) forms are for antiparticles. The  $\Delta$  particles in Figure 5.2 and their (non-depicted) anti-particles span the whole spectrum of eight charges and, therefore, can be used to obtain the quantum phase forms of baryons.

The only way the  $\Delta^{++}$  particle can have a charge equal to +2 is when  $\Delta^{++}=(+,+)(+)$ . Furthermore, it seems reasonable to assume that the quantum phase forms of adjacent  $\Delta$  particles in the multiplet change by at most one phase inversion. Application of this rule yields the quantum phase forms of all delta-particles as

$$\Delta^{-}=(-,-,-), \Delta^0=(-,-)(+), \Delta^{+}=(-,+)(+) \text{ and } \Delta^{++}=(+,+)(+)$$

Using this result in combination with Figure 5.1 it follows that

$$\Sigma^{*-}=(-,-,-), \Sigma^{*0}=(-,-)(+) \text{ and } \Sigma^{*+}=(-,+)(+)$$


$$\Xi^* = (-, -, -) \text{ and } \Xi^{*0} = (-, -)(+)$$

$$\Omega^* = (-, -, -)$$

Using photon equivalence in Figure 5.1 yields in terms of quantum phase forms for the neutron and proton, respectively<sup>4</sup>

$$N^0 = \Delta^0 = (-, -)(+) \text{ and } N^+ = \Delta^+ = (-, +)(+)$$

Similar results can be obtained for the other baryons. Given a baryon, the quantum phase form of its corresponding anti-particle is obtained by inverting all quantum beat phases. For example,  $(-, -)(+)$  is the inverse of  $(+, +)(-)$ . These considerations lead to the (anti-)baryon quantum phase form multiplets illustrated in Figure 5.4 ( $J=1/2$ ) and Figure 5.5 ( $J=3/2$ ).



**Figure 5.4: J=1/2 Baryons**

<sup>4</sup> Their slight difference in mass can now be attributed to their different quantum phase forms. This explanation does not require the existence of quarks as the Standard Model does.




Figure 5.5: J=3/2 Baryons

## 5.5 Neutrinos

Experiments seem to indicate that neutrinos have mass. Consequently, according to the theory in section 2 they should perform a quantum beat process. To get a better impression of the nature of neutrinos, consider the baryon decay processes

- $N^0 \rightarrow N^+ + e^- + \bar{\nu}_e$ . In quantum phase form this is  $(-,+)(+)(+) \rightarrow (-,+)(+)(+) + (-) + \bar{\nu}_e$ .
- $\Sigma^- \rightarrow N^0 + e^- + \bar{\nu}_e$ . In quantum phase form this is  $(-,+)(+)(+) \rightarrow (-,+)(+)(+) + (-) + \bar{\nu}_e$ .
- $\Sigma^+ \rightarrow \Lambda^0 + e^+ + \nu_e$ . In quantum phase form this is  $(-,+)(+)(+) \rightarrow (-,+)(+)(+) + (+) + \nu_e$ .

And consider the meson decay processes

- $\pi^- \rightarrow \mu^- + \bar{\nu}_\mu$ . In quantum phase form this is  $(-,+)(+)(+) \rightarrow (-,+)(+)(+) + (-) + \bar{\nu}_\mu$ .
- $\pi^+ \rightarrow e^+ + \nu_e$ . In quantum phase form this is  $(-,+)(+)(+) \rightarrow (-,+)(+)(+) + (+) + \nu_e$ .

Lastly, consider the following leptonic decay processes

- $\mu^- \rightarrow e^- + \bar{\nu}_e + \nu_\mu$ . In quantum phase form this is  $(-,+)(+)(+) \rightarrow (-,+)(+)(+) + (-) + \bar{\nu}_e + \nu_\mu$ .
- $\tau^- \rightarrow e^- + \bar{\nu}_e + \nu_\tau$ . In quantum phase form this is  $(-,+)(+)(+) \rightarrow (-,+)(+)(+) + (-) + \bar{\nu}_e + \nu_\tau$ .
- $\tau^- \rightarrow \mu^- + \bar{\nu}_\mu + \nu_\tau$ . In quantum phase form this is  $(-,+)(+)(+) \rightarrow (-,+)(+)(+) + (-) + \bar{\nu}_\mu + \nu_\tau$ .

In these cases it seems grouping of quantum beat processes in the original particle produces a single neutrino while two neutrinos of different types are produced when the original particle is a lepton. These results still do not indicate conclusively whether neutrinos consist of a single quantum beat process or a binding between two processes.

Supposedly neutrinos are neutral. This means that they should consist of a binding between two quantum beat processes and are represented as  $(-,+)$ . Another possibility, which allows for neutrinos and anti-neutrinos, is that they are represented by  $(-,-)$  and  $(+,+)$  quantum phase forms and perform a very low frequency quantum beat instead of a synchronized quantum beat like other massive particles. In that way it appears as if neutrinos hardly have any effect on the electromagnetic protofield. This idea only holds true when, for each type, the total number of neutrinos is equal to the total number of anti-neutrinos.

For now the working assumption will be that neutrinos have a quantum phase form equal to  $(-,+)$  although it is at this moment unclear how neutrino particles and antiparticles can be distinguished.

