

## The Standard Model's concept of the particle

The Standard Model's particle concept is a very poor concept.

Permanent particles **MUST** be distinguished from momentary resonances.

The proton, for example, will probably be a permanent particle for the next hundred billion years or so thus showing us that it is indeed a scalar standing wave particle, the same as *Dr. Milo Wolff* proved the electron to be.

Standing waves are waves that are not absorbed.

Permanent particles are ALL standing wave resonances.

Momentary resonances are NOT. Unlike standing waves, they get absorbed. They merely clutter up the bookkeeping landscape and should not even be in the same classification as permanent particles.

Permanent particles are NOT absorbed because of both their resonant makeup and the resonant makeup of their immediate and distant surroundings

Even the neutron - as long as it's inside the atom - can be considered a permanent particle therein because it is a standing wave resonance therein. Once it comes out of the atom then it is no longer a standing wave in regard to its new surroundings and is absorbed (in about fifteen minutes or less)

Thus permanent particles TELL us about their surroundings.

We are not satisfactorily using this information now but in the future we most certainly will.

In a previous message I stated this: . . . outside the proton, "*the quark to distant quark binding energy (gravity & inertial mass) is the square of the quark to electron binding energy (that hold the electrons in their respective orbitals).*"

This IS correct

BUT

I should have made it more concise such as this: . . . outside the proton, "*the quark to distant quark **quantum units of binding energy** (gravity & inertial mass) is the square of the quark to electron **quantum units of binding energy** (that hold the electrons in their respective orbitals).*"

This has absolutely nothing to do with the scalar standing wave frequency of the quark being the square of the scalar standing wave frequency of the electron, which I've found to be the case.

The SCALAR standing wave frequency has NOTHING to do with mass or energy. It only builds the particle itself within its same frequency surroundings. Also it determines TIME for that particle within

those surroundings.

VECTOR bindings via spin, orbit/orbital, spin precession and orbital precessional frequencies between two impedance matching entities is what determines space, force, mass and inertial qualities.

A multitude of these VECTOR bindings at one spin frequency, for instance, can and do make up a SCALAR standing wave resonance at a lower frequency.

And a spin (even perhaps an orbit/orbital) of a SCALAR standing wave resonance, binding with another impedance matched resonance via Ampere's Laws can and will produce space, force, mass and inertial qualities at an even lower frequency, which will make this another entirely different dimension with an entirely different spacetime interval.

And this goes on and on perhaps to infinity.

So we can visualize an infinite frequency spectrum universe of universes.

In the abovementioned "*the quark to distant quark quantum units of binding energy (gravity & inertial mass) is the square of the quark to electron quantum units of binding energy (that hold the electrons in their respective orbitals).*" This does NOT mean  $h$  (Planck's constant) plays a role in the smallest quantum of energy/momentum for the quark.

It only indicates that the frequency of the electron spin is some lower harmonic of that particular quark spin in the proton that the **electron, orbiting around** it, is mirroring via Ampere's Laws.

Please forgive me for bringing motion into the above "**electron orbiting around**". I agree with the quantum theorists. It's all resonances. Motion is not there. But to visualize this scenario as pure waves not only is a complete waste of time but purely irrational unless we are all mathematical physicists discussing the relevant wave/resonance math. You cannot mix wavlets and wave math with a particle and motion concept. They don't mix. But sometimes the particle-motion concept, in the microcosm, is viable as Niels Bohr and others have proven.

A study of the University of Alabama, in this article casts doubt about  $h$  playing any role whatsoever in the quark's smallest quantum of momentum that causes gravity and inertia. What this university's personnel did not realize is that the gravitational quantum IS there but its time-period is only the square root of  $h$  and it is this reason the picture stayed sharp.

To see why, simply click this link <http://www.rbduncan.com/page4.html> and scroll half way down.

Just as a multitude of individual vector energy/momentum quanta produce the scalar distribution of light in TIME so also do a multitude of individual vector energy/momentum quanta produce the scalar entity of a particle in SPACE, such as the electron now has been shown to be.

DPFJr

*Over 4 Decades of Daniel P. Fitzpatrick's Books, Papers and Thoughts*

Over 4 Decades of Fitzpatrick's Books, Papers & Thoughts <http://www.amperefitz.com/4.decades.htm>