## 5.6 Particles and Anti-particles

One can sub-divide the total class of all particles (including anti-particles) into two equal groups by defining one quantum form as particle and its associated phase inverse particle as anti-particle. Table 5.4 provides the classification of particles  $p$  and anti-particles  $\bar{p}$  based on previously obtained results. The following constraints have been used to compile this table

- Electrons  $(-)$  and protons  $(-,+)(+)$  seem to exist much more abundantly than their anti-particles. Therefore they are classified as particles.
- Mesons with a quantum phase form  $(-,-)$ , possess the same charge as electrons and are, therefore, classified as particles.

The particles subclass contains many of the all-minus quantum phase forms  $(-)$ ,  $(-,-)$  and  $(-,-,-)$ . Consequently, the anti-particle subclass contains many of the all-plus quantum forms  $(+)$ ,  $(+,+)$  and  $(+,+,+)$ . For baryons, going from left to right, the quantum phase forms for the particle subclass make a phase step equal to  $+1$ . Consequently, this phase step is equal to  $-1$  for anti-baryons.

Type	Particles $p$	Neuter-Particles	Anti-Particles $\bar{p}$
Baryons	$(-,-,-), (-,-)(+), (-,+)(+), (+,+)(+)$		$(+,+,+), (+,+)(-), (+,-)(-), (-,-)(-)$
Mesons	$(-,-)$	$(-,+)$	$(+,+)$
Leptons	$(-)$		$(+)$
Neutrinos	$(-/+)$		$(+/-)$
Photons	0		0

**Table 5.4: Quantum Phase Forms for various Particle Classes**

One additional class is needed for mesons such as  $\pi^0$  and  $\rho^0$ , since they are their own anti-particles. These particles are called neuter particles. Note that, although neutrons are neutral, they have an anti-particle and, therefore, they are not neuter-particles.

According to the Particle Model at least two quantum beat processes need to be bound together to obtain a neutral particle.

The dual existence of phase and anti-phase in the electromagnetic protofield provides not only a simple explanation for the existence of two kinds of charge, but also for the annihilation of any particle and its antiparticle into photons as a consequence of matching (anti-)quantum beat phases.

The issue of the supposed asymmetric abundance of particles over anti-particles in the universe may be resolved as follows. According to its quantum phase form, a proton  $N^+ = (-,+)(+)$  consists of the binding between a neutral meson-like  $(-,+)$  particle and a positron-like  $(+)$  particle. In turn, the meson-like particle could be viewed as a combination of an 'electron' and a 'positron'. In other words, a proton consists one 'electron' and two 'positrons'. Since the number of electrons and protons in the universe is identical, the number of 'electrons' and 'positrons' is identical. This observation could resolve the mentioned asymmetry but now requires another one to explain the existence of a different asymmetry, namely the number of protons over anti-protons. Such an asymmetry could be caused by the specific nature of the two protofields which facilitate the existence of all particles.

## 5.7 Charge-Quantum Phase Law

As mentioned before, (anti-)mesons and (anti-)baryons have following quantum phase forms

- Negative mesons:  $(-,-)$ , neutral mesons:  $(-,+)$  or  $(-)(+)$ , positive mesons:  $(+,+)$
- Baryons
  - Negative baryons:  $(-,-,-)$ ,  $(-,+)(-)$
  - Neutral baryons:  $(-,-,+)$ ,  $(-,+,+)$ ,  $(-,-)(+)$ ,  $(+,+)(-)$
  - positive baryons:  $(-,+)(+)$ ,  $(+,+,+)$ .
- Negative leptons:  $(-)$ , positive leptons  $(+)$
- Neutrinos:  $(+/-)$  and  $(-/+)$
- Photons:  $(0)$

Combination of the content of Tables 5.1 through 5.4 yields the *Charge-Quantum Phase Law*

$$Q(p) = \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \varphi_i(p) + B(p) \right) \quad (5.1)$$

where the phases  $\varphi_i$  are equal to the quantum phases, but with the  $-$  sign replaced by  $-1$ , and the  $+$  sign replaced by  $+1$ , and the quantum number  $B(p)$  is defined according to Table 5.5.



Class	$B$ for Particles	$B$ for Anti-Particles	# of Quantum Beat Processes $N$
Baryons	1	-1	3
Mesons	0	0	2
Leptons <sup>5</sup>	-1	1	1
Neutrinos	0	0	2
Photons	0	0	0

**Table 5.5: Values of  $B$  and  $N$**

The quantum number  $B(p)$  should not be interpreted as the baryon number that is used in the Standard Model, since in the Particle Model it is different from zero for leptons.<sup>6</sup> Expression 5.1 has solely been derived from particle quantum forms and is independent of the particle being in a ground state or excited state. For hadrons and non-neutrino leptons  $N$  indicates the number of quantum beat processes. For neutrinos  $N$  has been set to 2. This is in compliance with the assumption in section 5.5, but may have to be changed when the physical properties of neutrinos become better known. For photons it has been set to 0 corresponding with the absence of quantum beat processes. The charge-quantum phase law solely depends on the quantum phase form of a particle and is completely independent of any grouping of particles in multiplet structures.

Expression (5.2) is called the *summed-quantum phase* of the particle.

$$\left( \sum_{i=1}^N \varphi_i(p) \right) \quad (5.2)$$

To illustrate the charge-quantum phase law some examples are provided for hadrons. In the charge-quantum phase law ( $N=2$ ,  $B=0$ ) holds for mesons and ( $N=3$ ,  $B=1$ ) for baryons. Observation of the last three columns in Tables 5.6 and 5.7 shows compliance with the charge-quantum phase law. Since this law is independent of the excitation states of particles, similar tables can be compiled for other (non-)excited particles ( $J=1$  mesons and  $J=\frac{1}{2}$  baryons).

Particle	2Q	Quantum Phase Form	Summed-Phase	B
$K^-$ , $\pi^-$	-2	(-, -)	-2	0
$K^0$ , $\pi^0$ , $\overline{K}^0$	0	(-, +)	0	0
$K^+$ , $\pi^+$	2	(+, +)	2	0

**Table 5.6: Charge-Quantum Phase Law for  $J=0$  Mesons**

<sup>5</sup> Excluding neutrinos.

<sup>6</sup> The quantum number  $B(p)$  can be viewed as a generalization of the Baryon and Lepton numbers assigned to particles in the Standard Model.

Particle	2Q	Quantum Phase Form	Summed-Phase	B
$\Delta^- , \Sigma^{*-} , \Xi^{*-} , \Omega^-$	-2	(-, -, -)	-3	1
$\Delta^0 , \Sigma^{*0} , \Xi^{*0} ,$	0	(-, -)(+)	-1	1
$\Delta^+ , \Sigma^{*+}$	2	(-, +)(+)	1	1
$\Delta^{++}$	4	(+, +)(+)	3	1

**Table 5.7: Charge-Quantum Phase Law for  $J=3/2$  Baryons**

### 5.8 Charge-Quantum Phase Law applied to Baryons

Suppose that a baryon can be viewed as a bound system of an (anti-)meson and a non-neutrino (anti-)lepton. An example is a  $N^+$  particle, but not a  $\Omega^-$  particle. In that case a relation can be obtained between charge-quantum phase laws. The charge-quantum phase law for an (anti-)meson is

$$Q(p_m) = \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^2 \varphi_i(p_m) \right) \quad (5.3)$$

For (anti-)leptons it is

$$Q(p_l) = \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^1 \varphi_i(p_l) \pm 1 \right) \quad (5.4)$$

where, at the right-hand side, for leptons one should use -1 and for anti-leptons +1. Adding both equations together, representing the binding yields

$$Q(p) = Q(p_m) + Q(p_l) = \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^2 \varphi_i(p_m) \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^1 \varphi_i(p_l) \pm 1 \right) \quad (5.5)$$

or

$$Q(p) = \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^3 \varphi_i(p_l) \pm 1 \right) \quad (5.6)$$

The latter equation is exactly the charge-quantum phase law for (anti-)baryons since, according to Table 5.4, the -1 for the phase of the bound lepton corresponds with an anti-baryon and thus with a negative phase (-1) in (5.6). A similar conclusion can be obtained with a positive phase (+1) for the phase of an anti-lepton.

### 5.9 Fractional Particle Charge

The charge-quantum phase law for any particle can be written in terms of the charge of the particle as

$$Q(p) = \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \varphi_i(p) + B(p) \right) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \varphi_i(p) + \frac{B(p)}{N} \right) \quad (5.7)$$

therefore

$$Q(p) = \sum_{i=1}^N Q_i^F(p) \quad (5.8)$$

where the *fractional charge*  $Q_i^F(p)$  of the  $i$ -th quantum beat process of a particle  $p$  is defined as

$$Q_i^F(p) \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left( \varphi_i(p) + \frac{B(p)}{N} \right) \quad (5.9)$$

The definition of fractional charge depends on the quantum beat phases of a particle and depends implicitly on the internal structure of the particle by the quantum number  $B(p)$ . The fractional charge of a quantum beat process is completely independent of any organization of particles in multiplets or particle excitation, as it should be for any proper definition of fractional charge.

For the various (anti-)particles one obtains the fractional charges as shown in Table 5.8. The Particle Model yields exactly the same fractional charges for (anti-)baryons as the quark charges of the Standard Model. However, for mesons, the Particle Model fractional charges are  $+1/2$  and  $-1/2$ .

According to the definition of fractional charge, the charge of a particle can be viewed as a linear superposition of the fractional charges of the quantum beat processes of the particle. So, although physical particles only have integer charge values, it is possible to assign a formal notion of fractional charge to each of the quantum beat processes of particles. Alternatively, when quantum beat processes are perceived as quasi-particles each of them is now assigned a fractional charge value.<sup>7</sup> However, the physical relevance of the notion of fractional charge, if any, remains to be understood.

The notion of charge expresses the long-range electromagnetic interaction mediated by the electromagnetic protofield (section 2). The quantum beat processes, on the other hand, execute a highly non-linear oscillation. The fractional charge of a quantum beat process

---

<sup>7</sup> They will not be called quarks since the charge value assigned to the quantum beat processes of mesons is different from the quark model.

can, therefore, be interpreted as the long-range electromagnetic interaction caused by the non-linear quantum beat process. This long-range interaction cannot be determined separately for each quantum beat effect but only be measured (at a relatively large distance) as the aggregate charge  $Q(p)$ .

Class	Fractional Charges		
Baryons	-1/3		+2/3
Anti-Baryons	-2/3		+1/3
Mesons	-1/2		+1/2
Anti-mesons	-1/2		+1/2
Leptons	0		
Anti-Leptons			0
Neutrinos		0	
Anti-Neutrinos		0	
Photons		0	
Phases	$\varphi_i = -1$	$\varphi_i = 0$	$\varphi_i = +1$

**Table 5.8: Fractional Charges**

Measurement of charge at a short distance of a stable particle probably yields a statistical result where, in case of a proton  $N^+ = (-,+)(+)$  in 1 in 3 times a negative charge is measured and 2 in 3 events a positive charge is measured, exactly matching the fractional charge values given by (5.9). In case of (short-lived) mesons, a short-distance charge measurement, if at all possible, would result in fractional charges of  $\pm 1/2$ .

The following additional observations can be made

- In analogy with the Standard Model the fractional charges of baryons are labeled<sup>8</sup>  $U \equiv +2/3$  and  $D \equiv -1/3$ . For the phase form of the proton  $N^+ = (-,+)(+)$ , one obtains the fractional charge form  $UUD = (+2/3, +2/3, -1/3)$ . Similar expressions hold for other baryons. For anti-baryons one can define the two fractional charges  $\bar{U} \equiv -2/3$  and  $\bar{D} \equiv +1/3$ , and obtain similar charge quantum forms.
- For baryons, the quantum phase forms and corresponding fractional charges are
  - $(-,-,-) \rightarrow (-1/3, -1/3, -1/3)$
  - $(-,-)(+) \rightarrow (-1/3, -1/3, +2/3)$
  - $(-,+)(+) \rightarrow (-1/3, +2/3, +2/3)$
  - $(+,+)(+) \rightarrow (+2/3, +2/3, +2/3)$

<sup>8</sup> Capital letters are used to distinguish them from the lower case  $u$  and  $d$  used to designate up and down quarks in the Standard Model.

For anti-baryons, the quantum phase forms and corresponding fractional charges are obtained by inverting the above forms.

- For (anti-)mesons there are two fractional charges. The fractional charges for the (anti-)mesons are  $-1/2$  or  $+1/2$ . One can define the two fractional charges  $E \equiv +1/2$  and  $F \equiv -1/2$ . For the phase form of the pion  $\pi^+ = (+, +)$  the fractional charge form is  $EE = (+1/2, +1/2)$ . Similar correspondences hold for other (anti-)mesons.
- For (anti-)mesons and neuter-particles, the quantum phase forms and corresponding fractional charges are
  - $(-, -) \rightarrow (-1/2, -1/2)$
  - $(-, +) \rightarrow (-1/2, +1/2)$
  - $(+, +) \rightarrow (+1/2, +1/2)$
- From the above considerations on mesons and baryons it can be concluded that the fractional charges inside a quantum phase form are determined by the quantum phase and not by the grouping in the quantum phase form.
- The fractional charges of the non-neutrino (anti-)leptons are 0 because they perform a single quantum beat process. The fractional charges for (anti-)neutrinos and photons are also equal to 0.

The nature of physical charge is described independently of Standard Model quarks. In other words, the Particle Model does not need the postulation of (u, d, c, s, t and b) or quarks with fractional charges to describe the nature of charge. However, according to the Particle Model definition, fractional charges can still be defined formally for the quantum beat processes inside particles.

## 6 Strangeness

This section defines the notion of strangeness for any type of particles.<sup>9</sup> For hadrons, this results in exactly the same strangeness values that are assigned in the Standard Model.

### 6.1 Definition

The masses of some sets of particles are approximately the same. Examples of such sets are  $\{N^0, N^+, \bar{N}^0, \bar{N}^+\}$  and  $\{\pi^-, \pi^0, \pi^+\}$ . Within these sets, all particles have a different quantum phase form. It might therefore be concluded that the slight mass differences of particles within the set originate from the difference in phase forms. Despite these slight differences in mass, it is useful to introduce a measure that considers all particles within such a set somehow as identical. This measure is called strangeness and can be used to distinguish so-called Standard Model strong and weak-interaction processes. The formal definition is complex, although the calculation of strangeness is in fact quite simple as illustrated by the examples following the definition.

---

<sup>9</sup> It is called strangeness because it has exactly the same properties as strangeness in the Standard Model.

The *Strangeness*  $S(p)$  of a particle  $p$  is defined in terms of the following procedure<sup>10</sup>

1. Find the set  $R(p)$  of all particles, neuter-particles and anti-particles which have approximately the same mass as particle  $p$  (including  $p$ ).
2. If this set contains a neuter-particle<sup>11</sup> keep the set  $R(p)$  the same and re-label it  $Z(p)$  and go to step 5.
3. If this set does not contain a neuter-particle,<sup>12</sup> then split the set  $R(p)$  into two subsets; the set of particles  $RP(p)$  and a set of anti-particles  $RA(p)$ .
4. If particle  $p$  belongs to  $RP(p)$ 
  - keep  $RP(p)$ , re-label it  $Z(p)$  and ignore  $RA(p)$  for the calculation of strangeness, go to step 5.
  - otherwise keep  $RA(p)$ , re-label it  $Z(p)$  and ignore  $RP(P)$  for the calculation of strangeness, go to step 5.
5. Define the strangeness of particle  $p$  in terms of the particles in  $Z(p)$  as

$$S(p) \equiv \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M \sum_{i=1}^N \varphi_i(p_j) \quad (6.1)$$

where

- $M = |Z|$  .
- The index  $j$  runs over all particles within the set  $Z(p)$ .
- The index  $i$  runs over all  $N$  quantum beat processes of the particles in  $Z(p)$ . For leptons  $N=1$ , for mesons  $N=2$ , and for baryons  $N=3$ .

This definition applies to any particle including leptons and photons, not just hadrons. It is important to realize that this definition of strangeness is completely independent of the organization of all particles in multiplets.<sup>13</sup>

In (6.1) the notion of particle strangeness is defined as a property of a collection of particles and not an internal particle property corresponding with the presence of a strange quark as in the Standard model. Strangeness could be defined for each constituent quantum beat process in a similar fashion as the notion of fractional charge. This, however, does not provide any additional physical insight and is therefore not pursued in this report.

<sup>10</sup> Particle is meant here in the generalized sense: particle or anti-particle.

<sup>11</sup> In that case the particles are mesons, but not every set of mesons has a neuter-particle such as the set  $\{ K^0, K^+ \}$ .

<sup>12</sup> This is certainly the case for leptons and baryons, see Table 5.4.

<sup>13</sup> In the Standard Model, one somehow always gets the impression that the organization of particles in multiplets is important for the strangeness value a given particle is assigned.

Examples (from Figures 5.4, 5.5, 6.1 and 6.2):

- Determine  $S(\pi^-)$ .  $R(\pi^-) = \{\pi^-, \pi^0, \pi^+\}$ . This set contains neuter-particle  $\pi^0$ , thus  $Z(\pi^-) = R(\pi^-)$ , and  $S(\pi^-) = \frac{1}{3} \sum_{i=1}^2 \varphi_i(\pi^-) + \varphi_i(\pi^0) + \varphi_i(\pi^+) = 0$ . Similarly it follows that  $S(\pi^0) = S(\pi^+) = 0$ .
- Determine  $S(\Xi^0)$ .  $R(\Xi^0) = \{\Xi^-, \Xi^0, \bar{\Xi}^0, \bar{\Xi}^+\}$ . There is no neuter-particle, thus  $Z(\Xi^0) = \{\Xi^-, \Xi^0\}$  and  $S(\Xi^0) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^3 \varphi_i(\Xi^-) + \sum_{i=1}^3 \varphi_i(\Xi^0) = \frac{1}{2}(-3-1) = -2$ . Similarly it follows that  $S(\Xi^-) = -2$  and  $S(\bar{\Xi}^0) = S(\bar{\Xi}^+) = +2$ .
- Determine  $S(\bar{\Delta}^{++})$ .  $R(\bar{\Delta}^{++}) = \{\Delta^-, \Delta^0, \Delta^+, \Delta^{++}, \bar{\Delta}^-, \bar{\Delta}^0, \bar{\Delta}^+, \bar{\Delta}^{++}\}$ . This set does not contain a neuter particle, thus  $Z(\bar{\Delta}^{++}) = \{\bar{\Delta}^-, \bar{\Delta}^0, \bar{\Delta}^+, \bar{\Delta}^{++}\}$  and therefore  $S(\bar{\Delta}^{++}) = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i=1}^3 \varphi_i(\bar{\Delta}^-) + \sum_{i=1}^3 \varphi_i(\bar{\Delta}^0) + \sum_{i=1}^3 \varphi_i(\bar{\Delta}^+) + \sum_{i=1}^3 \varphi_i(\bar{\Delta}^{++}) = 0$ . Similarly it follows that  $S(\bar{\Delta}^-) = S(\bar{\Delta}^0) = S(\bar{\Delta}^+) = 0$ , and that  $S(\Delta^-) = S(\Delta^0) = S(\Delta^+) = S(\Delta^{++}) = 0$ .
- For the neutral  $\eta$  meson ( $J=0$ ) there are no other particles with a different quantum phase form and approximately the same mass. Therefore,  $Z(\eta) = \{\eta\}$  and  $S(\eta) = \frac{1}{1} \sum_{i=1}^2 \varphi_i(\eta) = 0$ . Similarly,  $S(\eta') = S(\eta_c) = 0$ . In the same way the strangeness of other mesons, such as  $f_0$  and  $a_0$ , can be derived. They all have a strangeness  $S=0$ .
- For the  $\Lambda^0$  particle ( $J=1/2$ ) holds  $R(\Lambda^0) = \{\Lambda^0, \bar{\Lambda}^0\}$ . There is no neuter-particle, thus  $Z(\Lambda^0) = \Lambda^0$  and  $S(\Lambda^0) = \frac{1}{1} \sum_{i=1}^2 \varphi_i(\Lambda^0) = -1$ .

Strangeness has several properties

- Strangeness adheres to the *inversion property*  $S(\bar{p}) = -S(p)$  since

$$S(\bar{p}) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M - \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \varphi_i(p_j) \right) = -S(p) \quad (6.2)$$

- Any particle that is part of  $Z(p)$  has the same strangeness value as  $p$ . This follows from the definition of strangeness, because the value of the summation stays the same. This can also be observed from the above examples.
- For non-hadrons the following properties apply
  - For leptons  $S(p) = -1$  and for anti-leptons ( $S(\bar{p}) = +1$ ). For electrons the

derivation is  $S(e^-) = \frac{1}{1} \varphi(e^-) = -1$ . For the positron and muon and tau (anti-) particles the derivation is analogous. The Standard Model assigns a strangeness value equal to 0 to those particles. Strangeness conservation according to the Standard model should therefore be interpreted differently than in the Particle Model.

- For (anti-)neutrinos  $S(\nu) = S(\bar{\nu}) = 0$ . For electron neutrinos the derivation is  $S(\nu_e) = \frac{1}{1} \varphi(\nu_e) = -1 + 1 = 0$ . For other neutrinos the derivation is analogous.
- For photons  $S(\gamma) = 0$  because  $\varphi(\gamma) = 0$ .
- It is not necessarily the case that  $S(p) > 0$  for particles (non anti-particles) as can be observed from the multiplets provided in the next section.

## 6.2 Charge-Strangeness Multiplets

Particles can be organized in so called *charge-strangeness multiplets*, i.e., an organization of particles in a rectangular grid with the following properties


- The particles all have the same number of quantum beat processes and spin.
- Charge of particles is represented along the horizontal axis.
- Strangeness of the particles is represented along the vertical axis.

Extended multiplets for the same spin are illustrated in Figure 6.1 and Figure 6.2. In Figure 6.1, particles such as  $\eta_c$  are not illustrated. In addition, the  $J=1$  meson multiplet, the  $J=1\frac{1}{2}$  baryon multiplet and the trivial multiplets for leptons and neutrinos are also not depicted. In general, going to the right in the extended multiplets shows fewer particles. This decrement can be explained by assuming that a higher particle mass results in less stability. Consequently, some excited states may not be possible.<sup>14</sup>


---

<sup>14</sup> In the Standard Model, a quark flavor called charm is postulated to explain the existence of the extra multiplets within the extended multiplet. Here, this is not necessary because the formal definition of strangeness avoids the need to introduce quarks.





**Figure 6.1:  $J=0$  Meson Baryon Charge-Strangeness Multiplets**



**Figure 6.2:  $J=1/2$  Baryon Charge-Strangeness Multiplets**

## 7 Isospin

This section mathematically defines the notion of isospin for any particle. This notion is completely independent of particle spin.

### 7.1 Definition

The *isospin* of a particle  $p$  is defined in terms of its summed-phase and strangeness as<sup>15</sup>

$$I(p) \equiv \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \varphi_i(p) \right) - S(p) \quad (7.1)$$

where the index  $i$  runs over all  $N$  quantum phases of the particle  $p$ .

This definition applies to any particle including leptons and photons, not just hadrons. The following properties hold for isospin

- Isospin has the inversion property  $I(\bar{p}) = -I(p)$ , which is proven as follows

$$I(\bar{p}) = - \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \varphi_i(p) \right) - (-S(p)) = -I(p) \quad (7.2)$$

- The Isospin of a particle is related to its charge and strangeness according to

$$Q(p) = \frac{1}{2} (I(p) + S(p) + B(p)) \quad (7.3)$$

This relation is obtained by using the charge-quantum phase law (5.1) in combination with the definition of isospin.

- $I(p) = 2 I_{\text{SM}}(p)$ , where  $I_{\text{SM}}(p)$  corresponds with the isospin value of the Standard Model. This relation can be verified observing the multiplets of the Standard Model. Obviously it holds that

$$Q(p) = I_{\text{SM}}(p) + \frac{1}{2} (S(p) + B(p)) \quad (7.4)$$

which is the same relation as in the Standard Model but where  $B(p)$  has a generalized meaning since it is different from zero for leptons.

- For non-hadrons the following properties apply

– For leptons  $I(p)=0$  and for anti-leptons  $I(\bar{p})=0$ . For electrons the

---

<sup>15</sup> The definition is, besides a factor 2, identical to the definition of the Standard Model, see also the discussion of its properties below.

derivation is  $I(e^-) = (e^-) - S(e^-) = (-1) - (-1) = 0$ . For positrons and for muon and tau (anti-)particles the derivation is analogous. These results are the same as in the Standard Model.


- For (anti-)neutrinos  $I(\nu) = I(\bar{\nu}) = 0$  since for electron neutrinos  $I(\nu_e) = \varphi(\nu_e) - S(\nu_e) = 0 - 0 = 0$ . For anti-electron neutrinos and other (anti-)neutrinos the derivation is analogous.
- For photons  $I(\gamma) = \varphi(\gamma) - S(\gamma) = 0 - 0 = 0$ .

## 7.2 Isospin-Strangeness Multiplets

Particles can also be depicted in so called *isospin-strangeness multiplets*, which is an organization of particles in a rectangular grid with the following properties:<sup>16</sup>

- The particles all have the same number of quantum beat processes and spin.
- Isospin of particles is represented along the horizontal axis.
- Strangeness of the particles is represented along the vertical axis.

The isospin-strangeness multiplets for  $J=1$  mesons and  $J=3/2$  baryons are shown in Figure 7.1.  $J=0$  meson and  $J=1/2$  baryon multiplets can be obtained similarly by applying the definition of isospin on charge-strangeness multiplets. The trivial lepton and neutrino multiplets are not illustrated. Figure 7.1 indicates that isospin-strangeness multiplets are symmetrical versions of charge-mass multiplets. As isospin-strangeness multiplets are the result of formal manipulation, it does not change the physical properties of particles in any way but merely provides a different view of the particle relations. Consequently, in all likelihood, no deep physical significance should be attached to the obtained symmetry of the multiplets.



**Figure 7.1: Hadron Isospin-Strangeness Multiplets**

<sup>16</sup> Particles are here intended to include particles, anti-particles and neuter-particles.

## 8 Fundamental Interactions

In QFM the electromagnetic protofield mediates the long-range electromagnetic interaction and the short-range weak interactions. The gravitational protofield mediates the long-range gravitational interaction and the short-range strong interaction (section 2). These protofield interactions have a continuous character, but are caused by discrete quantum beat process dynamics and do not require any interaction-particles.

Photons play a special role in QFM. Photons are a soliton-like binding of the electromagnetic and gravitational protofield. Photons can be emitted and absorbed by massive particles. Electromagnetic protofield interaction between charged particles (cause) may result in the exchange of photons (effect) between the charged particles. Therefore, photon exchange between charged particles is a second order interaction effect. It is also important to note that photons should not be confused with the electromagnetic field between charged particles. An electromagnetic field is a mathematical description of the long-range electromagnetic protofield interaction that is defined only between charged (massive) particles [6,7].

The Standard Model in combination with Quantum Field Theory distinguishes long- and short-range interactions in terms of, supposedly existing, interaction particles and isospin/strangeness conservation,<sup>17</sup> i.e.<sup>18</sup>

- Electromagnetic Interaction – any interaction process involving photons. This interaction conserves strangeness.
- Gravitational Interaction – any interaction process involving graviton interaction particles.
- Strong Interaction – any process involving gluon interaction particles. This interaction conserves both strangeness and isospin.
- Weak Interaction – any process involving  $W^{\pm}$  or  $Z^0$  virtual boson interaction particles. This interaction does not conserve strangeness and isospin.<sup>19</sup>

From the perspective of the Particle Model, many characteristics of particle-interaction models are artificial. Besides the already mentioned aspects, fundamentally the character of space is not understood, and time operates in the global background instead of being an intrinsic part of particle behavior as QFM maintains. Conservation of strangeness and isospin might be a mere consequence of the specific formal choice of their definitions. In other words, the Standard Model seems to be organized around formal conservation laws.

---

<sup>17</sup> As indicated in section 6.1, strangeness slightly differs in the Standard model and QFM.

<sup>18</sup> To unify all interactions into a single theory, supersymmetry proposes even more regular particles and interaction particles. QFM, on the other hand, relies on an absolutely minimal interaction model based on protofields and, therefore, does not require an explosion of particles to facilitate unification.

<sup>19</sup> These particles are called virtual particles since they appear as inner-legs in Feynman diagrams and their existence can only be implied indirectly from experiments by their effect on real particles. This raises the question if these bosons really exist or are merely theoretical artifacts that match the indirectly obtained experimental results quite well.

Experimentally it is well known that electrons and hadrons do not seem to exhibit strong interaction. Although still speculative, within the Particle Model this might be a consequence of the nature of the electron. The electron might be the simplest manner for the electromagnetic and gravitational protofields to interact and should, therefore, have an extremely stable quantum beat frequency. Strong interaction between electrons and hadrons could therefore be minimal, although protons and electrons could be related in terms of their existence (section 5.6).

## 9 Particle Processes and Conservation Laws

Consider a particle interaction process of the form

$$p_{11} + \dots + p_{1K} \rightarrow p_{21} + \dots + p_{2L} \quad (9.1)$$

where  $p_{11} \dots p_{1K}$  are pre-interaction particles of any type and  $p_{21} \dots p_{2L}$  are the post-interaction particles. In conjunction with the interaction process (9.1) the quantum phase difference  $\Delta \varphi$  is defined as

$$\Delta \varphi \equiv \left( \sum_{l=1}^L \sum_{i=1}^{N_l} \varphi_i(p_{2l}) - \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i=1}^{N_k} \varphi_i(p_{1k}) \right) \quad (9.2)$$

The quantum number difference  $\Delta B$  is defined as

$$\Delta B \equiv \left( \sum_{l=1}^L B(p_{2l}) - \sum_{k=1}^K B(p_{1k}) \right) \quad (9.3)$$

The Strangeness difference  $\Delta S$  is defined as

$$\Delta S \equiv \left( \sum_{l=1}^L S(p_{2l}) - \sum_{k=1}^K S(p_{1k}) \right) \quad (9.4)$$

The Isospin difference  $\Delta I$  is defined as

$$\Delta I \equiv \left( \sum_{l=1}^L I(p_{2l}) - \sum_{k=1}^K I(p_{1k}) \right) \quad (9.5)$$

### 9.1 Conservation of Charge

Since charge is conserved in any interaction process, according to charge-quantum phase law (5.1), for the process (9.1) must hold that

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N_k} \varphi_i(p_{1k}) + B(p_{1k}) \right) = \sum_{l=1}^L \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N_l} \varphi_i(p_{2l}) + B(p_{2l}) \right) \quad (9.6)$$

Using definitions (9.2) and (9.3) it follows that

$$\Delta \varphi = -\Delta B \quad (9.7)$$

## 9.2 Conservation of Strangeness

Assume that strangeness is conserved in an interaction process of the form (9.1). Isospin definition (7.1) can be written as

$$S(p) \equiv \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \varphi_i(p) \right) - I(p) \quad (9.8)$$

Since strangeness is conserved it follows that

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N_k} \varphi_i(p_{1k}) - I(p_{1k}) \right) = \sum_{l=1}^L \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N_l} \varphi_i(p_{2l}) - I(p_{2l}) \right) \quad (9.9)$$

Using definitions (9.2) and (9.5) yields for a strangeness conserving process

$$\Delta \varphi = \Delta I \quad (9.10)$$

## 9.3 Conservation of Isospin

Assume that isospin is conserved in an interaction process of the form (9.1). Analogous to the derivation in the previous section it follows that

$$\Delta \varphi = \Delta S \quad (9.11)$$

## 10 Conclusions

The Particle Model suggested in this report is based on a relatively simple set of ideas, some of them originating from experimental observations, others from Quantum Field Mechanics theoretical considerations namely

- Experimentally observed particle charges and the relative rest-masses.
- The QFM postulated, but physically motivated, electromagnetic and gravitational protofields facilitate the existence of all massive particles and photons, and the four types of fundamental interactions.
- The assumption that quantum beat processes have two phases as primarily observed in the electromagnetic protofield.
- The assumption that quantum beat processes can be bound into tightly packed objects which mask the existence of multiple quantum beat processes having the same phase.

These ideas do not appear to violate experimental results from fundamental particle physics. The Particle Model proposes a re-assessment of the nature of particles in terms of their structure, the nature of mass and charge, and the additional notions of strangeness

and isospin. Specifically the following results are obtained.

The physically motivated protofields and their interaction mediate the four fundamental interactions and does not require interaction-particles. The introduction of virtual interaction-particles by the Standard model and the explosion of additional particles proposed by Supersymmetry is thereby superfluous. The experiments supposedly detecting virtual particles remain to be re-interpreted in the context of the Particle Model.

The charge of electrons and more complex particles appears to be related to the phase of bound quantum beat processes. Mathematically this is expressed as the charge-quantum phase law. According to the Particle Model, a hard pit detected during scattering experiment should be interpreted as a quantum beat process and not be interpreted as a quark particle with a fractional charge. Still, in the Particle Model, the notion of fractional charge of a quantum beat process in a particle can be introduced based on the charge-quantum phase law.

The charge-quantum phase law, together with the definitions of strangeness and isospin, allows derivation of the well-known Standard Model relation  $Q=I_{SM}+(B+S)/2$  between charge, strangeness and isospin, although the interpretation of the quantum number  $B$  is different from the one in the Standard Model.

The notions of strangeness and isospin obtain a more general meaning as compared to the Standard Model since they apply to all particles. These notions do not yield physical insight but merely provide different views of particle multiplets. For hadrons, the strangeness and isospin values of particles match the values of the Standard Model.<sup>20</sup> Since leptons are assigned a strangeness different from zero, strangeness may not be conserved in some particle processes while it is conserved in the Standard Model.

The ultimate test of the suggested Particle Model is, of course, the compliance with the results of all particle experiments and therefore remains the topic for additional research.

## 11 Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Andrei P. Kirilyuk for providing detailed answers on questions concerning the Quantum Field Mechanics and Sandra Baten and Peter Kirslis for providing textual corrections on several versions of this report.

---

<sup>20</sup> Apart from a scaling factor for isospin.

## 12 References

1. A.P. Kirilyuk. Universal Concept of Complexity by the Dynamic Redundancy Paradigm. 1997. Naukova Dumka, Kiev.
2. A.P. Kirilyuk. Double solution with chaos: Dynamic redundance and causal wave-particle duality. <http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/9902015>.
3. A.P. Kirilyuk. Double solution with chaos: Completion of de Broglie's nonlinear wave mechanics and its intrinsic unification with the causally extended relativity. <http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/9902016>.
4. B.J. Baten. Quantum Field Mechanics I – Dynamic Redundance Paradigm.
5. B.J. Baten. Quantum Field Mechanics II – Quantitative Description.
6. B.J. Baten. Quantum Description of Electromagnetic Interaction - I.
7. B.J. Baten. Quantum Description of Electromagnetic Interaction - II.
8. Particle Data Group. Particle Physics Booklet. 1998. C. Caso et al. (Particle Data Group), European Physics Journal C3, 1. 1998 and 1999 partial update for edition 2000. <http://pdg.lbl.gov/>.